Comment Author	Lindler, Danielle
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_211-1	Master Response AQU-1A Sediment Amounts and Effects on Fish. The 20 million cubic yard estimate is from previous studies conducted by Gathard Engineering Consulting (2006) and Stillwater Sciences (2008) with more limited data. The 13.15 million cubic yard estimate is from one of the Secretarial Determination studies conducted by Reclamation (2010) and is considered more accurate.	No
GP_MC_1020_211-2	As described in Section 3.10.3, the predicted changes in climate change contemplate conditions over the next century (end of 21st Century). The analysis was intended to show a conservative (worst-case) description of climate change-related impacts that could occur in the future. While thinning the forests or other techniques could possibly reduce the impacts of climate change, implementing such actions over nine million acres is infeasible for several reason including: such actions are likely to cause adverse environmental effects, require additional regulatory approvals, be cost prohibitive, and fail to meet the current National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) purpose and need or most of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) objectives. As a result, the Lead Agencies did not analyze the effects of thinning nine million acres of national forest land.	No
GP_MC_1020_211-3	Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants.	No
GP_MC_1020_211-4	The CA North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board issues permits with conditions and requirements that support and prevent harm of beneficial uses. The forestry related permit programs are designed such that forestry related operations are conducted in a manner that prevents or minimizes the discharge of sediment. The discharge of sediment from the dams will have to undergo a permitting process and evaluation just as any other discharge does. Any permit issued will require conditions to ensure the protection of beneficial uses. In the case of restoration projects, where a long-term threat to beneficial use would be eliminated, the Regional Water Board has some discretion. For example, the Regional Water Board can apply conditions such as a compliance schedule that balances the potential impact of the immediate restoration action against the long-term benefits to water quality. If the final preferred alternative of the Klamath Facilities Removal EIS / EIR is that the dams should be removed because they represent a long-term impact to water quality and beneficial uses	No

Comment Author	Lindler, Danielle
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	(e.g., fish populations) then the Regional Water Board will need to balance the potential immediate impacts of dam removal (e.g., sediment discharge) against the potential long-term water quality benefits.	
GP_MC_1020_211-5	Specific information about the haul routes needed for construction and deconstruction activities as well as potential right-of-way requirements would be provided in the Definite Plan for Facilities Removal. There would be subsequent environmental analysis on this plan to analyze traffic and transportation impacts from dam removal and related construction activities. The Detailed Plan for Dam Removal assumes that existing roads on project lands would be improved as necessary for use during construction. As part of the development of the construction plan, an in depth analysis of bridge and road capacity and state of repair would be conducted by the dam removal entity (DRE), with remedial actions taken prior to the commencement of facility deconstruction. Following completion of dam deconstruction additional analysis of road condition would be completed and where needed, as a result of wear generated by deconstruction repairs and or replacement actions would be completed. In total, there would be approximately 11.6 miles of new temporary unimproved (i.e. graded, no gravel) roadways established to facilitate revegetation efforts (Appendix D of the Detailed Plan for Dam Removal describes these roads). There would be 7 miles at Copco 1, 2.6 miles at Iron Gate, 2 miles at J.C. Boyle, and zero miles at Copco 2.	No

GP_EM_1117_740

From: Paul A. Lindstedt[SMTP:PLINDSTEDT@SISQTEL.NET]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 12:06:18 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

It makes absolutely no sense to take out hydro-electric producing dams in order to satisfy the environmental loons. Most of the information on the Klamath and Scott Rivers as it relates to Salmon is distorted, so cut the crap and stop the nonsense and leave the dams in place.

Paul A. Lindstedt
Fort Jones, CA

Comment Author	Lindstedt, Paul
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_740-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_119

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MR. DENNIS LINTHICUM: My name is Dennis Linthicum, L-i-n-t-h-i-c-u-m.

I would like to thank you for allowing time to

speak tonight. And as you know, in the long run the world

is governed by ideas. Therefor when ideas are spread to

and adopted by a significant number of people, cultural

change happens. Unfortunately this can be either good or

bad.

Comment 1 - NEPA

For the 40 years since the creation of the National

Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, there has been a mistaken

effort to extol the chaotic world of the natural realm as

being more valid and appropriate than the systematic and

intelligent manipulation of natural resources for man's

distinct benefit.

In your EIR and EIS document the five reams of

paper basic report, many indices, many tables and many

facts. And they are presented nicely, but what is missing

is the a priori ideas that are guiding this document's

creation. This is a veiled attempt at a false paradigm.

You can see it at the very beginning of this

document. There is a blue call-out text box on page 1-4

that starts with this sentence. When the settlers of European decent first arrived in the Basin, and it finishes with this phrase: Land use patterns in the Klamath Basin will continue to reflect the value of natural resources in providing economic gain for local communities and the nation. Returning to the conditions seen in the 1800s is unrealistic. However, there are opportunities, dot, dot, dot and it continues on.

Now, where did that sentence come from, returning to the 1800s? Did that blossom from the scientific analysis? What generated that idea in the hydrology of the Basin? This is a sentence from left field, or more appropriately it is a glimpse of a faulty world view, a world view that imagines the chaos of the natural realm is more productive and beneficial than the controlled management of natural resources.

Remember, I mentioned the world is governed by ideas, and you cannot see ideas floating in the air like pollen. These ideas are only influential in so far as they are adopted and put forward by people.

Dennis, your job as coordinator and hearing officer is to make sure that the large volume of people that are in this room who are against the dam removal get their voices heard. Thank you.

Comment Author	Linthicum, Dennis
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_119-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_WI_1117_758

From: mlinvill@yahoo.com[SMTP:MLINVILL@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 7:25:29 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath river dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Mike Linvill
Organization:

Subject: Klamath river dam removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: The excessive building of dams has severely harmed California's natural heritage by destroying aquatic life and their habitat. The Klamath River has been especially adversely affected, and we must take ameliorative action now. Accordingly, all dams must be removed from the Klamath River and its tributaries as soon as practicable. In addition, all naturally-occurring wetlands in the upper Klamath must be restored (including Lower Klamath Lake, Tule Lake and Upper Klamath Lake).

Comment ↑ - KBRA

In addition, all restoration activities must be implemented so that they also improve conditions for salmon on the Scott and Shasta Rivers. Salmon populations have been seriously depleted, which has wrought devastating damage on local fisheries.

Also, minimum flow of 1,300 cubic feet per second at the Iron Gate gauge must be enforced for the dry season.

Comment 3 - Fish

Finally, the Secretary of Interior should ensure that more water from the Trinity River stay within the watershed so that increased water flows in the dry season assist salmon migration in the Lower Klamath River.

Only through the implantation of these minimum requirements can the Klamath hope to recover its natural grandeur and economic importance. Thank you.

Comment 4 - Out of Scope

Comment Author	Linvill, Mike
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1117_758-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_1117_758-2	Restoration programs under the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) apply to the Scott and Shasta Rivers as well as the mainstem of the Klamath River. Please see Klamathrestoration.gov for a copy of the KBRA. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzes the potential effects of these restoration activities programmatically.	No
GP_WI_1117_758-3	Master Response AQU-11A NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management. The Biological Opinion (BO) does not require a minimum flow of 1,300 cfs downstream of Iron Gate Dam during all months and hydrological conditions. Master Response AQU-11B through J NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management. The comment as presented provides no evidence that minimum flow of 1,300 cfs is necessary for protection of fishery resources in dry years.	No
GP_WI_1117_758-4	Master Response GEN-27 Interplay between Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) and KBRA. Conversely, improvements to fish habitat conditions, associated fish populations, and improved knowledge of biological conditions in the in the Trinity system will be of overall benefit to Klamath fish populations. The parties to the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) and the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) are committed to transparency, adaptive management, real-time reporting, and the production of annual (and in the case KBRA, decadal) reports which will facilitate the sharing of information and coordination between the two programs. The TRRP partners have for years made their data and restoration efforts available to the public via the TRRP website and other means. The goals of the TRRP and the KBRA are closely aligned in program plans and intended benefits to fisheries throughout the basin; water and power users in the Upper Basin; counties; Indian tribes; and basin communities. Both programs include extensive habitat restoration, and improvements to water flow and quality.	No

Comment Author	Linvill, Mike
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	The interconnectedness of the two programs in their implementation evidence a commitment to continued support in the common restoration effort of the Klamath River. From a biological perspective, the TRRP and KBRA are closely aligned and the two programs will complement one another.	

GP_WI_1118_764

From: dlipman@mcn.org[SMTP:DLIPMAN@MCN.ORG]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 10:12:09 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Urge dam removal on Klamath River Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Donald Lipmanson
Organization:

Subject: Urge dam removal on Klamath River

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: As a northern CA resident, former Mendocino County planning commissioner (2000-2006) and long-time advocate for restoration of salmonids and their fishery in this region, I write in support of the rapid removal of all dams on the Klamath River and its tributaries. Restoration of historic wetlands and marshes in the upper Klamath basin would enhance that restoration, as wetlands and riparian zones near the river filter out pollutants and provide breeding areas for the insects on which juvenile salmonids feed.

Comment 2 - Hydrology

Besides elimination of dams, salmonid restoration also will require adequate minimum water flows in the Klamath and its tributaries, especially during dry season. Since NMFS is requiring such minimum flows to attain ESA compliance, DOI Secretary Salazar should "bite the bullet" and set adequate minimum flows for the Klamath River basin and its tributaries.

Comment Author	Lipmanson, Donald
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1118_764-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_1118_764-2	Master Response AQU-11 NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management.	No

GP_MC_1018_154

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. LINDA LONG: I'm Linda Long, L-o-n-g.

Comment 1 - Disapproval of Dam Removal

In the spring of 2009, Representative Garrard, Representative Gillman, and Senator Whitsett commissioned an independent telephone poll to determine the level of support for the removal of four hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River.

Those three legislators, who represent the entire Klamath River watershed in Oregon, privately paid the costs of a professional poll performed by Target Market Strategies, located in Portland, Oregon.

Target Market Strategies wrote the questions and randomly selected 300 individuals registered to vote in Klamath County to participate in the poll.

The poll achieved a statistical confidence of 95 percent. That level of statistical confidence means that if the poll were repeated 100 times, the same result would occur 95 times out of a hundred times.

The poll determined that 65 percent of Klamath County residents opposed the destruction of the hydroelectric dams at that time.

There was no statistical difference in the

response among those polled in Chiloquin, Klamath Falls, Merrill, Malin, or Bonanza. They uniformly opposed dam removal by a two-to-one margin. There was no statistical difference between the age groups or the sex of the respondents or among political party affiliations. Across the board, two out of three Klamath County residents opposed the demolition of the hydropower dams.

Supporters of dams, of dam destruction, have attempted to minimize this poll. Some of the same folks hired -- some of the same folks have hired high-powered public relations firms to sway public opinion toward accepting the destruction of the hydroelectric infrastructure.

County, state, and tribal governments, as well as media outlets, have both adequate funding and opportunity to develop their own public opinion polls. The professional 2009 public opinion poll cost less than $5,000. Yet, in more than two years, no one has published a poll that even attempts to contradict that two-thirds level of public opposition to dam removal. The only logical conclusions are that the 2009 legislative poll was not only accurate, but that the two-thirds level of opposition to the destruction of our hydroelectric infrastructure remains viable and vocal.

The destruction of the Klamath River

hydroelectric project is wrong and I strongly oppose that

action.

I would also like to comment on Jim

Carpenter's, um, thought that -- being a Hatfield Upper

Klamath Basin, Oregon, group member, I did not agree with

Jim Carpenter's appraisal of the KBRA or the dam removal.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Long, Linda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_154-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_523

From: LLOPER@GMAIL.COM[SMTP:LLOPER@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 3:11:05 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: remove lower 4 dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Laura J Loper
Organization:

Subject: remove lower 4 dams

Body: The salmon ought to have triage priority over the human businessmen. The human's are supposed to be smart enough to figure out how to take care of themselves AND protect the natural resources. The salmon are supposed to be salmon: beautiful inspiring smooth creatures driven by biological urges to come upstream and spawn.

Comment 1 - General/Other

Comment Author	Loper, Laura
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_523-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

Klamath Settlement EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) MICHAEL LUFI

Representing CDRO

Notes: I AM AGAINST THE KBRA AND DAM REMOVEL

34

*Please read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

GP_MF_1019_089

Comment Author	Luft, Michael
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_089-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_141

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter

MR. MICHAEL LUFT: My name is Michael Luft, L-u-f-t.

I have got a pretty good background all my

life in natural resources, in commercial fishing, in

logging, working in timber and I grew up on a cattle

ranch.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I am definitely against taking the dams out.

Comment 2 - KHSA

I'm definitely against this whole agreement.

It was done behind closed doors. Our local

politicians made a fait accompli. We have a local

election here where the ballot was so confusing that

many of the elderly voted in favor of it when they

were actually opposed.

Comment 3 - Water Quality

It does nothing to address something and

that's the water quality in Klamath River. You have

a natural phosphorus building hot water heater up

here called Klamath Lake.

Comment 4 - Fish

Now, some very intelligent biologist called

for the releasing of all that water which could have

gone to the farmers down to benefit the salmon.

Salmon, the minute you get it fresh in the water move

into the rivers and try to go to their spawning

grounds.

Comment 5 - Algae

Hot water breeds parasites. We had a disaster that should have been known would have happened. This is the kind of science I've seen goes through with this.

Comment 6 - Hydropower

You want to take out four dams with green power and replace it with what? Nothing. You don't sit here with any proposal to replace that power. And then you expect us as citizens to pay for it. And, whoa, wait a minute, all this money on these studies could have paid for this but you want us to pay for it. And on top of it you want us to pay for land for the tribes -- and I have no problem with the tribes getting land. But I think they need to negotiate with the federal government. I wasn't part of their losing their reservation and all the problems that they have. So the way this thing is, it's a mess.

Comment 7 - KBRA

Now, you take salmon, that is something I know something about. The Secretary says this is going to create all kinds of salmon fishing jobs, commercial fishing jobs. That little dab of fish in the Klamath River really doesn't mean anything. We have a coast-wide disaster in three states and

Comment 8 - Economics

probably a little bit in British Columbia and above.

And this is not even addressing a tiny bit of it.

So I'm going to end with this. Pretty much

the other points that I had have all been said.

Comment 9 - Alternatives

I am opposed, my wife is opposed, everybody I

know is opposed to this removal.

And if you guys want some good ideas of

things to do, there has been some suggestions in this

meeting, one of them was dredging Klamath Lake.

THE FACILITATOR: Mr. Luft, your time is up.

MR. MICHAEL LUFT: Okay, I'm going.

Comment Author	Luft, Michael
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_141-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1018_141-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA. Master Response GEN-13 Range of Alternatives Considered.	No
GP_MC_1018_141-3	Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements.	No
GP_MC_1018_141-4	Conflicts over the use of water in the Klamath Basin have gone on for years. In broad terms, the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) speaks to removal of hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River; the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) speaks to the settlement of long-running disputes concerning the use of Klamath Basin water for irrigation, fish and wildlife. Combined, both agreements seek to advance the restoration of salmonids in the Klamath Basin while providing more predictable water supplies for agricultural uses. Flows for agricultural supply are analyzed in Section 3.8, Water Supply/ Water Rights. The Secretary of the Interior may select the No Action/No Project Alternative, which is responsive to this comment or one of the action alternatives. Alternatives 2 and 3 include implementation of the KBRA; Alternatives 1 (No Action/No Project Alternative), 4, and 5 do not include implementation of the KBRA. As described in Section 3.8.4.3 Effects Determinations, Alternative 2 (the Proposed Action) and Alternative 3 increase the flows of water for agriculture through implementation of the KBRA.	No
GP_MC_1018_141-5	We assume that the comment refers to the 2002 adult fish kill on the lower Klamath River. The 2002 fish kill in the lower Klamath is noted in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Section 3.3.3.3, Diseases and Parasites. Additional text has been added to Final EIS/EIR Section 3.3.3.3.9 Disease and Parasites. In the last week of August and first week of September, 2002, an estimated 33,000 adult salmon and steelhead died in the lower 40 miles of the Klamath River. The fish kill of 2002 in the lower Klamath is unprecedented in magnitude.	Yes

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Based on a review of available literature and historical records, this is the largest known pre-spawning adult salmonid die-off recorded on the Klamath River and possibly the Pacific Coast (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] 2003). The immediate cause of death was massive infection by two common pathogens, *Ichthyophthirius multifis* (Ich) and *Flavobacterium columnare* (columnaris) that are widely distributed and generally become lethal to fish under stress, particularly if crowding occurs (National Research Council [NRC] 2004, p. 9). Ich and columnaris occur episodically and under different circumstances than the myxozoan parasites *Ceratomyxa shasta* (*C. shasta*) and *Parvicapsula minibicornis* (*P. minibicornis*) that chronically affect salmonids in the Klamath River. The effects of Ich and columnaris are generally not as harmful as the myxozoan parasites (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.3.3, p. 3.3-36), although the 2002 fish kill in the lower Klamath provided dramatic evidence of the ability of Ich and columnaris to cause significant salmon mortality. Subsequent reviews of the 2002 fish kill by California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) (2004), NRC (2003) and USFWS (2003) determined several factors contributed to the epizootic of Ich and columnaris. An above average number Chinook salmon entered the Klamath River during this period. Klamath River flows in September 2002 were among the lowest recorded in the last half-century (CDFG 2004, p. 36). Low flow can cause crowding of the fish in their holding areas as they await favorable conditions for upstream migration and can be associated with high water temperature and with lower than normal concentrations of dissolved oxygen (NRC 2003, p. 279). Low river discharges apparently did not provide suitable attraction flows for migrating adult salmon resulting in large number of fish congregating in the warm water of the lower Klamath River (USFWS, 2003). Fish passage may have been impeded by low flows, contributing to the crowding of fish (CDFG 2004, p. III). The NRC did not rule out low flows as a contributing factor but hypothesized high water temperatures may have also inhibited the fish from moving upstream (NRC 2003, p. 281-3). Whether inhibited by low flows or high temperatures or both, fish in the lower Klamath stopped migrating upstream resulting in crowded, stressful conditions and possibly longer residence times in a confined reach of the river. The low flows and river volumes combined with the above average run of salmon, resulted in high fish densities in a relatively short segment of the river that had warm temperatures typical of late summer. The high densities of stressed fish in warm water facilitated the epizootic of the Ich and columnaris pathogens	

Comment Author	Luft, Michael
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	causing the deaths of over 33,000 adult salmon and steelhead (CDFG, 2004; USFWS 2003). As noted in the CDFG review, algal toxins were ruled out as a cause of mortality. Projected KBRA flows for the river are consistent with recommendations by California Department of Fish and Game to avoid flows and conditions that occurred when the 2002 adult fish die-off took place (Section 17.4 (p. 5), KBRA Operations, Reclamation 2012d). In the lower Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam, over the long term, dam removal and KBRA flows would alter the hydrograph so that the duration, timing, and magnitude of flows would be more similar to the unregulated conditions under which the native fish community evolved (Hetrick et al. 2009; Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-91). If the comment refers to juvenile salmon disease please refer to Master Responses AQU-28 and AQU-27.	
GP_MC_1018_141-6	Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_MC_1018_141-7	The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the KHSA and KBRA.	No
GP_MC_1018_141-8	The Draft EIS/EIR addresses the specific effects of four action alternatives pertaining to Klamath Dam removal and the KBRA relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Consistent with this intent, the scope of the fisheries analysis is limited to Klamath Basin fish populations.	No
GP_MC_1018_141-9	Master Response ALT-7 Elimination of KBRA without KHSA Including Alternatives 16 - Dredge Upper Klamath Lake and Alternative 18 - Partition of Upper Klamath Lake from Detailed Study.	No

GP_WI_1104_360

From: watermaniac1@gmail.com[SMTP:WATERMANIAC1@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 5:36:49 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Trevor Lynn
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Body: I fully support alternative 2, the full removal of all dams.

Comment Author	Lynn, Trevor
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 04, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1104_360-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1128_942

10/15/11

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

PROTESTING THE REMOVAL OF FOUR KLAMATH RIVER DAMS

I spent 28 years with Pacific Gas and Electric in Power Control. I was involved in power system planning and operations including power generation. For the last 13 years I have owned a ranch in Siskiyou County. From my experience in the power business and as a rancher I protest the removal of the four Klamath River Dams.

To begin with, hydroelectric power is the cleanest, cheapest, and the most dependable power generation. The generation units and the infrastructure are already in place and operational. The fish can survive and navigate around hydroelectric generation. For these reasons and the many other reasons listed below, the Klamath River Dam Removal Project should be terminated.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

The four Klamath River Hydro Generation Dams are the power supply (170 mega watts) for Siskiyou County and a portion of Southern Oregon. They also deliver 70 mega watts south to PG&E. This is clean, cheap and dependable power and would have to be replaced by another 170 mega watt generation plant which would have to be coal, natural gas, nuclear, or oil. Wind and solar are not dependable power. The point is, the rate payer will pay for the cost of dam removal ($1.9 billion), the cost of building the replacement power generation plant and the increased energy cost difference between hydroelectric and the new replacement generation. PacificCorp was pressured into giving up the hydrogenation and it was not their first choice.

Comment 3 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

BELOW ARE PROTEST POINTS AGAINST DAM REMOVAL

- Agriculture is the leading economic base for Siskiyou County and dam removal will result in forcing several hundred farms and ranches out of business further reducing US food production. Everyone in the United States is penalized for this action.
- Klamath River is the water supply to the City of Yreka.
- The annual loss of up to $1,000,000 for county tax revenue from PacificCorp Dams.
- The Siskiyou County lumber industry was destroyed by the spotted owl study which was based on unproven science that is similar to the Klamath River Dam Removal Project. There were 18 lumber mills and 6000 jobs lost. Because of this we are still dependant on timber harvest subsides for schools and roads. Taking out the dams would completely destroy our economy.
- The lack of water storage already exists in the western states and dam removal increases that condition.
- The loss of water supply for fire fighting protection.
- The loss of flood protection down stream.
- The loss of sustained river flow regulation.

Comment 3 cont.

- During drought years the loss of the dams would be detrimental to the fish habitat.
- Dams prevent erosion, the reduction of water temperature, and provide a water cleaning process.
- The loss of property value of the many homes all the way to the coast that would be in and out of the changing water line.
- The annual flood damage for years to come.
- The loss of recreation in and along the river.
- The tunnel by pass alternative to the dam removal which will enhance and expand the salmonids habitat has been ignored by the dept of interior.

In the November 2010 election, 79 percent of the Siskiyou County residents voted no to dam removal on an advisory measure. The fact is, the people are being forced by our own government to have the dams removed. The fish are being used as a tool in the process. If the alternative tunnel by pass was utilized, the fish, the people of Siskiyou County, the Indians, agriculture, lumber industry, miners, and PacificCorp can all benefit from the Klamath River with the dams left undisturbed. Therefore, the dam removal project is wrong for all the above reasons and should be terminated.....

Don Mackintosh
5322 Hoy Road
Weed, ca, 96094
(530)859-1941

Comment Author	Mackintosh, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1128_942-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response ALT-4 Elimination of Alternative 8 - Dam Removal Without KBRA from Detailed Study. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power.	No
GP_LT_1128_942-2	Master Responses GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increase. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power. Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No
GP_LT_1128_942-3	The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates effects to water supply (Section 3.8, Water Supply Water Rights), regional and agricultural economics (Section 3.15, Socioeconomics), property tax revenues (Section 3.15), public health and safety (including firefighting protection) (Section 3.18, Public Health & Safety), flood protection (Section 3.6 Flood Hydrology), erosion (Section 3.11, Geology Soils and Geology) and habitat (Sections 3.2, Water Quality, Section 3.3, Aquatics, and Section 3.5, Terrestrial Resources). None of the alternatives, including the No Action/No Project Alternative, would impact food prices. There are thousands of farmers and ranchers nationwide producing products that are also grown/raised in the Klamath Basin. Farmers and ranchers in the Klamath Basin supply a very small portion of commodities to the total market, which includes the rest of the United States and world markets. Therefore, Klamath farmers and ranchers accept the market price of commodities and have no influence on market prices. The cumulative analysis in Chapter 4 considers effects other projects and programs in conjunction with the Proposed Action and the Proposed Action's contributions to such effects. The cumulative economics analysis considers recent trends because of the economic recession and also decreased timber industry. The EIS/EIR considers Alternative 11 (Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing) in Appendix A, the Final Alternatives Report. the Lead Agencies received independent review of Alternative 11, which confirmed the Lead Agencies' conclusion that the fish bypass method is unlikely to be used by adult anadromous fish or outgoing smolts.	No

GP_MC_1020_218

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. DON MACKINTOSH: Don Mackintosh,

M-a-c-k-i-n-t-o-s-h, 5322 Hoy Road, Weed.

Let's see, I have spent 28 years with PG & E in

power control and what I did was, I was -- oh, let's see,

we are in -- I controlled the power grid and we did the

planning and the operations. And then I now have, the

last 13 years, owned a ranch. So the basic thing, I

changed my thing here because there was some false

statements made earlier.

So I have to qualify myself for making a

statement here. So basically we had, oh, a case with the

PUC. It was from 2005 to 2008. And we won. It was an

eminent domain. It was a case against a power system, you

know, routing of power line which was electrically wrong.

So we won.

During this time we did -- I paid for it --

$12,000 power flow test, study, for this area from

Northern California into Oregon. And we, so I know what

this power system does.

And so the wrong statements, false statements

in connection with this power company, I know for one

thing, PacifiCorp would not -- incidentally, you can

Google John and Judy Mackintosh versus PacifiCorp, and you

get a hundred filed documents on this case, okay. So what

I'm saying is the truth.

So the thing is that the power generations, it

can be kept going forever.

PacifiCorp would not want to give them up

without the pressure that the government put on them,

okay. And that's the pressure of realizing the thing. So

they had no choice to take it out.

You know, hydroelectric power is the most

cleanest, you know, it is clean, cheap and dependable.

You can schedule it for the next day and it's -- but,

basically, the thing is that, the thing, these four dams

supply 170 megawatts for this whole area. It supplies

power to this whole county, southern part of Oregon; and

then it sells power to PG & E down, 70 megawatts down to Redding.

THE FACILITATOR: Mr. Mackintosh, your time is up.

Comment 1 - Opposes Dam Removal

MR. DON MACKINTOSH: The dams should not be

pulled out.

Comment Author	Mackintosh, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_218-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_838

From: Matt_Baun@fws.gov[SMTP:MATT_BAUN@FWS.GOV]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 10:22:09 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fw: Web Inquiry: Klamath dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

bmadgic@charter.net

11/19/2011 07:37 AM

To matt_baun@fws.gov

cc

Subject Web Inquiry: Klamath dam removal

Subject: Klamath dam removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: The four dams should be, must be, removed. They have been highly damaging to the river and its salmon and steelhead, The value of these fish is greater than the value given to those artificially created. Take the dams down!
Bob Madgic, author, A Guide to California's Freshwater Fishes.
From: bmadgic@charter.net
Phone: 530-365-5852

Comment Author	Madgic, Bob
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_838-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1114_699

BUREAU OF RECLAMATON
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
NOV 16 '11

11/8/11

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation,
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Classification ENV-6.00
Project
Control No 11085082
Folder I.D. 110948-1
Date Input & Initials 11/14/2011 IW

Dear Ms. Vasquez:

Comment 1 - Costs

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS/EIR. As a resident of Siskiyou County, I am appalled at the amount of money that has been and will be spent on the KHSA and the KBRA and that the draft recommends the removal of four hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River. The expenditures for this ill conceived project are absolutely irresponsible at a time of state and federal economic crisis. The cost of dam removal and implementation after removal is largely believed to be in excess of $3 billion. Because of the unknowns, how can anyone even come close to estimating what the cost will be? This project could create such a disaster that there will be no end to the amount of money it will take to deal with the damage it could cause.

Where is the common sense in this issue? How can destroying one of the cleanest most economical sources of renewable power, at a time when there is such a push for green energy, possibly be justified? What will the hydroelectric power be replaced with? Nothing is as economical or efficient as what we already have, including coal, windmills, or natural gas. How can this study be complete or any estimates made if it is not known exactly what the power replacement will be?

Comment 2 - Hydropower

The residents of Siskiyou County voted 79% against dam removal in an Advisory Measure on the 2010 November ballot. The loss of the dams will put the final nail in the coffin of the already struggling economy of this county. Because of the spotted owl debacle we lost the majority of our timber industry with the closure of 18 mills and the elimination of nearly 6,000 jobs. We are now dependent on timber harvest subsidies to maintain our schools and roads and are also now in jeopardy of the Rural School Act not being renewed. The dams bring in 300,000 to 1 million dollars a year in tax revenue to our county. Not only will the residents be facing taxes and rate hikes for the cost of dam removal but higher costs for electrical generation replacement (we are already paying an increased rate for our power even though the dam removal has not yet been approved). We are also facing the destruction of our agricultural industry. Losing the dams will have the effect of putting over several hundred farms and ranches out of permanent food production and destroy over one third of the economic base of the County. Shasta Valley agricultural operations amount to about 56% of the total economic output for Siskiyou County. Because there is an increasing need for water, food production and food independence throughout the nation and the world, isn't the loss of green hydropower, water storage and irrigation of serious concern to us all?

Comment 3 - Economics

Comment 4 - Fish

Will the removal of the dams truly enhance the salmonids habitat? Since there is no proof that it will, is it not an unknown? The federal government's own "expert panel" of six has expressed concerns that the science is not in place to support a conclusion that removal of the hydroelectric facilities would result in the restoration of the species at issue. The same panel

SCANNED

said this entire process amounts to a huge "experiment." Why was the tunnel bypass alternative to the proposed dam removal (which would enhance and expand the salmonids habitat) totally ignored in the study? And because the salmon spend 83% of their lives in the ocean, why was the Klamath River studied and not the ocean in the proximity of the mouth of the Klamath River? Could not the loss of Irongate Fish Hatchery, the loss of sustained minimum river flows and the release of a massive amount of sediment allowed to freely flow to the Pacific Ocean, cause the salmon to disappear from the River for 100 years or more? And what will happen in drought years when there is not enough water in the Klamath to support the salmon? Will the farmers and ranchers who use water for irrigation from Upper Klamath Lake and from creeks and streams that feed into the Klamath River, then be cut off from their water supply? That is what happened in the Klamath Basin in 2001. Because of the sucker fish, 1200 people were forced out of business. How will this be prevented from happening again? The Department of Fish and Game is already planning to do water flow studies on the Scott and Shasta Rivers. Why? If there is not enough water in those rivers for the salmon, what then?

Comment 5 - Cultural Resources

How can this study be complete without thoroughly researching the Indian ancestral rights to the territory encompassing the Klamath River? How do you justify compensating some of the Klamath River Basin Tribes but completely excluding the Shasta Nation? Fifty percent of the Klamath River is in the ancestral territory of the Shasta Nation and all four dams are in that same territory. The Shasta Nation's ancestral territory has been usurped, and the question is, by your actions, will you not become a part of the illegal claim taking?

The purpose of our government is to serve the people and as government agencies it is not the function of the Department of Fish and Game and the Department of the Interior to aide the United Nations in making this area of California and Oregon off limits to human use. Agenda 21 has not been rarified by the U.S. Government and is against the United States Constitution. Yet this project seems to play directly into the goal of Agenda 21. The dam removal will destroy our economy and force the people off the land. Are you as government agencies willing to illegally aide the U.N. under the guise of saving the salmon?

Comment 6 - Other/General

Comment 7 - NEPA

Because the Draft EIS/EIR is based on unproven science and not on facts, I urge you to do a more comprehensive study, coordinate with the people who will truly be affected by your decisions and give those same people more time to do an in-depth study of this complex and deceptive document. Fish and wildlife are important to all of us, but not to the point of disallowing human habitation! I urge you to change your recommendations to a more realistic goal for restoration of natural fish production that does not destroy clean renewable power, flood control, water storage, sustained river flows, farming, ranching and the economy of Siskiyou County.

Comment 8 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Respectfully,

Judy Mackintosh
5322 Hoy Road
Weed, CA 96094

Comment Author	Mackintosh, Judy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1114_699-1	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No
GP_LT_1114_699-2	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_LT_1114_699-3	Estimated changes to agricultural employment relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative are discussed in Section 3.15. Over the period of analysis, employment in the agricultural sector is anticipated to be an important part of the regional economy The tribal effects described in Section 3.15 (Socioeconomics) are narrowly focused on fishing and related practices. Sections 3.12 (Tribal Trust) and 3.13 (Cultural and Historic Resources) provide more comprehensive consideration of tribal effects as they relate to aquatic resources (not just fish), tribal trust obligations, and effects of the No Action and Action alternatives on the rivers cape, cultural resources, and cultural and social practices. Section 3.16 (Environmental Justice) addresses the issue of disproportionate effects. The KBRA would establish water diversion limitations that would be more reliable in the long-term and simultaneously develop programs to address decreased diversions. The KBRA would include the Water Use Retirement Program (WURP), a voluntary program for the purpose of supporting fish populations restoration by permanently increasing inflow to Upper Klamath Lake by 30,000 acre-feet per year. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes impacts from the WURP on p. 3.8-21 and 3.8-22, and concludes that "Implementation of the WURP is anticipated to have a less than significant impact to water rights because rights would be voluntarily retired. Implementation of the WURP is expected to have no effect to water supply because there would be no changes to diversions." Future hydrologic conditions, including agricultural water supply, are discussed in the technical report entitled “Hydrology, Hydraulics and Sediment Transport Studies for the Secretary’s Determination on Klamath River Dam Removal and Basin Restoration,” which can be found on www.klamathrestoration.gov. Section 3.15 discusses potential effects to electricity bills of PacifiCorp customers as a result of the Proposed Action and alternatives, specifically on p. 3.15-48 for the No Action/No Project Alternative, 3.15-63 for the Proposed Action, 3.15-81 for the Partial Facilities Removal Alternative, 3.15-84 to 3.15-85 for the Fish Passage at Four Dams Alternative, and 3.15-87 for Fish	No

Comment Author	Mackintosh, Judy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Iron Gate and Copco 1 Alternative. PacifiCorp considers many factors in setting customer rates which in turn are subject to Oregon Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and California PUC approval; therefore, it is difficult to assess the size of potential rate effects or even the extent to which rates might increase at all under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Utility rates under the dam removal alternatives are not expected to increase above the existing surcharges as a direct result of dam removal costs. For the fish passage alternatives, customer rates would likely increase above the existing surcharges as a direct result of construction, operations and maintenance costs for fish passage facilities. The degree to which the cost could be passed to the ratepayers is not known and would be subject to Oregon and California PUCs. The cost of dam removal is discussed on p. 3.15-53. The costs for full facility removal are estimated to be approximately $178.4 million in 2012 dollars. P. 3.15-64 discusses the effects of reduced PacifiCorp property tax payments to counties under the Proposed Action. California and Oregon law requires the states to pay the current assessed value on transferred lands. If the counties receives in-lieu payments of equal value to PacifiCorp property tax payment, there would be no net effect to county revenues under the Proposed Action relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative.	
GP_LT_1114_699-4	This Draft EIS/EIR has been developed in accordance with the requirements of NEPA and CEQA to analyze the potential impacts to the environment from the removal of the four PacifiCorp dams on the Klamath River as contemplated in the KHSA and from the implementation of the KBRA. Together, these two agreements attempt to resolve long-standing conflicts in the Klamath Basin. Some of the conflicts and issues these agreements attempt to resolve are enumerated on Draft EIS/EIR p. ES-1 and ES-8-9. The activities leading to the development of the KHSA and the KBRA are discussed on P. ES-7-13. Both the KHSA and KBRA were negotiated and signed by a diverse array of over 40 parties with an interest in resolving Klamath Basin issues. The goal of the KHSA is found on p. 3 or the agreement and the goals of the KBRA are found on p. 4 of that agreement. This comment includes concerns regarding effectiveness of the Proposed Action, alternatives for fish passage, ocean conditions, loss of hatchery production, sediment movement, water supply during dry years, and socio economic impacts to the area. The following response addresses each of these issues:	

Comment Author	Mackintosh, Judy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	• Proposed Action. Master Response AQU-5 Will Benefit All Salmonids. Master Response AQU-6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook. Master Response AQU-7 Expert Panel Likelihood of Success. Master Response AQU-13 Ocean Conditions. The Draft EIS/EIR does include an analysis the Pacific Ocean in the proximity of the mouth of the Klamath River (See Draft EIS/EIR, Section 3.3, Aquatic Resources). • Alternatives for fish passage. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes two alternatives in detail that include fishways (Alternatives 4 and 5). Engineered bypasses, as identified in this comment, are part of Alternatives 10 and 11 in Sections 4.2.10 and 4.2.11 of Appendix A and in Section 2.3, Table 2-2 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternatives 10 and 11 did not meet any elements of the purpose and need or project objectives; therefore, they were not carried forward for further analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) conducted a preliminary analysis of the Hart Bypass (also known as the Bogus Creek Bypass) proposal, and concluded it would not provide an effective alternative for passage of adult salmon and steelhead populations for the upper Klamath River (California Department of Fish and Game 2009). Alternatives 10 and 11 also had independent reviews that concluded that the bypass systems do not comport with known salmonid migratory behavior and do not include provisions for outmigrating juvenile salmonids (Mefford 2011 and White 2011). Mr. Mefford states that the tunnel alternative provides no ecological benefit for the river, and, to a degree, further degrades the ecology of the Klamath River within this reach by diverting water. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (2011) reviewed all Engineered Bypass proposals submitted. They concluded that the proposed conceptual by-pass alternatives all contain elements related to fish passage that are beyond the realm of known, successful application and that the proposals are not acceptable alternatives to dam removal, from fish passage perspectives.	

Comment Author	Mackintosh, Judy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Alternatives 10 and 11 would not provide a simple alternative for passage of salmon and steelhead populations past the lower four dams in the Klamath River. • Loss of Hatchery Production: Master Response AQU-18 Fate of Iron Gate Hatchery under Alternatives. • Sediment Movement. Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-20 Bedload Sediment and Fish Habitat. Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging. • Water Supply during dry years. Section 3.8.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR provides information regarding water supply and water allocation. The KBRA, which is a component of the Proposed Action, encompasses several programs that could affect water rights and water supply, including the Water Diversion Limitations Program (Program), the On-Project Plan and Drought Plan. The Program provides specific allocation of water for refuges and limitations on specific diversions for the Reclamation's Klamath Project intended to increase water availability for fisheries purposes. The program would be implemented during dry years to increase flows for fisheries by reducing Reclamation's Klamath Project diversion upstream of approximately 100,000 acre-feet. Water diversions could increase by 10,000 acre-feet for irrigation in some years if: 1) dam removal is implemented, 2) 10,000 acre-feet of new storage is created, or 3) Klamath Basin Coordinating Council concurs. Implementation of the diversion limitations would include assurances of increased reliability of diversions. The On-Project Plan provides the framework for management of Water Diversion Limitations implementation. While reducing diversions during the driest years would affect water supply for irrigation, it would not affect what is needed for public health and safety. Water may not be available to fulfill some water rights or adjudication claims during dry years; however the On-Project Plan, Drought Plan, and Future Storage Opportunities to be implemented as part of the KBRA would help to offset a portion of these deficiencies. These plans would provide mechanisms for irrigators to plan for water deliveries based on the type of water year. It is likely that health and safety issues related to water supply would be a priority whereas, water for irrigation would likely be less of a priority. The	

Comment Author	Mackintosh, Judy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	geographic separation between the Water Diversion Limitations and the hydroelectric facility removal actions analyzed above reduce the potential for negative water supply effects generated by this program from contributing to water supply effects generated by facility removal. Section 3.15 of the Draft EIS/EIR contains an analysis of the socioeconomic impacts of the Proposed Action and the alternatives. Section 3.15.4.2 (Effects Determinations) describes the economic effects for the Proposed Action and the alternatives. Although outside the scope of the EIS/EIR, a brief response to the commentor's mention of proposed flow studies in the Scott and Shasta River is provided below as part of the Lead Agencies good faith effort at full disclosure. The State of California has identified the Scott and Shasta Rivers as high priority watersheds for instream flow assessments. The California Department of Fish and Game is preparing to develop the study plans necessary to conduct Instream flow assessments for the purposes of: 1) identifying flows necessary for the conservation of coho salmon (a State and Federally listed species under the Endangered Species Act) and that would also benefit Chinook salmon and steelhead; 2) identifying gaps in available information; and, 3) identifying appropriate methodologies for flow assessments in these unique watersheds. This planning phase (Phase I) will be conducted through a multidisciplinary, transparent, and collaborative approach that involves local, state, federal, tribal and basin stakeholders from the on-set. No field work will occur in this phase. However, this planning effort will be followed by an implementation phase (Phase II) wherein on-the-ground assessment work following the approach identified in Phase I would occur. Funding for Phase II has not been identified.	
GP_LT_1114_699-5	Master Response CUL-1 Shasta Nation Participation. Master Response CUL-2 Federal Recognition.	No
GP_LT_1114_699-6	Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21.	No
GP_LT_1114_699-7	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
GP_LT_1114_699-8	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. The Draft EIS/EIR evaluates effects to water supply (Section 3.8, Water Supply Water Rights), regional and agricultural economics (Section 3.15, Socioeconomics), hydropower (Section 3.18, Public Health & Safety), flood protection (Section 3.6, Flood Hydrology),	No

Comment Author	Mackintosh, Judy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	and habitat (Section 3.2, Water Quality, Section 3.3, Aquatic Resources, and Section 3.5, Terrestrial Resources).	

GP_WI_1111_620

From: ldmahony@gmail.com[SMTP:LDMAHONY@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 11:41:52 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Lynne Mahony
Organization:

Subject: Dam removal

Body:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I support Alternative 2 - full removal of four dams.

Comment Author	Mahony, Lynn
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_620-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_170

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. BEVERLY MALLAMS: Hi, I'm Beverly Mallams,

M-a-l-l-a-m-s. I, too, would like to thank you for

coming. And I would especially like to thank you for

recording this.

I cannot tell you how many meetings we've been to

that we were told that you wanted to hear what we had to

say but you didn't want to record what we had to say.

That was rather disheartening to us that you did not feel

that we were -- the things that we had to say needed to be

recorded.

I have heard several comments tonight saying

various terms from different ones. They kept saying

status quo and they were using the word crisis.

To me these are just tactics to make people afraid.

They are afraid not to do something.

That's wrong. We shouldn't have to scare people

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

into doing the right thing. And the right thing is leave

our dams where they are.

Comment 2 - Economics

I was asked this evening what the KBRA Jobs signs

are. And I told them, I said walk in the building and

take a look around on the edges and you will see lots of

men and women with badges on and lots of them in here

working. That is KBRA Jobs. Those will be jobs that will

be created and kept.

I'm concerned about the precedence that this

settlement agreement would set. One would be relatively

small dams off the Klamath River systems. We would have

effects on the Upper Klamath Basin power rates. The

greater effect is the precedence that this will set.

What will happen if this settlement agreement

issued is to order the removal of the Columbia River or

the Snake River dams? Those are out there and they are

being discussed.

Environmental groups have long been successful at

taking very small steps towards a long-term goal. They are

very patient. With every small step there is little

concern. And then one day you turn around and you realize

they are now taking out the Columbia River Dam. It is not

a small crumbling Chiloquin Dam.

Please stop the environmental groups from marching

over the Klamath River system by taking small steps on the

way to much larger steps to a more detrimental end.

When our economy in Klamath Basin is in the

condition it is in, why would we want to remove four

perfectly good dams? And to quote Tom McClintock, it is
insane. Thank you.

Comment 3 - Hydropower

Comment 4 - Other/General

Comment 5 - Costs

Comment Author	Mallams, Beverly
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_170-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1018_170-2	Appendix P describes potential job effects of the KBRA. The KBRA includes 112 activities that would be implemented over a 15-year time period. Up to 44 of the activities are currently projected to extend for at least 14 years of the 15-year program. The activities vary in nature, including, but not limited to, restoration actions, monitoring programs, economic development programs, water agreements, power projects, and would create a range of job opportunities. Jobs would be full-time and part-time and include construction, operations, biology, engineering, technical, field work, administrative, government, and other professional jobs. Money generated by these activities will benefit other economic sectors and households as it circulates through the economy.	No
GP_MC_1018_170-3	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_MC_1018_170-4	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1018_170-5	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) Beverly S Williams

Representing

Notes: Dam removal is wrong & should not happen. I am against Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

the back side of this card

169

GP_MF_1019_099

Comment Author	Mallams, Beverly
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_099-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_168

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. KANTICA MALLAMS: Good evening, my name is

Kantica Mallams, M-a-l-l-a-m-s; My father is Tom Mallams.

First, I'd like to say that the cost of dam

Comment 1 - Hydropower

removal here to our community, our small, wonderful

community, is going to be astronomical, and since

ratepayers are going to be paying for this cost, this will

cause a large cost increase on electricity to ratepayers,

including homeowners and elderly and, in this community,

we have a lot of elderly people.

I am very concerned about how the ratepayers

and the taxpayers and the elderly are going to afford this

increase in the electricity costs.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

I have the privilege of working for a home

medical company so I come in contact with elderly people

on a daily basis. And my company is fairly large so it

has a financial assistance program which is absolutely

amazing, and it just -- it blesses these people in so many

ways, and with the increase of the electricity, there is

-- I've seen their budgets, they are on a tight budget,

they are very proud, they are very proud of those budgets

and being able to pay their bills in a timely manner, and

I just don't see that feasible with the increase of

electricity.

I just see them stressing more and maybe not

feeding themselves like they are supposed to, and I -- it

really concerns me that this wonderful community that we

all live in doesn't take into consideration the fact that

they are struggling already, so I'm very much against dam

removal.

Thank you.

Comment 3 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Mallams, Kantica
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_168-1	Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_MC_1018_168-2	The Klamath Basin is on the regional electrical grid. Removal of the dams will not affect electricity availability or significantly change electrical rates. P. 3.18-23 and 3.18-24 of the Draft EIS/EIR describe how the loss of hydropower from dam removal would be replaced. P. 3.15-63 of the Draft EIS/EIR describes the potential changes in energy rates for PacifiCorp customers with dam removal.	No
GP_MC_1018_168-3	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) Kantica Mallams

Representing Citizen

Notes:

I am against Dam Removal

approves of Dam Removal

...elines on the back side of this card

168

GP_MF_1019_103

Comment Author	Mallams, Kantica
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_103-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) Savannah Mallams

Representing Citizen

Notes: I am against Klamath Dam Removal!

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

*Please read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

57

GP_MF_1019_104

Comment Author	Mallams, Savannah
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_104-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_159

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. SAVANNAH MALLAMS: Savannah Mallams, M-a-l-l-a-m-s.

Prior to the man before me I also think that there needs to be more alternatives explored. Such alternatives may include fish waters, trucking fish as is conducted on the Columbia River. Dean Brockbank, vice-president and general counsel of PacifiCorp was quoted as saying the government made it very clear from a public policy point of view that they did not want these dams re-licensed. Once that became abundantly clear, we shifted our framework from re-licensing to a settlement involving a possible dam removal framework. What this statement makes clear to me is that the top level officials within the Department of the Interior conspired to orchestrate the removal of the dams from the beginning and that the rest of his discussion was simply window dressing and not a sincere attempt to settle the issues with all options available. Even with the dams out the fish will have to be trucked past Keno Dam and its reservoirs. Why are we worrying about dam removal if our schools are having problems? The Klamath schools need

Comment 1 - Alternatives

Comment 2 - KHSA

Comment 3 - Fish

Comment 4 - Costs

$47 million to make needed repairs. But instead we're putting our efforts and money into dam removal. Obviously our priorities aren't straight. I'm against dam removal. Thank you.

Comment 5 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Mallams, Savannah
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_159-1	Appendix A, Final Alternatives Report, from the Draft EIS/EIR describes the alternatives considered during development of the document. Alternative 9, Trap and Haul Fish, considers collecting fish and transporting them around the passage obstructions. Transporting fish has been shown to be ineffective in this type of application (CDFG 2006). Alternative 9 was not carried forward for more detailed analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR because it does not meet the purpose and need under NEPA or most of the program objectives under CEQA. (Reference is in Appendix A: CDFG. 2006. Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Klamath Hydroelectric Project, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project No. 2082-027. Sent November 29, 2006 by Donald Koch, Regional Manager, Northern California-North Coast Region, 601 Locust Street, Redding, CA 96001.)	No
GP_MC_1018_159-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No
GP_MC_1018_159-3	As noted in the Draft EIS/EIR on p. 2-39, trap and haul around Keno is seen as a temporary solution, for a single fish stock (fall Chinook adults) and would only be done seasonally when water quality cannot meet certain criteria (U.S. Department of the Interior 2007; NMFS 2007 - modified fishway prescriptions). These conditions generally occur during the period July-October, however they can occur over a broader period on occasion. In some years it may not be necessary. In the long run, implementation of KBRA and TMDLs may eliminate the need for trap and haul around Keno Impoundment/Lake Ewauna, or sooner if engineering solutions to the low summer DO in the Keno reach can be found and implemented. Trap and haul around the four dams would bypass 58 miles of important salmonid main stem and tributary habitat and cold water refugia (Administrative Law Judge 2006).	No
GP_MC_1018_159-4	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No
GP_MC_1018_159-5	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_125

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MR. TOM MALLAMS: I thank you for coming here tonight, I appreciate your efforts on behalf of the citizens here.

My name is Tom Mallams, M-a-l-l-a-m-s.

Comment 1 - NEPA

I do, like Mike King, think such a large document deserves much more time to investigate it and to come up with some conclusions to find all the many holes in your document.

We had -- the dam removals is, in a nutshell, basically a power-control government at its worst. This process has been so flawed from day one, it defies all imagination.

I am ashamed to say that I was a stakeholder in the meetings for some time, I was ashamed to be at those meetings. When I left those meetings, I told my wife, "I need to go have a shower because I feel like I'm violated." That's how bad it was, in my opinion.

Even Judge Wanger gave a scathing ruling against Secretary Salazar and the Department of Interior on the issues down in the San Joaquin Valley area. He called the department full of zealots with an agenda, and

their actions were totally illegal in many cases.

The KBRA dam removal scenario mirrors what has

been happening in the San Joaquin delta area and the delta

smelt.

So what can a citizen do? Citizens can come to

these meetings like this and sit and listen and try to get

educated, participate, testify and what have you: You

never give up. Our county fathers never gave up and we

will never give up. We will be there every time there are

meetings and we will keep at it, and more and more people

will stand up and voice their opposition to what is going

on.

Each of us has to decide how much we can do as

an individual. Can I raise the bar? Lengthen our stride

or pick up the pace, more and more.

We need, in our county, leaders that are

willing to take that extra step forward to see that all

things are done correctly, and that all citizens are

represented. We need to have leadership that will help us

thrive, not just survive.

Then I came to a decision to do exactly all of

the above just not too long ago, and so I'm taking this

opportunity to announce that I am filing as a candidate

for Klamath County Commissioner. Thank you.

Comment Author	Mallams, Tom
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_125-1	Master Response N/CP-12 Comment Period.	No

GP_MC_1020_236

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. TOM MALLAMS: My name is T-o-m, M-a-l-l-a-m-s.

I'm an irrigator in the Upper Basin. I am

president of the Klamath Project Water Users Association.

Very well acquainted with the gentlemen here. They don't

like me very much sometimes but that's okay. I can live

with that.

I do recognize the hard work that has gone into

this document. It is a huge document. One gentleman had

it back here, held it up, very impressive.

Unfortunately a large document like that

doesn't necessarily mean it's worth anything more than a

case of toilet paper.

THE FACILITATOR: Would you slow down.

Comment 1 - NEPA

MR. TOM MALLAMS: I not only expect scientific

integrity, I demand it. I think people do this as well.

This document is lacking everywhere you look. It doesn't

have scientific integrity, it has paid-for science.

A few examples of that is the Stillwater Report

was bought and paid for by American Rivers, proved to be

faulty. The Dr. David Gallo's report to the economic

parts of this thing bought and paid for by Cal Trout and

prosper. They are all signatories to the KBRA and dam removals.

This just reeks of non-peer-review so-called science.

There is talk about the Rogue River. I grew up in Rogue Valley over there in my younger days. I spent a lot of time in the Rogue River, very clean river.

Unfortunately they took the dams out there, and the river design is a company out of Corvallis that did the modeling on that project there.

Guess what, you heard the story before, oops, they made a mistake. They didn't quite figure that was going to happen to those dam removal projects there.

Scientific integrity, guess who's doing the modeling on the Klamath River dams, river design? Does that mean that you're a two-time loser, government is going to hire you back again to do another one?

Well, I'm sorry, the Klamath River is not exactly like the Rogue River. It is an impaired river, always has been, always will be by naturally recurring phosphorus.

If you have the whoops in the Klamath River like they had in the Rogue River, you're going to have an environmental disaster of epic proportion as has been

mentioned before. A hundred years or more of sterilized

river that will never recover.

You can't do this. You're denying and ignoring

your scientific panels that have already put out stuff

there.

We had one here not too long ago, back in June,

didn't get a very glowing report. It seems like that

report is being ignored completely. You're denying the

FERC report that has been put out there, CDN report that

was out there, dam removal cost, somewhere in the area of

1.9 to 4.4 billion dollars because you cannot ignore the

sediment issues.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Mallams, Tom
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_236-1	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No

GP_MF_1019_087

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) TOM MALLAMS

Representing KLAMATH OFF-PROJECT WATER USERS

Notes: AGAINST DAM REMOVAL

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

*Please read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

35

Comment Author	Mallams, Tom
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_087-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_055

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: DAVID MAC IVOR

Organization: VOTER & TAX PAYER

Title: N/A

Address: 7649 BOOTH RD K-Falls OR 97603

Email: SYCAN2@GMAIL.COM

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comments: KEEP THE DAMS - THEY ARE GREEN

PUT IN SOPHISTICATED FISH LADDERS

MANAGE THE WATER ACCORDINGLY.

Comment 2 - Alternatives

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Mallvor, David
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_055-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power.	No
GP_MF_1019_055-2	The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes the construction of fish ladders in Alternative 4, Fish Passage at Four Dams.	No

Klamath Settlement EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1020_286

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Norman R. Malmberg

Organization: Self-employed Real Estate Broker, 36 yrs in Siskiyou Cty

Title: Captain, USN (Ret.)

Address: POB 113, Greenview, CA 96037

Email: pandn42@sisqtel.net

Comments: I am opposed to removal of the dams. I am not convinced it is necessary. Leave them alone. We would lose power generation. Power would most likely be more expensive. Why does government always interfere? Why were the dams installed in the first place? Have those reasons changed? I doubt it. What about the sediment which will be released? Word is that a dam removed on the Rogue River released sediment which is causing detrimental effects. I understand that this EIS/EIR cost about $20 Million, a waste I think especially in these times of economic slump & national debt. I call it irresponsible.

Comment 1 - Opposed to Dam Removal

Comment 2 - Hydropower

Comment 3 - Sediment Transport

Comment 4 - Costs

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Malmberg, Norman
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1020_286-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MF_1020_286-2	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities.	No
	Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	
	Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	
GP_MF_1020_286-3	Master Response WQ-11 Comparisons With Rogue River and Downstream Sediment Effects.	No
GP_MF_1020_286-4	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_EM_1230_1196

From: Stefan Manhart[SMTP:KIPP-MANHART@AN-NETZ.DE]
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2011 1:00:13 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: I Support Alternative 2 - Full Removal of 4 Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Dear Secretary Salazar:
I support alternative 2 within the draft dam removal EIS/EIR – full removal of four Klamath River dams. The draft EIS/EIR correctly shows that alternative 2 is the best option for fisheries restoration, job creation, and the reduction of toxic pollution. Option 2 is supported by a growing body of scientific research and best serves the public interest.

Stefan Manhart

91555

Comment Author	Manhart, Stefan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1230_1196-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_524

From: smarch13@gmail.com[SMTP:SMARCH13@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 3:34:53 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Remove the Klamath Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Sara March
Organization:

Subject: Remove the Klamath Dams

Body: As a resident of Northern California, and an environmental scientist, I strongly support immediate dam removal on the Klamath River and its tributaries. This is essential for sustaining fish populations and to restore ecological health to the ecosystem. I also strongly support ecological restoration activities on the Klamath, Scott and Shasta rivers. Dam removal is of critical importance to the people where I live, and everyone I speak to is in favor of it. Please support dam removal immediately.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	March, Sara
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_524-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1019_046

From: Kate[SMTP:KATMAX@CHARTER.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2011 12:19:33 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Comments on Draft EIS/EIR Klamath settlement
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Thank you for taking our comments.

I'm a 4th generation Oregonian and active in the Klamath community. I serve on many local boards, including Ross Ragland Theater, the Herald and News editorial board, Discover Klamath, and the Klamath County Tourism Grant Review Board.

I care about Klamath's economic and social health. I support the KBRA/KHSA because they are the brightest hope and best road forward for resolving the ongoing water crisis (and accompanying social/political divisions) that hampers Klamath's economic and social health. I look forward to the day when Klamath is known, not as ground zero of the western water wars, but as the place where differing, even contentious, groups came together and hammered out an agreement.

Kate Marquez
2034 Fremont Street
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97601
541/883-2127
katmax@charter.net

Comment Author	Marquez, Kate
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1019_046-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1020_208

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. RICHARD MARSHALL: My name is Richard

Marshall, R-i-c-h-a-r-d, M-a-r-s-h-a-l-l.

I live in Fort Jones where I have a small ranch.

We use Pacific Power for electricity and we get our ag

water from the well.

Comment 1 - General/Other

My first comment concerns the DOI mission

statement which is right behind the front cover, which

does not mention protecting the people here in this room.

Comment 2 - NEPA

My second statement is concerning the abstract

page which states that the EIR/EIS is prepared in

accorddance with NEPA and CEQA. Firstly, because both

acts require coordination, which hasn't been done in this

case, with the county of Siskiyou, referred to earlier.

If fact, I would point out that by letter dated May 12,

2010: The county of Siskiyou board of supervisors,

specifically requested Secretary Salazar that coordination

should take place in accordance with the county

comprehensive land use and resource management plan.

The Secretary's response by Mr. Stopher, I

believe, on June 14th, 2010, the county was advised that

the EIS/EIR would specifically describe inconsistencies

which it doesn't contain.

Comment 3 - Alternatives

Apparently the plan does not review the no action plan in detail and specifically how the funds, some three billion dollars in all, could be spent better than removing green power plant that produces efficiently enough electricity for this area.

Comment 4 - Real Estate

The plan looks only at downstream benefits only and is not considering the detrimental impacts on land values and the quality of life costs associated downstream as a potential result of dam removal.

In Siskiyou County alone with a 20 percent reduction in value, which could take place over a period of time as the dams are taken out, could result in a loss of nearly a billion dollars to Siskiyou County valuation according to the assessor's office. The total assessment value is about four billion in Siskiyou County.

Comment 5 - Other/General

Five, the secretary of the Interior has been rightfully criticized on misrepresenting scientific facts and manipulation of scientific information to achieve the Administration's desired results. In the case of the dams removal process, the Secretary has developed a bogus survey referred to earlier, which I looked at fairly thoroughly, and that survey, which was of 12,400 homes throughout the US, doesn't consider Siskiyou County's

interest in having the dams stay. In fact, Measure G, which everyone here knows about, 80 percent of the people approve keeping the dams in place.

Comment 6 - Alternatives

Six, the decision to breach the dams by Mr. Salazar instead of taking them out is relatively a new approach and is not really seriously evaluated as to its impact.

Comment 7 - Hydropower

Finally, I point out nowhere is there an identification of where the electrical power that replaces the power that is taken out is going to come from. What will be its cost, will be another question everybody ought to wonder about.

Comment Author	Marshall, Richard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_208-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1020_208-2	Master Response N/CP-2 Coordination.	No
GP_MC_1020_208-3	The No Action/No Project Alternative is a requirement of NEPA (Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations for Implementing NEPA, 40 CFR Part 1508.25(b)(1)) and CEQA (Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines) and must be analyzed in an EIS or an EIR. The No Action/No Project Alternative is presented in the Draft EIS/EIR as Alternative 1. Additionally, Alternative 4 leaves all Four Facilities in place and Alternative 5 leaves two dams in place to produce hydropower. Master Response ALT-8 Inclusion of Alternatives Solely Based on Cost. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No
GP_MC_1020_208-4	Master Response RE-1E Real Estate Evaluation Report. Master Response RE-2A Changes in Property Values.	No
GP_MC_1020_208-5	Master Response GEN-22 Willingness-to-Pay Survey.	No
GP_MC_1020_208-6	No decision has been made regarding yet about which alternative to implement. The Draft EIS/EIR, Appendix A, includes all of the alternatives considered during development of this document. Alternative 12, Notching Four Dams, would involve cutting concrete and excavating earthen material from the middle of the dams down to the river bed to create a free-flowing condition. This process would leave portions of each dam intact on either side of the river, along with many of the appurtenant structures (see Figure 3-9 in Appendix A). The appurtenant structures would be retired, but left in place. This alternative was considered, but it did not move forward for further evaluation in the Draft EIS/EIR because it was very similar to Alternative 3, Partial Facilities Removal of Four Dams and would result in similar impacts. Alternative 3 was selected to move forward and is analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR.	No
GP_MC_1020_208-7	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No

GP_LT_1208_990

November 18, 2011

Bureau of Reclamation
Attn: Elizabeth Vasquez
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

California Department of Fish & Game
Attn: Gordon Leppig
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Re: Klamath Facilities Removal
EIR/EIS Comments
Siskiyou County, Calif.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Gentlemen,

Comment 2 - Alternatives

So that there is no confusion let me say that there should be **no removal of the dams**. Instead there should be an effort spent to review the many alternatives which have been suggested by concerned citizens and which are much less controversial and less expensive to the Nation and the State. On its face, the idea of removing four clean, "green" hydropower dams which provide enough power for 70,000 homes makes no sense. The cost, for example, of constructing a fish tunnel to allow volitional fish passage to the Upper Klamath past the Dams and at a reasonable cost was not fully explored. Instead, we have a politically motivated and one sided attempt to redistribute tax and rate payer dollars to fund a collection of self serving environmental NGOS and a few Indian Tribes. This project consists of a monumental expense of more than 3 Billion Dollars to increase production of a fish, which is not indigenous to the area.

Comment 3 - NEPA

The Department of Interior and the CFG have spent years and millions of dollars to fund this effort to produce the EIR/EIS and are giving the citizens and their agencies **only 60 days to respond** to this approx 1900 page document. This is an egregious situation which demands that an extension of time be given for the working citizen and local agencies to respond. An entire region and its citizen's welfare are at stake.

Comment 4 - NEPA

Several problems are immediately apparent with the tenor of this analysis presented by the CFG and the Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation. *The first* is the mission statement of the US DOI which states in part "to honor our trust responsibilities to Indian Tribes". Continuing through the statement there is no comment about protecting the citizens of the region. The citizens evidently don't count as evidenced by *the second fact* presented in the Abstract is that the "EIR EIS has been prepared according to requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)" which if true and it is not, would mean that the Agencies had engaged in CO ORDINATION. CO ORDINATION IS A SPECIFIC PROCESS OF GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT MEETING TO ACHIEVE CONSISTENCY WITH THE LOCAL LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN. THIS PROCESS IS ONGOING UNTIL CONSISTENCY IS ACHIEVED.

This was not done by the DOI or CFG and in fact even though it had been specifically requested in writing by the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors, the DOI in writing, (Bezdek) told the County that they didn't have to coordinate. Mr. Stopher representing the CDFG went even further adding insult to incorrectness by stating "The Department does not have the resources or the capacity to commit to a separate coordination process with Siskiyou County regarding its Comprehensive Land and Resource Management Plan, and as a matter of law this is not required". Not having the funds is not an answer. It is not the public's fault that the State and Federal government have not planned adequately.

The CDFG needs to train its people regarding this matter of the CO ORDINATION PROCESS. This is a complete misstatement and the result is the attitude of the agencies is clearly shown as biased right from the beginning. In short, the Agencies despite the law and "good sense" of providing a vision of "evenhandedness" chose to take the approach that they were going to proceed with this project, and the public be dammed. This attitude of course reverberates throughout the process and doesn't belong in the consideration of this massive federal and state project which will change the lives forever of the

Comment 4 - cont.

communities of Siskiyou County. The County government extended its hand several more times to enter into COORDINATION with the Agencies. They were rebuffed each time. If the COORDINATION PROCESS had been followed from the beginning we might have had an entirely different project before us and one which everyone might support.

Given the above and the continuing attitude of the Agencies involved, destruction of the dams seems completely doomed. The serious problem is not only the massive cost (exceeding 2.5 Billion dollars) for this "experiment", but if it is a failure in terms of its stated objective, i.e. to "provide for the restoration of native fisheries and sustainable water supplies", there will be no going back to a more moderate approach. Several serious alternatives were presented through the Siskiyou County Water Users Association and discarded out of hand by the DOI. These alternatives provided a much less costly method and more moderate approach to accomplish the same goals and provide a cushion of safety.

Comment 5 - Hydrology

Besides losing a renewable and green source of electricity the safety valve of being able to flush the river bed in the late summer season will be lost with the removal of the dams. These dams also provided opportunity for flood control and a source of water for late summer forest fires.

Comment 6 - NEPA

Comment 7 - Fish

The EIR EIS in its scientific approach defeats its own purpose by using words throughout such as "could, might, may, should etc. It also states in many places that the COHO would be returning to its native territory in the Upper Klamath. This is a blatant fabrication. The Karuk Tribe in one of its meetings which is now public knowledge indicated that the COHO was not native but could be used much like the spotted owl. It is also unfortunate the COHO is listed as ESA, as this is also not true. COHO abound in the ocean and their range according to NOAA extends all the way around the Pacific through the Bering Straits to the coast of Japan. They are a cold water fish and follow the cold water columns in the Pacific and generally spawn in the rivers not far back from the coast. The representation in the EIR that the COHO will travel some 40 miles upstream to warm, shallow and phosphorous laden waters for spawning is a total misrepresentation.

Further complicating the truthfulness of the EIR EIS are the recent statements made by Mr. Ken Salazar Secretary of the Department of the Interior that the dams are coming out. Only now instead of a total deconstruction of the dams they are just going to breach them (blow a

Comment 8 - KHSA

Comment 8 cont.

hole in them). How the environmental community can support this approach is beyond me. The DOI has stooped so far as to have developed a bogus "non use evaluation survey" engineered to provide a cover for the Secretary to sign off on the project claiming national support. No mention made of the recent Measure G voted on in Siskiyou County supporting keeping the dams. This measure passed with a nearly 80% vote. The entire project smacks of political overtones aimed at using public funds to send money to tribes and environmental organizations that have made public their intentions to remove all dams everywhere throughout the West. I think many of these people have not lived in California through the forties and fifties when we had huge floods in the springtime and extremely dry summers. The solution was to build the dams. The dams among other benefits provided a source of clean power. This allowed California to grow and prosper to the point where it was the envy of the nation. This movement to go backwards in time makes poor economic sense.

Comment 9 - Fish

The fish problem is a result of overfishing the oceans and the mouths of the rivers. The low fish count the DFG always refers to, says very little about the impact of international fishing fleets and in particular the Native Americans gill netting of Salmon returning to spawn. They have used a zigzag netting technique covering fully 90% of the river width. This is not "subsistence fishing". The NMFS in its reports pays only a passing remark to the climate impacts on the fish.

In summation, I would say that the DOI and CDFG need to go back to the drawing board and start working with everyone in the community to solve perceived problems and to COORDINATE with the County and its agencies as required by law and good sense.

Respectively Submitted

Richard Marshall
Fort Jones, California

Comment Author	Marshall, Richard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 08, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1208_990-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_LT_1208_990-2	Master Response ALT-2 Elimination of Alternative 10 - Fish Bypass: Bogus Creek Bypass and Alternative 11 - Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing from Detailed Study. Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. The Draft EIS/EIR did evaluate fish passage alternatives that would allow the dams to remain in place to produce hydropower. Alternative 4 leaves all Four Facilities in place and Alternative 5 leaves two dams in place.	No
GP_LT_1208_990-3	Master Response N/CP-12 Comment Period.	No
GP_LT_1208_990-4	Master Response N/CP-2 Coordination. Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement. Master Response N/CP-18 Process to Select Alternatives for Detailed Analysis. Master Response ALT-2 Elimination of Alternative 10 - Fish Bypass: Bogus Creek Bypass and Alternative 11 - Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing from Detailed Study.	No
GP_LT_1208_990-5	*Power Generation* The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes impacts from the replacement of hydropower facilities with other power generation in Section 3.10, Greenhouse Gases/Global Climate Change. The analysis finds that emissions from power replacement would be a significant impact. Mitigation Measures CC-1 through CC-3 would be implemented to reduce emissions from replacement power. Although these measures are expected to lessen the degree of significance, it is expected that GHG emissions would remain significant and unavoidable in the short term until PacifiCorp adds new sources of renewable power that would replace the removed dams. *Flood Mitigation* Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection.	No

Comment Author	Marshall, Richard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 08, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Fire Fighting The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes impacts to water availability for fire fighting in Section 3.18, Public Health and Safety. The impact analysis recognizes that Copco 1 Reservoir is used as a source of water for fighting fires; however, the Klamath River can also be used as a water source. The impact to availability of water for firefighting is therefore less than significant. *Flushing of the River Bed* Master Response AQU-20 Bedload Sediment and Fish Habitat.	
GP_LT_1208_990-6	Master Response N/CP-5 Use of "Would" or "Could."	No
GP_LT_1208_990-7	Master Response AQU-4 Coho Are Native. Other than an anecdotal comment by a member of the Karuk Tribal Council, the comment as submitted, provides no evidence to support the claim that coho salmon are not native to the Klamath River. Counter to the claim made by the author of this comment, the native language of the Karuk people includes a name for hookbill or coho salmon, "**achvuun."** Adult male coho salmon develop a large hooked kype as they become sexually mature on their spawning migration upriver, hence the reference to hookbill salmon. There is also a well known legend about a raven and hookbill that has been told for generations among the Karuk people. The title of the legend is "How Buzzard Became Bald." Additional information is available at the University of California, Berkeley at: http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~karuk/karuk-dictionary.php?lx=&ge=coho&sd=fish&lxGroup-id=126&audio=&index-position= Coho salmon are known to be able to swim long distances to return to their freshwater spawning grounds. In the Columbia River Basin, coho salmon historically spawned in the Snake River, a tributary to the Columbia well over 1,000 miles from the coast. In the Yakima River system in Washington, coho salmon travel 400 or more miles from the ocean to reach their spawning grounds. Coho salmon traveling upstream nearly 230 miles to Spencer Creek in the Klamath Basin is well within their capability.	No
GP_LT_1208_990-8	Master Response GEN-13 Range of Alternatives Considered. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No

Comment Author	Marshall, Richard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 08, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-22 Willingness-to-Pay Survey.	
GP_LT_1208_990-9	Declines in salmon runs are caused by several factors. These include loss and degradation of freshwater habitat, low ocean productivity, and over-exploitation of fish populations. With respect to fish harvest, ocean recreational and commercial as well as tribal commercial and subsistence fishing activities for Chinook salmon are tightly regulated on an annual basis by State, Federal and Tribal fishery managers. Annual catch limits are set based on annual population surveys. Since 1987, based on recommendations from the Klamath Fishery Management Council, the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) amended the spawning escapement goal for fall Chinook salmon within the Klamath Basin. Rather than establishing a fixed numerical ocean escapement goal, the PFMC adopted a policy of "Harvest Rate Management". Under harvest rate management the overall goal is to allow a fixed percentage of all salmon from each brood year to spawn. The allocation method allows the spawning escapement to fluctuate. In high population years the escapement would be larger than if the stock was fished down to a fixed numerical escapement and in low year's fisheries would not be closed to meet an escapement that was not attainable. By allowing a wide range of escapements, fishery managers may be able to determine the actual carrying capacity of the river system. To protect the salmon stocks in very low abundance years, an escapement "floor" of 35,000 natural spawners was established (Kope 1992, Prager and Mohr 2001, PFMC 2011). The comment as submitted provides no evidence to substantiate the claim that the fish problem is a result of overfishing. Climate change is addressed in EIS/EIR, Chapter 3.10 and in Part IV, Section 19.4 of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA). Potential effects of climate change on the Proposed Action include: • Projected changes in precipitation would result in drier summers and increased frequency and severity of extreme events (USGCRP 2009; Barr et. al. 2010; OCCRI 2010). These precipitation changes would produce some adverse effects in the Klamath Basin. Adverse effects could include increased flooding, decreasing water quality (due mainly to the effects of higher water temperatures and changing vegetation), higher fire potential (with	No

Comment Author	Marshall, Richard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 08, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	subsequent water quality impacts), and adverse low flow conditions due to summer droughts. • Average annual air temperatures are projected to increase approximately 1 to over 4°C in the next century. Temperature changes would increase water temperature; water temperature increases could create stressful conditions for fish during some times of the year and reduce the migration window. The Proposed Action would create initial decreases in water temperature by removing dams and increasing river flows, but climate change could partially offset some of these temperature improvements. The Proposed Action is positioned to respond to the changes in climate conditions compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Dam removal can increase ecosystem resiliency by restoring floodplain wetlands, which allow the river system to handle the projected changes in seasonal precipitation (Dinse et al. 2009). Also, sediment budgets may return to pre-controlled conditions, revegetation of the watershed can replace missing large woody debris, and more dynamic flow regimes can diversify channel morphology and increase habitat complexity. Master Response AQU-19 Chinook Expert Panel Proposed Action Better Than No Action. Other benefits of the Proposed Action include: additional riparian zone to reduce peak flooding impacts; improved water quality by removing large quiescent water areas that are subject to temperature increases and evaporation; restored natural sediment budget to improve in-channel habitat diversity; more available stream channel habitat; a migration corridor for fish to move further upstream to find cooler water; access to the largest concentration of cold springs and spring-dominated tributaries in the Klamath Basin; and improved habitat quality, water quality, and riparian and floodplain functionality in and above Upper Klamath Lake. In contrast, the No Action/No Project Alternative would require modified management and dam operations to off-set flow regime changes; provide no new opportunities for new in-channel or riparian/floodplain habitat; and be subject to greater water quality impacts due to projected temperature increases. As described in Section 3.2, Water Quality, removal of the reservoirs under the Proposed Action would result in a 1 to 2 degrees Celsius (°C) increase in spring water temperatures and a 2 to 10 decrease in late-summer/fall water temperatures immediately downstream of Iron Gate Dam. These effects would decrease in magnitude with distance downstream of the dam and would not be evident by the Salmon River confluence (RM 66)	

Comment Author	Marshall, Richard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 08, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	(PacifiCorp 2004, Dunsmoor and Huntington 2006, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board 2010, Perry et al. 2011). General warming of water temperatures under climate change is projected to be on the order of 1 to 3°C in the Klamath Basin (Bartholow 2005, Perry et al. 2011), which would partially offset anticipated water temperature improvements from the Proposed Action, particularly further downstream of Iron Gate Dam where the improvements would be of smaller magnitude. However, overall the primary effect of dam removal is still anticipated to be the return of approximately 160 miles of the Klamath River, from J.C. Boyle Reservoir (River Mile (RM) 224.7) to the Salmon River (RM 66), to a natural thermal regime. This return would also include increased daily fluctuations in water temperature immediately downstream of Copco 1 and Iron Gate Dams, as water temperatures once again achieve equilibrium with (and reflect) daily fluctuations in ambient air temperatures. In contrast, in the Bypass Reach downstream of J.C. Boyle Dam, daily fluctuations in water temperature would decrease under the Proposed Action, as hydropower peaking flows would not occur. As described in Section 3.3, Aquatic Resources, improvement in the river thermal regime by the Proposed Action would likely moderate the anticipated stream temperature increases resulting from climate change.	

GP_WI_1112_579

From: telstar11@verizon.net[SMTP:TELSTAR11@VERIZON.NET]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2011 11:16:31 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Restoration Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Tim Marshall
Organization: NA

Subject: Klamath Restoration

Body: I am in full agreement to remove the Dam and restore the Klamath River.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Marshall, Tim
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1112_579-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1026_319

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 26, 2011
PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA

MR. MARTIEN: Jerry Martien, J-e-r-r-y

M-a-r-t-i-e-n.

My letter is really not very technical, but on behalf of the arts, I think that the dams are an impediment to the imagination. For several decades, as a carpenter, a fisherman, even a tourist, as a poet and writer, an editor of a little bioregional rag called Upriver/Downriver, and as a guest at traditional Yurok, Karuk, and Hupa dances, I have worked and traveled and celebrated the Klamath watershed, from the Sprague and Williamson to the headwaters of the Trinity and down to the river mouth at Requa.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I strongly urge you to adopt Alternative 2, the full facilities removal of Boyle, Copco 1 and 2, and Iron Gate Dams.

The dams were conceived in a time of limitless faith in progress, when it was believed rivers and all of nature could be reclaimed and improved and subordinated to short-term return on investments. They were constructed with no concept of water ecology, no regard for native wisdom, and apparently no recall of even the oldest Euro-American traditions warning against arrogance and pride.

I live near Elk River, a tributary of Humboldt Bay and, like the Klamath, listed by the EPA as a 303(d), an impaired watershed. A few days ago, I was at a conference in Ashland, Oregon, where artists and writers were asked to respond to the looming consequence of climate change. Our message was clear: unless we give these rivers a chance to survive, our own survival is at risk.

Here is a chance to correct a past error, to restore some of what was lost, and perhaps send an instructive lesson to future generations. In a lifetime of the usual foolishness and stumbling, I've found that such opportunities are rare. On behalf of responsible governance, reaching across region and basin and range, across state lines and the divisions of human politics, and most urgently across the boundaries of species, I urge you to seize this opportunity and bring down the dams.

May we all live to see it. Thank you.

Comment Author	Martien, Jerry
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 26, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1026_319-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_865

From: Lazaro Martin[SMTP:LWMARTIN67@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 8:48:54 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov
Subject: STOP DAM REMOVAL ON THE KLAMATH
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Please I ask you to NOT Remove the Dam on the Klamath!

The dam removal will wipe out clean, affordable, electrical power to 70,000 homes, release tons of sediment from behind the dams and make the river less reliable for irrigation; the river will be a mere stream in the summer, a flood threat in the spring, and toxic.

Duplicative language from GP_EM_1118_800

Please take my email into consideration along with all the others asking you not to remove the dam.
Remember, there is a God who sees and Judges the hearts of man.

Sincerely,
Laz Martin

Comment Author	Martin, Lazaro
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded - GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_EM_1118_800 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_865-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_060

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Les Martin

Organization: me

Title:

Address: 7005 Henley Rd. K.F.

Email:

Comment 1 - Water Quality

Comments: There are many lakes with no Cattle upstream of them & they have algae just like Klamath Lake. So what is the real water quality problem - whats the real cause. Sulfuric Hot Springs? So taking out the Dams will not help the lake - the source of the problem. So what is the point of Hundreds of Millions being thrown at it.

We do not trust the Dept. of Interior!

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Martin, Les
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_060-1	Master Response WQ-5 Upper Basin Geology and Land Use Implications for Water Quality. Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. The comment does not provide enough information to know whether the other lakes referred to that have algae problems are in the Klamath Basin or are elsewhere. Eutrophication of lakes and cyanobacterial blooms are a growing regional problem, however the sources of nutrients feeding blooms are not always the same. In most cases, human alteration of the landscape has contributed, at least in some way, to a likely increase in nutrients.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_061

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Leo Martin

Organization: American Tax payer

Title:

Address: 7005 Henley Rd. K.F.

Email:

Comment 1 - Disapprove of Dam Removal

Comments: I am opposed to the EIR.

Comment 2 - Cost Estimate

Its not a good time to spend $500 Mil.
If you have to do it - Breach the dams as cheap as possible! No removal of debris.

Its mainly the cost that we object to!

I do not agree with our government officials overly cooperative with the Indians. They are telling us what to do and how much to spend. Not good.

Comment 3 - ITAs

I suggest we terminate all Treaties with Indians in 75 years. Its long past for them to be self Sufficient! They lost remember. I should not have to pay for 150 year old agreements.

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Martin, Les
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_061-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MF_1019_061-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MF_1019_061-3	As described in Section 15126.6(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, an EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The comment author suggests an alternative that is illegal and therefore infeasible. This alternative will not be considered for this project.	No

GP_LT_1019_064

October 18, 2011

To: Department of Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
Calif. Dept of Fish and Game
Oregon Dept of Fish and Game

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I am totally opposed to spending Half a Billion dollars to remove dams and the efforts to beautify an ugly desert river canyon.

Comment 2 - ITAs

You are going overboard on catering to Indian and Environmental groups.

Problems that I see are:

Comment 3 - Economics

1. Killing farmers and the businesses that sell products to them.

Comment 4 - Fish

2. Saving a trash fish (suckers). They eat trout eggs don't they?

3. Fisherman are sill allowed to kill salmon as we speak. If the Salmon are in short supply why is this going on?

Comment 5 - Fish

4. Lies about lower Power rates for Farmers!

Comment 6 - Hydropower

5. Population growth demands more non polluting electric power, not less!

Comment 7 - Hydropower

6. Population growth demands more farms and cheap water to handle our future food needs, not less!

Comment 8 - Economics

7. Throwing Old men gold dredgers off of the Klamath River with no logical reasons. That's called witch burning. Also see #3.

Comment 9 - Other/General

Thanks for consideration of my view point.

Les Martin

Les Martin
7005 Henley Rd.
K. Falls, OR.

Comment Author	Martin, Les
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1019_064-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate. Master Response RE-4 Takings.	No
GP_LT_1019_064-2	Public involvement is a key part of the environmental review process and provides numerous opportunities for public input. All written comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and all verbal comments received during the public meetings on the Draft EIS/EIR (within the specified comment period), by law, become part of the record and must be presented in the Final EIS/EIR. In the Final EIS/EIR, the Lead Agencies must respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues related to the Draft EIS/EIR. If the comment does not address the content and analysis of the Draft EIS/EIR, no additional response will be provided. After the Final EIS/EIR is released, the public will have the opportunity to provide written comments on this document. These comments will then be considered by the Lead Agencies before making a decision. The Secretary of the Interior will review the Draft and Final EIS/EIR and the comments received on those documents, as well as the Klamath Dam Removal Overview Report for the Secretary of the Interior (a separate document containing additional technical information), and will then release a Record of Decision (at least 30 days after the public release of the Final EIS/EIR), that will include either an Affirmative or Negative Determination on whether or not to remove the four Hydroelectric Facilities on the Klamath River. The Governors of California and Oregon must then concur with this decision to allow dam removal to move forward. According to the Constitution of the United States, Federally recognized tribes possess a nationhood status and retain powers of self-government, including the right to make and enforce laws. Several executive orders, including Executive Orders 13007, 13084, and 13175, require specific consultation with tribes when government policies or actions may affect Indian tribal self-government, trust resources, and Indian tribal treaty and other rights. These government-to-government consultations notify the tribes of the proposed actions and to allow the tribes to provide meaningful and timely input on matters that could affect their communities. The Lead Agencies have complied with the Executive Orders by consulting with potentially affected and interested Indian tribes throughout the environmental review process and development of the project, and have incorporated their input into the project.	No

Comment Author	Martin, Les
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

	NEPA mandates that Federal agencies responsible for preparing NEPA analyses and documentation do so "in cooperation with State and local governments" and other agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise. (42 U.S.C. §§ 4331(a), 4332(2)). Interested and affected tribes were invited by the Lead Agencies to participate as Cooperating Agencies for this Draft EIS/EIR. As Cooperating Agencies, the tribes have provided relevant information and technical expertise, participated in document development and reviewed drafts, and provided input throughout the environmental review process.	
GP_LT_1019_064-3	Estimated changes to agricultural employment relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative are discussed in Section 3.15. Over the period of analysis, employment in the agricultural sector is anticipated to be an important part of the regional economy.	No
GP_LT_1019_064-4	Shortnose and Lost River suckers do eat trout eggs. Information regarding the feeding habits of Lost River and shortnose suckers is limited, but does suggest both Lost River and shortnose suckers consume zooplankton, benthic macroinvertebrates, and detritus, implying they may feed in close association with the lake bottom (Scoppettone and Vinyard 1991; Moyle 2002; NRC 2004). Trout dig redds or gravel nests to deposit their eggs while spawning. Many of the eggs will float out of the redd before the redd is filled with gravel by the spawning fish. As these eggs float near the bottom of the lake, stream or river they are often eaten by other fish (this can include suckers and other trout). Trout and other native fish (including suckers) have evolved with this feeding behavior for thousands of years and is one reason trout will deposit several hundred or thousands in redds during a typical spawning cycle.	No
GP_LT_1019_064-5	Fishers are still allowed to harvest Chinook salmon. However, in-river and ocean fishing seasons have been limited. In 2006, the commercial salmon fishing season was closed along 700 miles of the West Coast for much of May, June, and July, the most productive months of the season, to protect a weak return of Klamath River Chinook salmon stocks. Tribal Commercial and subsistence, along with ocean commercial, sport and in river sport fishers continue to be restricted by gear and time closures. As with other business sectors (such as agriculture and ranching) in the Klamath Basin, salmon harvest restrictions cause economic distress to the fishing economy of the area. That said, fishery managers at the federal and state level attempt to manage the harvest of salmon while allowing sufficient salmon to return to the river to spawn. Ocean recreational and commercial as well as tribal commercial and subsistence fishing activities for Chinook salmon are tightly regulated on an annual basis by State, Federal and Tribal fishery	No

Comment Author	Martin, Les
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

	managers. Annual catch limits are set based on annual population surveys. Since 1987, based on recommendations from the Klamath Fishery Management Council, the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) amended the spawning escapement goal for fall Chinook salmon within the Klamath Basin. Rather than establishing a fixed numerical ocean escapement goal, the PFMC adopted a policy of "Harvest Rate Management". Under harvest rate management the overall goal is to allow a fixed percentage of all salmon from each brood year to spawn. The allocation method allows the spawning escapement to fluctuate. In high population years the escapement would be larger than if the stock was fished down to a fixed numerical escapement and in low year's fisheries would not be closed to meet an escapement that was not attainable. By allowing a wide range of escapements, fishery managers may be able to determine the actual carrying capacity of the river system. To protect the salmon stocks in very low abundance years, an escapement "floor" of 35,000 natural spawners was established (Kope 1992, Prager and Mohr 2001, PFMC 2011). The comment as submitted provides no evidence to substantiate the claim that the fish problem is a result of overfishing.	
GP_LT_1019_064-6	Comment noted. Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_LT_1019_064-7	Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_LT_1019_064-8	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_LT_1019_064-9	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

Duplicate of GP_LT_1117_751

GP_LT_1118_796

I am writing this letter to object to the proposed removal of four dams on the Klamath River: Iron Gate, Copco 1, Copco 2 and JC Boyle Dams.

- The total cost of dam removal and implementation after removal exceeds $1.9 billion. Irresponsible expenditures during a national economic crisis
- The science to support dam removal is based on unproven science and not on facts. Lacks of factual evidence that dam removals will restore salmon runs.
- Dam removal will have the effect of putting over several hundred farms and ranches out of permanent food production and destroy over one third (1/3) of the economic base of the County. Shasta Valley agricultural operations in 2006 (95.15 Million) amounted to 56% of total economic output for Siskiyou County.
- America needs clean renewable energy and food independence.
- The spotted owl was listed as endangered in 1995. We had closure of 18 mills and elimination of nearly 6, 0000 living wage jobs. We have never fully recovered and are still dependent on timber harvest subsides to maintain our schools and roads. *The rural school act is in jeopardy of not* being renewed. We cannot allow destruction of our agricultural industry.
- In the last two years Siskiyou County has lost freight rail services and gold mining,
- 79% of Siskiyou County residents voted NO Dam removal on an Advisory measure on the November ballot 2010
- Dams bring in 300,000 to 1 million dollars a year in tax revenue to our county.
- Substantial increase in electricity cost as hydroelectric is the cheapest source of engery.
- Lost of habitat wildlife
- Loss of lake fisheries
- Loss of Irongate fish Hatchery
- Loss of recreation
- Loss of property value
- Loss of down river flood protection
- Loss of roads and bridges from flooding which has been document by the flood of _____
- Loss of fire protection…the lake is used to put out fires
- Irresponsible release of dam sediments down river by state and Federal agencies.
- Loss of Shasta Nation burial grounds which will be uncovered which are behind the dams.
- Loss of sustained Minimum River flows
- Tunnel by pass alternative to the proposed Dam removal which will enhance and expand the Salmonids Habitat has been totally ignored by the dept. of the interior.

The Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement consist of 2 farming units, 3 tribes, 3 Federal Cabinet Secretaries, 3 Oregon State Depts., 1 CA stated Dept. and only 2 of the 9 basin counties, 8 environmental groups and 2 fishing associations. Siskiyou County was not representatives. These agreements were done in secret. It wasn't until the BOS learned of these agreements that public hearings were finally heard. The majority of Siskiyou County residents are opposed.

Office of Environmental Affairs
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825
Attention: Elizabeth Vasquez
Telephone: (916) 978-5040
Fax: (916) 978-5055
E-mail: evasquez@usbr.gov
klamathsd@usbr.gov;

There is nothing good about Klamath River Dam Removal. It is a "pie in the sky" idea that is very sad and destructive — and the ruin of Siskiyou County.

Regards,
Pat Martin

12531 Table Rock Rd
Montague, CA 96064

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Martin, Pat
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded - GP_LT_1117_751. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_LT_1117_751. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_LT_1117_751 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1118_796-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1215_1041

From: riverrock8@gmail.com[SMTP:RIVERROCK8@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2011 4:00:00 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Rosada Martin
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Body: I would like to send my support for the full removal of the dams on the Klamath River (ie: option 2) Let's bring the river back to the way it use to be!

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Martin, Rosada
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 15, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1215_1041-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1229_1188

From: rmason@pdx.edu[SMTP:RMASON@PDX.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2011 1:03:15 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Removal of Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Ramona Mason
Organization: student

Subject: Removal of Dams

Body: Native people have always taken care and loved the land and all her inhabinants. We were never influenced by greed such as corporations. What those whose voice is heard through profit do not understand is we are concerned about our land that not only provides for us, but for their children also.
Please consider the damages done and future damage to come if you do not remove these dams.
Thanl You, Ramona Mason

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Mason, Ramona
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 29, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1229_1188-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1119_779

From: Harold Mathis[SMTP:HJMATHIS@TDS.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 9:00:59 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Removal of dams on Klamath River
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

To whom it may concern:

We strongly oppose the removal of dams on the Klamath River. This will hurt water rights and property rights.

Thank you for your attention.

Joann and Harold Mathis
2297 Long Canyon Road
Trinity Center, Ca. 96091
530-286-2217

Comment Author	Mathis, JoAnn and Harold
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1119_779-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1119_780

From: driverfn@suddenlink.net[SMTP:DRIVERFN@SUDDENLINK.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 7:08:58 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Dam Removal on the Klamath
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - NEPA/CEQA Process

Not enough study has been made as to the possible aftermath from removal of the four dams. Providing passage for the fish by ladders or tunnels might be expensive but the destruction of the dams will lead to more costly problems in the future.

Albert. Nelson
Resident of Eureka, CA.
Joann and Harold Mathis
2297 Long Canyon Road
Trinity Center, Ca. 96091
530-286-2217

Comment Author	Mathis, JoAnn & Harold
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1119_780-1	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No

GP_WI_1216_1044

From: Stoecker@akita.wrinkledog.com[SMTP:STOECKER@AKITA.WRINKLEDOG.COM]
Sent: Friday, December 16, 2011 11:51:05 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Please Support Alternative 2- Full Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Matt
Organization: Stoecker Ecological

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Please Support Alternative 2- Full Dam Removal

Body: Please Support Alternative 2- Full Dam Removal. This alternative provides the greatest benefit to the Klamath River watershed, fisheries, and eliminates future tax payer dollars that would be needed to maintain parts of the aging dam infrastructure.

Thank you for your detailed analysis on this project and consideration of supporting Alternative 2.

Comment Author	Matt
Agency/Assoc.	Stoecker Ecological
Submittal Date	December 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1216_1044-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1112_581

From: Sue[SMTP:SUSANADAN@AOL.COM]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2011 7:33:50 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Remove the dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule Dear Sir,

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Please continue to pursue the removal of the four hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River. It will cost more to provide fish passage than to remove the dams. A functional river with aquatic passage is far more beneficial than the small amount of hydroelectric power that is generated from the dams. We can generate power from solar, wind, tidal and other safe methods.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sue Mattenberger
752 Longacre Ln
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Comment Author	Mattenberger, Sue
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1112_581-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1114_667

From: troutfella@aol.com[SMTP:TROUTFELLA@AOL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 7:33:21 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Richard May
Organization: retired

Subject: Klamath River Dams

Body: I support the removal of the four dams historically blocking many miles of salmon and steelhead spawning and rearing habitat. Life for fish. Jobs for man. Slam dunk.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	May, Richard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1114_667-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1117_1079

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 11:01:00 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

>>> tmay33 <tmay33@uoregon.edu> 11/17/2011 11:11 AM >>>

The document attached entitled SALMON IS EVERYTHING is submitted as public comment in favor of full dam removal on the Klamath River and the return of Klamath and other tribal homelands and resource rights to Tribal communities. SALMON IS EVERYTHING is a script and theatrical production composed of the voices of Karuk, Hupa, Yurok, Klamath and Modoc people in the Klamath Watershed, and also farmers and ranchers in the Klamath basin.

It constitutes strong community support all along the river for dam removal and sustainable management of the river by tribal communities. Thank you for this opportunity

Theresa May
Assit. Professor Theatre and Environmental Studies University of Oregon

Salmon Is Everything

A docu-drama about the Klamath Salmon Crisis

By Theresa J. May
With the Klamath Theatre Project

Copyright 2006 Theresa J. May

This script was developed over a two-year period by Theresa May in collaboration with students, faculty, staff, and community members who believe that by sharing stories, we can grow the compassion necessary for change, justice and ecological sustainability. We have called ourselves the Klamath Theatre Project. The script has grown out of interviews of folks living in the Klamath Watershed, and also the creative writing of the KTP group. The characters are fictional, and drawn as composites to represent the various viewpoints about the Klamath River. Parts of the script also draw from published works including: "For the Yurok, Salmon is Everything" by Barry McCovey, Jr.; and "Yanix Journal" by Becky Hyde.

Copyright 2006, Theresa J. May. All rights reserved. No part of this script can be performed, recorded, or duplicated by any means without the express permission of the playwright.

In order for this script to remain a "living document" and adapt to the changing public debate around this issue; and also to insure the integrity of the stories and interviews included in this script as well as the dramatic structure, the playwright, Theresa J. May, retains copyright to this material. Future directors, casts and community members may suggest changes to this script by contacting the playwright at: University of Oregon, Dept. of Theatre Arts, Villard Hall 207, Eugene, Oregon 97403-1231. Phone: (541) 346-1789.

Those who have worked with Theresa May on the development of this script include: Holly Couling, Heather Hostler, Lauren Taylor, Nikolai Colegrove, Jessica Eden, Ron Griffith, Christina Perez, Aaron Waxman, Kendall Allen, Robin Andrews, Darcie Beeman-Black, Emily Blanche, Roberta Chavez, Jacob Froneberger, Beth Weissbart, Jean O'Hara, Marlon Sherman, Phil Zastrow. Thanks to Margaret Kelso and Larry Fried for their dramaturgical assistance.

Props ~
Many of the objects used in this play belong to members of the cast or their families. They are not theatrical objects, nor are they "artifacts". Rather they are creations that have living spirits and are used in ceremonies and in everyday life. Babybaskets are handmade and used to keep children safe in body and spirit. The Brush Dance skirt is a living spirit, and as such a sacred ceremonial object. Please do not touch any of these objects. We are honored that the objects have come to be part of our play, and we thank them and the hands and spirits that made and inhabit them. *They may only be handled by the actor who uses them.*

Note: Running time is approximately 90 minutes; there is no intermission.

Characters:

ROSE: Karuk-Yurok Elder, Julie's Gram
LOUISE: Social worker, Yurok, Julie's Aunt, 30s-40s
MARY & ZEEK: Louise's children, ages 6-9
MAX: Yurok Elder, Tribal Fish Biologist
PHILLIP: Klamath Elder
WILL: Yurok-Karuk Native Fisherman, 20s-30s
JULIE: Will's partner; Yurok-Karuk, 20s-30s
JOHNNY: Yurok Fisherman, Will's Cousin
ANDY: Yurok-Nu-Tini-Xwe Fish Biologist; Professor of Biology
KATE: Fish researcher, biology graduate student, 20-30s
RACHEL: Kate's partner, photographer, 20s-30s
ALICE: Upper Klamath Rancher, 70s
TIM: Alice's son, upper Klamath rancher, 40s
GRACE: Tim's daughter, age 6
WALT: Upper Klamath Farmer, 70s
REPORTER
PRIEST
TOURISTS
UPPER and LOWER KLAMATH FOLKS

Note: Actors may play several roles, changing posture, costume, etc., as needed.

Scene Breakdown	Characters
Scene 1 -- Procession	EVERYONE
Scene 2 -- Salmon Is Family	Julie, Will, Rose, Johnny, Max, Louise, Mary, Zeek
Scene 3 -- Basin Family	Alice, Tim, Grace, Walt
Scene 4 -- Confluence	Rachel, Kate
Scene 5 -- Media Wars	Reporter
Scene 6 -- Telemetry	Julie, Kate, Andy
Scene 7 -- Tourists	Julie, Will, Tourists
Scene 8 – Knowledge	Max, Kate (Rachel non-speaking)
Scene 9 – Lamentation	EVERYONE
Scene 10 – Aftermath	Kate, Rachel, / Will, Andy, Julie
Scene 11 – Respects	Kate, Rachel, Louise, Rose, Julie, Mary, Zeek
Scene 12 – Town Hall	Julie, Andy, Johnny, Max, Louise, Tim, Walt, others
Scene 13 – Tires	Rachel, Kate, Tim
Scene 14 – Visit	Julie, Tim, Will
Scene 15 – Ranch Tour	Tim, Kate
Scene 16 – Communion	Alice, Tim, Grace, Priest
Scene 17 – Capt. Jack's Stronghold	Tim
Scene 18 – Ultimate Title	Alice, Tim, Grace, Phillip
Scene 19 – Sacred Is	EVERYONE [Julie, Tim internal scene]

4

Scenic Suggestions: The stage should provide actors with a variety of spaces and levels. Areas for three families can be established in the early scenes are should remain consistestent. Living spaces can be distinguished from outdoors with domestic props, rocking chair, but is largely dependent on the actors. Likewise, outdoor scenes can be suggested through sound effects (running water, birds, wind), but should be primarily an illusion maintained by the actors relationship to space/place. Scene transitions should be accomplished by actors who move stools, boxes and props as needed. During scene transitions projections and sound effects can be used to suggest the next location, or to underscore the theme or mood of the scene. Large images of swimming salmon should be used Underwater photography of swimming salmon are key images to be used, as this is the only representational presence of the salmon themselves. The website for the Klamath Restoration Council, which keeps an archive of Klamath watershed images, and has other valuable information is:
http://www.pelicannetwork.net/klamathrestoration.htm

Salmon Is Everything was first performed in the Studio Theatre of Humboldt State University May 5, 2006, with the following cast and designers:

Rose, Karuk-Yurok Elder ..... Kathy McCovey
Max, Yurok Elder .....Marlon Sherman
Phillip, Klamath Elder .....Marlon Sherman
Julie, Yurok-Karuk, ...Mary Campbell
Will, Yurok-Karuk fisherman, ...Jason Reed
Mid River Man.....Jason Reed
Johnny, Will's Cousin..... Bobbie Perez
Modoc Man..... Bobbie Perez
Louise, Julie's Aunt .....Robin Andrews
Lower Klamath Woman.....Robin Andrews
Andy, Hupa, Fish Biologist/Professor ..... Phil Zastrow
Little Mary, Louise's daughter .....Mary Risling
Zeek, Louise's son ..... Ethan Frank
Kate, a graduate student..... Darcie Beeman-Black
Rachel, her partner..... Beth Weissbart
White Water Woman ..... Beth Weissbart
Female Tourist ..... Beth Weissbart
Male Tourist.....Jason Tower
Walt, Klamath Project Farmer .....Jason Tower
Priest .....Jason Tower
Fisheries Woman .....Josephine Johnson
Alice, Rancher, Tim's Mother .....Josephine Johnson
Tim, Upper Klamath Rancher.....Lincoln Mitchell
Grace, Tim's daughter .....Talia Sophia Moss
Reporter.....Jacob Fronberger
Voiceovers .....Kendall Allen, Roberta Chavez

Production Staff

Project Director/Playwright .....Theresa May
Co-Stage-directors .....Jean O'Hara, Theresa May
Cultural Resources Advisor ..... Kathy McCovey
Lighting Design .....Emily Blanche
Film Montage.....Christa Dickman
Film Footage .....Klamath Media Collective, Michael Hentz

6

Welcome / Blessing

As a way of leaving the ordinary world behind and entering into the imaginative, even sacred space, of story, a tribal person,, with the authority to do so, conducts a blessing of the space. This can take many forms from song, prayer, drumming, or by whatever means the person uses. Note: This blessing should not be understood ad "part of" the script or performance, but as a making-ready of the space, so that the world of the play can begin. The words, gestures, or other expression of the person should not be recorded, nor duplicated by any other person.

SALMON IS EVERYTHING

Scene 1 - Procession

Water and landscape projected; pre-show music dissolves into the sounds of the river, blackbirds, and osprey. Actors enter amid the projected images of water and landscape. Movements may be created that indicate in abstract ways, life on the river. Various poses may be taken, dissolved, and others formed.)

ROSE: I am Karuk.

MAX: I am Yurok.

ANDY: I am Nu-Tini-Xwe--Hupa.

JULIE: We are Yurok. We are Klamath.

WALT: I am a farmer.

WILL: We are Karuk, we are Modoc.

KATE: I am a biologist.

MAX: We are Wiyott, Klamath, Yurok.

ACTOR[Jason T]: I am a logger.

LOUISE: We are Nu-Tini-Xwe, Karuk.

REPORTER: I am a reporter.

JULIE: We are Yurok, Modoc, Karuk.

TIM: I am a rancher.

RACHEL: I am a photographer.

GUIDE: I run whitewater.

LOUISE: I am a social worker.

WILL: I am Yurok, Karuk.

FISHERIES WOMAN: I am a commercial fisherman.

ANDY: I am a teacher.

TOURIST: I am on vacation.

JULIE: I am at home.

MAX: I am Klamath, Yurok, Karuk, Nu-Tini-Xwe

ALICE: I am a mother

MAX: I am a grandfather.

WILL: I am a father. I am a son.

ROSE: I am a grandmother. I am daughter.

MAX: I am Karuk, Nu-Tini-Xwe, Yurok. For my people Salmon is everything. Salmon is the center of our world, our brothers.

Scene 2 – Salmon Is Family

The sound of laughter; actors in a pool of light go through motions of working-- hauling in nets, cleaning fish, canning smoked; children play on the floor. The mood is joy, excitement. JULIE and WILL are a couple and have an 8-month old baby, who sleeps in a traditional baby-basket; LOUSIE has two, a boy and girl age 4-6. Dialogue is easy and playful, as the family invokes memories, and the Elders speak to the children.

ROSE: When we do this work we are giving thanks to the Creator for the Salmon, for the River.

MAX: Salmon is the center of our world, our heart, our sustenance.

LOUISE: (*to one of her children*) Salmon is our family.

ANDY: An Anglo student of mine said to me" how can the Salmon be your relative? You eat them?"

WILL: What an idiot!

ANDY: And I told him, Salmon are our relatives because we have lived in an amazingly bonded way with them since the beginning. The connection goes much deeper than food. It's a relationship created from thousands of years of co-existence.

JULIE: I'd tell him, Salmon is what we do in the summertime! When I was little I used to run around telling everyone, "My Daddy is fishing. My Daddy is on the boat, on the river."

WILL: Yeah, yeah. That's how I learned -- from watching my uncles, my cousins, people that are older than me. I just watched. People don't have to tell me how to do stuff step-by-step. I just watch.

JOHNNY: If you're a good listener and watch everything, you'll be good at it. I had a little boat and I was always on the river.

WILL: I became a good fisherman when I was ten years old. Because that's when you could get a fishing license and a buoy and all that -- when you were ten.

LOUISE: It's spending most of the spring and summer at the mouth of the river--people from all over coming together and feeling good, feeling happy. It is delivering fresh-caught fish to my family …

JULIE: … and to elders and other people who can't get out to fish but love to eat it.

WILL: You take as much as you need. Always, always give fish to your elders or people who don't fish. That was always like a precious, precious thing to do is to share what you have, not just hoard it all or throw it away, you know. That is the one key thing, you know, always, always share. So every time I get a little piece, even if I don't get that much fish, I always try to give a lot of it away to others who don't get a lot of fish.

JULIE: Remember me and you sleeping in a tent down by the River with the bears, sleeping by the smokehouse so the bears don't eat all the fish …

WILL: … that I worked so hard to catch. You were scared.

JULIE: You were too!

ZEEK: Salmon is blood on my hands and fish guts everywhere!

JULIE: Remember all ten of us in that small trailer, sitting around, cutting the smoked fish into pieces and stuffing them into glass jars all day long, taking bites every now and then.

(ROSE slaps her hand.)

JULIE: It was only a little!

LOUISE: Salmon was my daughter's first food. Yesterday she was saying, "When I get bigger, I can fish with my Daddy."

ROSE: It was the men who caught the fish and the women who did the smoking and canning.

JULIE: Change happens Gram.

MAX: Salmon is being part of something bigger than yourself.

ROSE: Red, full-bodied, home-seeking, home loving, unspeaking, mysterious.

MAX: Salmon is the will to go home, the wisdom to know the way.

ROSE: Remember home, the smell of home, the smell of that current, that particular place, that turn up the estuary, into the downward current, that cool scent of feeder creeks.

MAX: Salmon is headstrong!

WILL: Salmon knows lots of things I don't know.

JOHNY: that's for sure.

(Transition lighting/imagry/sound.)

Scene 3 – Basin Family

In another area of the stage, ALICE, stands looking out over her land. Then, as if time has passed, she sits in the wheelchair.

ALICE: We woke that morning to three feet of drifting snow around the house, and the roads drifting shut within minutes of plowing track. My husband worried about feeding the hungry calves. Timmy spun circles in the deep snow, spinning and spinning in bright red boots until his blue coat spun off in the wind …. When I married, I married this land. In my mind it was all about coming to this ranch, the natural beauty, and fixing the River. Fixing everything. Paint the old dingy house. Fence the river. Dig thistles. Clean the shop. Chainsaw down the old fence, build some new fence. The hardest realization for me this season is that what's really changing is me.…

(A conversation they have had in some form before; an issue that is on-going.)

ALICE: (*ALICE, now in a wheelchair*) Did you talk to him?

TIM: I did.

ALICE: Call him back. I'll talk to him. You can't sue your own family!

TIM: No you won't. And yes you can. You the one always saying this family is a business. Well Greg's married into Walt's family and that sure as hell is a business -- about 7000 acres of business. They need the allocation. It's a drought comin' on and without it they're belly up.

ALICE: Get me the phone.

TIM: The hearing is scheduled for next week. Water board'll decide. Lawyers'll decide, just like they always do. Is there more o' that cobbler?

ALICE: You raise ‘em up straight, give ‘em the fear of God, and healthy respect for Nature, and love of the land, and they turn around and sue your water rights out from under.

TIM: (*under his breath*) Sorta like what we did to the Indians.

ALICE: I heard that and no it’s not, that’s different. It’s that Mac Hardy. I knew he’s a greedy son-of-a-bitch when your father and he played poker on Wednesdays. Always drunk our beer and never brought any. I was pregnant with you then. I couldn’t sleep and I’d watch them from the landing upstairs, and that Hardy he’d get a look in his eye outa some old western movie.

TIM: (*He has heard all this before*) It’s not personal, Mom. Isn’t that what you always tell Phillip?

ALICE: That’s different.

TIM: How? Indians should not get the share of the water they need but they should not take it personally? But we can?

ALICE: This is family.

TIM: I hardly know what family means anymore. Seems to me not having fish to feed your family is pretty damn personal. I’m going up. I got paperwork. Need anything?

ALICE: Grace asleep?

TIM: Yeah. Out like a light. Good night. Use the buzzer like they showed you when you’re ready.

ALICE: Wheel me outside, would you son? (*He does so*) Look there, the Milky Way is so clear it’s reflected in the marsh.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 4 – Confluence

RACHEL is viewing her most recent photographs on her laptop. As she forwards from slide to slide, the image is projected on the rear scrim, or in some other place the audience can see. The images take us on a visual tour of the Klamath River below Iron Gate dam. KATE is packing her backpack and gear, but is drawn in by the images. They are used to conversations in which they finish one another's sentences.

KATE: Wow, now that's a great shot!

RACHEL: Iron Gate

KATE: You can totally see the algae growing in the reservoir. Makes you wonder what they were thinking in 1909.

RACHEL: Electricity.

KATE: Irrigation. *(more slides)* Ishi Pishi falls.

RACHEL: Birth place of the Karuk people.

(KATE snorts)

RACHEL: Don't be irreverent.

KATE: I'll show you irreverent girlfriend *(tackles and tickles her, while the slide project continues to change slides every 5-8 seconds.)*

RACHEL: Hey! … you… stop it… okay, okay!

(both women are laughing, breathless)

KATE: Oh my god, it's doing it on its own! *(more laughter)*

RACHEL: That's the Salmon River…. *(she puts the machine on pause)*

KATE: I'll miss you. I wish you'd just come with us.

RACHEL: I just got home.

KATE: You just don't like science types.

RACHEL: That's not true; there was wildlife guy in the photo-workshop. I just didn't know you'd be going out there. If you'd told me your schedule sooner, we could have planned the trip together. You count fish, I shoot pictures, but you can't seem to let me know what you're doing one minute to the next. *(new slide)* What, are you afraid of being out to your colleagues? Is that it?

KATE: No. They're cool.

RACHEL: Fine.

KATE: I'm sorry. Next time, I promise, 'kay?.

RACHEL: 'kay. There's Weitchpec . Tell me again why the Trinity water is so much clearer than the Klamath?

KATE:. Doesn't carry the kind of silt load. It's colder, below Shasta dam it's forested and it runs through a protected wilderness area. The Klamath has to be everything to everybody. You have farmers and ranchers in Oregon using the headwaters, the seven or so dams, then logging and mining along the mid-river, then the water that's made that long toxic journey is what you see at this confluence -- the clear cold Trinity running into the warmer, greener Klamath. That's why flow levels are so critical in both rivers. Most of Trinity flows are dammed up behind Shasta and sent down to central California.

RACHEL: *(as if she is tasting the word)* Confluence. It's a beautiful word isn't it?

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 5 – Media Wars

S/He is on location, getting ready to go on camera, checks his hair, perhaps rubs out a cigarette.

REPORTER: Okay you ready? Yeah, good to go. Good evening. I'm standing on the border of Oregon and California in some of the most beautiful country I've ever seen, but that beauty disguises a troubled landscape. The Klamath River Basin has become a prime example of a problem facing the entire West: How to share limited water with farmers guaranteed irrigations rights by the federal government, fish protected by the Endangered Species Act, and Indian tribes with treaties promising their fisheries will go on forever. The Klamath tribes consider the sucker fish sacred. Historical records indicate that the Klamath Tribes brought in 10,000 pounds of sucker fish in one season. Now this once plentiful fish is protected under the Endangers Species Act. Last year farmers in the Klamath River Basin saw their crops shrivel as the federal government cut irrigation water to protect the sucker fish. Downriver, the Hupa, Yurok and Karuk tribes consider the Salmon a critical part of their livelihood as well as spiritual life, and now this fish, which used to be so plentiful that tribal elders claim "you could walk across the river on the backs of salmon," is threatened too. This year the Yurok tribe of Northern California have warned the Federal government that a fish kill of unprecedented magnitude could devastate the salmon runs. President Bush has repeatedly pledged to do all he could for the farmers, but full irrigation means less water for the sucker and the salmon.

(off camera now, to the camera person, who is Karuk) Okay, good. That was pretty good. Was there really a time when you could walk across the river on the backs of salmon?

(either end here, or if there is an actor playing camera, use the following response)

CAMERA: Oh yeah. Just talk to my Gram.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 6 – Telemetry

River sounds. JULIE and KATE both students of ANDY are working over tanks, putting tracking devices in the fish, then letting them go.

ANDY: (*explaining to JULIE, as KATE has done this before*) We put a tracker in the esophagus of the fish. We try to track ten fish a week.

KATE: Last summer we did about a hundred fish.

ANDY: There is a temperature recorder glued to each transmitter. We can download information off the temperature recorder. The data from the temperature recorder will help us prove that when the River is too warm, fish are more prone to disease.

KATE: The main point of the project is to prove that the fish are trying to get out of the warm-ass river into the cold creeks.

JULIE: Which is why we're concerned about a fish kill this year.

KATE: Every year. (*demonstrating*) Pick 'em up real gentle like this, they've already had enough trauma. Easy there, this is gonna help us help you, brother salmon.

JULIE: Here's what I don't get. Indians lived their lives understanding the tides and the river. We knew how to survive for 1000s of years on this river. Isn't that proof enough the we know what we are talking about?

ANDY: Yeah but the federal government wants data. We were an oral society. The Indians' data was a different kind of data. Now we have to go back and quantify what was a way a life and a body of knowledge passed down through generations.

JULIE: My Gram says we should be doing the First Salmon Ceremony.

ANDY: I don't think anyone knows the First Salmon Ceremony anymore. We haven't done it for 150 years.

JULIE: She says we should be doing it. She says it's our part….

ANDY: I like to think about it this way – Indian people have always made good use of the tools the Creator gave us. Science is a tool. If we can use it to help the salmon, that's a good thing. (*pause*) So, are we good to go here? I'm going to check on the other teams. (*exits*)

(JULIE and KATE both continue; movement of tagging and releasing the fish can be symbolic.)

JULIE: I saw you on TV.

KATE: Oh god, I so sucked. I felt like I let everyone down. The reporter just made me seem like some rabid environmentalist. Rachel says it's the dreads.

JULIE: It's not your hair. It's anti-Indian rhetoric. Pro-farmer propaganda. Same ol' same ol' stuff.

KATE: I could have not fallen over myself. (*changing the subject*) Did Andy tell you about the Stakeholders Meeting next month?

JULIE: Yeah.

KATE: Are you going?

JULIE: No.

KATE: You should go. The last one didn't have a single Tribal person there.

JULIE: Figures.

KATE: The Tribes should be part of this conversation. What?

JULIE: I'm sorry, I just wish you wouldn't tell me what I need, or what I should do. You don't have the kind of stake in this issue that Native people do and you shouldn't be telling us what to do.

KATE: I care about the River and the fish. It's what I've chosen to do with my life!

JULIE: It's different. For my people salmon is everything – subsistence, culture, history, identity. It's who we are!

KATE: Ordinary citizens can't have the same investment in caring for the planet?

JULIE: All I'm saying is that for you it's about being right; it's about winning; about "saving the environment" as if that's something other than yourself. For us it's about staying alive.

KATE: That's exactly what I mean. It's about being alive for all of us. Everything we do in our culture has an impact, every choice, what we drive, what we buy or buy into.

JULIE: But for us the threat of extermination is immediate, just like it is for the fish. You come here doing your research that will eventually get you some good agency job. You care, sure, but if the salmon go extinct, you'll find some other species to save. For my family, if the salmon don't survive my grandmother will die of a broken spirit. You called that fish "brother" –

KATE: When?

JULIE: --a couple minutes ago – but it's a metaphor for you. It's *not a metaphor* for us! My people have lived here for 10,000 years or more. (*increasingly angry as if something unstoppable is welling up from within her)* My people live here, they die here. They are the trees, the water, the fish. That the salmon are brothers is not some kind of myth; the salmon are not symbols of life, they are life. We have maintained a healthy balance with the river and the salmon and everything else because it's all one body, one family. If the salmon die, we break apart; the salmon make life make sense. That's who we are!

(*pause*)

KATE: When are you going to say that to the people who need to hear it? (*she picks up equipment and moves away*)

(*ANDY, who has been listening to their conversation, re-enters the scene)*

JULIE: She just pisses me off sometimes. I don't know what it is. I get sick of her trying to "advocate" for us, telling me how to protect what's already mine, ours, our people's. The water rights belong to us and were promised to us by treaty long before greedy white potato farmers dammed up our river and killed our fish with pesticides.

ANDY: You ought to go to that Stakeholder's Meeting.

JULIE: I haven't got the money, and Will is already pissed off I'm doing this. And I don't have a babysitter.

ANDY: I can get you school funds. Take Corina with you – other people bring kids.

JULIE: I'll think about it.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 7 – Tourists

(JULIE and WILL at home. He gathers some gear and heads out the door.)

JULIE: Where are you going? Can you give me some money first? I need $10. I need to by food and stuff for her. (*WILL exits*) Don't slam the door! Where are you going? *(she turns to the audience)* My mother was born to a full-blooded Yurok woman, raised on the Klamath River. My ancestors go all the way back to the beginning of time. My great-great-great grandfather was named Peck-Wan John. This means that I have ancestors who lived at Pecwan, upriver. My great-grandmother was born in Klamath in 1909. She lived just upriver from Requa, by where the Golden Bears Bridge is now. Now I'm involved in this terribly intense relationship… the father of my child… he's a subsistence fisherman, Yurok-Karuk. He grew up down-river, but now he fishes like an upriver guy, with a dip net. He says he gets closer to the fish, closer to the river that way.

(MAN & WOMAN TOURIST enter the scene and become part of JULIE's story. During the following, WILL. with his long dip-net, and JOHNY (his "clubber") and one of the children silhouetted high on a rock.)

JULIE: I gave a farmer from Bakersfield a ride the other day. This tourist and his wife--they locked their keys in their big white truck. So I gave them a ride to their big white camper to get the spare key out of the old lady's humungous purse. They were bragging about how many fish they were taking home to where ever. They had a huge cooler in the back of their huge white truck. I am suddenly aware that I smell like fish guts because I'd been chopping heads off all morning, getting it ready for smoking.

MAN TOURIST: Water seems low this year.

JULIE: I can see his wife in my rear-view in the backseat, scowling. Might as well dive in, I

think, after all, how many times to you get to be face to face with one of them? *(to the TOURIST)* Farmers upriver in the Klamath Basin turned the water off. You're probably using some of our water, aren't you?

MAN: I'm from Bakersfield myself. Been a farmer all my life. That's why I moved to Bakersfield.

JULIE: Isn't that part of the Sacramento Valley? Did you know 70% of the Trinity River, which flows into the Klamath, is diverted down south to farms like yours?

MAN TOURIST: No, we're not using your water. We have a private pump. And we have aqueducts. Our water comes from the San Joaquin and the Kern…. So, uh, are you going to school?

JULIE: Yeah, Native American Studies major, with a focus Environmental Law. Our Tribe needs good lawyers to protect our water rights.

MAN TOURIST: We're having dinner at Steelhead tonight, with some friends of ours. It's our 30th wedding anniversary. We've made it that long.

JULIE: Hey Happy Anniversary! I've eaten there once. I had the lobster.

WOMAN: We love lobster! We had real Maine lobster *in Maine*. We've had fresh Alaska salmon on an *Alaskan cruise*. We've had this wonderful Cajun crawdad stew, in New Orleans. We even had Buffalo steak in Wyoming!

MAN: Yep, we put 24,000 miles on our camper touring the country. Sometimes I feel like I'm re-tracing my own ancestor's migration West! When we retired we sold our house and now we can go wherever we want and see all things we've missed. We've earned it! This is what we worked for all our lives. That's what our friends say.

(TOURISTS dissolve into the shadows leaving JULIE alone)

JULIE: When I dropped him off, he tried to give me twenty dollars. No thanks, really, I don't need anything. But he insisted *(pulls a $20 bill out of pocket)*, so I took it. For the fish. For our daughter.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 8 – Knowledge

KATE works while RACHEL shoots pictures that simultaneously appear on the scrim; MAX is in the shadows among moving images of fish.

MAX: The Creator cried and the Salmon were born. The Salmon have gave themselves to the Human People.

KATE: One theory says that salmon navigate by the stars. Feeling the stars in their bones.

MAX: Salmon smell the high country. It's in their blood. There is memory in the blood.

KATE: *(to the Salmon)* Do you call out to one another? Do you sing with joy when you smell it, when you make that turn from the big river up your own fond creek? Do you echo one another in some unknown language, some dark memory place your ancestors knew?

MAX: The same spirit goes up and down the River, the fish changes, but the spirit remains.

KATE: How do they know?

MAX: How do you know when you are hungry?

KATE: Sometimes it hits me when I'm out here checking the equipment, trying to gather information to protect them: they *are* knowledge, they embody it.

MAX: Salmon is all time, ancient time, old one, keeper of knowledge, keeper of time.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 9 – Fish Kill/Lamentation

(to audience)

LOUISE: It was just after one of the Jump Dances in the Fall. We were all exhausted and ready for a feast. The women were getting ready at the long tables and the men were hanging up the regalia. Kids were running around and we were all happy and laughing. My grandson, who was four, was always talking about how he couldn't wait to fish with his daddy and his granpa, but the men wouldn't let him out there. "When you're bigger than the fish, my father would say, that's when you can catch one!" So that day, we're laughing and talking and happy. Where's my son? Down by the water across the path there where the grass breaks and the sand begins. He's okay. *(ZEEK enters, proud, barely able to hold a huge representative salmon)* Then I hear his voice and we all turn around and there he is with a great big salmon draped across his two little arms. Straining and fighting to keep standing, he's so happy, crying out …

ZEEK: *(entering with a large salmon draped over his arms)* Look Mama I caught a fish! I caught it myself! I caught a fish!"

LOUISE: *(taking it)* That fish was dead; it was already dead.

The REPORTER's text and the lamentation must seem simultaneous. The actors and director should work to make sure that the words of both are understood, even though voices may overlap. Under the lamentation, MAX may lead the men's rhythmic song. As the lamentation and report are spoken, the representational fish brought onstage by ZEEK is passed in slow motion from person to person. The intensity and volume of the lamentation increases gradually until the REPORTER is nearly drowned out.

JULIE: 30,000 and counting.

ALL: As they return.

LOUISE: 40,000 salmon dead.

ALL: As they return.

JOHNNY: 50,000 and counting.

ALL: As they return.

("As they return" *whispered under the REPORTER's lines.)*

REPORTER: Chinook salmon, coho salmon and steelhead continue to litter the shores of the Klamath River in one of the worst fish kills in U.S. history. Tribal spokespersons say the die-off was a direct consequence of the refusal by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to release more water into the river. The reduced flow on the Klamath River resulted in higher than normal water temperatures – conditions that foster disease in salmon. Adult salmon returning upriver to spawn and juveniles migrating downriver are hurt or killed by high water temperatures and poor water quality due to reduced flows. Temperatures above 60 degrees can be fatal to salmon, and temperatures in the Klamath River in the weeks prior to the kill were well into the high 70s.

WILL: Gill rot!

ALL: As they return. *(This line repeats as a whisper under the REPORTER's lines.)*

REPORTER: Last year, when farmers stormed Iron Gate Dam to demand more water for potato, alfalfa, and hay, Secretary of Interior Gail Norton pledged ample water this year. Tribal and commercial fishermen and environmental groups recently filed litigation challenging the federal government's allocation of water to the agricultural Klamath Basin during a drought year.

(REPORTER pauses, letting the lamentation stand alone)

ANDY: 30,000 and counting.

ALL: As they return

LOUISE: 40,000 salmon dead.

ALL: As they return.

JOHNNY: 60,000 salmon dead!

ALL: As they return

WILL: Gill rot!

ALL: As they return

ROSE: 70,000 dead.

ALL: As they return

REPORTER: The question now is: What will they do with the bodies? Dead fish lay decomposing along 30 miles of the river. Last week end a handful of volunteers gathered some of the debris. It was later composted with sawdust and woodchips.

(the rhythmic lamentation growing in intensity; MAX continues to lead the men's song, keeping the beat steady.)

ROSE: The fishermen abandoned their nets.

ALL: As they return!

WILL: We counted them; we hacked their tails off.

ALL: As they return!

JULIE: Leaving the bodies open, bellies to the sun;

ALL: As they return!

ROSE: Floating -- each its own shipwreck of life.

ALL: As they return.

JULIE: Each not only a meal but a life.

ALL: As they return.

JULIE: 33,000 dead in heaving waves of flesh.

ALL: As they return.

ROSE: As if these sweet ones are litter not corpses of our underwater families.

ALL: As they return.

ANDY: Those who would have, in any other year, in any other time, been setting nets in the sun, teaching our sons …..

WILL: Mostly I left them there. I wanted people to see them, to smell them.

ALL: As they return.

ROSE: Who picked up these dead and dying ones?

ALL: As they return!

ROSE: Who laid them to rest, mixed their flesh with woodchips and ash?

ALL: As they return!

ROSE: Carried them one at a time, for some were three feet long.

ALL: As they return!

ROSE: Who witnessed, who was not driven back by the smell?

ALL: As they return

JULIE: We carried them in our arms, on our backs, in our hearts.

WILL: We counted them.

ALL: As they return!

ROSE: We carry them still. In our arms, on our backs, in our hearts.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 10 – Aftermath

RACHEL: How's Julie?

KATE: Crazy with grief, what do you expect? For her family it's the Holocaust! You know?

RACHEL: Yeah, actually I do.

KATE: I didn't mean it that way.

RACHEL: I know. We should go visit her family.

KATE: *(hardly hearing)* You work and you work and you count the juveniles and open the creeks and you move the sites and you fight with the white water guides and the miners and the dope dealers, and you try to talk to the feds and the farmers and you interpret the data and you get more data and you write opinions and you get pressure from the feds to change the data, but all in all you think things are getting better. You think, well at least in this river we haven't started putting them on trucks and driving them up river! And then this. We predicted it; we did predict it. Hurrah for science! I can't imagine how Andy feels. He's already had to tell some families that they've caught their quota, and there's 25% unemployment on his rancheria, and now he has to explain to them why there are suddenly 50 thousand dead salmon on the riverbank?! It's only my frigging dissertation. For him, salmon is everything. What am I doing, Rach? How did I ever think that I could make a damn difference?

(pause)

RACHEL: In Hebrew the word for universe also means fabric, garment. And the fabric is being torn everywhere. When we do mitzvah's—good actions—it's like we're reaching up and helping to mend the torn fabric of the Universe.

KATE: It's not a tear, it's a huge rip, it's a gash.

(*cross fade)*

WILL: We told them! Before the fish kill happened, we told them there was going to be a fish kill. We said you're gonna devastate our fishery. We've got written documents that showed and told them it's going to be a terrible thing.

ANDY: I wrote several Reports for the Yurok Tribe predicting this! California department of Fish and Game warned them that lower levels could cause this disaster. Michael Kelly at US Fish and Wildlife wrote two scientific reports advocating for higher river flows in order to save Coho salmon.

WILL: His reports were squashed…..

ANDY: Quashed…

WILL Quashed, whatever.

ANDY: The Department of Interior told Kelly and other biologists to alter their reports in favor of less water, in favor of the farmers. This happened for one reason: high water temperatures caused by low water levels.

JULIE: How can they justify giving more water to farmers when this is a drought year for everyone?

WILL: 'Cause farmers give big bucks to the Bush campaign that's why.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 11 – Respects

KATE and RACHEL visit JULIE's family. Only the women and children are there. Only necessary props of rugalach, jars, basket, brush dance skirt, dip net should be used to suggest activities. Feeling awkward and out of place, KATE sits on the floor interacting with the children; RACHEL sits near ROSE. The stroller may also be present.

ZEEK: Can I have another one?

LOUISE: One.

ZEEK: What's the name of them again?

RACHEL: Rugalach.

ZEEK: Is that an old name?

LOUISE: He means is it Yurok. He calls it the old language.

RACHEL: It's Yiddish. Which is old, but not as old as Yurok.

LOUISE: Go on, take another one for Mary too, and then go outside.

ZEEK: My uncle and grandpa are out getting dead fish. I found the first one. There's tons!

MARY: They stink.

ZEEK: We saw them from the bus. They have to cut the tails off.

LOUISE: Go on now.

MARY: My teacher was crying. They sent us home from school. My dad was crying.

LOUISE: That's enough. Both of you go out and play.

(the children take more rugalach and leave; an awkward pause)

ROSE: It's nice of you to come see us.

LOUISE: Yes, thank you for the sweets – sugar's the best medicine!

RACHEL: Thank *you*. This is a terrible thing that has happened to you.

KATE: We're so so sorry.

(Awkward pause; ROSE is working willow root for basket weaving)

RACHEL: What are you making?

ROSE: This is the willow root. Willow roots to make your baskets and the caps like this one we wear in the dances. When I go down to the river and pick the willow roots, I'm on my hands and knees. My hands and fingers are in that dirt pulling on that long twine to pull the root out, and then going home, soaking it and peeling it – like Louise is doing. You know that's a whole process with the earth.

RACHEL: Then when you wear to cap your thoughts are deep like the roots and flowing like the river.

ROSE: You got it! (*laughs*) I like this girl, Kate, she knows.

RACHEL: How do you get the colors?

ROSE: To make the red, I use the bark of the Red Alder tree. The black color comes from the stems of the Five finger fern and the white color comes from beargrass. When I want to make a really fancy basket, I put yellow in it. I dye porcupine quills yellow with that mountain moss, you know, that one that grows high up in the trees in the high country.

KATE: *Letharia vulpine* -- wolf lichen.

ROSE: We just call it moss. You see to the Karuk people everything and everyone has a purpose. The spirit people taught the Karuk how to live on the land, what to do, what to eat, how to behave and how and when to conduct ceremonies. Then when the Karuk people knew what to do the spirit people went into the sky, the earth, the trees, the animals, the rocks and into the plants. You see when I am in the forest, I am never alone, I am surrounded by spirit people.

JULIE: Try telling that to a forester!

ROSE: I have!

(In the way that some things seem hilarious at a funeral, Julie's ironic comment provokes peels of laughter, which breaks what is left of the ice.)

KATE: How is Will doing?

JULIE: When I saw his face when he came home the first day when he saw the fish dead, I thought someone in his family had died. He was too upset to express any emotion. He got up at 3 am one night and just started writing his heart out. He's never done that before.

LOUISE: It seems as if we are struggling to hold on.

JULIE: It just hit us so hard. We feed salmon to our babies before they can talk or walk. It's like it's our blood spilled.

ROSE: It is a big hurt and cry for all our people. Our life on the river lay rotting. What do we do? We have to get down and pray.

LOUISE: It was like how it feels when you grieve for a family member that has passed on -- that heavy feeling in your gut. But when you have a funeral there's an event; there's a grieving time. Elders have never heard about anything like it in legends or stories.

ROSE: Salmon have seen death all around them, but they still fight back. They are strong! Watching them always makes my heart glad.

JULIE: It keeps coming to me that through our medicine we should be able to do something about the fish kill. Why can't we fix this? Did we do something wrong in our dances that caused this to happen?

ROSE: My mind takes me to a time when we thrived as healthy peoples. A time when only our people managed this beautiful land.

LOUISE: How can a system that has been perfected over thousands of years been discarded so easily? Not even two hundred years later a catastrophe has devastated that abundance.

ROSE: During this time there would be the First Salmon Ceremony and a feast that gave thanks to the Salmon for giving their lives for the survival of the people. This was something that has never been done in my lifetime.

JULIE: Why don't we try to bring the First Salmon Ceremony back and use it as healing?

ROSE: All the men had a meeting down at Requa and they were standing around talking about what should they do. And out there in the water there was a sea lion splashing and throwing salmon around. That was a prayer time. That was a prayer time.

LOUISE: I guess some of us feel sense of shame, a sense of responsibility.

ROSE: There is a difference between blame and responsibility. We have a relationship that needs tending. When I was a child the River gave me a prayer and I sewed it into my brush dance skirt. Let me show you something. *(starts to rise)*

JULIE: I'll get it Gram.

ROSE: Get me my brush dance skirt. In that suitcase there. No, not that one. The blue one there. That one. Bring me that here. *(JULIE brings out a shelled brush dance skirt and ROSE takes it; the sound of the ocean rises from the apron and skirt* This is the skirt Mary will wear.

RACHEL/KATE: *(Kate moves around to see better*) Oh, gosh, it's beautiful!

(*Julie unpacks the other skirt; JULIE and either ROSE or LOUISE hold the apron and skirt up and walk with it, evoking the sounds and allowing the whole audience to see and hear*).

ROSE: I made these. My grandfather and I took this deer when he was about 80 and he could not see anymore. After my grandfather passed away, I took these two hides out of the freezer and had them tanned. I then made a dress from them, to honor my grandfather. I picked up

almost all of these abalone and olivela shells myself. This dress took a few years to make. Almost everything in this dress comes from nature and from my memories.

RACHEL: Feel how heavy it is.

KATE: Wow!

ROSE: Listen. Can you hear it?

RACHEL/KATE: Oh my gosh. It sounds exactly like the ocean!

ROSE: (*MARY comes back drawn by the skirts and the stories*). This is the skirt you will wear, little Mary!

LOUISE: I am so glad my daughter gets to dance! I remember my first summer camp was at Requa by the Brush Dance Pit. I was a counselor. When she was 2 1/2 she was absolutely entranced by the dancers in the pit. She began slowly bobbing up and down the way the girls are supposed to. My heart filled with joy. You will dance! It's coming up soon. I need to finish this cap.

JULIE: Me and my cousin would always be so tired after a long night of Brush Dancing, and we would always play this little game where one of us would stay awake and watch the other fall asleep only to be scared awake again by one of us shaking each other.

ROSE: You don't have to be Indian to go. We have the dances out at Patrick's Point you can go to. You just call the park and they'll tell you when.

RACHEL: Oh, I'd love to go! *(pause)*

ROSE: My grandpa used to tell me a story about a rock out by the Orick beach: a lady used to live out there on that rock eating clams, oysters, and muscles. When I was little I had always believed it. I made up my mind that if I ever had the chance to go and see if it were true or not, I wouldn't go. I have believed in the lady who lived off the sea ever since.

(*ZEEK and MARY have come back to the group, drawn by their great-Gram's stories; they sit by RACHEL, liking her attention*.)

MARY: Have you ever gone eeling?

RACHEL: What's eeling?

MARY: Catching eels. Some people think only boys can do it, but I really want to.

ZEEK: The don't catch 'em, they hook'em! They have this long stick, like an arm, with a hook. They just dip it in and get an eel.

MARY: I saw a pretty one that was all carved on the handle.

RACHEL: I hope you get to do it someday.

KATE: We should probably get going. I'm supposed to be out there helping Will.

RACHEL: Thank you Rose.

LOUISE: Thank you for the rugalach.

(ROSE gives them a jar of smoked salmon).

ROSE: *My* gram's recipe!

KATE & RACHEL: Thank you, how kind, thank you so much.

(they exit)

ROSE: Nice girls.

JULIE: They're lesbians, gram.

ROSE: I know. You think I was born yesterday? Even white folks need a tribe. *(JULIE laughs)* In the old days those ones would have a place in the circle.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 12 – Town Hall

(Citizens and experts sit in a circle; perhaps they stand up to a microphone to speak.)

REPORTER: *(on camera)* Salmon are amazing. Born knowing this river and their place in it. Traveling the same way their ancestors have done for centuries. Now, here at the mouth of the Klamath River, the Salmon themselves have called a Town Hall Meeting. Farmers and ranchers from the upper Klamath Basin, mid-river folks, and lower Klamath Tribal fisheries experts and community members have come together in a series of Stakeholder Meetings to discuss what must be see as a shared future. How do you balance the water level of a river when agriculturalists and commercial fishermen depend on it for money, consumers for food, and indigenous people for life? How thin can we spread the bounty? Does anyone have to give up their lifestyle altogether? Who gets to decide? And what will they say to those they erase? Tonight we bring you some excerpts from that Town Hall meeting….

(A prop microphone is passed from person to person as they speak; actors respond in character, sometimes in audible sounds, to other character's perspectives.)

MAX: We need to have the federal government recognize that we have a senior water right. We have court cases and court decisions that have substantiated this right. "How much water does it take to protect fish?" For crying out loud, enough so that they don't die. This is an allocation issue plain and simple. More water must flow down river.

TIM: Look, I'm not anti-fish, I'm just anti-bullshit. I don't accept that the water is over-allocated. My family has been cattle ranching in upper Klamath for 150 years. A lot of folks like me love this land as much as our Indian neighbors do. We're trying to preserve a way of life that

has been handed down and fight off the carnivorous southern California developers. We want to preserve our traditional rural values. We want our children to have a reason to stay and work the land. And that means economic incentives.

KLAMATH TRIBAL MEMBER: You talk about your family values. We've seen evidence of your people's values over the years. Like when our Reservation was "terminated" without our participation or consent. We were participatin' in your economy back then, in 1930, 1940, fair and square. Then in 1950s the government just terminated our land, no democratic process, just took it. How many times are your gonna take it, man? (*pause)* We not only lost our land, we lost our whole social fabric. Some of use lost our souls. I don't want that to happen to the Indian people in the lower Klamath. That's all I got to say right now.

FISHER WOMAN: I live in Crescent City, California. My family business is fishing and we don't have any support from the government like you all. I drove up here because I wanna know how the hell a whole industry disappears overnight? Marine Fisheries Dept. tell us we're out of a job this year, next year. The '70s were hard enough, when we started feeling the effects of the dams. A lot of families got out. Now our worst nightmare has become reality. The whole coastline is closed. We've lost a whole industry in the blink of an eye without compensation or even much notice by the government. The effects on families are long term – the divorce rates, the domestic violence, the drunk driving rates. We sold Sonja for $7,000, and that's what I been living on. My husband was aching to be back at sea. He lives by the elements – water, fish, and family. He went to Alaska to work crab 'cause there aren't any fish here. Crabbin's very

dangerous if you know….. and now he's never coming back… My community will never get back what we've lost. *(by the end she is completely overcome and can hardly finish)*

WALT: *(the is heartfelt, not aggressive)* My ancestors came from Eastern Europe, got out of the tenements of NY, then came to the Klamath basin in 1902. The government wanted them to "feed the West" and said "we're gonna fund it". The Bureau of Reclamation was gonna build a dam and recover Tule lake. My ancestors were part of a national dream. And then after World War II the government was giving land to veterans, and so it went for 70 years. Everything went pretty well until the Endangered Species Act passed. Now suing under the ESA has become a cottage industry out here thanks to a band of liberal-ass judges! I worked hard, all my life. I got up at 4 in the morning, hardly ever saw my children, to build this farm, to grow what I was told would feed Americans. I resent being held to count by a bunch of lazy Hippies and Indians. I tell you one thing, the farmers are the next Indians being run off their land by the government!

LOUISE: I've heard from some people up Klamath Falls who are ranchers and they're like "Geez, this is third generation for our family to be here." And I understand that, but it's like, this is the hundredth generation for my people, so put it in perspective. When the fish died, that was me, also dying. That was our people. My family have lived along that river for thousands of years.

MID-RIVER GUY: I grew up Karuk. I remember when I was seven years old I caught my first salmon. I was so proud because now my family would have food to eat! There's a whole tradition with this place… you fasted and you prayed to get the spring Chinook to come early…

it's no different than your Christian faith.. you pray for rain, don't you? I've heard some things today that… I need to say this. I need to dispel this myth of the lazy Indian and the lazy hippie. There's a lot of work go on here… the basket-making and making the nets and tending the trees and doing control burns to clear the undergrowth –this river IS a farm! These stereotypes are dangerous. We have an elder here who just passed away. He signed up and fought for this country in World War II, and then when he came back, the US Forest service had sold off his land. The Karuk have chosen not to fish the spring runs anymore because they're so low – and no ESA ruling had to tell us that! We know how to manage this resource.

JULIE: The fish kill is a process. The fish kill isn't like a one-time thing. It happens every year. All year the small fish are dying because of the water temperatures and the dams. This is a community issue, not just an Indian issue. Most non-Natives see it as an Indian issue, and they don't even understand what that means. It's a spiritual issue. It's our job to take responsibility. We have an opportunity to right a great wrong here.

WHITEWATER GUIDE: I used to *BE* a hippie. Now we run Blue Mountain Rafting Company where the Salmon River meets the Klamath. The year of the fish kill there was so little water that people were unable to safely travel the river by jet boat or raft. I've seen rocks that I didn't know existed before! We are part of this community too. We uphold part of the economy here. We care about the health of this river. We want to see it free and wild and runable for our grandchildren and yours. We've got to ask what's our ethical obligation here? Doesn't our ethical obligation outweigh even the economic concerns? Sure farmers are going to have to take a hit – we have, the tribes have – we all have to share in the change because it's the right thing to

do for this extraordinary wilderness. You'd sacrifice for your child, if your child was sick. It's a sacrifice, but it's also an act of love.

(Town Hall assumes frozen or slow-motion positions, and silence, while lights change to show TIM outside the Ladies Room waiting for GRACE. JULIE comes out with her baby in a traditional baby-basket.)

JULIE: Hey.

TIM: Hi. Thank you for what you said in there. I guess I never saw it that way. *(She is about to roll past him on her way back to the meeting, then stops.)*

JULIE: That your little girl in there?

TIM: Yeah. She's old to sleep in a basket.

JULIE: I'm just lucky today.

TIM: *(looks in stroller)* How old is she, about 12 month?

JULIE: 8 months.

TIM: She's beautiful. Babies are like little ambassadors from another world!

JULIE: They are.

TIM: Yeah. *(pause)* So, do you think we'll solve anything here?

JULIE: I doubt it. I've heard a lot of this talk before.

TIM: So what would help?

JULIE: I don't know. I guess if people up there understood that this is not only our livelihood that's at stake, it's our culture, our traditions, our way of life.

TIM: People where I come from think they are trying to protect their way of life too.

JULIE: Tell that to my father and her dad when 50 thousand salmon are rotting on the riverbank!

TIM: Okay.

JULIE: Okay what?

TIM: Okay, I'd like to talk to them, your dad and..

(GRACE comes out of the Ladies Room bright and bouncing.)

GRACE: Okay Dad, I'm done! *(short pause)* Do we have to go back in there? It's soooo boring!

(Cross fade to REPORTER as JULIE and TIM re-enter the TOWN HALL)

REPORTER: *(to camera, then interviewing MAX)* I'm standing high above the mouth of the Klamath River. This is where tribal fishermen make their livings. This is where they are losing that living. The situation really hits home for one tribal elder, who grew up on smoked salmon and acorn soup.

MAX: I wonder how many generations of people these rocks have seen. They never get tired of watching their friend the ocean roll in and out. I bet that these rocks and ocean are good old friends and take in all that they see. These rocks are the first to see the Salmon returning. These two old friends, the rocks and ocean, must have wept and grieved when they saw the Salmon floating on their sides, gills rotting, devastated spirits. You'd see dead fish from time to time but I've never seen what's going on now. It's real hard to take, seeing them die like that.

(Scene returns to inside the Stakeholder's Meeting)

KATE: *(now with microphone & to the audience as if they are also part of the town meeting)* The mouth of the Klamath is a glorious place, the river rushing out into the sea. As I walk the beach with my friends whose families fish there, they're all -- Can I borrow your binoculars? I wanna see who's down there. I wanna see who's eeling. Check it out! Some guys on a quad are

zooming buy and they're whistling and asking if we want a ride and my friends are all "oh, *those* guys", and "yeah, they're cousins, we're so over them." And then it hits me! I'm out here like this is some wild coastal preserve; but my friends are in their *neighborhood.* This is their hood! Where they hang in summer; where they meet guys and dance and sleep over and eat food that their Moms made and where they play radios loud and tell secrets to girlfriends. And then it hit me again. What if, in *your* neighborhood, in mine, at the end of a fabulous summer, there were 50,000 dead animals on the streets, in the yards, on the sidewalk, animals you loved, animals you knew and considered part of your family? Animals that were the life-blood of your community? What if that happened to you? And it began to sink in, what this meant, what it must have felt like, just a little.

(meeting disperses; light change)

Scene 13 – Tires

Pool of light on RACHEL as she beings the prayers and movements of Shabatt, lights candles; a loaf of bread before her.

RACHEL: Baruk ata adonoi elohanu / Mela ha olam….

(KATE enters, drops gear, backpack, etc., stubs her toe)

KATE: Crap. Sorry. Sorry I'm late. I can never remember what time you start this

RACHEL: Sundown

KATE: That's not a time.

RACHEL: It used to be a time.

KATE: I really need to take a shower. (*taking off layers of outdoor clothing*)

RACHEL: In the cycle of the seasons, in sacred time, sundown is a time, a time that the people understood as a time.

KATE: But not 6 o'clock?

RACHEL: No, that's western rationale time

KATE: Not scared time

RACHEL: Are we gonna do this again?

KATE: I just need a time that's all.

RACHEL: That's the point, you can't put Shabbat in your day-timer. It's outside of day-timer-time.

KATE: Sorry. Really I am.

RACHEL: You of all people should know that there are different kinds of time – there is the time the salmon come home in the fall, the time the salmon come home in the spring. Isn't that what you're trying to get the farmers and feds up there to understand?

KATE: That's political.

RACHEL: It's spiritual. If you miss that, I don't think all your biological opinions are worth much….

KATE: Sure is gorgeous country. When you come over this ridge, there it is, the Basin – the war zone – but it looked like heaven. Then I start noticing the signs. Like "Farmers Feed America", "Forget the Fish and Feed the Masses", "EPA Go Home", or "I'm pro Farmer, I vote AND I shoot". Oh, you were right about the bumper-sticker, by the way.

RACHEL: Did you talk to anyone?

KATE: Park rangers. Agency biologists. You know me, I don't know how. You don't just walk up to someone with pointy boots in a feed store and say, "hey are you a farmer or a rancher? Are you running 12,000 head of angus on land that used to belong to the Klamath Tribes? Or are you a farmer growing monsoon crops in what used to be, and incidentally still is, intermittent wetlands? Can we talk? No I didn't talk to anyone. Well, no, I did talk to one guy. But not about fish. I had a few close encounters...

RACHEL: What kind of encounters?

KATE: …of the red-neck kind. I didn't talk to anyone Rach, because I was in getting coffee at what would euphemistically be called a Mom and Pop diner and somebody, some buckaroo, some bucket-brigadier was out in broad daylight slashing my tires.

RACHEL: Oh my god! Are you okay? (*ideally, this line is simultaneous with KATE's next line*)

(*Lights change as she enters the scene; TIM joins her. KATE coming out of a diner with coffee, sees her car. TIM is on his way in. He sees it too.*)

KATE: Oh my god. Oh my god.

TIM: Ouch!

KATE: (*turns on TIM*) Who did this? Did you see them? What kind of people do this? (*takes out cell phone*) I'm calling the police. Shit. (*her phone is out of ra*nge) Why did they do this? Who are they? Where am I?!

TIM: It happens. You're in Klamath Falls. Take it easy. Let's got you some help. (*takes out his cell phone*) Bob. Tim. Busy? Good. Would you send a truck over to Maxine's parking lot with four tires for.. (*walks around car*) a Toyota Corolla…?

KATE: 1998.

TIM: 1998. No, that's okay. I'll be gone, but just take care of it for me, okay? (*offers her his phone*) Here, wanna call the police?

KATE: Yeah. This is gonna max out my visa. What's the number up here?

TIM: 911 I think. Tires are on the house.

KATE: What? No. No way. You can't do that.

TIM: Too late, already did. I'm sorry about this.

KATE: It wasn't your fault.

TIM: No, but it's my town.

KATE: Who did this? Why?

TIM: People do stupid things when they feel powerless. They see your bumper-sticker and, well, it's a guerrilla war for them. Like Captain Jack fighting off the U.S. Cavalry to hold on to the Modoc homelands. A lot of these farmers and ranchers think they're Captain Jack now. "I'm pro Salmon and I vote"? That's cute. Up here people are suspicious of this interspecies suffrage movement….. I gotta get to the feed store, got a sick calf. Bob will fix you up.

KATE: Wait. Thanks. Uh, I'm Kate.

TIM: Tim. Tim McNeil.

KATE: Thanks.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 14 – The Visit

JULIE and WILL at home.

JULIE: Just try to be civil, okay? He wants to hear our perspective, that's all.

WILL: You didn't answer my question. Who said you could invite this guy to our home?

JULIE: No one. No one said. No one needed to say who I can invite.

WILL: This is your Gram's house, and you didn't ask her? And you sure as hell didn't ask me.

(knock at the door)

JULIE: Please Will, just one cup of coffee? *(she answers the door)*

TIM: Hi. You must be Will. *(awkward moment)*

JULIE: How was your drive? Did you come through Happy Camp or around?

TIM: Around. I never get to see enough of the ocean.

JULIE: Then you drove along the Smith River, before Crescent City. Did you stop at Requa like I told you?

TIM: I did. I hiked to the top where you can look down on the mouth.

JULIE: That's near where we have our Brush Dances.

TIM: Beautiful country. Beautiful river.

WILL: Should have seen it when there were 1000s of dead fish floating on top.

TIM: I'm sorry that happened. I know it was real hard on your family and your people.

JULIE: Want coffee?

WILL: No. No. I'm sorry. Mr. Uh –

TIM: McNeil.

WILL: Mr. McNeil. This is our "people's" house – our Gram who didn't speak for four days after the fish kill. Julie's father whose only work this season has been counting the dead.

TIM: I'm just trying to understand the implications….

WILL: What is this another "study"? You don't have the stomach for the implications, man. This is genocide going on here. Like killing off the buffalo. Only now we recognize the pattern.

TIM: I don't think…

WILL: Now you come down here like we're all supposed to sit around some Thanksgiving table and what, eat potatoes?

JULIE: He doesn't grow potatoes.

WILL: Well, I don't want your poison food. I don't want to sit at your table. I want you to get –

JULIE: Will, please.

TIM: That's okay. I want to hear what he has to say.

WILL: I've lived in the Klamath River system my entire life. The river is part of me, the life-blood of my people… The Klamath is my home, my church, garden, highway, counselor, friend, brother -- hell, provider… The carnage I've seen over the weeks is so utterly disgusting I can't sleep. I close my eyes and the images of dead, rotting fish -- maybe you've seen photographs… but you cannot begin to imagine the smell. The smell of death and decay messes with my mind. I can't eat because food, no matter what it is, reminds me of the smell. Come walk along the banks of the river with me … I dare you... Come and walk with me and cut open the bellies of rotten salmon to detect their sex… Come and walk with me… count with me…hack their tails so they won't be recounted. You can't escape the smell. This is a real life situation. It's not a book; it's not pretend. It's not something you read about that happened a hundred years ago. It's happening right now, today. To people in my life. Maybe all your rancher and farmer friends up there don't understand that. You tell them to get the hell down here and help us clean up this mess that they helped make. *(pause)* That's all I have to say.

TIM: I will tell them. *(WILL leaves)*

JULIE: I'm sorry –

TIM: No, don't be. I'm glad he spoke his mind. I wanted to hear.

JULIE: We aren't asking for all the water, just enough for salmon to survive…Salmon are the center of our culture. If they leave the river, we don't know what will become of us… We are running out of miracles.

TIM: I know. Us too. Thanks for havin' me down.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 15 – Ranch Tour

(TIM's office)

KATE: I didn't know ranchers had offices.

TIM: It's a business.

KATE: Yeah. Guess I expected moose heads on the wall, and, well, you know, big bear hide rugs.

TIM: Those are at the house.

KATE: Thanks for meeting me. I don't really know where to begin. There's a lot of people in pain where I live, Tribal people who depend on salmon for subsistence, commercial fishermen and women who lost their livelihood. They think you all up here are using all the water and not enough goes down river.

TIM: Wanna see some birds, or are you just a fish person?

KATE: No. No, I like birds.

TIM: Our ranch is a historic wetland, so we can't just put all the water in-stream for the sucker fish, or any fish. We'd loose the wetlands, we'd loose the sandhill crane.

KATE: Intermittent wetlands actually…. The birds use the wetlands when nature makes a wetlands – in the spring and fall. Preserving wetlands in the middle of summer, aka irrigation, when the fish need the water is kinda over-management.

(walking outside)

TIM: People up here are just scared, Kate. A lot went down during the time of Termination.

KATE: The '50's?

TIM: Yes, and before and after. Klamath tribal land used to extend "from mountain top to mountain top." Then came the Dawes Act that tried to make Indians into farmers. Whites like my

great-grandfather started buyin' up allotments; that's how we came by these acres. Then in the 1950s the Federal government terminated the last of the Klamath Reservation. That brought a stampede of social problems, the drugs, alcohol, wrecked cars and wrecked homes. In our basin upriver we have so much conflict it's just hard to see the bigger picture. We have a history of violence at a level no one talks about. There's a lot of shame around it. We made a lot of mistakes, but I think you'll find when you really listen that people up here do care about the land, about each other. We keep the cattle outa the riparian areas, we try to do right by our Indian neighbors. You met Phillip – he's a good friend to my family, but his father almost killed my father 40 years ago. Things do change.

KATE: My friend and I were traveling through Idaho a couple years ago coming back from a ski trip, and we stopped in this diner for hot fudge Sundays. A group of skin heads came in, shaved head, swastika tattoos, the whole bit. The started checking us out you know, and I looked at my friend, my girlfriend, we both had spiked hair then and I thought, "do we look queer… and how Jewish does she look? I live in a town where I can hold her hand in line at the post office. But there we were in Idaho and cold fear just shot through me. When I saw my tires that day, I had the same feeling. It didn't hit me that it was about FISH.

TIM: What's your girlfriend's name?

KATE: Rachel.

TIM: Is she a fish lady too?

KATE: No, she's a photographer and rabbi-wannabe.

TIM: Bring her up, take pictures. We get a lot of photographers up here. My daughter's favorite subject is the pelican. Look at those guys. Makes you wonder what God was thinking!

KATE: She's the one told me to come back and talk to you. She has this theory. Kind of new-age Jew. About how the universe is like one big garment, that all the violence and distrust in the world are like tears in the fabric and that all we can do with our lives is try to mend little bits of the garment.

TIM: We're trying. Some of us are trying to mend what our ancestors broke. But we can't do it if we're being shot at.

(KATE leaves and TIM crosses to where ALICE is receiving Holy Communion from a visiting priest.)

Scene 16 – Communion

In the Catholic tradition of insuring those who cannot attend Mass receive Holy Communion, a Father Mac has come to visit Alice and gives her communion.

FATHER MAC: …. Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.

ALICE: Amen

FATHER MAC: Deliver us from every evil, oh Lord..

BOTH: For Yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory now and forever. Amen.

FATHER MAC: *(takes a host from a small gold compact)* Alice, The body of Christ.

ALICE: Amen *(takes the host, eats.)*

(pause)

ALICE: Thank you, Father. Coffee's hot.

FATHER MAC: Cookies in the regular place.

ALICE: Uh huh, unless Grace got to 'em. Help yourself.

ALICE: In my mind it was all about coming to this place, the natural beauty, and fixing the River. Fixing everything. Showing, in some way, with an angry determination, that really agriculture and rivers could live together. The opportunities to change the place were unlimited. Drag tires and washers out of the spring. Paint the old dingy house. Move cattle from here to there and then back over here. Don't let them eat the new willows. Fence the river. Dig thistles. Clean the shop. Chainsaw down the old fence, build some new fence. Bring people together. Change the place. The hardest realization for me is that what's really changing is me. This is a bit unsettling for someone controlling enough to think that they might change a place, a valley of rushes and sedges and people!

TIM: *(as he enters)* Change it and hope that someone like the environmental community would notice and let rural communities survive. Hey Father, how are you?

FATHER MAC: Doing the doing of the lord. *(pause)* Well, gotta head up to see Phillip's Aunt next. Thanks for the cookies.

TIM: Thank you for coming, Father.

FATHER MAC: See you next time. *(exits)*

TIM: Ran into Phillip at the cash machine that night of Grace's ballet recital. We were all standing there in the Bank of America parking lot looking up at the stars. Grace was asking if we could see the Milky Way….

(*PHILLIP comes downstage into the light, joins them, as TIM's memory becomes the present GRACE enters the scene twirling..*)

GRACE : Where's the big dipper daddy?

TIM: See that star there, follow my finger. Right there, just over home plate.

GRACE: I see it!

TIM: Now listen. Keep your eye on my finger. See the dipper's four corners? Now follow the handle and then up -- that's the North Star! That's what the first explorers used to navigate to the new world.

GRACE: The North Star's not very bright.

TIM: But it's constant.

GRACE: Why do they call it the Milky Way? Does the dipper get milk out of it?

PHILLIP: We call it "where the people come home." All the ancestors are up there, watching over you, and dancing with you.

TIM: Now every time she sees the Milky Way she does this little two-step and says “I’m dancing with the ancestors!” *(GRACE dances back to bed..)*

ALICE: I was never a very good dancer.

TIM: Me neither. Grace is though.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 17 -- Captain Jack's Stonghold

The craggy landscape of Lave Beds National Monument suggested in light or projections; TIM sits alone, fingering a brochure; then speaks directly to audience. GRACE sits in front of ALICE as ALICE combs her hair.

TIM: If you're a tourist at Lava Beds National Monument you pass General Canaby's marker first – a white cross at the place he breathed his last, after Captain Jack's ambush. Looking north just there you can see the southern boundary of my brother's acreage in the Tule Lake sump. This is sagebrush. High desert. Intermittent marshlands. You drive up another three miles into the weird lave formations and there's another little interpretive area called Captain Jack's Stronghold. 50 Modoc warriors held up right here and fought off the US Army. 50 warriors killed 400 cavalrymen. Look around you can see what great fortress the land provided. Black lava rocks in mounds that would allow fellas to hide easy. A few juniper pines, lots of sage brush, crevasses where a whole line of men could hide and still see and shoot anybody approaching from the low lying marshes. 50 people spent a whole winter here and the army couldn't take 'em. Tule Lake used to come right up to the edge of this high ground. Finally the army was able to cut off the Indians access to water. All the Modocs wanted… you can read about it in the little trial guide… all Captain Jack wanted was for his people "to live unmolested on their homeland unmolested." They just wanted to be safe, just like me, just like you.

Scene 18 – Ultimate Title

Light fades up on Rancher's family. Outside, looking out over the Klamath Marsh from the large porch of a ranch house built in 1890s. Sounds of wildlife. ALICE and TIM on their porch looking out over the marsh they irrigate and the land on which they run cattle, the same land that belonged to the Klamath Tribe "from mountain top to mountain top."

TIM: Moon's not up yet.

ALICE: Nope.

TIM: Hear that? Owl got himself a bull frog.

ALICE: Guess he'll live for one more day.

TIM: Don't brood Mom, it's too cold for that.

ALICE: A woman prays for sons when she marries land like this. Don't have 'em and you feel like you failed the land. Now I got 'em…

TIM: You didn't fail, none of us failed.

ALICE: My eldest son suing my youngest son, taking away the only peace I've ever had, and you tell me we got only three options: give in to Greg and loose our water, sell to these vulture developers, or do this so-called land trust arrangement with the Indians. None of those sound like the American dream to me. If I can't die knowing my great grandchildren are going to inherit this, going to continue on this land, my life might as well be dust, just like my Gramz's life. She died with a mouthful of Kansas dust.

TIM: I know Mom. Nobody's leaving. Just the paperwork is changing. It's you always said God's got Ultimate Title.

ALICE: We ran 3,000 head of angus once we got the last allotment. 3,000 head. Then okay we gotta be careful of erosion and fouling the water; okay, we run fewer and fewer head. But damn

it, we're hardly making it now. And my son the potato farmer is now taking what's left. What will be left for Grace?

TIM: Change happens, Mom.

(pause)

ALICE: One December Gregory got so sick that along with a temperature of 103 his heart rate was 200, and below his breastbone was contracting in several inches every time he took a breath…. By the time we finally got to the emergency room his black curls were wet with sweat and stuck to his head. After eleven attempts to stick a catheter in his veins, fluids and antibiotics. His chubby little arms were so bruised up…. By the time we got checked out of the hospital, I got the flu and couldn't talk. When we got home neighbors showed up within hours and stayed for three days. They made soup; they figured out the dosing schedule for his five medications. They walked the baby—that was you. You were a very fussy baby.

(*PHILLIP enters the pool of light with the Ranchers, carrying a traditional baby-basekt.*)

One day when Phillip was over, you were fussing. The next Sunday, Phillip returned with a baby-basket made specially to fit you.

TIM: I didn't know that.

ALICE: It's soft tan leather on the front with laces that go up in a complicated crisscross pattern.

PHILLIP: The frame is made of Hazelwood.

ALICE: The back is soft black leather. Inside is a hand-sewn brown corduroy pillow. You slept sound in your cradleboard. Your eyes would open, then shut, your little face smiling. *(pause; (to PHILLIP)* How does one put into words the special nature of such a gift? How does one begin to give back?

TIM: We just start, I guess.

ALICE: I know what it's like when the sand hill cranes return to the Sycan marsh – a marsh we irrigate. It's like a miracle. Miles of white running wings. A visitation of spirit. I'd grab you and little Greg and say "look! There they are! The good Lord sent the cranes back to us again!" *(pause)* But I don't know what it's like when the salmon return.

TIM: We can imagine. We can imagine what it might be like to have those Salmon returning, not just to the Klamath river, but to the Sycan river. I can feel the excitement for what it might be like to have them come. To be a hungry seven year old boy -- and have them come.

ALICE: I am tired of fighting. I am hungry in my soul. I suppose it would be more an act of love than of water. Holding another place tight, holding other families tight. Love is the only thing that ever changes anything anyway.

(GRACE has come out to join them, sleepy.)

TIM: Couldn't sleep? (*Picks her up as she mumbles*) What's that? *(She whispers in his ear).*

ALICE: What's the matter sweet pea?

TIM: Grace asked if we were going to give our land back to the Indians.

GRACE: Daddy, what's a Conservation Land Trust? Do we have to move?

TIM: No, no. We can live here as long as we want. It just means that we're going to work with the Indian neighbors to help take care of the land. It's kinda like what Phillip said, like when you're dancing with the ancestors.

GRACE: Are you going to dance?

TIM: I'm going to try. If you'll dance with me? Will you do that?

GRACE: Okay.

(Transition lighting/images/sound.)

Scene 19 – Sacred

ROSE: *(speaking as the River)* When I was a child, the River gave me a prayer: I am alive in you and I am the source of your hope. Every time someone appreciates my stillness, my beauty and peace, eats the food that I offer, cares for the vegetation and the wild animals that I sustain—every moment of your gratefulness is my renewal.

MAX: Sacred were gifts that were given to us by Creator at that time of the spirit people.

ANDY: Sacred is a word that if said in the Yurok language would likely have so much more meaning that the English version. In this language it doesn't do justice to my life or my people.

ROSE: Sacred is the story's that we were given from our elders who learned them from their elders. Sacred is our prayer medicine that carries my prayers, hopes and dreams up to Creator every night. Our ceremonies are sacred and bring life, repairing what bad feelings or actions have created.

WILL: Sacred is my relative, the Salmon, who has ensured the survival of my people since time immemorial.

JULIE: Sacred is my family who love and support me and have given me the gift of self-respect.

LOUISE: Sacred is my daughter, without whom my life stops.

MAX: Sacred is something that is woven not only into your life, but into the lives of your ancestors. It is something that can't be removed from you, your culture or traditions without devastating it. Sacred is the Salmon, you need to protect it, because it protects you.

The recorded voices of "Sacred Is…" in Yurok, Hupa and Karuk, mingle with the live voices; we loose the English translation and finally hear only the recorded voices, which continues under MAX's lines and TIM & JULIE's phone conversation.

MAX: Once the salmon thrived and we prayed for them and gave them thanks as a whole tribe. We felt that it was our responsibility to take care of them, because they took care of us. Now, we struggle with wanting to do something, but feeling helpless and with out the necessary skills to carry out a First Salmon ceremony or make medicine for the river and the fish. I don't believe this means it is lost. It is an opportunity to bring back something that has been done since time before time. We need to once again take care of the Salmon physically and spiritually. This is the time, for our survival and theirs.

(TIM is alone; visibly moved; he takes out a cell phone, looks up a number and dials. JULIE's phone rings and she picks up, and steps away; the others freeze.)

JULIE: iye-ah-qui *(phonetic spelling)*

TIM: Julie? Hi. Tim McNeil.

JULIE: Hi.

TIM: Hope I didn't catch you at a bad time. How are you?

JULIE: Keepin' on keepin' on.

TIM: Listen, I don't know how to say this… but I wanted to say something… I mean I want to *do* something, we're trying to do something up here, but it's going to take some time… You know how you were telling me about how when the first salmon came up the river the your

people would do a ceremony and then send a runner upriver to the Karuks and Nu-Tini-Xwes and then they would do a ceremony?

JULIE: Yeah.

TIM: I know this sounds stupid, but when that first salmon comes I want you to call me. Call me and tell me, okay? Would you do that? And on that day I'm going to go down to the pivot field and turn off my irrigation pump for the day. And if the hell pump is running, I'll turn it off as well. Then, we're going to call our friends who irrigate down in the Scott valley and they're going turn their pumps off. And I'm going to call Walt in the Klamath Project and he's agreed to turn his water off for a day. And he's going to call the members of the Water Users Association and they're all gonna turn their water off on that day. A dozen admin folks who work for the City of Klamath Falls are going to fill milk jugs with water from the tap in their house, and drive it down to the edge of the Klamath river and dump it in. Don't laugh. I know it's more an act of love than of water. It's holding another place tight, holding other families tight.

JULIE: Okay.

TIM: Okay?

JULIE: Okay. I'll call you. I'll tell my Gram and the others.

TIM: This is just a start. We've got a lot of people up here who will be hard to convince. They're just afraid.

JULIE: I always wonder if the salmon are afraid after they've gotten used to the ocean and all that freedom, if they're afraid to swim home.

TIM: Well, I hope we can all have as much courage as a fish.

(cross fade to REPORTER)

REPORTER: Here in the Upper Klamath, some say a handful of farmers and ranchers have lost their marbles. What will one day of water do for the salmon struggling up the Klamath? Spokespersons say that this show of solidarity with fish and Tribal people will be symbolic at first, but that others who hear the news will do what they can, in their way, on that day, when the fish come back.

ROSE: When I was a child, the River gave me a prayer: I am alive in you and I am the source of your hope. Every time someone appreciates my stillness, my beauty and peace, eats the food that I offer, cares for the vegetation and the wild animals that I sustain—every moment of your gratefulness is my renewal.

MAX: Sacred were gifts that were given to us by Creator at that time of the spirit people.

ANDY: Sacred is the story's that we were given from our elders.

ROSE: Sacred is our prayer medicine.

WILL: Sacred is my relative, the Salmon.

JULIE: Sacred is my family.

ALICE: Sacred is my family.

JOHNNY: Sacred is the river.

TIM: Sacred is the earth that we steward.

GRACE: Sacred is my dad, and friends.

LOUISE: Sacred is my daughter, without whom my life stops.

ZEEK, MARY & GRACE: Sacred is the Salmon, you need to protect it because it protects you.

The voices of "Sacred Is.." in Yurok, Karuk & Hupa overlap the lines above; then only the recorded voices are heard as the lights dim. (In performance the recording continued for several seconds while the actors stood in darkness.)

THE END

On the final night of performance, the community person who gave the blessing at the start of the performance, may want to give a Closing Blessing.

All performances should be followed by a community discussion, facilitated when ever possible by local Elders or other "expert" community members.

INDIGENOUS RIGHTS
SALMON ARE OUR FUTURE
UNDAM THE KLAMATH
LET THE JOBS FLOW!
Let the Jobs Flow!

KBRA = JOBS

Do you support the KBRA and the jobs, wildlife and economic stability it will bring to the Klamath Basin? If so, now is the time to act. This month the federal government will be holding a series of meetings in the Basin to collect public comment on a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). These public comments and descriptions of these meetings are included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), which will determine if the federal government moves forward with the proposed project. YOUR COMMENTS in support are essential to convince the government to decide in favor of the Klamath Agreements.

It is critical that supporters of the KBRA attend these meetings, show the media our active participation and say a few words so our side is recorded as supporting a solution that will bring jobs to the Basin. These essential meetings make the Agreement happen. Please consider attending and show support for a brighter future in our community.

What to Expect:

Before the meeting begins there will be a sign-up form for those who are interested in making comments. Comments can be brief; what matters is the number.

At the meeting 8-12 representatives from the US Fish and Wildlife and the appropriate State of California and Oregon Agencies will give a brief presentation on the federal process and the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). A court reporter will be present and will be taking notes, the transcript from the meeting will help the Secretary of Interior decide whether to implement with the Agreements.

The Klamath Agreements Will:

- Ensure that agriculture continues to be a major contributor in the Basin economy.
- Create jobs and help the local economy
- Restore healthy rivers and wildlife
- End decades of water related lawsuits in the region

When and Where:

Oct 18, Klamath County Fair Grounds, 3531 S. Sixth St., Klamath Falls, 4:30-8:00 pm
Oct 19, Chiloquin Community Center, 140 S. 4th St., Chiloquin, 4:30-8:00 pm
Oct 20, Yreka Community Theatre, 812 North Oregon St., Yreka, 4:30-8:00 pm

> "This *historic settlement has moved us beyond the water wars of the early 2000s. There is real hope for a healthier basin and a stronger economy*"
>
> –Interior Secretary Ken Salazar, Sep 21, 2011

Need More Information:

Please contact Belinda or Kenny at KBRAequalsJobs@gmail.com for more information.

We Need Your Presence AND Your Voice:

Many people are hesitant to speak in public, but even short comments focused on your issue will help. Just coming to support helps. Show up to a meeting and we can give you a sticker indicating you are with us. Show California, Oregon, and US Congress that we support solving problems and protecting jobs to the Basin.

Building Blocks of a Sustainable Klamath Basin

There are a many reasons why the KBRA is important to the region. These are just a few examples of general KBRA benefits:

- Jobs and Strong Business that employs our kids and invites new members to the community
- Strong Agriculture is part of our culture; it provides jobs, feeds the country
- Strong fisheries do the same on the coast: create jobs, feed our country, and are culturally significant to tribes as well as sporting anglers down the river to the ocean.
- A healthy environment makes this a special place in the world: with its abundance of wildlife and natural beauty
- KBRA is people working together to solve problems and create opportunity

More specifically stated in the Klamath Agreements:

Equitable Water Sharing: Gives water certainty to grow crops, and water certainty to keep rivers healthy.

a. Farmers and ranchers need to know they will have water to plan their businesses
b. Fish will have water to maintain healthy populations

Healthy Rivers / Clean Waters: Provides clean water and good habitat for the Basin's salmon, steelhead, trout and sucker fish runs.

a. Healthy fish mean strong commercial and sportsfishing businesses
b. Healthy rivers and wetlands are places to hunt, fish and enjoy
c. Healthy rivers are the basis for tribal culture

Regulatory protection: Shelters those who are working on their farm or ranch to make things better for the community and the environment from regulatory penalties.

Renewable energy and energy efficiency: Empowers our natural assets and creativity to save more power and harness renewable resources

a. Local ingenuity to save costs on irrigation
b. Capturing sun, water, wind, biomass and geothermal power to control power costs and provide jobs

Ratepayer protection: No more paying for dams that are not wanted, even by their owners, and that PUCs say are very costly to keep.

Strong tribal communities: Promotes culture, jobs and businesses for the area's tribal groups

People working together:

a. Spirit of adaptability and cooperation in tackling the challenges of the future.
b. Local control and autonomous determination

THE DAM FACTS!

The Dams are NOT "ours"—Dams are private property of PacifiCorp:

- SUPPORT the company's PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS, particularly because the Public Utility Commission has said this will be the LEAST COSTLY OUTCOME FOR YOU as a ratepayer.
- The Dam owner is making a PRIVATE BUSINESS DECISION.
- TAKING OUT DAMS IS CHEAPER than relicensing for fish passage.
- Privately owned dam removal on the Klamath river is NOT PRECEDENT SETTING.
- Taking out the dams WILL NOT TURN OFF YOUR LIGHTS.

WHAT THE DAMS DON'T DO:

- Dams DO NOT PROVIDE STORAGE FOR IRRIGATION WATER.
- Dams DO NOT PROVIDE FLOOD CONTROL.
- Dams DO NOT PROVIDE PREFERENTIAL PUMPING RATE.
- Dams DO NOT/ will not OPERATE AT FULL CAPACITY if relicensed.
- Dams DO NOT SAVE YOUR FAMILY FARMS AND RANCHES from water shortage and environmental regulations.

Comment Author	May, Theresa
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_1079-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_171

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MR. AMBROSE McAULIFFE: My name is Ambrose McAuliffe, A-m-b-r-o-s-e, M-c-A-u-l-i-f-f-e, F as in Frank.

Thank you folks for being here. I can't help but start out by maybe sharing a lighter side. And I got to thinking about the advocates and those opposed, which, of course, I am. But I go back to times when they were having the riots in LA. I'm sure some of you recall a guy named Rodney King. He got beat up. And when it was all over and done with he more or less gathered himself up and said, "Now, why can't we all just get along?"

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment 2 - Our of Scope

Wouldn't that be nice?

And I am sure -- I want to give you a few reasons why we are not getting along. And I would like to start at the head of the watershed Annie Creek Canyon. And the road to Crater Lake is quite a viewpoint there that is hard to see the bottom, in fact it is something that the tourists make a point of stopping to look.

Well, there is not too many years back the geothermal study was done by way of the Park Service, of course, trying to find out what the geothermal potential

was.

In the course of that they discovered that there is

still 500 feet to go before they reach the bottom of the

original channel.

Now, what does that lead to? If you're familiar

with the Wood River and Annie Creek, the fish from the

lake go above the confluence of Annie Creek to spawn in

the clear water, the Redman trout, that is.

So that sediment that comes from Annie Creek every

year is hard to measure. It goes into the river and ends

up in the lake. If you look at the river, as so many

fishermen I'm sure have, wondered what's going on on the

bottom of the river. It just keeps rolling. That

sediment is going to fill the lake eventually. Obviously

that could have an effect on some of our aspirations.

Where is that sediment going to end up?

Well, I would like to jump forward to an incident

that took place when ECONorthwest hired by the US Fish and

Wildlife to do an Environmental Impact Study, not just on

the Basin but on the Fort Klamath Rogue River area. They

maintained unequivocally there would be zero impact on the

community, period. All right.

Well, that's when Fort Klamath Critical Habitat was

born because the water users in our area felt that that

was the end of the line if that was to take place.

So we were able to avoid that designation. In the process of doing that, I thought maybe we could mitigate the sucker issue by building a riparian fence, fish ladders that were developed by Water for Life as far as the cost share program that was successful and still there today --

THE FACILITATOR: Mr. McAuliffe. Your time is up.

MR. AMBROSE McAULIFFE: One little shot, this is about trust, developing trust. At any rate, ECONorthwest, it's an open lawsuit with them. They were collaborating with Fish and Wildlife. And it had to do with high cost pricing of the water in the Wood River Valley. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

MR. AMBROSE McAULIFFE: I was just getting warmed up.

THE FACILITATOR: You can always put it in writing.

Comment Author	McAuliffe, Ambrose
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_171-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1018_171-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_EM_1031_262

Comment 1 - Costs

Comment 2 - Fish

I am not particularly impressed with the logic behind removal of the Klamath River dams. Particularly in these economic times, I find it hard to justify the expense. I have also been unconvinced that removal of the dams will actually benefit the salmon yet it will cause major disruption in the area.

Comment 3 - Terrestrial Wildlife

I am particularly concerned about the impact removal will do to the wildlife there. There is a large population of white pelicans that live and breed at Copco Lake during the year. What is the plan to accommodate them? Eagles and osprey will make the switch to a river, but not the pelicans.

Comment 4 - Disapproves Dam Removal

I request that the project be tabled and reconsidered.

Thank you,
Marsha McBaine
Ashland, OR

Comment Author	McBaine, Marsha
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 31, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1031_262-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1031_262-2	Master Response AQU-5 Will Benefit All Salmonids. Master Response AQU-6 Expert Panel Coho Steelhead and Chinook. Master Response AQU-7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success. Master Response AQU-17 Expert Panel Second Line of Analysis, Not the Only line of Evidence. Master Response AQU-21 NRC Dam Removal Help Coho. It is unclear from the comment, what is meant by major disruption in the area. For the purposes of this response, it is assumed the disruption referred to is related the physical removal of the dams under the proposed alternative. Master Response AQU-12 Sediment and Chemical Analysis. Master Response AQU-2A Sediment Dredging. Appendix C details the water quality impacts of dam removal and Section C.7 contains a detailed contaminant assessment. Appendix E of the Draft EIS/EIR address effects to fish related to the rise in suspended sediment concentrations. Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR addresses effects to fish as the result of bed material changes resulting from the release of fine sediment.	No
GP_EM_1031_262-3	Master Response TERR-2 Reservoir Habitat.	No
GP_EM_1031_262-4	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_552

From: john@bioinvest.com[SMTP:JOHN@BIOINVEST.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 6:08:22 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: John McCamant
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath dams

Body: I support alternate 2 which would remove dams on the Klamath river. I would spend much more time and money in the Klamath basin if it were a healthier river. My previous experience has been disappointing as I have run into very low water in the summer.

Comment Author	McCamant, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_552-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1118_761

From: alanpol@humboldt1.com[SMTP:ALANPOL@HUMBOLDT1.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 10:56:43 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dams Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Alan McCann-Sayles
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dams Removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I strongly support Alternative 2, full removal of 4 dams on the Klamath River. As you know, this would restore over 420 miles of salmon habitat, giving critical aid to our declining salmon population.

Thank you very much.

Comment Author	McCann-Sayles, Alan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1118_761-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1208_978

From: danielms@humboldt1.com[SMTP:DANIELMS@HUMBOLDT1.COM]
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2011 10:52:17 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dams: Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Daniel McCann-Sayles
Organization:
Subject: Klamath Dams: Removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I urge you to support Alternative 2 - full removal of four dams on the Klamath River.

This will help restore critical salmon habitat in Oregon and California.

Comment Author	McCann-Sayles, Daniel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 08, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1208_978-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1118_769

From: jonsonario@comcast.net[SMTP:JONSONARIO@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 12:19:30 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath restoration Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jonathan McClelland
Organization: none

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath restoration

Body: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this issue. I am encouraged that the preferred alternative is full removal of the 4 hydro power dams on the Klamath. Although this will not entirely solve the problem of a nearly destroyed fishery it is an important step in the right direction. Many segments of our society will be improved by this action, and it has been carefully crafted to minimize the hardships that a very few individuals will sustain in the short term. It might in fact lead to a more thoughtful and long term sustainable change in agricultural practices for those who believe they are adversely impacted by this change for the greatest common good.

Comment Author	McClelland, Jonathan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1118_769-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1121_845

From: tommcconnel@frontiernet.net[SMTP:TOMMCCONNEL@FRONTIERNET.NET]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 12:55:21 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Tom McConnel
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I support Alternative 2 of the Klamath Draft EIS/EIR proposal (full removal of the Iron Gate, Copco1, Copco2, and J.C. Boyle dams).

Comment Author	McConnel, Tom
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1121_845-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1025_297

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 25, 2011

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ORLEANS, CALIFORNIA

MS. B. McCOVEY: For me, this river is a real emotional tugging and heart-rendering thing. I have lived 60 years on this river. As a child growing up, I have always seen the river. I was brought up to believe that the river water was the strongest element and that the river was a -- it was always significant to me as a sign of life and power. Nowadays, there is not much life or power in the water. And so, to pass this on to my grandchildren doesn't have the same effect that it had on me as a child. And I support taking the dams down.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

And as a child, when I grew up here, when fish were plentiful, this town was an ongoing -- not only -- before the forestry and logging was here, it was a really active, recreational town for recreational fishermen. It had a couple of restaurants in this town. It had two or three -- it had two hotels. It had three or four businesses that had cabins and such. And so, the economy was run on tourism.

This thing isn't staying up very well. And I see that if we do bring the dams down, we will have a large -- because of the recreational value of this river, the steelhead and all the fish that were

here, if they do come back and the river does get healthy again, we have viable ways of income. And I also see that if they remove the dams there and the river is healthy, that it will continue on up the river. They will have -- their little communities and little towns will again grow and prosper.

On the -- at the mouth of the Klamath River, when its fishing was good, there was at least a million fishermen a year who came to fish at the mouth of our Klamath River.

And the other thing I have heard people talk about how it's going to -- how the water at the source is warmer, and so, therefore, this river it will be warmer and it will be contaminated if the dams are removed. That was some of the comments I heard in Yreka. And this is not true. The Klamath River is different from all other rivers; it is because it's cleaner at its mouth than it is at its source. And it's the only river that is that way.

And the geography of this area is we have rocky terrain and such; therefore, our water, it purifies itself within so many feet. It didn't have the gravel and stuff on the riverbeds.

And I don't see the silt being removed as being a 100-year or a 50-year thing. After seeing the video on the Sandy, where they removed the dams there, and within

nine months their sediment and everything was gone, I was told and after seeing that video.

And I would really like to thank you guys for having to listen to us. I don't know how many times I have done this process, but, again, thank you.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, BeaVi.

Comment Author	McCovey, B.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1025_297-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1020_227

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MS. BEAVI McCOVEY: B-e-a-v-i M-c-C-o-v-e-y.

Comment 1 - Approves Dam Removal

I am here because I am for the dam removal. I

Comment 2 - Hydrology

have heard people talk about flood control, and I like to think I don't look my 60 years, but I am, and I've lived all 60 years on the Klamath River, and if you see the '64 flood, you will not say a dam is for flood control. I've seen the river raise eight feet in less than an hour because the dams were cracking. They cannot hold back the water. You talk about water? You haven't seen water. We have been in a drought now for the last four years. This place, when I grew up in Northern California and on the lower Klamath, it would rain and not let up, and it poured down for 40 days straight and the sun won't come out, so we had that kind of water. And that dam will not hold it, they let the water go and you don't have any control over it.

Comment 3 - ITAs

The other thing I'd like you guys to know, um, Klamath does not mean "stinking," it means "rapid," and that was a real slur to the Klamath people.

Comment 4 - Real Estate

Um, and for property values, I don't know how to tell the people that are on Copco Lake and stuff like

that, but I don't know anywhere where property values have not dropped. We are deceiving ourselves if we think that things are going to be better if they keep the dam. All of our economies are gone. Um, we are in a really hard situation. I think we are now in a depression and we have to learn to live with that. We are going to lose money, that's all there is to it, but we didn't --

Comment 5 - Fish

And you talk about livelihoods and stuff like that, we are all lost without fish, without -- we no longer have guides on the lower Klamath for fish guides. We have lost those incomes, but fish will bring it back. Um, you talk about voting, um, people with 80 percent; well, the other counties, we have a right to vote, too, and you seem to think your county outweighs -- Siskiyou outweighs Del Norte, Humboldt, and Trinity, so -- That's all I have to say. I think we should cooperate with each other, and that's all I have to say.

Comment Author	McCovey, Beavi
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020-227-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1020_227-2	Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection.	No
GP_MC_1020_227-3	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of the Record.	No
GP_MC_1020_227-4	Master Response RE-2B Changes in Property Values.	No
GP_MC_1020_227-5	Master Response AQU-26 Increased Abundance for Harvest and Tribes.	No

GP_EM_1209_1014

From: Kathleen McCovey[SMTP:KMCCOVEY@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, December 09, 2011 3:18:53 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: I Support Alternative 2 - Full Removal of 4 Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear Secretary Salazar:
I support alternative 2 within the draft dam removal EIS/EIR – full removal of four Klamath River dams. The draft EIS/EIR correctly shows that alternative 2 is the best option for fisheries restoration, job creation, and the reduction of toxic pollution. Option 2 is supported by a growing body of scientific research and best serves the public interest.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Kathleen McCovey

96039

Comment Author	McCovey, Kathleen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 09, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1209_1014-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1025_289

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 25, 2011

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ORLEANS, CALIFORNIA

MS. McCOVEY: Hello. I'm Mavis McCovey.

MS. JONES: And I'm going to ask if you would each spell your names, first and last names.

MS. McCOVEY: M-a-v-i-s M-c-C-o-v-e-y.

And I was born on the Klamath River, and I have lived here except for -- on the Klamath River, except for eight years out of my life. So, I have been on the river for 70 years.

And I remember, as a child, going to school and walking along the riverside, and the river was so thick with mud that it looked like -- almost like molasses. And it was bright orangey-brown, and it was from the mining. And already my grandpa would say, "We're not getting hardly any spring salmon. The spring salmon run is going down." And that was in the '40s, and the river was already sick.

And then next came the logging, and it got worse. And then, down the river, I was living down there then, and they said, "The spring salmon are disappearing down here. We only get four or five. Setting our nets, we only get four or five of them at a time. We're hardly getting any. And the run is real short."

And then, the next thing that came along was they moved the borders of the United States from 25 miles out in the ocean to three miles out in the ocean. And then you see the big trawlers coming from Russia and from Japan, and they were -- and then the Coho salmon started going down and the other salmon.

And then, the next thing we know, the river is sick, and there's poisons growing along the river. And the mining slowed down, and so, it was clean in the wintertime, anyway.

And now something has to be done, because the river is just getting sicker and sicker and the salmon have gotten diseases. And you can't even clean your fish off in the water anymore. If you kill a fish, you have to take it to some spring water someplace or some creek and rinse it out, because you can't rinse it with the river water because the river water is too contaminated.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

So, I think taking the dams down would help a lot. And the logging is -- there is very little logging now, and there's no -- very little mining. So, maybe the river could heal itself again and the fish could start running again, and the water could be healthy. Because it can't be good to have the river, such a big piece of water, being unhealthy. It must make all the other plant life and everything else get unhealthy.

That's all. Thank you.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

Comment Author	McCovey, Mathis
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1025_289-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Mavis McCovey written testimony re: Klamath Facilities Removal DEIS

12.19.11

GP_LT_1227_1180

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
DEC 27 2011

CODE	ACTION	SIGNAM & DATE
152	✓	

December 19, 2011

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Gordon Leppig
California Department of Fish & Game
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Re: Comments on Klamath Facilities Removal Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIS)

Dear Ms. Vasquez and Mr. Leppig,

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I support Alternative 2 --full removal of four dams by 2020--in the DEIS about the Klamath Facilities Removal.

I've lived my entire life on the Klamath River, and I've noted a lot of changes, not only in the river but also in the use of the river and the weather pattern. In the last 25 years there has been drastic changes in our weather pattern. The weather is fluctuating so much, we have no idea what the weather is going to be.

When I was a child walking to school, the water in the winter was really thick with mud, and it rained a lot and the water would get really high, and the hydraulic mining made the water really muddy and bad. There were a lot of pollutants in the water because of the runoff from the mines, usually mercury.

Classification	ENV-6.00
Project	12
Control No.	11095175
Folder I.D.	1194398
Date Input & Initials	12/27/2011 AO

SCANNED

But the fish were still coming in good, and in August you could stand on the Orleans Bridge and look all day long and the whole bottom of the river would get black with fish. They'd take a five or ten-minute break and then keep coming, and it went on and on like that for about two weeks. That went on until the early 1950s.

Then the mining wasn't as prevalent, and they were clear-cut logging. And up here before that they had done mostly select cut logging, didn't waste time with the little ones and took only the big trees. It was more eco-friendly. After they started the clear-cutting, within two to five years there were two large floods (1953 and 1955). People started complaining that spring run Chinook salmon (they were huge fish) had gone down in population and they weren't getting as many fish for subsistence fishing--that's all they had to subsist on. I lived downriver then.

In 1960, they moved our borders on ocean fishing from 25 miles out at sea to 3 miles out at sea. You could see the Russian and Japanese trollers out fishing from Orick. Within three years, fall and spring salmon runs were less for subsistence fishing.

Then the U.S. government decided they weren't going to let Indians have subsistence fishing on the Klamath River. There was quite a bit of controversy over that. My mother in law was 56 and she was subsistence fishing. She heard the feds were coming so she pulled her net up and sat on it for the whole day without water or bathroom so they couldn't take it from her.

Then we lobbied and got our rights to fish from the falls recognized by the state, not the feds. Now we have our fishing rights from the federal government, but we didn't then.

Then we started having a drought in the 1970s. It never rained like it used to. And the logging companies were still clearcutting and using chemicals, and the mining companies were doing what I call vacuum mining (also known as suction dredging), and that wasn't helping salmon any. Tribes started making fish hatcheries. That went on for about 10 years. I don't know how much it helped, but they all did it.

Then I'd say about 20 years ago the blue green algae became more prevalent in the river. I'd say it was always in the river, but it started building up in high concentrations in the reservoirs behind the dams and then going downriver from the dams.

Comment 2 - Hydrology

I see where they estimate that if they do remove the dams, flooding will go down to Happy Camp. I'm just wondering why does it stop there? I would presume that the flooding would go all the way down the Klamath.

When they used to release water out of the dam, about 2 p.m. the water came up 2 feet in Orleans. When there was a flood, we saw more of a flood because of the dams. Actually they were more dangerous than if we didn't have any dam on the river.

When we stayed down on the lower reservation, the houses were above the flood plain. And at least 25 feet above the flood plain was where the water went in the '64 flood. The river was a half-mile wide after they released water from the dams. It was coming up at a steady one foot an hour (my husband was measuring the water levels with sticks).

Then I went over to deliver food and my kids and blankets and everything in a pickup truck. One guy said he'd come over the fill one time to get the kids. We walked back a mile to our place. When we got down there to the house, the water had come up eight feet in

the time we were gone--about an hour. That river was a half-mile wide. That dam caused more havoc than it helped. When they built Iron Gate (Dam) in the 1940s, they told us it would help with floods.

Other than electricity, I don't think that dam helps. We've got more herbicides and chemical runoff in our water. The sticks we use for our baskets are thicker and more knotty than before. The things they put in the water make our willows grow better. But it doesn't make them better willows; it makes them worse to us basket weavers. On the other hand, denser willow growth could make more shady spots for the fish, although the river is extremely hot.

I swam in the river in the 1940s and 1950s. By the 1960s, it didn't smell good, and we were swimming in the creeks and the Salmon River. Now, within the last five years, the Klamath River has gotten warmer. I don't study the temperature or anything, but when you swim in it you can feel the difference. You can't stay in the water for very long when the water is cold. The river has always been polluted up there in the Upper Klamath Basin. As it came downriver, it's cleaner because we have a wilderness area and all these big creeks and the Salmon and the Trinity River. But the Klamath River used to be cold.

They still had native freshwater mussels in the 1960s downriver, but they have disappeared upriver. We used to eat them but can't any more because they are polluted, just like the river.

There used to be millions upon millions of eels, but their populations have cut way back also. You used to see the eels that hadn't made it back to the ocean after spawning, dead in the eddies, but you don't see that many any more. You don't see as many great big salmon spawning any more either.

Back in the 1920s, the Yuroks had a canning factory in Klamath. My husband was born in the fish camp while his father was commercial fishing. My mother in law and her mother worked in the fish cannery. But then there were a lot of fish. I feel putting dams in the river, mining in it, logging it and overfishing in the ocean and the river has hurt our Klamath salmon runs.

In Klamath in the 1950s, a million sport fishermen came there in a year. Every place you could see there were motels and hotels. There were guides. There were three restaurants, four bars, a movie house. All of that was just for tourists. There were redwood carvings and agates for sale.

There must have been at least a hundred Indian men that hired out as guides, every day all through fishing season. It was a big business. There was fish-related tourism clear on up into Happy Camp. We ran a hotel and three or four campgrounds. They had little boats down by the river and people dotting the river bank like fence posts, fishing.

I believe it would help taking those dams out to get the Klamath River to start purifying itself. The Klamath River is one of the few rivers in the world that has always been cleaner downriver than at its start.

I think the dams are helping the contaminants from the Upper Basin to get farther down, because it's holding them up there and they build up and they come slowly downriver. If the river were to run free, it would be able to purify. The lake isn't THAT contaminated.

The river is the center of our world. It's what our language is based on. Instead of north or south, east or west, we have words for upriver and downriver, towards the river and away from the river in our languages.

Mavis McCovey written testimony re: Klamath Facilities Removal DEIS

12.19.11

Used to be you would walk in the store or a restaurant or any public place around here and hear people talking about what the conditions were like in the river. That's how it was; it flowed through us and it was a central part of our lives.

Again, please move ahead with Alternative 2 outlined in the Klamath Facilities Removal DEIS released in September of 2011.

Thank you.

Sincerely, Mavis McCovey

Mavis McCovey, Karuk Tribal Member and Lifelong Orleans Resident

Mavis Mc Covey
PO Box 179
Orleans, CA 95556

EUREKA, CA
PM
DEC 22
2011

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

9582531898

Comment Author	McCovey, Mavis
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 27, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1227_1180-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_LT_1227_1180-2	Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection. A significant amount of flood water enters the Klamath River from tributaries downstream of the Four Facilities. During flood events, any change in flood flow associated with the removal of the Four Facilities is not significant beyond Humbug Creek (see Figure 3.6-11).	No

GP_WI_1006_023

From: poliklah@yahoo.com[SMTP:POLIKLAH@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2011 1:39:09 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: We must not forget why we need dam removal.
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Shaunna McCovey
Organization:

Subject: We must not forget why we need dam removal.

Comment 1 - Fish

Body: In 2002, the Klamath River and its people witnessed the largest fish kill in recent memory. The article below is from the front lines of the fish kill and should be entered into the record for this EIS/EIR. We must not forget why dam removal is so important and we must never lose sight of the work of every person - tribal, environmental, farmer, fisherman, government staff, and industry - who committed time and effort to reach the most historic agreement of our time.

For the Yurok, Salmon is Everything

Indian Country Today, Barry Wayne McCovey Jr., Posted: Oct 12, 2002

I have lived within the Klamath River system my entire life. I'm not very old, but I've witnessed and experienced the river for twenty-four years. The river is an inherent part of me, and the lifeblood of my people.

As a Yurok Tribal member and college student in the fisheries field, I spend my days working along the Klamath. The carnage I've seen over the past week and a half is so utterly grotesque that I cannot sleep at night. I close my eyes and the images of dead, rotting fish envelop me. You may have seen photographs in newspapers or caught a glimpse on the television, but you cannot begin to imagine the smell. This smell of death and decay is impossible to escape. It fills the air and plays with the mind in ways that I could never describe. I can't eat because food, no matter what it is, reminds me of the smell. Perhaps it's because the rotting fish represent so much of my people's food gone to waste. The water levels in the river have never been in such decline. Numerous tribal and non-tribal elders have assured me of this fact. In my lifetime, I have never seen the Klamath so shallow.

Over the past month, the lack of water has actually stopped the tribal fisheries program from completing tasks that were routine last year. There is so little water that people are unable to safely travel the river by jet boat or by raft. I've seen rocks that I didn't know existed protruding from dangerous rapids, making the attempt to count dead and dying fish a risky endeavor. Yet even in its shrunken state the river humbles me and demands my respect. I am fortunate enough to spend time within its grasp and to be able to know and understand the power of the Klamath. For me, nothing is greater. Civilizations will come and go, but the river will remain. This I know. People will try to destroy it, to use it for

hydroelectric power, use it to irrigate a desert, use it to get votes and push policies contradictory to natural laws. But the river will survive. All of the sickness and greed in the world cannot stop the river from its flow. In the not so distant future the world's population will surpass the Earth's carrying capacity. People will starve, become infected by disease and suffocate just like that salmon in the Klamath. This insanity will stop, and the river will rise. Unfortunately, the chinook, coho and steelhead salmon will not see the river rise.

Just like the wild grizzly and wolf, these fish are being run out of California. Some would argue there isn't a problem because we can just grow new fish in the hatchery system, but that system, like many others in forced management, is flawed. The hatchery system has created fish of unknown origin. It is impossible to tell the difference between a hatchery born fish and native fish without extensive genetic studies. It is estimated that only 10 percent to 25 percent of hatchery chinook are marked for identification, and estimates of the native fish population estimates are very difficult to make. Arguments that dismiss the magnitude and future impact of this fish kill sicken the spirit. It may as well be said that Yurok people could just die off because other native and non-native people could easily replace us and thrive in our traditional homeland. Native fish, not hatchery fish, are the only hope for the future of the species. Without a doubt, the native chinook, coho and steelhead are endangered.

Recent fish kill estimates in the Klamath have been conservative, but as many as 30,000 chinook, 600 coho and 1,000 steelhead are likely to be counted among the dead. These numbers may not sound like much unless you've witnessed the putrid, decaying fish kill firsthand. Washington bureaucrats, like Secretary of Interior Gale Norton, need to come to the Klamath and walk along the banks of the river with me. Perhaps a view of the carnage might lead them to see things differently. I personally invite officials from the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Interior to come and cut open the bellies of rotten salmon to detect their sex. I invite them to hack off fish tails in an effort to keep them from being recounted. I want them to realize there is no escaping the smell.

The Klamath is everything to me. It is my home, church, garden, highway, counselor, friend, brother, and provider. Even in its depleted state, nothing on this planet could equal its beauty and its power. Secretary Norton has a rare opportunity to do something great. She has the power to reverse an incredible injustice. The Yurok people aren't asking for all of the water in the Klamath, just enough for our most important resource to survive. Her job is not easy, and her decisions affect people's livelihoods. But her decisions also affect generations of Yurok, Hupa and Karuk tribal peoples. Another fish kill of this magnitude could bring about extinction. Salmon are the center of our tribal culture. If they leave the river system, we don't know what will become of us.

If farmers growing potatoes in the Klamath Basin faced crop die-offs, they could easily recover. The same cannot be said for native salmon species in the river. Is the federal government really willing to risk the demise of salmon species and tribal culture because the irrigation of crops in the basin is, in their minds, the right thing to do? Potato crops are not endangered. Farmers are not endangered.

It is a miracle to me that chinook, coho and steelhead are still in the river, and that this kind of fish kill has not happened before. What is equally miraculous is the fact that the river still holds such beauty despite the robbery of its mass and the degradation of its quality. But we are running out of miracles. These stories of survival have all but come to an end here on the Klamath.

The people of the Klamath, and our way of life, deserve the same respect given to the farmers of the upper basin during their so-called water crisis. The Department of Interior and Secretary Norton need to understand that this type of ecological disaster cannot happen again. The time will come when she will have to decide the fate of the salmon essential to our survival. For the Yurok, and other tribal groups impacted by the current situation, this is not simply a struggle for water rights. It is a matter of life and death.

Comment Author	McCovey, Shaunna
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 06, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1006_023-1	The article has been included in the record as a public comment. History and causes of fish kills are extensively analyzed in Section 3.3.3 – Aquatic Resources, Existing Conditions / Affected Environment and Section 3.10.3 – Greenhouse Gases / Global Climate Change, Existing Conditions / Affected Environment. Effects of fish kills on Indian Tribes are discussed in Section 3.12.3 – Tribal Trust, Existing Conditions / Affected Environment.	No

GP_WI_1111_547

From: inthetank@hotmail.com[SMTP:INTHETANK@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 5:10:06 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: How about this.....
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: McCoy Pauley
Organization:

Comment 1 - Costs

Subject: How about this.....

Body: Blowing those dams SHOULD happen, but why spend taxpayer money to do it? You've got all these whacko extremists who like to blow stuff up, right? Paint a cartoon of Allah on every dam, post a photo on the internet and step back. Hint: don't arrest them until AFTER they blow up the dam, comprende? WHAT! I mean, this way, EVERYBODY's happy, right?

Comment Author	McCoy, Pauley
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_547-1	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No

GP_LT_1114_697

Elizabeth Vasquez
MP 150
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento Ca. 95825

Nov 9, 2011

BUREAU OF RECLAMATON
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
NOV 14 '11
52 7/15 mg

Dear Elizabeth Vasquez

Thank you for accepting my comments about the KBRA and KHSA Public Drafts.

My name is Donald McCullough, I want to complement the parties for their work in drafting these proposals. A person only has to review the proposals to realize how much time and effort were put into them. I can appreciate all this work but I have strong concerns with some areas of the drafts.

I think the [illegible] to every one (farmers, citizens, tribes and etc.) having enough water is to build storage areas for water.

Comment 1 - Alternatives

There are several areas within the boundaries of the drafts where this could be done, store excess water in the off season then use it in the on season.

Generators installed in the outflow from the storage areas could help recover costs of building and operating storage areas.

(1)

SCANNED

Classification ENV-6.00
Project 18
Contract No. 1185086
Folder ID 1190448
Date Input & Initials 11/14/2011

I want to state I have no interest in Pacific Corp other than I buy electricity from them. Yes I am a stakeholder, yes I am a fisherman, and yes I am a conservationist. I don't believe in creating what I think are larger problems to solve different problems.

Comment 2 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

If the dams in question are removed I see this as a real problem. Loss of energy, clean up of materials, pollution, and loss of flood control are some of the negatives.

The dams provide electricity for approximately 70,000 homes. Lets take a close look at the number of homes in the areas covered by the dragets, yes approximately 70,000.

Comment 3 - FERC

Yes I want to buy electricity as reasonable as I can, therefore I say lets build fish ladders or alternate methods instead of removing the dams to get fish back to the head of Klamath River from the Pacific Ocean.

Bottom line do not remove dams.

Comment 4 - Fish

After almost 100 years with the dam(s) in the Klamath River would the fish remember how to return to the head of the river about a 400 mile journey from the Pacific Ocean.

Comment 5 - KBRA

If the Tribes want the Mazama tree farm they should buy it, not expect the tax payers to give it to them.

Yours Truly
Donald McCullough

5422 Balsam Dr, Klamath Falls, OR 97601

(2)

Comment Author	McCullough, David
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1114_697-1	Implementation of the KBRA would include development of additional water storage. Section 18 of the KBRA includes three restoration projects intended to increase the amount of water storage in the Upper Klamath Basin (see p. 2-47 for more information). The KBRA Sections 18.3 and 15.1.1 include provisions for further investigation and acquisition of at least an additional 10,000 acre-feet of storage (see p. 2-48 for more information). The KBRA is a connected action to Alternatives 2 and 3; implementing additional storage would require additional environmental compliance activities.	No
GP_LT_1114_697-2	The Draft EIS/EIR evaluates impacts to energy in Section 3.18, Public Health & Safety, Section 3.2, Water Quality, Section 3.9, Air Quality, Section 3.10 Greenhouse Gases, and Section 3.6, Flood Hydrology.	No
GP_LT_1114_697-3	The effects of each Alternative in regard to fish passage are disclosed in Section 3.3 (Aquatic Resources) as well as Section 4.4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Your comment will be considered as part of the Secretarial Determination relative to the four dams on the Klamath River.	No
GP_LT_1114_697-4	Section 11 of the KBRA describes possible salmon and steelhead reintroduction plans using salmon and steelhead native to the Klamath River to reestablish runs in the Upper Klamath Basin. There is ample evidence and documentation regarding the fact that anadromous salmonids historically occurred above Iron Gate Dam (River Mile 190) in the mainstem Klamath River and several tributaries. There is also ample evidence and documentation indicating anadromous salmonids, native to the Klamath River, would recolonize their historical habitat given the opportunity. Evidence includes: • Published reports which provide a sound basis for the occurrence and distribution of salmon (including Chinook and Coho) and steelhead above Iron Gate Dam. These include: o Hamilton et al., 2005 o Butler et al., 2010, which corroborates findings of Hamilton et al. • On October 16, 2006 Administrative Law Judge Honorable Parlen L. McKenna's Decision included the following findings of fact (FOF) in his decision (Administrative Law Judge 2006): o While the precise geographic distribution is uncertain, historical records and Tribal accounts demonstrate that	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	anadromous fish (Chinook salmon, Coho salmon, and steelhead trout) migrated past the present site of Iron Gate Dam which provided a viable ecosystem and habitat for those stocks of fish. (FOF 2A-3, p. 12). o Chinook salmon (both spring and fall-run) were abundant in the tributaries of the Upper Klamath Basin, including Jenny, Fall, and Shovel Creeks, as well as the Wood, Sprague, and Williamson rivers. (FOF 2A-4, p. 12). o Steelhead trout utilized habitat in Spencer, Shovel, Fall, Camp, and Scotch Creeks, and they were likely distributed as far upstream as Link River. (FOF 2A-5, p. 12). o Coho salmon spawned in Fall Creek. (FOF 2A-6, p. 12). o The record shows that those anadromous fish proximate to Iron Gate Dam are genetically most similar to those populations that existed in the Upper Klamath Basin prior to the construction of the dams. (FOF 2A-22, p. 15). o Anadromous fish are highly adaptive to differing conditions typically can readily migrate into and colonize new habitat or recolonize historic habitat. FOF 6-3, p. 32).	
GP_LT_1114_697-5	Master Response KBRA-5 KBRA and Klamath Tribes.	No

GP_EM_1120_816

From: Rosslynne[SMTP:CUTIEPI2U@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 4:40:25 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: DAM REMOVAL
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Please do not go forward with our plans to remove the dams on the Klamath River. We can't move backward in the West. You will be destroying all that we have worked for and enjoyed. There is no need, except for political reasons, to do such a disastrous thing to the individuals who lice and work in the area. It makes NO sense.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosslynne McCullough

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Sent from my iPad

Comment Author	McCullough, Rosslynne
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_816-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_505

From: don@donsart.com[SMTP:DON@DONSART.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 2:16:07 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River restoration Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Don Scott Macdonald
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath River restoration
Body: I support Alternative 2 of the Klamath Draft EIS/EIR proposal (full removal of the Iron Gate, Copco1, Copco2, and J.C. Boyle dams).

Comment Author	MacDonald, Don Scott
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_505-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_0922_001

From: Meg McDonald[SMTP:MEGMCDONALD@CENTURYTEL.NET]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2011 4:47:01 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath River dam removal: Draft EIS/EIR
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Hello!

I'm writing again to request a specific modification to the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed removal of the dams on the Klamath River.

I would like to see the paragraph on page 3.3-23 that addresses the Southern Resident Killer Whales amended to read as follows:

The Southern Resident Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*) DPS is designated as endangered under the ESA (NOAA Fisheries Service 2005). This DPS occurs in the inland waters of Washington State and southern Vancouver Island, particularly during the summer. However, approximately three-quarters of this endangered population (L and K pods) travels south past Oregon into California waters throughout every fall, winter, and spring. Individuals from the Southern Resident Killer Whales have been observed off coastal California in Monterey Bay, near the Farallon Islands, and off Point Reyes (Heimlich-Boran 1988; Felleman et al. 1991; Olson 1998; Osborne 1999; NOAA Fisheries Service 2005). Southern Resident Killer Whale survival and fecundity are directly correlated with Chinook salmon abundance (Ward et al. 2009; Ford et al. 2009).

The Southern Resident Killer Whales will experience tremendous positive effects from changes in salmon populations in the Klamath River caused by the Proposed Action (food abundance is one of the elements of their critical habitat, as described in the Critical Habitat Section). Hanson et al. (2010) found that Southern Resident Killer Whale stomach contents included several different ESUs of salmon, including Central Valley fall-run Chinook salmon.

Comment 1 - Marine Life

Thank you,

Meg McDonald
24107 Wax Orchard Rd SW
Vashon, WA 98070

From: Meg[SMTP:MEG17@CENTURYTEL.NET]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2011 3:41:12 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath River dam removal: Draft EIS/EIR
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Hello!

I'm writing to request an improvement to the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed removal of the dams on the Klamath River.

The Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed removal of the Klamath River dams completely overlooks the immense benefit that removing these dams will give to the highly endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales. Over half of this endangered population of orcas spends late fall, all of winter, and all of spring traveling south from Washington State, past Oregon, and into California waters as far south as Monterey Bay. The Southern Resident Killer Whales feed almost exclusively on Chinook salmon, which have become increasingly scarce. As this food source has become more difficult to find, the SRKWs who travel south to search for Chinook salmon have experienced increasing mortality rates due primarily to starvation.

Please modify the EIS/EIR for the Klamath River dam removal project to address the incredible opportunity that removing these dams gives us to improve the survival chances of the iconic and beloved, but gravely endangered, Southern Resident Killer Whales.

Thank you!

Meg McDonald
24107 Wax Orchard Road SW
Vashon, WA 98070

Comment Author	McDonald, Meg
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	September 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_0922_001-1	Section 3.3.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR describes the Existing Conditions and Affected Environment within the project area. A description of the potential effects of the Proposed Action on Southern Resident Killer Whales is described in Section 3.3.4.3 Effects Determinations beginning on p. 3.3-93. In addition to the analysis presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, the potential effect of the Proposed Action is subject to interagency consultations under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The DOI released a final Biological Assessment (BA) in October 2011 and they have concluded that the Proposed Action may affect listed species and therefore ESA Consultation is required. A copy of the BA is available for download at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/Klamath%20BA_%20Final%20_10-03-11.pdf. The National Marine Fisheries Service is currently developing a Biological Opinion (BO) for the Proposed Action and the findings of that analysis will be available to the public when completed. Your comment will be considered as part of the Secretarial Determination relative to the four dams on the Klamath River.	No

GP_WI_1111_555

From: rjmcewan@me.com[SMTP:RJMCEWAN@ME.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 5:26:27 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Alternative 2 Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: ROBERT MCEWAN
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath Alternative 2

Body: I support the removal of the four Klamath River Dams.

Comment Author	McEwan, Robert
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 01, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_555-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1020_226

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. HAROLD McFALL: H-a-r-o-l-d,

M-c-F-a-l-l.

God bless America. Even before it was America,

natives were here, you know. I want to give honor to the

common roots, Shasta, you know, the Founding Fathers here,

settlers. I'm one of those, you know. I barely got here.

I was 2,000 or something like that, some ridiculous

number.

My ancestors did not come over here on the

Mayflower, they were before the Mayflower. They came on

slave ships.

I'm not a rancher, I'm not a miner. What's my

stake in this? I'm American. I'm a veteran. And I did

take an oath to defend the United States and this

Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Okay. Mr. Salazar -- oh, we have so many

esteemed politicians here today, stemming from politics.

Everyone knows that one. Politics. Poli, many, ticks,

blood suckers.

There is some politicians, there is some good

Congress people, some good government people. I am not

going to try to tell you who they are, let's let the good Lord tell.

All right, what I want to say, what I want to

say, you know one thing he said, Father forgive them so

they know not what they do.

And later on there will never be an excuse I

was only doing my job, I was only following orders.

I am a firm believer in people. If given the

truth, they can be depended upon to meet any national

crisis. The Great White is bring them on real fast.

And if this, you had up here is coffee, bring

me tea. I'm looking at some of you, and I have looked at

body language -- I am no great decipher of body

language -- but I do know you schedule a lot of them and

their body language says a lot, it says man, let's get

this over. I am so tired of being here. Let's have these

people out there say, the decision has been made, people

don't get excited. They aren't going to do what you want.

They don't listen to you. Mr. Salazar,

Comment 1 -Out of Scope

Mr. Obama, Congress, you know what, the people are the

power. The people are the power. You need to listen to

the people. The people have spoken, you don't listen to

them.

The people, that is the only legitimate

foundation of any company --

THE FACILITATOR: Mr. McFall --

MR. HAROLD McFALL: Thomas Jefferson --

THE FACILITATOR: If you would like to submit

your comments.

MR. HAROLD McFALL: Okay.

Comment Author	McFall, Harold
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_226-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_MC_1018_147

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter

MS. ELIZABETH McGILVRAY: I'm short. I'm

Mrs. McGilvray, Elizabeth, M-c-g-i-l-v-r-a-y.

I was born in Malin. My grandparents dug the

ditches that you are using today, they helped build those

dams, for a reason, many years ago.

Comment 1- Sediment Transport

But the reason I'm standing here is because I

want you to know that if you take those dams out, you have

a silt problem that can never be corrected; example, your

very Rogue River here in Oregon, it took them more than

ten years and they still haven't gotten that silt out of

it. So think very seriously about that before you decide

anything.

Thank you.

Comment Author	McGilvray, Elizabeth
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_147-1	Master Response WQ-11 Comparisons With Rogue River and Downstream Sediment Effects.	No

GP_WI_1229_1192

From: danomcginn@yahoo.com[SMTP:DANOMCGINN@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2011 4:23:46 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Restoration Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Dano McGinn
Organization: none

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath Restoration

Body: I strongly urge and support the full removal of the four lower dams on the Klamath River. Benefits to citizens will be a healthier watershed resulting in improved native fish populations, increased recreation, and greatly reduced dam operation/maintenance costs.

Comment Author	McGinn, Dano
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 29, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1229_1192-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1118_787

From: Sue McGuire[SMTP:SNOOZE@NCCN.NET]
Sent: Saturday, November 19, 2011 3:52:20 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Dam Removal Proposals
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I oppose the proposed dam removals and particularly the impetus allegedly behind these proposed actions.

Comment 2 - Water Quality

How will taking down dams improve water quality? Common sense dicates that removal of the dams will create shallow waters which become warm in the extremely less depth of slow moving rivers, particularly in the surrounding volcanic area.

Comment 3 - Sediment Transport

How will the State mitigate damage from the built up sediments at the bottom of the lakes/dam? How much will it cost to be properly done?

Comment 4 - Hydropower

How could you possibly provide energy in a less costly way than the current green energy produced by hydroelectric power? Common sense dictates that it can't be done.

Comment 5 - KHSA

Who is behind this? Who are the stakeholders? It should be "The People" the inhabitants who live in the area, not special interests. Have the true stakeholders received proper notice pursuant to due process under our Constitution? Have the Indian tribes? If so, are you listening?

Why are you even considering this for the alleged purpose of protection of salmon, which are not native to the area? Why don't you consider the hatcheries, etc.? Common sense again dictates against this entire effort to take down dams necessary and irreplaceable for energy.

I am a California native and am personally affronted by the failure to follow due process and to use common sense. What is your true motive in this devasatation caused to farmers, ranchers, miners, loggers, fisherman, communities and local residents?

Comment 6 - Fish

This conduct against the will of the People should be stopped.

Susan Kay McGuire

Attorney at Law

Leave the dams alone!

Jo Hatcher

Fresno County

Comment Author	McGuire, Sue
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1118_787-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1118_787-2	Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. Master Response WQ-19 Water Temperature Models and General Predictions.	No
GP_EM_1118_787-3	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-2A Sediment Dredging.	No
GP_EM_1118_787-4	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_EM_1118_787-5	Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement. Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations in Private. This EIS/EIR has been developed in accordance with the requirements of NEPA and CEQA to analyze the potential impacts to the environment from the removal of the four PacifiCorp dams on the Klamath River as contemplated in the KHSA and from the implementation of the KBRA. Together, these two agreements attempt to resolve long-standing conflicts in the Klamath Basin. Some of the conflicts and issues these agreements attempt to resolve are enumerated on Draft EIS/EIR p. ES-1 and ES-8-9. The activities leading to the development of the KHSA and the KBRA are discussed on p. ES-7-13. Both the KHSA and KBRA were negotiated and signed by a diverse array of over 40 parties with an interest in resolving Klamath Basin issues. The goal of the KHSA is found on p. 3 or the agreement and the goals of the KBRA are found on p. 4 of that agreement. See Klamathrestoration.gov for the KHSA and KBRA. The Klamath agreements are examples of negotiations designed to resolve longstanding legal battles over the use of water resources in the Klamath Basin. PacifiCorp, tribes, environmental, fishing and agriculture interests are using these agreements to avoid litigation. Signing the KHSA was voluntary for all signatories and no signatory was required to sign to make KHSA a valid agreement. To obtain a copy of the agreements please visit KlamathRestoration.gov .	No

Comment Author	McGuire, Sue
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1118_787-6	Master Response AQU – 4 Coho are Native. The comment, as submitted, provides no evidence to support the claim that coho salmon are not native to the Klamath River. Master Response AQU – 18 Fate of Iron Gate Hatchery under Alternatives. In addition to the Interim Measures under the KHSA described above, the KBRA also provides for development of a conservation hatchery (Section 11.4.4 Conservation Hatchery) to assist in reintroduction efforts if the need is identified in the Fisheries Reintroduction Plan. Iron Gate Hatchery, Fall Creek Hatchery, or another facility could serve to meet this purpose provided it satisfies the requirements to operate as a conservation hatchery. The development of guidelines for the use of the conservation hatchery would be outlined in the Phase I Fisheries Reintroduction and Management Plan and would support the establishment of naturally producing anadromous salmonid populations in the Klamath Basin following implementation of the KHSA (Draft EIS/EIR 3.3-140). Replacement power for the region will be provided by PacifiCorp through the power grid. There is enough excess generating capacity in the Northwest region to meet the demand in the Klamath region if the dams are removed (North American Electric Reliability Corporation 2010). However, in their 2008 Integrated Resource Plan, PacifiCorp acknowledged that there would be a “summer peak resource deficit” in the region by summer of 2011, meaning that more power is needed in the region to meet current peak summertime demand. Due to the economic downturn, this deficit did not occur as forecast, but PacifiCorp’s Strategic Plan has identified the need for new power sources and increased transmission capacity in the region regardless of the outcome of the proposed decommissioning (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.18 Pg 13-14). New sources of power will be needed to meet the increasing demand in the region due to the fact that hydropower facilities are able to provide peaking power, but not sustained, heavy load production. All current energy forecasts show the Northwest region having an energy surplus at the beginning of the 2010 forecast period that, while in decline over the study period (2010 – 2018), are sufficient to meet the needs of the sub region through 2018 (WECC 2009). The surplus capacity may not be able to be sustained over a prolonged cold spell or heat wave, due to the nature of hydro generation (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.18 Pg23). Additionally, PacifiCorp has already begun upgrading their transmission capacity through its Energy Gateway project	No

Comment Author	McGuire, Sue
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	(http://www.pacificorp.com/energygateway). There have been few improvements in transmission capacity over the last 20 years, despite population growth and increased demand. The planned improvements to the transmission systems, as well as additions to generating capacity, are targeted to be online by 2018, prior to the proposed removal of the dams.	

11/23/2011

With (unreadable) back the salmon fishing industry on the North Coast.
We must restore the rivers and streams as a result of erosion and chemical waste from agriculture.
Remove the dams and save us all including the fish and birds and animals.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

GP_LT_1125_946

NOV 25 2011

I am PRO Dam Removal!

Ms. Vasquez

Back The Salmon Fishing Industry on The North Coast.
We must Restore the Rivers + Streams as a result of erosion + chemical waste From Agriculture.
Remove The Dams + Save us all including our Fish and Birds + animals.

From: Melvin McKinney
5262 North Ridge Rd
Eureka Ca 95503

To: Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

the Northcoast Environmental Center

SCANNED

Classification PRT-1300
Project 12
Control No. 11-10-A
Date ID 113134
Date Rec'd 11/25/2011

Comment Author	McKinney, Melvin
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1125_946-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1220_1106

From: briseboy@msn.com[SMTP:BRISEBOY@MSN.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2011 10:12:08 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Michael McLaughlin
Organization:

Subject: Klamath dam removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Since the Klamath dams have led inexorably to massive loss of anadromous spawners for several species, removal as soon as humanly possible is the most economical method to prevent government financial losses through necessary implementation of costly mitigation and litigation.
Historically, this free-running river supported numerous Native tribes, many, many sport fishermen, and several distinct ecosystems. All of these individuals, groups, and living systems suffer irreparably from each moment those dams exist.

As you know, these dams are not assets, but liabilities to their owners, as well as to the future health of citizens, native species, and even distant commercial fisheries and other industries.

Other dams still licensed are also implicated in the species loss, and this, too, impacts the necessity for expeditious removal. If a significant portion of the Klamath can be restored to health and productivity, when the time occurs for removal or superior replacement of those, the species temporarily eradicated and endangered have a far stronger chance for repopulation.

For these and other reasons, these dams must be removed as soon as humanly possible.

Thank you.

Comment Author	McLaughlun, Michael
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1220_1106-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1018_044

From: chm111@q.com[SMTP:CHM111@Q.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2011 5:09:31 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: KBRA/KWAPA
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: C. H. McMillan
Organization:

Subject: KBRA/KWAPA
Body: Comments of C. H. McMillan 3rd in re: Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement & KWAPA

As specific to the Klamath Basin, I have been very disappointed with the lack of depth of alternatives addressed by the KBRA. There seems to be a pervasive failure to recognize, if not near denial of, the fact that freshwater is the most important factor in the survival of all terrestrial species and the world and the nation are well on their way to critical shortages.

Comment 1 - KBRA

With this as the guiding principle, a much broader inquiry into alternatives must be undertaken, to wit:

The eutrophic escalation of a dying upper Klamath Lake must be minimized and offset. To do this the surface area must be drastically reduced by the diking off of shallower areas such as Hanks Marsh, Copic Bay, the entire upper West side toward Rocky Point and North to Cherry Creek, and the restoration of the recently removed dikes in the Tulana Farms area and South of the Williamson River estuary. The upper Klamath River should be contained to reduce surface area an increase flow in areas of the lower Klamath Lake basin south of the river in the Miller Island and Rat Club areas west of US 97. Reducing the surface area substantially reduces evaporation and increases flow movement through the lake and river. Dredging of the lake to raise the level of land in the diked off areas will result in a deeper and hence cooler body of water and the creation of productive agricultural lands that should be irrigated with highly efficient modern systems rather than saturated by flood as has been the custom in the past.

Additional areas of storage need to be considered and developed.

1. The Boundary Dam proposal on Lost River.
2. Consideration of a deep lake created in the Bly basin of the Sprague River drainage by the construction of a dam at the Beatty narrows.
3. Consideration of expansion of Clearlake and development of water supplies thereto from subterranean sources in the hundreds of unoccupied square miles south and east. These wells could be powered by solar cells floated on the Clearlake surface and a portion of the water could be siphoned to the West into lower Tule Lake.

Native American cultural heritage considerations are being overemphasized when it comes to restoration of the sucker species. Today's Native American buys their

Comment 2 - ITAs

Comment 2 cont. - ITAs

food at Walmart or Safeway just like the rest of us; cultural significance of sucker fish can be preserved in artificial habitat just as their baskets, bowls, arrowheads and other artifacts are preserved in museums. In contrast, economic viability and self-sustainability of the tribes should be a major factor of consideration. To a degree the viability of salmon populations plays into this economic element and they should be entitled to an interest in increased agricultural production acreage created by the extensive diking of Klamath Lake and river.

As to the existing dams, upgrade of fish passage has been considered and found to be exorbitantly expensive. Perhaps it would be worthwhile to investigate the functionality of water driven dam face fish elevators in contrast to fish ladders.

Comment 3 - FERC

KBRA endorsement is an illegal over extension and power grab of individual property rights by self interested district directors elected and empowered only to manage delivery of water to member properties. They should only be allowed extended powers as the result of a majority vote by all district members and any member should reserve the right to be exempt from any plan that encroached on individual property right.

Comment 4 - KBRA

KWAPA is an illegal assemblage of special interest persons assuming authority over district utility rate decisions w/o legislative authority or open election to such a Board, should it ever be authorized.

Comment 5 - KBRA

Comment Author	McMillan, Cliff
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1018_044-1	KBRA Section 18.3 identifies the need to complete appropriate studies for additional water storage projects. The KBRA analysis, however, is programmatic, as described in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, because the details of these potential water storage projects are unknown and not reasonably foreseeable at this time. A program-level document is appropriate when a project consists of a series of smaller projects or phases that may be implemented separately. These programs will likely undergo detailed development and analysis in the future. Therefore, it is anticipated additional National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analyses for the suite of actions contained in KBRA will be tiered as appropriate to this EIS/EIR. See Klamathrestoration.gov for a copy of the KBRA. A discussion of the storage potential of new dams on Lost River or Sprague River or expansion of supplies from Clearlake would be speculative and are beyond the scope of the analysis of this EIS/EIR. Both NEPA and CEQA include provisions that the draft environmental review analyze a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the purpose and need/project objections, and are potentially feasible (40 CFR § 1502.14; 43 CFR § 46.420(b); Pub. Resources Code, sec. 21002; CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a), (c), (f)). Alternatives should be limited to ones that avoid or substantially lessen the Proposed Action's significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines secs. 15126.6(a), (c), (f), sec. 15204(a); Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.3). The Lead Agencies are not required to consider all conceivable alternatives to the Proposed Action. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21091(d)(2)(B); CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a); sec. 15204(a). Nor are the Lead Agencies required to analyze an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(f)(3). The Lead Agencies developed a list of 18 preliminary alternatives that were screened down to five. These five alternatives were analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR because they best meet the NEPA purpose and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, and are potentially feasible (Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.3). (A full description of the alternatives and the rationale for screening the alternatives is presented in Appendix A, the Alternatives Formulation Report).	No
GP_WI_1018_044-2	During consultation and in the ethnographic record Indian tribes identified the historic use sucker species for subsistence and as an important component of their traditional cultural practices (e.g., ceremonies). The discussion in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIS/EIR regarding sucker species primarily acknowledges the religious and ceremonial use of sucker species by Indian tribes.	No

Comment Author	McMillan, Cliff
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1018_044-3	Alternative 4 is based on the fishways prescribed by the Department of the Interior (DOI) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service (DOI 2007; NOAA Fisheries Service 2007) for the proposed relicensing of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project, as those fishway prescriptions have been modified through the trial-type hearing and alternative process under the Energy Policy Act of 2005. It thus represents the current position of the Departments in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) proceeding. In developing the fishway prescriptions, the Services considered different prospective methods of providing passage. The prescriptions are consistent with ladders for upstream migration that have been successful at other dams. For example, the North Fork Dam (upstream of River Mill Dam) on the Clackamas River has a 2 mile long ladder that rises 196 feet (it is higher than Iron Gate Dam, the tallest of the lower four Klamath River Dams). This fishway has been in operation since 1958 and has generally had good passage success and virtually all anadromous salmonids that enter the ladder also exit, according to Doug Cramer (as cited in DOI, 2007 p. C-29). Accordingly, the the fishways prescribed for the Klamath facilities would provide safe, timely, and effective passage for anadromous salmonids, redband trout, suckers, and Pacific lamprey.	No
GP_WI_1018_044-4	The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the KHSA and KBRA.	No
GP_WI_1018_044-5	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

GP_MF_1218_1100

Comment Form

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION OFFICIAL FILE COPY RECEIVED

Please mail your comments to: **All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.**

(Please print legibly)

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathDOI@doi.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

CODE	ACTION	SURNAME
150		

Name: Jim McQuillen

Organization: Self & Family

Title: Person / citizen

Address: 60 Grace Lane
Crescent City Ca.
95531

Email:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I'm the Dam Removal process I am for taking all Dams down. not just one or two but all dams need to come down. It will create better water quality and colder water for the Fish. I have experienced the affects of the poor & low water on the Klamath river with myself & my children getting rashes & swimmers itch due to what evers in the water. We have a hard time getting up the river in a boat due to low flows also. We also witnessed the Fish kill a couple of years back & this can not occur again. Please bring down all Dams

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	McQuillen, Jim
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1218_1100-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1117_751

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
NOV 3 7 '11

Dear Mr. Vasquez,

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I am writing this letter to object to the proposed removal of four dams on the Klamath River: Iron Gate, Copco 1, Copco 2 and JC Boyle Dams.

- The total cost of dam removal and implementation after removal exceeds $1.9 billion. Irresponsible expenditures during a national economic crisis
- The science to support dam removal is based on unproven science and not on facts. Lacks of factual evidence that dam removals will restore salmon runs.
- Dam removal will have the effect of putting over several hundred farms and ranches out of *permanent food production and destroy over one third (1/3) of the economic base of the County.* Shasta Valley agricultural operations in 2006 (95.15 Million) amounted to 56% of total economic output for Siskiyou County.
- America needs clean renewable energy and food independence.
- The spotted owl was listed as endangered in 1995. We had closure of 18 mills and elimination of nearly 6, 0000 living wage jobs. We have never fully recovered and are still dependent on timber harvest subsides to maintain our schools and roads. The rural school act is in jeopardy of not being renewed. We cannot allow destruction of our agricultural industry.
- In the last two years Siskiyou County has lost freight rail services and gold mining,
- 79% of Siskiyou County residents voted NO Dam removal on an Advisory measure on the November ballot 2010
- *Dams bring in 300,000 to 1 million dollars a year in tax revenue to our county.*
- Substantial increase in electricity cost as hydroelectric is the cheapest source of engery.
- Lost of habitat wildlife
- Loss of lake fisheries
- Loss of Irongate fish Hatchery
- Loss of recreation
- Loss of property value
- Loss of down river flood protection
- Loss of roads and bridges from flooding which has been document by the flood of _____
- Loss of fire protection…the lake is used to put out fires
- *Irresponsible release of dam sediments* down river by state and Federal agencies.
- Loss of Shasta Nation burial grounds which will be uncovered which are behind the dams.
- Loss of sustained Minimum River flows
- Tunnel by pass alternative to the proposed Dam removal which will enhance and expand the *Salmonids Habitat has been totally ignored by the dept.* of the interior.

The Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement consist of 2 farming units, 3 tribes, 3 Federal Cabinet Secretaries, 3 Oregon State Depts., 1 CA stated Dept. and only 2 of the 9 basin counties, 8 environmental groups and 2 fishing associations. Siskiyou County was not representatives. These agreements were done in secret. It wasn't until the BOS learned of these agreements that public hearings were finally heard. The majority of Siskiyou County residents are opposed.

Comment 2 - KHSA

Classification ENV 6.00
Control No. 1108 6079
Folder No. 1175998
Date Input & Initials 11/17/01

Respectfully,
Julie B. McRoberts
P.O. Box 536
Fort Jones, CA 96032

SCANNED

Comment Author	McRoberts, Julie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 08, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1117_751-1	The total cost of the project would be less than $1.9 billion. Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information. Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection. The cumulative impact analysis considers other actions that have affected the region. The effects of reduced tax revenues are addressed in Section 3.5 of the EIS/EIR. Master Response AQU-18 Fate of Iron Gate Hatchery under Alternatives. The impacts listed in the comment and mitigation measures to address the impacts are discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR: - Habitat and wildlife effects are discussed in the Section 3.5, Terrestrial Resources. - Fishery effects and effects to Iron Gate Hatchery are discussed in Section 3.4, Aquatics. - Recreation effects are discussed in Section 3.20, Recreation. - Real estate and property value effects are discussed in Section 3.15, Socioeconomics. - Flooding effects are discussed in Section 3.6, Hydrology and Flooding. - Fire protection effects are discussed in Section 3.28, Public Health and Safety. Master Response ALT-2 Elimination of Alternative 10 - Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing from Detailed Study. Property taxes currently paid are described in Section 3.15, Socioeconomics. The baseline for analysis of flooding effects for the Proposed Action is discussed in Section 3.6, Flood Hydrology. Master Response CUL-1 Shasta Nation Participation.	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1117_751-2	Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement. Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA.	No

GP_WI_1108_399

From: jeffmctear@gmail.com[SMTP:JEFFMCTEAR@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2011 11:16:00 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Kalamath dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jeff McTear
Organization:

Subject: Kalamath dams

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I support the removal of all four of the dams being considered for removal. I believe that the long-term benefits of this proposal far outweigh the costs.

Comment Author	McTear, Jeff
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 08, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1108_399-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1024_254

SCANNED

10-21-11

150

To - Bureau of Reclamation
Elizabeth Vasquez

From - James McVay
926 Lorna Linda Dr.
Klamath Falls OR 97601

PRO 1300
12
HUBD 195
115 3134
Initials
10-24-2011

This letter is to convey my concerns about the proposed Klamath River Restoration agreement and the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement.

I have lived in the Klamath Basin for 71 years and farmed for many years at Malin, and Merrill in Oregon and Tulelake in California.

Comment 1 - Hydropower

My major concern is the removal of 4 hydroelectric dams. These are clean energy producing facilities and as state Senator Doug Whitsett said, "removing four perfectly good hydroelectric dams is insane."

Comment 2 - Water Rights/Supply

The agreements lack provisions for more water storage. How can you have sustainable water supplies with the current amount of water? In drought conditions there must be more water to meet the competing demands.

Comment 3 - Hydropower

I agree that the farmers need lower power rates. They should have rates equal to other irrigators in Oregon and California.

I am concerned about the Tribes signing these agreements. As sovereign nations, in the future they

Comment 4 - ITAs

can back out if they should disagree with any provision.

In closing I find the only solution is Adjudication and more water storage.

James McVay

James McVay

Comment Author	McVay, James
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 24, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1024_254-1	Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_LT_1024_254-2	See Klamathrestoration.gov for a copy of the KBRA. Many sections of the KBRA address measures and plans for additional water storage in the upper basin including KBRA Sections 18 and 20. In addition, KBRA Section 19 describes a process for developing a drought plan to equitably manage water demand during drought conditions.	No
GP_LT_1024_254-3	Klamath Basin power users formerly paid reduced power rates for irrigation and other purposes under a 1956 contract between the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and Copco (now PacifiCorp Power). In April 2006, the Oregon Public Utilities Commission (OPUC) determined that the 1956 contract would expire on April 16, 2006, and it decided to shift irrigation customers to full general irrigation tariff rates over several years. In re Pacific Power &Light, No. UE 170, 2006 WL 1675377 (OPUC Apr. 12, 2006) (Order No. 06-172). The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) similarly decided to transition irrigation customers to full tariff rates following the April 16, 2006, expiration of the contract. In re Application of PacifiCorp, No. U 901-E, 2006 WL 1049355 (CPUC Apr. 13, 2006) (Decision No. 06-04-034). The rates paid by irrigators are equal to the rates paid by retail rate payers in California and Oregon.	No
GP_LT_1024_254-4	National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)0 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) both require the Lead Agencies to respond to comments on significant environmental issues related to the Draft EIS/EIR. Because the comment does not address the content and analysis of the Draft EIS/EIR, no additional response is provided. Nevertheless, your comment regarding the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and/or the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Action.	No

GP_EM_1022_183

From: DON MEAMBER[SMTP:DMEAMBER@SBCGLOBAL.NET]
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2011 1:01:03 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Cc: Siskiyou Co. SupervisorJim Cook; Ed Valenzuela; Michael Kobseff; Marcia Armstrong; Grace Bennett; Rick Costales
Subject: Klamath Settlement comment
Auto forwarded by a Rule

To whom it may concern:

Reasons the Klamath Dams should remain standing

I am a rancher along the Shasta River who has served on the local Resource Conservation District Board and have been very active in restoring my stretch of the River and a tributary for the salmon for the last 20 years. I also keep the local City wastewater from polluting the River with year-round storage and subsequent recycle on my pastures.

Comment 1 - KHSA

1. Flushing out the sediment stored behind the dams by use of winter flow may do damage to the runs of Coho Salmon during December. The runs on the Shasta in recent years according to CA Fish & Game counting stations, have been running from about 10-26 until 12-26, and on the Scott River from 10-26 until 12-24. Some of the large floods, such as 1964 occur during late December.

2. The poor water quality in the four hydro-electric dams is not caused by the water in storage there, but by the discharge from the Upper Basin, chiefly from Upper Klamath Lake, Lake Ewana, and especially by return flow from project irrigators and the Wildlife Refuge through the Klamath Straits. If the problem was because of storage in these reservoirs, then places like Shasta Lake and Trinity Lake would also be charged with poor quality water.

Comment 2 - Water Quality

3. That poor Upper Basin water quality is reason enough to not encourage the salmon to move upstream. In addition, tributaries above Iron Gate that might be used for spawning, are few in number and habitat space until getting above Upper Klamath Lake.

Comment 3 - Fish

4. This poor quality water should be used more for irrigation in the Upper Basin, so that the springs below J.C. Boyle Dam and the various Klamath R. tributaries would comprise a greater portion of the River's warm season flow, keeping the warm season flow cooler. Discharges from the dams could also be drawn from deeper colder water, as it now is at Shasta Dam.

Comment 4 - Alternatives

5. Probably the number one cause of fish take in the River is from diseases to in-transit smolts, returning to the estuary. The River is being mismanaged in a way that causes more disease, and has nothing to do with the dams. The flow is kept too high during the summer, which fosters higher populations of poychaete worms, *Manayunkia speciosa,* the host for the two myxosporean parasites, Ceratomyxa Shasta and Parvicapsula Minibicornis. Lower flows, according several scientific reports, should help to dry out some of the streambed where

Comment 5 - Fish

Comment 5 cont. - Fish

the worms live, destroying them and their habitat. Summer is not the time that either smolts or adult spawners use the River, so maintaining significant flow by releases from Upper Klamath Lake should not be as important as controlling disease. Smolts move out in the spring and adults come up in the fall. High winter flows are also recommended for flushing out the worms and parasites. These measues of River management are things that the lay person can easily understand, and don't need scientific studies to confirm.
http://www.fws.gov/arcata/fisheries/reports/technical/Final%20KR09%20Report%20May%206%202010.pdf
http://www.northcoastjournal.com/020807/news0208.html

http://www.times-standard.com/localnews/ci_14746435

http://www.times-standard.com/localnews/ci_11991477

Comment 6 - Fish

5. Another alternative to save the fish in the long run is to close down Iron Gate Hatchery. Mismanagement is probably destroying the wild population by raising 2-year old steelhead, which have been found to stay as residents in the River, consuming wild as well as hatchery smolts that are leaving the system. In addition, many scientists feel that hatchery fish compete with wild salmon for food, lessening the numbers of preferred wild salmon. The waste outfall from the Hatchery is probably also causing all kinds of bad repercussions to the River, such as providing nutrients to grow more habitat for the Polychaete worms.

Thank you for reading my concerns, as well as, listening to my 3 minutes at the Yreka Hearing on October 20, 2011.

Don Meamber

Montague, CA

Comment Author	Meamber, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1022_183-1	The effects of increases in suspended sediment concentration to coho salmon are described in Section 3.3.4.3., under Effects Determinations, and Appendix E of the Draft EIS/EIR. The timing of upstream migration of coho salmon in the main stem Klamath River is described to span from September to January. The Draft EIS/EIR found that the effect of the Proposed Action would be significant for the coho salmon from the Upper Klamath River, Mid-Klamath River, Shasta River, and Scott River population units in the short term and the effect of the Proposed Action would be beneficial for the coho salmon from the Upper Klamath River, Mid-Klamath River, Lower Klamath River, Shasta River, Scott River, and Salmon River population units in the long term as a result of increased habitat availability and improved habitat quality.	No
GP_EM_1022_183-2	Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. Although out of scope for the Draft EIS/EIR, general information on Shasta and Trinity reservoirs is provided below to directly address this portion of the comment. Shasta and Trinity reservoirs are much deeper and larger than the Klamath Reservoirs and contain colder water. These reservoirs were created for flood control and irrigation storage of winter rain runoff and spring snowmelt. Unlike the Klamath system, the reservoirs were not created below areas with large natural wetlands or marshes. They also do not have significant agricultural runoff introducing nutrients to the systems. Additionally releases from these reservoirs are much larger than releases from Klamath River dams. See the following web page for more information on both the Shasta and Trinity dams: http://www.usbr.gov/projects/Project.jsp?proj_Name=Shasta%2FTrinity+River+Division+Project In winter flood control releases from Shasta can be up to 50,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). Summertime irrigation flows range from 9,000 cfs to 15,000 cfs. See web page at: http://cdec.water.ca.gov/histPlot/DataPlotter.jsp?staid=KES&sensor_no=23&duration=D&start=10%2F25%2F2004+&end=now&geom=Small. These high flows continue throughout the irrigation season. This creates a much more quickly moving dynamic system with water releases from various levels of the reservoir using the temperature control devise. Trinity Reservoir also has large volumes of water discharged throughout the summer. Trinity Reservoir is the fourth largest reservoir in California. Historically up to 90% of the Trinity River flows were directed over to the Sacramento River watershed. Trinity River flows have now been adjusted to mimic the more natural flows to restore the habitat	No

Comment Author	Meamber, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	values of the river. Beginning in May, depending upon the type of water year, flows are ramped up from 4,000 cfs to 11,000 cfs. These high flows last through July. See web page http://www.trrp.net/?page_id=391 for more information. These larger volumes of water and higher discharge flows of cold water make the reservoir dynamics very different from the Klamath River system.	
GP_EM_1022_183-3	In most years (2011 being somewhat of an exception) water quality in UKL and Keno is seasonably poor. To assess what this might mean for reintroduced salmon, Iron Gate Chinook salmon stock were tested in UKL and the lower Williamson River to assess whether current conditions would physiologically impair Iron Gate Hatchery Chinook salmon reintroduced into the Upper Klamath Basin. Juvenile Chinook salmon were tested in cages In Upper Klamath Lake and the Williamson River in 2005 and 2006. These juveniles showed normal development as smolts in Upper Klamath Lake and survived well in both locations (Maule et al. 2009). This evidence (documented in Section 3.3.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR) strongly suggests that Upper Klamath Lake habitat is suitable to support salmonids for at least the October through May period. The authors concluded that there was little evidence of physiological impairment or significant vulnerability to C. shasta (a fish parasite) that would preclude this stock from being reintroduced into the Upper Klamath Basin. The life history of Type I fall-run Chinook salmon, which emigrate downstream in the spring, does not include a freshwater phase from July through September. Thus, conditions for fall-run Chinook migration through Upper Klamath Lake appear favorable. The timing of the migration period for Type II spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead trout would generally avoid the period of poor water quality in Upper Klamath Lake. Spring inputs in the Williamson River and on the west side of UKL would likely provide thermal habitat for these year round life histories. Regarding habitat in the Project reach, while the exact miles of habitat for use by anadromous fish within is unknown, 58 miles is a reasonable estimate based on the evidence contained in the record (Administrative Law Judge 2006). Access to habitat within the Project would benefit Coho salmon by: a) extending the range and distribution of the species thereby increasing the Coho salmon's reproductive potential; b) increasing genetic diversity in the Coho stocks; c) reducing the species vulnerability to the impacts of degradation; and d) increasing the abundance of the Coho population (Administrative Law Judge 2006).	

Comment Author	Meamber, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	There is about 22.4 miles (36.04 km) of riverine and riparian habitat (currently under reservoirs) that would restore riverine nutrient cycling and aeration processes provided by a natural channel. These improvements resulting from the Proposed Action would likely moderate the anticipated stream temperature increases resulting from climate change (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3). River channel habitat within the reservoir reaches would be low gradient habitat of critical importance for spawning and rearing for salmon, steelhead, redband trout, and Pacific lamprey. The upstream half of the J.C. Boyle Reservoir is shallow and considered low gradient (FERC 2007, p 3-185). FERC also considered the Copco No. 2 bypassed reach and reaches inundated by Iron Gate and Copco reservoirs to be low gradient. For these reaches, they estimated that the density of Chinook salmon spawners per mile for mainstem habitat was twice that of high gradient habitat (FERC 2007; p 3-315). These river channels would likely excavate to their pre-dam elevations within a Klamath few months, and revert to and maintain a pool-riffle morphology due to restoration of riverine processes, creating holding and rearing habitat for anadromous salmonids.	
GP_EM_1022_183-4	The water temperature effects of the cold water springs downstream of J.C. Boyle Dam are localized (see Draft EIS/EIR Appendix C, pg C-3). While the river water can be considerably cooled during summer months by input from the springs, particularly during non-peaking flows when the springs dominate mainstem flows, ambient heating from solar radiation results in considerable warming as the water travels further downstream. Additionally, existing data and numeric models described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2 (p. 3.2-76 to 3.2-125) indicate that the dams are not acting to cool summertime water that is transported downstream from Upper Klamath Lake. Instead, the dams increase late summer/early fall water temperatures in the Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam. This is due to the fact that powerhouse withdrawals for Copco 1 and Iron Gate Dams are primarily from the epilimnion (surface waters) (see Draft EIS/EIR Appendix C, pg C-3), which are heated by ambient conditions. Unlike Shasta Dam or other deep reservoirs that support downstream tail water fisheries by release of cool water from low level outlets, the location of Klamath dam outlets cannot be adjusted to access large volumes of cool water in the bottom of the reservoirs (hypolimnion). This is because hypolimnetic waters in the Project reservoirs are of limited volume and poor water quality. The prior FERC analysis determined that there are no controllable actions that can be taken to cool water released from either Keno or J.C. Boyle developments (FERC 2007, pg 3-142). Based on the analysis provided in FERC (2007), the duration of hypolimnetic releases from Copco 1 reservoir storage would last	No

Comment Author	Meamber, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	about 1.8 days at 1,000 cfs (see pg 3-145) and any such hypolimnetic flow release would likely be very low in dissolved oxygen (FERC 2007, see pg 3-146). Sustained temperature relief of more than two weeks to the Klamath River via releases from Iron Gate dam is not feasible (FERC 2007, see pg 3-146) and, as with hypolimnetic releases at Copco Dam, the dissolved oxygen of water released from near the bottom of Iron Gate reservoir would generally be very low (FERC 2007, see pg 3-146). In addition, the sole water supply for Iron Gate Hatchery withdraws cold water from the deeper water of Iron Gate reservoir; depleting or exhausting this cold water pool during the summer would likely seriously impair hatchery operations during any year that such hypolimnetic releases occur (FERC 2007, see pg 3-147).	
GP_EM_1022_183-5	The Draft EIS/EIR acknowledges that parasites and disease are harmful to fish however flows are only one of several issues associated with this topic. Parasites have on occasion proven to be devastating to salmonids in the mainstem Klamath, particularly in the Lower Klamath downstream of Iron Gate Dam. High parasite prevalence in the lower Klamath River is considered to be a combined effect of high spore input from heavily infected, spawned adult salmon that congregate downstream of Iron Gate Dam and Iron Gate Hatchery and the proximity to dense populations of polychaetes (Bartholomew et al. 2007) The highest rates of infection occur in the lower Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam (Stocking and Bartholomew 2007; Bartholomew and Foott 2010) (Final EIS/EIR 3.3.3.2). Master Response AQU – 27 Disease.	No
GP_EM_1022_183-6	Closing Iron Gate Hatchery does not meet the Proposed Action's NEPA purpose and need or CEQA objectives, as described in the EIS/EIR Executive Summary, and therefore this alternative was not analyzed in the EIS/EIR. Water quality considerations under all the alternatives analyzed in the EIS/EIR are subject to regulation under the Clean Water Act and therefore must meet load allocations defined through the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) process. The analysis of water quality impacts for all project alternatives and a discussion of TMDL implementation are included in EIS/EIR Section 3.2. It is assumed that all applicable federal, tribal, state, and local statutes and regulations would be followed under all alternatives. Master Response AQU – 18 Fate of Iron Gate Hatchery under Alternatives.	

Comment Author	Meamber, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Master Response AQU – 28 FERC Conclusions for Disease. Master Response GEN-13 Range of Alternatives Considered. Master Response WQ-22 TMDLs and the No Action/No Project Alternative (and Alternative 4).	

GP_MC_1020_234

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. DON MEAMBER: My name is Don Meamber,

D-o-n, M-e-a-m-b-e-r.

I am a rancher near Montague, and I am below

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

the Shasta River. I like fish, and I appreciate anything

for salmon recovery.

But in this case there is just too many, too

many reasons to leave the dams in there. And this is

being sold as a fish recovery, fish passage program; and I

feel like there is too many things not being done

properly.

Comment 2 - Water Quality

If you want to restore fish, the river is not

being managed properly under the present operation. The

river has been, it seems like, I think it has been about

since 2001 when the water was taken away from the Upper

Basin farmers. It is about that time when they noticed

the rivers managed to maintain flow, peek flow, large flow

all summer long, and it flat line about a thousand cfs.

I've read several scientific reports that say

that stimulating the survival of the polychaete worms

which are the host of the diseases of the small salmon

that leave the tributaries. And it's -- I want to say

something too about the fish, the water quality.

I went to a film for Fish & Wildlife about

three or four years ago. There was a group that came

there, talking to -- they had this film about salmon

recovery in the Klamath River. He said all we want here

is clear, clean, pure water in the Klamath River.

Well, I dispute that the Klamath River had

pure, clean water.

Comment 3 - Sediment Transport

Mr. Lynch talked about letting the sediment go

to the middle of the winter. Like in the December of '64

flood, was December, the fish reports I see from Fish and

Game, the Coho were running up November, December. They

are going to run into that sediment if they get a flood in

that time of year.

Comment 4 - Out of Scope

One other thing I want to say is my, even

though I have different feelings on the dam removal, I

want to say my uncle, my great uncle was actually the guy

that was in charge of building all the dams on the river.

So I do have a little sentiment on that. His name, John

Boyle. Thank you for your time.

Comment Author	Meamber, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_234-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1020_234-2	Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements.	Yes
	Master Response AQU – 27 Disease.	
GP_MC_1020_234-3	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish.	No
	Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging.	
	Master Response AQU – 16 Benefits to Coho.	
	Master Response AQU – 21 NRC Dam Removal Help Coho.	
GP_MC_1020_234-4	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_MC_1020_203

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. JOHN MENKE: John, J-o-h-n, Menke,

M-e-n-k-e. Retired professor, University of California at

Davis, University of California at Berkley, colleague of

Peter Boyle since 1973, but a grassland ecologist, not a

fishery biologist.

I have been here 19 years though studying the

fishery situation, and served on numerous committees

including the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force technical

work group. And I got involved very heavily --

I have a serious claim here to make.

Comment 1 - Algae

We have scientific misconduct happening on this

case. Now I want to give that evidence. And this goes

along right following Peter Boyle's ideas.

Bioremediation benefit of the dams. Peter is

worried about, as am I, the longer, the loss of the longer

transit time for bioremediation of the phosphorus

scrubbing ability of blue green algaes. Without the algae

to take up the phosphorus in the water, the lower river

will degrade. In fact, the scrubbing ability of these

algae cells that pick up phosphorus and drop it to the

bottom of the reservoirs, is a phenomenal bioremediation

remediation benefit to the fisheries.

The issue, then, is if the dams go out you will

lose that scrubbing ability. It is irrefutable evidence

with 21 million cubic yards of largely dead blue green

algae cells on the bottom of the reservoirs of how much

work those cells have done.

It is actually a vast resource, phosphorus is a

Very valuable element for productivity. And those areas

could easily be dredged, in fact there was an analysis by

Dr. Wedge's (phonetically) team to get the material out of

there.

Comment 2 - Proposed Project

I don't think the dam should ever go out until a

Comment 3 - Fish

substantial dredging operation precedes removal. The

other item is with the dams out you don't have the

hatchery operations there. Now that the habitat

management plan is farther along we will be able to do a

better job in producing fish that are not inbred and lead

to depression and performance.

Comment 4 - KBRA

Shockingly enough in the Upper Basin the natural

phosphorus is there and is almost all natural, requires

intensive agriculture to export phosphorus out of the

Basin, in cross and bone and livestock.

So taking those away, the whole wetlands

program, which is another kind of like an ESA strategy,

that is common work being used today by agencies. In fact, is the epiphysis of what needs to be done. Waterfowl mobilize phosphorus in their, in their dung slurry with both nitrogen and phosphorus together. And they tend to gather that and bring it onto the wetlands and defecate every day, gather around the area and defecate. So in fact the wetland's model for improvement is not a solution.

The misconduct --

THE FACILITATOR: Mr. Menke --

MR. JOHN MENKE: Let me make one statement. The misconduct is that all the jobs are going to be guarded by the agencies, not the Native Americans.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Menke, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_203-1	Concern #1: The dams trap algae and nutrients originating in Upper Klamath Lake, which is an important ecosystem service for the Klamath River. Response #1: There is no scientific misconduct happening as part of the analyses conducted for the Klamath Facilities Removal EIS/EIR. As described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.3 (p. 3.2-23 to 3.2-24) and (Appendix) Sections C.2.1.3 and C.2.1.4 (p. C-12 to C-15), existing conditions data for algal-derived (organic) suspended materials indicate that algal blooms originating in Upper Klamath Lake largely settle out of the water column in the Keno Impoundment (i.e., upstream of the Project reservoirs). Further decreases in concentrations of algal-derived (organic) suspended materials can occur downstream of Keno Dam, which may be due to the mechanical breakdown and settling of algal remains in the turbulent river reaches between Keno Dam and Copco 1 Reservoir, as well as by dilution from the springs downstream of J.C. Boyle Dam. In other words, the Project reservoirs are not responsible for “scrubbing” the majority of the algal material produced in Upper Klamath Lake from the Klamath River. In fact, concentrations of algal-derived (organic) suspended materials in this reach can also increase due to large seasonal algal blooms occurring in Copco 1 and Iron Gate Reservoirs. That said, the reservoirs at the Four Facilities do intercept and retain some amount of phosphorus and nitrogen originating from Upper Klamath Lake. As discussed in Section 3.2.4.3.2.3 (p. 3.2-101 to 3.2-104), under the Proposed Action these nutrients would be transported downstream and potentially be available for uptake by algae, including nuisance periphyton species. Analyses of the effects of dam removal on nutrients have been conducted by PacifiCorp for its relicensing efforts, California North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) for development of the California Klamath River total maximum daily loads (TMDLs), and the Yurok Tribe as part of an evaluation to improve previous mass-balance estimates of nutrients in the Klamath River and increase understanding of retention rates in free-flowing river reaches (see citations in the Draft EIS/EIR). Results of all of the evaluations recognize the trapping efficiency of the reservoirs with respect to total phosphorus (TP) and total nitrogen (TN), such that under the Proposed Action total nutrient concentrations in the Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam would increase. Estimates of the increases are relatively small for TP (2-12%) and larger for TN (35-55%), depending on the period of analysis (i.e., June-October vs. July-September). Despite the overall increases in absolute nutrient concentrations anticipated under the Proposed Action, the relatively greater increases in TN may not result in significant biostimulatory effects on primary productivity (i.e., periphyton growth). Existing data indicate that the	No

Comment Author	Menke, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Klamath River is generally N-limited (TN:TP <10), with some periods of co-limitation by N and P (see Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2.3, p. 3.2-101 to 3.2-104 and [Appendix] Section C.3.1.4, p. C-24 to C-29). However, concentrations of both nutrients are high enough in the river from Iron Gate Dam to approximately Seiad Valley (and potentially further downstream) that nutrients are not likely to be limiting primary productivity (i.e., periphyton growth) in this portion of the Klamath River. In addition, N-fixing species dominate the periphyton communities in the lower reaches of the Klamath River where inorganic nitrogen concentrations are low. Since these species can fix their own nitrogen from the atmosphere, increases in TN due to dam removal may not significantly increase their growth (see also Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.4, Algae), particularly if overall TN increases are less than those predicted by existing models due to implementation of TMDLs and general nutrient reductions in the Klamath Basin. Concern #2: The phosphorus deposits in the sediments behind the Project dams represent a resource and could be dredged. Response #2: The Alternatives Formulation Report identified the option of mechanical sediment removal as mitigation for sediment erosion impacts associated with removal of the dams. Subsequent analysis found this measure to be infeasible (Lynch 2011). (http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/lynch.memo.8.30.11.mech.dredge..pdf). Dredging of reservoir sediment was deemed infeasible for the following reasons: (1) dredging is relatively ineffective because it would only remove 43% of the erodible sediment at best; (2) since greater than 50% of the sediment deposits would still be transported downstream during reservoir drawdown, dredging would provide only a marginal benefit to fish; (3) disposal of the dredged sediments would have a large environmental impact on terrestrial resources and possibly on cultural resources; and, (4) dredging is associated with a high cost of about $165 million in 2020 dollars. While the analysis conducted for the Alternatives Formulation Report did not focus on phosphorus recovery from the sediment deposits, the relatively low effectiveness and high cost of dredging operations in the Project reservoirs may also mean that phosphorus recovery projects are infeasible.	
GP_MC_1020_203-2	The Lead Agencies considered mechanical removal of reservoir bottom sediments as a mitigation measure to reduce the effects of suspended sediment on aquatic resources, water quality, and other environmental resources. However, based on the findings that dredging would only remove a maximum of 43 percent of the erodible sediment, would only provide a marginal benefit to fish	No

Comment Author	Menke, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	during drawdown, would have a large environmental impact on terrestrial resources and possibly on cultural resources, and would cost on the order of $165 million in 2020 dollars, this mitigation measure was deemed infeasible and it was not explored further as a mitigation action in the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information on the reasons why this measure was eliminated, please see the Memorandum entitled "Infeasibility of the Mechanical Removal of Reservoir Bottom Sediments if Klamath Dams are Removed in 2020" dated August 30, 2011, that is available at the following website: http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/lynch.memo.8.30.11.mech.dredge.pdf	
GP_MC_1020_203-3	We believe the comment refers to a hatchery management plan rather than a habitat management plan. PacifiCorp and the California Department of Fish and Game are currently developing a Hatchery Genetics Management Plan (HGMP) for coho salmon reared at Iron Gate Hatchery. Under the HGMP Iron Gate Hatchery will be operated to conserve coho salmon populations incorporating the best available science for operating hatchery facilities consistent with the conservation of salmonid species. Master Response AQU – 18 Fate of Iron Gate Hatchery under Alternatives. In addition to the Interim Measures under the KHSA described above, the KBRA also provides for development of a conservation hatchery (KBRA Section 11.4.4 Conservation Hatchery) to assist in reintroduction efforts if the need is identified in the Fisheries Reintroduction Plan. Iron Gate Hatchery, Fall Creek Hatchery, or another facility could serve to meet this purpose provided it satisfies the requirements to operate as a conservation hatchery. The development of guidelines for the use of the conservation hatchery would be outlined in the Phase I Fisheries Reintroduction and Management Plan and would support the establishment of naturally producing anadromous salmonid populations in the Klamath Basin following implementation of the KHSA (Draft EIS/EIR 3.3-140).	
GP_MC_1020_203-4	The point the comment author is attempting to make is unclear. The Draft EIS/EIR thoroughly analysis the project's effects to phosphorus and water quality in Section 3.2. Master Response N/CP-13 KBRA Analyzed as a Connected Action.	No

GP_WI_1113_645

From: marmarket@gmail.com[SMTP:MARMARKET@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2011 6:20:23 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam, Klamath River Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Marisa Mercado
Organization:

Subject: Dam, Klamath River

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: All dams on Klamath River should be removed immediately, surrounding wetlands restored, and minimum flow of 1,300 cubic feet/second at Iron Gate, in accordance with Nat Marine Fisheries Service requirements. Our nation's bounty is our economic gain. Dwindling species of marketable seafood is our loss. Facing numerous threats, salmon need this opportunity to rebound, before losses become irreversible.

Comment 2 - Fish

Comment Author	Mercado, Marisa
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 13, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1113_645-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_1113_645-2	Master Response AQU – 11 NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management. The Current 2010 NMFS Biological Opinion does not require a minimum flow of 1,300 cfs downstream of Iron Gate Dam during all months and hydrological conditions.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_052

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Cheryl Medill

Organization:

Title:

Address: 1721 Donedale Rd.

Email:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comments: I strongly oppose the removal of the dams — It has been manipulated by ~~my~~ major interest groups and never voted on by the citizens — what was on the ballot was a ~~[illegible]~~ total misrepresentation — let us be heard

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Merill, Cheyre
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_052-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_500

From: kmerz@suddenlink.net[SMTP:KMERZ@SUDDENLINK.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 10:29:33 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Karolyn Merz
Organization:

Subject: Klamath River dam removal

Body: I support alternative 2; please save the fish & the river. we are running out of time.....

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Merz, Karolyn
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_500-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_537

From: meyerjs@aol.com[SMTP:MEYERJS@AOL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 4:13:20 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath restoration Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jon Mmeyer
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath restoration

Body: Restoration of salmon and steelhead populations depend upon waterways that are free of dams and other migratory obstacles. Guarantee future generations substantial populations of sea run fish by removing dams along the Klamath River and other western rivers.

Comment Author	Meyer, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_537-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1016_032

From: meyersbetty@yahoo.com[SMTP:MEYERSBETTY@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2011 12:51:19 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Betty Meyers
Organization: self

Subject: Klamath River Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Hydropower

Body: Removing the dams on the Klamath River will not help our local farmers and ranchers with better electrical rates. Until we have a cheaper way to produce electricity for those of us that use power from the Klamath Dams, then those sources need to stay in place. We are fast becoming a nation reliant on foreign-produced foods, when we used to be the world producer. The reason we were able to win World War II was because we produced everything we needed inside our own country. Where would we be today under those same circumstances? We need to take care of our needs, and then look to other options.

Comment Author	Meyers, Betty
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1016_032-1	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No

GP_WI_1116_705

From: aidamiho@gmail.com[SMTP:AIDAMIHO@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 5:23:32 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Please consider removing the Klamath River dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Please consider removing the Klamath River dams
Body: I am writing today to express my opinion about the Klamath River restoration project.

I am so grateful that you are considering removing the dams on the river. This is extremely important for a few reasons:

1. The restoration of all historic wetlands and marshes in the upper Klamath basin, including Lower Klamath Lake, Tule Lake and Upper Klamath Lake will bring Coho and Chinook salmon runs to their historic spawning grounds.

2. Therefore, it restores the Yurok Indians' way of life, which ties directly with the health of salmon. The relationship between the native community and salmon needs to be restored to make sure these people's human rights and indigenous rights are protected.

Thank you so much for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Miho

Comment Author	Miho
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_705-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_569

From: Mikeob@sacmag.com[SMTP:MIKEOB@SACMAG.COM]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2011 7:54:56 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Support of Klamath alternative 2 Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Mike
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Support of Klamath alternative 2

Body: I recommend Alternative 2, for restoration of fish habitat and migratory ability, lesser cost and long term benefit.

Comment Author	Mike
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_569-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1228_1186

From: millard@uoregon.edu[SMTP:MILLARD@UOREGON.EDU]
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2011 11:42:09 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Remove the Dam
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: James Millard
Organization:

Subject: Remove the Dam

Body: Remove the Dam!!!!

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Millard, James
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1228_1186-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1229_1183

From: jenniferfmiller@hotmail.com[SMTP:JENNIFERFMILLER@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2011 11:03:39 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Draft EIS/EIR - Klamath Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jennifer Miller
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Draft EIS/EIR - Klamath

Body: I am in full support of removing all Klamath River Dams.

Comment Author	Miller, Jennifer
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 29, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1229_1183-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1006_022

From: kstar337@gmail.com[SMTP:KSTAR337@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2011 12:14:38 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Comments: Klamath Damn Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Krista Miller
Organization:

Subject: Comments: Klamath Damn Removal

Body: I support the following action steps in Klamath Damn Removal as essential to the success of the project:

Comment 1 - Recreation

Public Access: Access is vital, especially where whitewater difficulty changes, so boaters can choose runs suited to their skills and tastes. Paddlers should request new or improved access at Keno Dam, Highway 66 Bridge, JC Boyle Dam Site, Frain Ranch, Above Wards Canyon, Below Wards Canyon, Irongate Dam Site.

Assistance for Outfitters: The river has long supported a vibrant commercial rafting industry. Dam removal will mean changes but these changes can be positive if basic steps are taken to address outfitter needs. These include improved access at Frain Ranch, timely issuance of permits for new runs, and restoration of a more natural flow regime just prior to dam removal to help outfitters evaluate the run and prepare guides, equipment and logistics for post-dam conditions. Following dam removal, continued access to flow information is important for all river runners.

Comment 2 - Recreation

Restoring the River Channel: In removing the dams, all debris associated with the man-made structures needs to be removed from the river channel to facilitate safe passage. In addition, vegetation that has colonized the dewatered Ward's Canyon needs to be removed.

Comment 3 - Alternatives

Preserving Open Space: PacifiCorp owns 3800 acres adjoining the reservoirs Management of these lands will profoundly affect river runners. AW supports permanent protection of all PacifiCorp lands that includes restoration and revegetation.

Comment 4 - Land Use

Permanent Protection: Finally, to protect the investment in river restoration, we support designating the entire Upper Klamath from Keno to Irongate as a National Wild & Scenic River.

Comment 5 - Wild and Scenic River

Thank you very much!
Krista Miller

Comment Author	Miller, Krista
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 06, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1006_022-1	Master Response REC-3 Mitigation Measure REC-1.	Yes
GP_WI_1006_022-2	Master Response REC-3 Mitigation Measure REC-1. In addition, during this process, there will be opportunity for stakeholders to have input on where access is provided and other measures that are taken to address changes in recreational opportunities. Section 7.3.3 of the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) states that the "Parties agree that PacifiCorp may continuously operate the Facilities subject to the ICP and Non-ICP Interim Measures identified in Appendices C and D to this Settlement and generate electricity at the Facilities through December 31, 2019." Power generation is dependent upon peaking flow releases which will not allow for restoration of a more natural flow regime prior to dam removal.	Yes
GP_WI_1006_022-3	All manmade debris in the river channel would be removed, as described in Section 4.0 of the Detailed Plan, which can be found online at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies. No vegetation would be removed from the river channel as part of dam removal.	No
GP_WI_1006_022-4	Section 7.0 Reservoir Management Plans (p. 105-123) of the Detailed Plan for Dam Removal – Klamath River Dams Klamath Hydroelectric Project FERC License No. 2082 Oregon - California (Reclamation 2012b) outlines specific goals and objectives and potential projects (Table 7.1) for revegetation and restoration of formerly inundated reservoir areas. Master Responses RE-6A, C and D: Disposition of Parcel B Lands.	No
GP_WI_1006_022-5	Master Response WSR-1 Wild & Scenic River Eligibility.	No

GP_EM_1120_1026

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 9:42:28 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Removal of dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> constancemitchell <constancemitchell@comcast.net> 11/20/2011 6:40 PM
>>> >>>
Please stop this insane removal of dams so crucial to the economic viability of the area and to the livelihood of so many people. Salmon are more important than human beings? This is a perfect example of why our country is going downhill so fast.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Mitchell, Constance
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_1026-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_549

From: jdmitchell@charter.net[SMTP:JDMITCHELL@CHARTER.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 6:16:08 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jason Mitchell
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath dam removal

Body: I would love to see a free flowing Klamath river!!! Bring it back to its natural state. I know hundreds of people that would be fishing this river and tributaries, if it was closer to it's natural state. can you imagine the rafters, boaters, kyaker's? Beyond the enjoyment/money that it would bring to thousands of people, it would be returned to it's natural state.... Not many things in this beautiful world can say that.

Comment Author	Mitchell, Jason
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_549-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) Jeff Mitchell

Representing Klamath Tribes

Notes: Support alt 2 or 3

Commetn 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

*Please read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

5-15

GP_MF_1019_093

Comment Author	Mitchell, Jeff
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_093-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1201_954

From: dmittel@gmail.com[SMTP:DMITTEL@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, December 01, 2011 5:26:03 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Don Mittelstaedt
Organization: Cal Trout

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Dam Removal

Body: I support full removal of the dam (Alternative #2)

Comment Author	Mittelstaedt, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 01, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1201_954-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1011_027

From: alden.moffatt@gmail.com[SMTP:ALDEN.MOFFATT@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2011 6:35:08 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Alden Moffatt
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approval of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Body: The Klamath River dams create sewage pits in summer bubbling with algae. We own a third of a mile of river front downstream that would benefit from improved water quality after the dams are removed. Larger fish runs would improve recreation and the economy of downstream communities.

Comment Author	Moffatt, Alden
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1011_027-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1126_905

From: moir1010@frontiernet.net[SMTP:MOIR1010@FRONTIERNET.NET]
Sent: Thursday, November 24, 2011 10:25:38 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jim Moir
Organization:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Body: Do not remove the dams. They are functioning as designed for all parties. The design of the system is a result of years of planning towards a common goal that benefits the citizens.

Comment Author	Moir, Jim
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 26, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1126_905-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1224_1168

From: youreyesonlymjm@yahoo.com[SMTP:YOUREYESONLYMJM@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Saturday, December 24, 2011 8:38:23 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Michael Molamphy
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath River
Body: It is best to remove all dams, and allow the natural flow of the Klamath.

Comment Author	Molamphy, Michael
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 24, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1224_1168-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_545

From: jmolin0131@comcast.net[SMTP:JMOLIN0131@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 5:55:23 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River Fishing Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jim Molinari
Organization:

Subject: Klamath River Fishing

Comment 1 - General/Other

Body: I have been fishing on the Klamath River for steelhead since 1976. My father and uncle fished the Trinity and Klamath Rivers beginning in the 1950s and 1960s. Based on their inputs and my own experience, the number of fish has significantly declined over this period of time. I feel dams on the Trinity and Klamath were the first major blow, but, over-fishing by both sport fisherman and Native American gillnets, logging, farming (pollution and water flow effect), etc. all have taken a toll. Fortunately, over the years there has been ongoing efforts to control the "catch" and increase the escapement for salmon and steelhead. Even though there are legal circumstances under which you can keep a salmon or steelhead, I practice "catch and release" only for many years now because of my perceived decline in these fisheries. I think it is a must due to the dwindling number of these incredible fish. Unfortunately, I do see more gillnets than ever and it seems commercial gillnetting is now allowed. This practice seems to be taking most of the larger fish. As to the river's health, what ever happened to the sturgeon I used to see in the Klamath. The eels are gone. Spring runs are abysmal. These fish are a valuable part of our ecology and a wonderful resource and I really support any effort to preserve them for future generations. But, I am very skeptical this will happen.

Comment Author	Molinari, Jim
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_545-1	EIS/EIR Section 3.3, Aquatic Resources, evaluates effects to fisheries under the Proposed Action and alternatives. Section 3.15, Socioeconomics, evaluates economic effects of in-river fishing.	No

GP_EM_1116_721

From: Carol Hamilton Monkerud[SMTP:HAMILTON@BAYMOON.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 11:27:34 AM
To: KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov
Cc: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Alternative 2: Remove four dams and restore the Klamath River now.
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Hello Elizabeth Vasquez and Gordon Leppig,

I am writing in support for alternative 2: the removal of the four dams and restoration of the Klamath River.

Damming the Klamath River has led to a precipitous decline in the native salmon population over the last century and will soon lead to its extinction if this agregeous mistake isn't corrected.

I urge you to remove the dams and restore the river. Let the local Native Americans manage the native salmon runs as they have done successfully for about 8000 years.

Adopt alternative 2 now, before it's too late.

Sincerely,

Carol Monkerud

Comment Author	Monkerud, Carol Hamilton
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_721-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

GP_MF_1128_935

Comment Form

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

OFFICE OF MID-PACIFIC REGION OFFICIAL FILE COPY RECEIVED NOV 28 '11 CODE 52

Name: JIM MORRIS

Organization:

Title: SCOTT VALLEY RANCHER

Address: 4129 EASTSIDE RD, ETNA CA 96027

Email: jim@bryan-morrisranch.com

Comments:

DEAR MS. VASQUEZ

Comment 2 - General/Other

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPERTUNITY TO MAKE A COMMENT ON KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL. I STRONGLY DISAPROVE OF THIS DRASTIC AND VERY EXPENSIVE EXPERIMENT. WHAT CONCERNS ME THE MOST IS THAT IF THIS EXPERIMENT FAILS REGULATORS WILL CERTIANLY COME TO THE RELATIVELY PRISTINE SCOTT AND SHASTA RIVERS TO MITIGATE FOR THE DAMMAGE IN THE MAIN STEM KLAMATH. IF THIS PROCESS DOES LEAD TO DAM REMOVAL THE SCOTT AND SHASTA RIVER LANDOWNERS MUST BE HELD HARMLESS FOR A DISASTER THAT WAS NOT OF THEIR MAKING.

THANK YOU.

SCANNED

Classification	ENV-6.00
Project	12
Control No.	1108X127
Folder I.D.	1090148-1
Date Input & Initials	11/28/2011 LN

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Morris, Jim
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1128_935-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MF_1128_935-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_WI_1116_725

From: michelecrail@hotmail.com[SMTP:MICHELECRAIL@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 10:52:41 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: The Klamath Dams Must Come Down Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Michele Moschetti
Organization:

Subject: The Klamath Dams Must Come Down

Body: The Klamath dams must come down. The economy, environment, and many lives will be severely damaged to the point of no repair if the dams are not removed. The fishing industry, the future health of the entire Klamath River ecosystem, every individual with cultural ties (tribal or not) to the Klamath River, as well as any person who disapproves of unnecessary damage to the environment are relying on these dams to be removed to prevent complete devastation to their own existences.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Moschetti, Michele
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_725-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1115_685

From: gigimoser@aol.com[SMTP:GIGIMOSER@AOL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 6:59:30 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Un-Dam the Klamath Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Becky Moser
Organization:

Subject: Un-Dam the Klamath

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Humboldt co. is where I was born and raised. Please do this un dam the klamath •The reopening of 420 miles of steelhead habitat and 80 miles of coho habitat.

•Anticipation of an 80% increase in Chinook, resulting in a major increase in commercial, tribal, recreational issues.

•Virtual elimination of the toxic algal and fish diseases in the Klamath.

•Restoration of more natural flows and introduce more gravel important for spawning grounds.

•Restoration of more natural temperature regimes, so that water will warm up faster in spring, and cool down much faster in fall, improving conditions for spawning salmon.

•Fish ladders will not solve the problems with toxic algae, the fish disease, or the temperature.

Comment Author	Moser, Becky
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 15, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1115_685-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1120_807

From: Ojai Quarry[SMTP:OJAIQUARRY@VERIZON.NET]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 12:08:35 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Out of Scope

I think you do-gooders should be put in jail. You have no common sense at all. The only thing you know is SAVE THE RAT. This country is on the way down the drain. When China takes over this country, do you think they are going to care about the fish? Why don't you people get into the real world, start to worry about the people not the rats.

Larry Mosler

Comment Author	Mosler, Larry
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_807-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_WI_1205_961

From: rmueller@farms-usa.com[SMTP:RMUELLER@FARMS-USA.COM]
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2011 7:46:31 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Response -
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Rex Mueller
Organization:

Subject: Response -

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Body: the notion of common good, in regards to the rivers, in the northwest.

The over arching intend of dam removal is salmon habitat.

the FAQ's clearly indicate something I would deem unconstitutional in terms of fair use practice.

Here in the midwest we recently dealt with poor river management as the result of congressional over reach.

As I see it, dams built on rivers serve several core concerns, 1st and foremost is seasonal flood control,2nd agriculture, 3rd in the case of the Klamath and over basins in the North West, electric power generation, and then use of the river for other activities.

The proposal appears to favor a few disparate tribal concerns without concern for the broad portion of society impacted by the removal of dams in the northwest.

I have concerns regarding this subject only as it impacts power generation, and thus impacts electric fees nation wide. Removal of these dams without a MW to MW replacement ready in advance, is a bit like cutting off nose to spite the face.

I have found over the last 40 years, I call myself a common sense conservationist, in the spectre of dam removal without some form of replacement for the energy lost around the Klamath basin is asinine thinking. And clearly is not done with the full faith of the common good.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

I clearly doubt, anyone but fishing and tribal interests concerns will be considered as viable voices in this battle that has been waging since the 1950s.

Comment 3 - KHSA

I would remind those involved, flooding along the Klamatn has and does occur on a periodic basis. the economic value of communities along it's course, should have a paramount say in the matter.
Midwest flooding destroyed several communities in the plains states as the result of poor management by the US-Army Corp favoring retention upstream in reservoirs for recreation and irrigation. Holding theamount until it was too late to release for impeding flood control.
Waters must be managed to the key reason they were placed.
the 1930s brought the dams to the North West for flood control, irrigation and power generation(as a by product).

Comment 4 - Hydrology

If these three concerns are not added to the consideration list it will be shameful of the DOI, BLM and othe federal agencies as favoring salmon over people.

Comment Author	Mueller, Rex
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 05, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1205_961-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_1205_961-2	Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_WI_1205_961-3	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_WI_1205_961-4	Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection.	No

GP_EM_1123_911

From: Sotero Muniz[SMTP:SJMUNIZ@CYBERPORT.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2011 1:44:43 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: blowing up dams on the klamath River
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - General/Other

I have rec'd Email information that 4 dams on the Klamath River are in threat of being blown up to save the coho salmon. If this is true I would like an address I can write to verify this data and request the agencies in charge of the lands these Dams are on and any expected timetables for these actions,

Thank You Sotero Muniz.

Comment Author	Muniz, Sotero
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 23, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1123_911-1	The email address to which you sent this request is the email address to provide comments and questions.	No

GP_EM_1123_910

From: Donna Munsen[SMTP:DMUNSEN@TAMPABAY.RR.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2011 10:14:21 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: leave the dams alone!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

We're on to your Progressive agenda (21) and you will very soon be out of power. You are shameful excuses for human beings. If anything needs to be destroyed it is YOU AND YOUR DAMNED AGENDA. So do your damage while you can. "WE THE PEOPLE" will not allow this to continue!

Comment Author	Munsen, Donna
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 23, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1123_910-1	Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_053

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Joanne Murphy

Organization:

Title:

Address: 4808 Sumac Klamath Falls Ore 97603

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Email:

Comments: I am against the removal of four viable working dams. They provide clean & cheap energy. They have been paid for. They help our farmers and our citizens. There is no proof that removing them will benefit the overall good. There has to be a better solution lets all work together to reach it.

It makes no sence, Keep the dams!

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Murphy, Joanne
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_053-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1116_1132

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 9:01:39 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: DON'T DESTROY OUR DAMS!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

>>> <Murphs2@aol.com> 11/16/2011 9:28 PM >>>
Please don't destroy four perfectly good, reliable dams in our valley. We need these.

P. D. Murphy, Property Owner
2205 Hilltop Dr. #159
Redding, CA 96002

Murphs2@aol.com (mailto:Murphs2@aol.com)

Comment Author	Murphy, P.D.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_1132-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1116_731

From: Murphs2@aol.com[SMTP:MURPHS2@AOL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 10:26:28 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Dams in No. California.
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Please leave the dams in. We need these in Northern California.

P. D. Murphy
2205 Hilltop Dr. #159
Redding, CA 96002

Murphs2@aol.com

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Murphy, P.D.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_731-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_051

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: RONALD W. MURPHY

Organization:

Title:

Address: 4808 SUMAC AV. KF OR 97603

Email:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comments: I DO NOT THINK THE FOUR DAMS SHOULD BE REMOVED ON THE KLAMATH RIVER. I CAN NOT UNDERSTAND WHY ANYONE WOULD TAKE OUT A DAM THAT WAS BOUGHT & PAYED FOR, ~~ETC.~~ MY UNDERSTANDING IS THE FOUR DAMS ARE STRUCTURLEY SOUND & ARE STILL PRODUCING ELEC. I DO THINK FISH LADDERS COULD BE A SOULATION I ALSO THINK YOU COULD OPEN UP THE SPILL GATES ON THE FOUR DAMS, LET THE WATER GO DOWN STREAM FOR A YEAR & SEE HOW IT WORKS. I AM OPPOSED TO DAM REMOVAL ON THE KLAMATH RIVER.

Comment 2 - Alternatives

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Murphy, Ronald
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_051-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MF_1019_051-2	Appendix A of the Draft EIS/EIR includes a wide range of alternatives representing diverse viewpoints and needs based on internal and public scoping. The alternatives that moved forward for more detailed analysis in this EIS/EIR are those that best meet the NEPA purpose and need and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, are feasible, and represent a range of reasonable alternatives (see Appendix A for more information). Alternative 4, Fish Passage at Four Dams, described on P. 2-70 in the Draft EIS/EIR, proposes the installation of fish ladders on the dams. The environmental effects of Alternative 4 are analyzed as part of the Draft EIS/EIR. The spillways of the four dams were not designed to accommodate fish passage; therefore, the alternative proposed in this comment would not meet any of the elements of the purpose and need/objectives of the project and requires no further consideration.	No

GP_EM_1120_804

From: Howard Myers[SMTP:1HMYERS1@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 6:32:56 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Do not remove the dams!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Bureau of Reclamation

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Hello,

As a landowner in Del Norte County I am outraged at the prospect of my own government causing such devastation with total disregard for the welfare of the people.

I won't bother to present the arguments against the dam because you already know them and obviously don't care. It isn't like you are protecting a native fish, or anything else. You are doing nothing constructive, only being destructive.

I can only assume you are doing this to further agenda 21 to force people off the land. This is not Europe, this is America. We don't force easily.

All I will say is for you to keep your damn hands off the damn dams.

You are not king and we are not your subjects.

The occupy idiots are occupying the wrong offices.

Howard Myers

Comment Author	Myers, Howard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_804-1	Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21.	No

GP_EM_1212_1199

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 9:33:48 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Do not remove the dams!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> Howard Myers <1hmyers1@comcast.net> 11/20/2011 5:32 AM >>>
Mr. Gordon Leppig
c/o California Department of Fish and Game

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Gordon,

As a landowner in Del Norte County I am outraged at the prospect of my own government causing such devastation with total disregard for the welfare of the people.

I won't bother to present the arguments against the dam because you already know them and obviously don't care. It isn't like you are protecting a native fish, or anything else. You are doing nothing constructive, only being destructive.

I can only assume you are doing this to further agenda 21 to force people off the land. This is not Europe, this is America. We don't force easily.

All I will say is for you to keep your damn hands off the damn dams.

You are not king and we are not your subjects.

The occupy idiots are occupying the wrong offices.

Howard Myers

Comment Author	Myers, Howard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1212_1199-1	Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1020_202

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Melissa Starr Myers
Organization: Human
Title: Mother, Daughter
Address: Hwy 169 Yurok Res.
Email: WIRT Hupa CA 95546
Comments: Healthy Indians = Clean Water

Dear Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez,

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I am a Yurok woman that lives along the Klameth Trinity River, I live by means of fishing + hunting. The river is most important to me because it's all we have, there are very few jobs and no power poles to bring us electricity. So therefore we fish to survive. I know personally the impact of our low water level and the toxic algae that grows well w/ warm water. Please hear our plea to UnDam the KLAMATH.

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Myers, Melissa Star
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1020_202-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_164

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. CAROLINE NASH: My name is Caroline Nash, N-a-s-h.

I would like to thank you for all sticking

around to hear me talk, we could all be home, eating

dinner.

But I would like to talk today just about what

Comment 1 - KBRA

-- the question has been asked, what is restoration, what

would restoration mean for this? And I think that's a

valid question, I think the word gets thrown around a lot

without actually addressing what it means.

And in terms of this agreement and in terms of

this settlement, as it is, it is a draft. That's been

stated before and I think that needs to really be

stressed. It's not perfect, it's not the be-all, end-all.

It's definitely an important step.

And as someone said earlier, no action means

crisis, and I strongly believe that, too.

And I think what we need to look at in this

form of restoration is that restoration goes beyond

fisheries, restoration goes beyond fish populations,

restoration of the river extends to the entire watershed

that the river drains, and all of us live in the

watershed, all of us thrive on this watershed and make our
livings in this watershed, and it's in all of our best
interests to preserve the natural function of it.
I got my degree in western water resources and
have studied the water cycle and soil science and a lot of
the different sciences involved in watersheds. And as
ranchers, as farmers, and as people who are involved with
fisheries, everybody knows this already: You guys are the
ultimate in land conservation, ultimate in knowing the
land, and this restoration agreement, the removal of the
dams, the partial removal of the dams and the associated
KBRA is going to restore not only the fisheries but it's
going to improve the overall functioning of the ecosystem,
and I think that's in all of our best interests.
I firmly believe that a healthy functioning
ecosystem is tied intrinsically to a healthy functioning
community and economy.
The region that we live in has incredible
natural history, an immense amount of richness, and I
think that if we allow the river to degrade any further,
we allow the natural resources on which we made this
living, we have made this economy, to degrade even
further, we are going to be in a serious crisis.
So I think that the best option for us is to

Comment 2 - Approves of Dam Removal

move away from the status quo, to try something different, and to do it as a community, to do it with all interests in mind, because we can't pitch fisheries against farming against ranching: We need everything in this basin, we need to all co-exist, and it is possible, and it is possible if we stop doing it as a mutually exclusive argument and start looking for solutions, and I believe that the KBRA and the agreement, as it stands, will not necessarily (inaudible) the first step towards that, towards what we all need for this basin to thrive economically, ecologically, and for future generations to be able to enjoy it and to enjoy the lifestyle we and generations before us had.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Nash, Caroline
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_164-1	In the context of the KBRA, restoration primarily means restoration of fisheries habitat. As described in Section 2.4.3.9 of the EIS/EIR, restoration activities could include: • Floodplain rehabilitation work includes activities to improve or restore connections between channels and floodplains to create and maintain off-channel habitat accessible to overwintering juvenile salmonids. Floodplain rehabilitation could include activities such as riparian planting and understory thinning, to facilitate the development of mature riparian stands that would provide shading and large and small wood to stream channels and floodplains; wetland restoration; and levee setback or dike removal to reconnect floodplain hydrology. • Large woody debris placement could include both mobile wood and complex structures and could be used to create off-channel habitat or provide cover in pools. • Correction of fish passage issues could include culvert upgrades or replacement to meet current fish passage standards and correction of other fish blockages to provide access to new or historic habitats. • Cattle exclusion typically includes the construction of fencing to prevent cattle from trampling stream banks, which allows riparian vegetation to grow. Cattle exclusion is often conducted in conjunction with riparian planting. • Mechanical thinning and prescribed burning are used to mimic some of the functions and characteristics historically provided by a natural fire regime. Thinning and prescribed burning reduce the potential for more catastrophic fires and the erosion that often follows. • Purchases of conservation easements and land from willing sellers allow for more direct land management for habitat enhancement purposes. • Decommissioning of roads could reduce road densities in areas with a high potential for failure and could stabilize slopes. Road failures can be a major source of chronic sediment inputs into stream systems. • Gravel augmentation involves the direct placement of spawning-size gravel into the stream channel. Gravel augmentation could increase spawning habitat in systems by increasing the amount of area with suitable substrate.	No

Comment Author	Nash, Caroline
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	• Most of the above activities would also reduce fine sediment inputs into stream systems. Treatment of fine sediment sources could include a broad array of actions including management of stormwater runoff from roads and other developed areas, agricultural and forestry management practices, and other specific actions depending on the sources of fine sediments.	
GP_MC_1018_164-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) Caroline Nash.

Representing self

Notes: Dam removal on the Klamath River would do more than restore fisheries – it would ~~restore the~~ be the first step in restoring an entire watershed + improve quality of life for all residents there.

*Please read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

Comment 1 - General/Other Comment

GP_MP_1019_091

Comment Author	Nash, Caroline
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_091-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_831

From: Shirley Nathan[SMTP:SHIRLDN@PACBELL.NET]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 12:05:56 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Removal of Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I strongly object to the removal of dams on the Upper Klamath River and urge you to reconsider this proposal!

Sincerely,

Shirley Nathan

Comment Author	Nathan, Shirley
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_831-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1125_931

Duplicate of GP_LT_1118_796

11-11-2011

I am writing this letter to object to the proposed removal of four dams on the Klamath River: Iron Gate, Copco 1, Copco 2 and JC Boyle Dams.

- The total cost of dam removal and implementation after removal exceeds $1.9 billion. Irresponsible expenditures during a national economic crisis
- The science to support dam removal is based on unproven science and not on facts. Lacks of factual evidence that dam removals will restore salmon runs.
- Dam removal will have the effect of putting over several hundred farms and ranches out of permanent food production and destroy over one third (1/3) of the economic base of the County. Shasta Valley agricultural operations in 2006 (95.15 Million) amounted to 56% of total economic output for Siskiyou County.
- America needs clean renewable energy and food independence.
- The spotted owl was listed as endangered in 1995. We had closure of 18 mills and elimination of nearly 6, 0000 living wage jobs. We have never fully recovered and are still dependent on timber harvest subsides to maintain our schools and roads. The rural school act is in jeopardy of not being renewed. We cannot allow destruction of our agricultural industry.
- In the last two years Siskiyou County has lost freight rail services and gold mining,
- 79% of Siskiyou County residents voted NO Dam removal on an Advisory measure on the November ballot 2010
- Dams bring in 300,000 to 1 million dollars a year in tax revenue to our county.
- Substantial increase in electricity cost as hydroelectric is the cheapest source of engery.
- Lost of habitat wildlife
- Loss of lake fisheries
- Loss of Irongate fish Hatchery
- Loss of recreation
- Loss of property value
- Loss of down river flood protection
- Loss of roads and bridges from flooding which has been document by the flood of _____
- Loss of fire protection…the lake is used to put out fires
- Irresponsible release of dam sediments down river by state and Federal agencies.
- Loss of Shasta Nation burial grounds which will be uncovered which are behind the dams.
- Loss of sustained Minimum River flows
- Tunnel by pass alternative to the proposed Dam removal which will enhance and expand the Salmonids Habitat has been totally ignored by the dept. of the interior.

The Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement consist of 2 farming units, 3 tribes, 3 Federal Cabinet Secretaries, 3 Oregon State Depts., 1 CA stated Dept. and only 2 of the 9 basin counties, 8 environmental groups and 2 fishing associations. Siskiyou County was not representatives. These agreements were done in secret. It wasn't until the BOS learned of these agreements that public hearings were finally heard. The majority of Siskiyou County residents are opposed.

We have a law passed in the 1950s signed by Oregon & Calif. legislators & both governors & Pres. of the the US Congress & signed by the President — called the "Fish of the Klamath River basin" — We also have laws in the United States Constitution that protect us.

T. Wayne

Comment 1 - Out of Scope

SCANNED

Comment Author	Naylor, T.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 25, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded - GP_LT_1118_796. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_LT_1118_796. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_LT_1118_796 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1125_931-1	The Proposed Action analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR does not change the Klamath Basin Compact. To ensure the Compact was given full consideration the Klamath Basin Compact Commission is a Cooperating Agency on the Draft EIS/EIR (see Table 1-2). Also, Section 3.8, Water Supply Water Rights, considers how the Klamath Basin Compact relates to the Proposed Action and water supply and water rights, Section 3.8.2.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR discusses the Compact as it relates to interstate water allocation, and Section 3.14, Land Use considers the Compact as it relates to land use, agricultural, and forest resources.	No

GP_EM_1123_913

From: Joel Nazara[SMTP:PALUKA7@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2011 3:05:37 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Good for all
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Out of Scope

If any man does a thing for the benefit of all, he will be blessed.

If any man does a thing for the benefit of himself by bringing harm to the all, he brings destruction upon himself.

THE WORD OF GOD

Comment Author	Nazara, Joel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 23, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1123_913-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_EM_1107_385

From: wneander@gmail.com[SMTP:WNEANDER@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 06, 2011 9:42:56 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Project Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Wendy Neander
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal Project

Body: Please let it be known that I support the Klamath Dam removal project. Given the precarious state of wildlife in today's world we need to make every effort possible to restore habitats in order to support and maintain ecological balance. The dam removal will restore 420 miles of much needed Salmonid habitat. Alternative 2 the full removal of all four dames is the best option for restoring the Klamath River.

Comment Author	Neander, Wendy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 07, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1107_385-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1026_367

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 26, 2011
PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA

Comment 1 - General/Other

MR. NELSON: Hello. My name is Denver Nelson, N-e-l-s-o-n. I have been coming to these meetings now for about 30 years. And I remember the first Bureau of Reclamation meeting I went to. I think, many of the people -- none of you were there. And I think many of the Bureau of Reclamation people were interested in building more dams.

And my concern at that time was there was a proposed Ah Pah Dam, which was going to divert most of the Klamath River water to the Central Valley. And I think it's weird -- obviously, I don't think any of you are here to try and put the Ah Pah Dam in. In fact, I think everybody here agrees that we should take out some dams and improve the state of the Klamath River.

And I think it's worth sort of stepping back and looking at where we have come, that -- it's sort of like I always use the analogy of a battleship. At the time, the battleship was headed in a particular direction, which is pretty much opposite of the direction we're heading in now, and now there still are some similarities. The room is still full of experts telling everybody how we should accomplish what it is we are accomplishing.

But I think it's worth keeping in mind that the battleship has turned, and I would like to encourage you all to keep the battleship going the way it is now.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Nelson, Denver
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 26, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1026_367-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1026_249

From: Rachel Neumann[SMTP:RACHELBNEUMANN@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 1:05:38 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Please pass Klamath Dam Removal Alternative 2:full removal of all 4 dams combined with restoration
Auto forwarded by a Rule Dear Mr. Gordon Leppig and Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez,

Because healthy fish help create a healthy ecosystem for all, because my family and I treasure the lower Klamath and Salmon tributary as one of the most beautiful places on earth, because removing the dams will help ensure salmon survival, a clean river, and economic sustainability for river communities, I strongly urge you to pass and implement Alternative 2: Full removal of all 4 dams combined with restoration.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Most sincerely,

Rachel Neumann
806 Vincente Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94707

Comment Author	Neumann, Rachel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 26, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1026_249-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1027_246

From: yeshi neumann[SMTP:YESHINEUMANN@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2011 9:24:18 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Cc: Sue Terence
Subject: Please remove klamath river dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule Dear Dept of Interior people

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Please remove all 4 dams and combine with restoration of our beloved klamath river
We need our salmon to survive, toxix algae is no good for anyone, we want to be able to fish and swim in the Klamath again and we want economic sustainability for river communities.

Thank you for listening to our plea
Yeshi Neumann

--
Yeshi Neumann, Certified Nurse Midwife, MPH MA IBCLC
www.mindfulfamilycircles.com

Conscious Grandmothering Workshop
Esalen Institute, June 2012

Comment Author	Neumann, Yeshi
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 27, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1027_246-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_563

From: dougng@pacbell.net[SMTP:DOUGNG@PACBELL.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 7:32:26 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Remove the Dams!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Douglas Ng
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Remove the Dams!

Body: I support Steelhead Salmon and Alternative 2 of the Klamath Draft EIS/EIR proposal. Please remove the dams!

Comment Author	Ng, Douglas
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_563-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_0927_009

From: wranglerdani@gmail.com[SMTP:WRANGLERDANI@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2011 11:22:12 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Don't remove the dam!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Dani Nichols
Organization:

Comment 1 - Disapproval of Dam Removal

Subject: Don't remove the dam!

Body: Dam removal will harm the local farmers and other businesses. Do not harm those who have worked so hard to create livelihoods, simply for an unproven idealogy.

Comment 2 - Economics

Comment Author	Nichols, Dani
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	September, 27, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_0927_009-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_0927_009-2	Estimated changes to agricultural employment relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative are discussed in Section 3.15. Over the period of analysis, employment in the agricultural sector is anticipated to be an important part of the regional economy.	No

GP_WI_1115_676

From: ktree4@yahoo.com[SMTP:KTREE4@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2011 5:29:23 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Restoration EIS/EIR Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: karen nichols
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Restoration EIS/EIR

Body: Hello,

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I wish to support the immediate removal of all dams on the Klamath River and its tributary streams.

In addition, restoration of salmon, other water dependent species, and habitat on the rivers, surrounding wetlands, and entire watersheds of the Klamath, Trinity, Scott and Shasta Rivers.

Comment 2 - Fish

In addition, please act on the health and well being of salmon, trout, amphibians, and other life by having the National Marine Fisheries Service determine the flow of water during the dry summer season months and acting on their recommendations.

Sincerely,

Karen Nichols

Comment Author	Nichols, Karen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 15, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1115_676-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_1115_676-2	Table 3.3-4 of the Draft EIS/EIR presents the minimum flows below Iron Gate Dam and lake elevations for Upper Klamath Lake from the 2010 Biological Opinion.As described in Section 3.3.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Proposed Action, which includes implementation of the KBRA, would result in flows more favorable to all life stages of salmonids, and would provide suitable habitat for resident riverine species, anadromous fish and lamprey in hydroelectric reach from the upstream end of J. C. Boyle Reservoir to Iron Gate Dam. In the lower Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam, over the long term, the Proposed Action would alter the hydrograph so that the duration, timing, and magnitude of flows would be more similar to the unregulated conditions under which the native fish community evolved (Hetrick et al. 2009). The Proposed Action would have a beneficial effect on Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for Chinook and Coho Salmon in the long term. The fact that Coho and Chinook salmon historically occupied the hydroelectric reach and the lower Klamath is also evidence that restoring flows to mimic historic patterns will be sufficient for maintenance and recovery of fish populations. Minimum flows for fish are also expected to be a result of future Biological Opinions by NOAA Fisheries Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service, pursuant to Section 7, of the Federal Endangered Species Act. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries Service) issued a biological opinion to Reclamation requiring releases from Reclamation's Klamath Project to produce specified rates of flow for the Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam, based on the habitat needs of coho salmon (NOAA Fisheries Service 2010, Draft EIS/EIR Section 2.4.2, p. 2-17). Implementation of the NOAA Fisheries Service 2010 Biological Opinion mandatory flows are a reasonably forseeable future action associated with Reclamation's Klamath Project (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.1, p. 3.2-35). Target flow rates in the Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam vary by month, and are dependent in part on the amount of water entering Upper Klamath Lake. Reclamation and PacifiCorps are required to meet these flow requirements. PacifiCorp currently coordinates with Reclamation to meet ramp rates in the NOAA Fisheries Service biological opinion on Reclamation's Klamath Project (Draft EIS/EIR Section 2.4.2, p. 2-17).	No

GP_MC_1018_145

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter

MR. ROGER NICHOLSON: Thank you for the

opportunity to comment.

My name is Roger Nicholson,

N-i-c-h-o-l-s-o-n. I'm from an agricultural family

that's been in the county since the 1890s.

Just a few brief comments. The Department of

the Interior recently issued your draft Environment

Impact Statement that proposes the demolition of

these four dams.

Comment 1 - Sediment Transport

Yet, by even your own estimates there's 20

million and some of the governmental estimates,

there's much more than that, cubic yards of silt and

debris behind these dams.

I see nowhere in the process that you suggest

doing anything with it, except letting it just wash

down the river.

Comment 2 - Sediment Toxicity

We can find no mention whatsoever of the

sediment accumulation above Keno Dam in this report.

Comment 3 - Other/General

It appears our government regulations have

two standards. One standard holds private citizens

to a standard that severely restricts or virtually

bars their activities in or near the water bodies.

That, then, holds private citizen really responsible

for their actions.

The other standard allows the government

entities to do pretty much whatever you wish, as long

as it is in your political correct view, and

eliminates all other view points on that. This dam

simply ignores -- chooses to ignore the potential

liabilities and attempts to absolve all government

parties of legal responsibility.

Comment 4 - Sediment Transport

How can we justify dumping the equivalent of

two million dollar truck loads of sediment into the

Klamath River to expedite the politically correct

hydroelectric dams.

Comment 5 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

In closing, I would have to say I'm very much

Comment 6 - KBRA

opposed to the removal of the dams and the KBRA. I

lead a group of some 200,000 acres of variegated land

that were excluded, disallowed from being part of the

KBRA and has become very obvious we weren't the only

ones.

If you look at this room, public forum, you

would simply find the general public was not allowed

to be part of that process, otherwise we never would

have got it. Thank you.

Comment Author	Nicholson, Roger
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_145-1	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging.	No
GP_MC_1018_145-2	Keno Dam will not be removed as part of the proposed action. No additional sediment investigation was performed in this reservoir because the sediment stored behind Keno Dam will remain in place.	No
GP_MC_1018_145-3	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1018_145-4	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging. The purpose of the NEPA and CEQA environmental review process is to disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of a proposed action or project and the manner in which those significant effects can be avoided or minimized (40 CFR Section 1502.1; Pub. Resources Code, sec. 21002). This EIS/EIR has been developed in accordance with the requirements of NEPA and CEQA to analyze the potential impacts to the environment from the removal of the four PacifiCorp dams on the Klamath River as contemplated in the KHSA and from the implementation of the KBRA. Together, these two agreements attempt to resolve long-standing conflicts in the Klamath Basin. Some of the conflicts and issues these agreements attempt to resolve are enumerated on Draft EIS/EIR P. ES-1 and ES-8-9. The activities leading to the development of the KHSA and the KBRA are discussed on P. ES-7-13.	No
GP_MC_1018_145-5	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1018_145-6	Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA.	No

GP_EM_1116_729

From: Andree Nippe[SMTP:ANDREEN3@LIVE.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 2:06:39 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: KLAMATH RIVER DAMS
Auto forwarded by a Rule

To Whom It May Concern:

REASONS FOR THE KLAMATH RIVER DAMS [4] MUST BE SAVED! DO NOT DESTROY THEM, NOW OR EVER!

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Dams must be saved to:

– Save the salmon and all the fish
– Save ESA listed eagles and their habitat in the Tulelake Refuge, which will be devoid of water.

Comment 2 - Sediment Transport

Other reasons:

– An estimated 22 million cubic yards of toxic sediment will sludge its way down the Klamath River destroying salmon runs, mucking up the environment affecting water clarity and purity! This amount of sediment will sterilize the river for 100 years.

Comment 3 - Hydropower

– Real science now proves original statements are fraudulent
– It has been admitted this is an "experiment" — we can't afford this kind of experiment!
– The four hydro-electric dams have been producing enough for 70,000 homes and businesses AND has potential to produce enough to power 150,000 — How will it be replaced? This is a true green electricity.
– There are alternatives to aid returning salmon past the dams BUT the federal agencies and CA DFG will not consider them.

Comment 4 - Hydrology

– The settlement agreement does not appear to provide any assurances that the irrigation water inside or outside the Klamath Project will be delivered.
– Additional in-stream flows for the Klamath River will put 30,000 acre feet of irrigation water diverted to the Rogue Valley in Oregon AT RISK!
– Feds will be paying out millions of TAX PAYER money, besides cost of dam removal there will be millions spent in grants for fake and fraudulent RESTORATION.
– Several federal and state agencies will spend $63 million on restoration projects on the Sprague, Williamson and Wood rivers; $67 million for the fringe wetlands around Upper Klamath Lake and fish diversions for the Keno Dam; $92 million for water conservation and ground water management; $47 million is budgeted for acquisition of lease of water rights, water conservation and land management programs; and $7 million for modification of dikes on the Wood River.

– A total of $385 million would support implementation of the water deal – things like paying for farmers to idle land and not farm, provide lower power rates to pump water, $65 million for tribal economic development and environmental management; each tribe will also get $14 million for fisheries management. The Salmon River Restoration Council will get $10 million for their projects.

Comment 5 - ITAs

--The Klamath tribe would like fishing rights on the Klamath River from Iron Gate to Interstate 5. This tells me that they don't expect the fish to get to Klamath Falls where their territory is, and they also get $21 million to purchase the Mazama Forest. The wildlife refuges get more water. There is $100 million budgeted to acquire water on a year-to-year basis for environmental needs.

Sincerely,

Andrée Nippe
Redding, CA 96003

Comment Author	Nippe, Andree
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_729-1	As described in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the dams have been shown to be detrimental to salmon. Removal of the dams would be beneficial. Section 3.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR explains that the dams do not provide water to the Tule Lake Refuge. Removal of the dams would not affect the refuge. See also N/CP-14 regarding future management of the refuges proposed in the KBRA.	No
GP_EM_1116_729-2	Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants. Master Response AQU-1C Sediment Amounts and Effects on Fish.	No
GP_EM_1116_729-3	Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_EM_1116_729-4	The main water bodies that store water for agricultural use in the Klamath Basin are Upper Klamath Lake, a natural lake now controlled by Link River Dam; the Lost River; and the Klamath River from the Keno Impoundment. Upper Klamath Lake holds 83 percent of the total storage capacity of the reservoirs on the Klamath River (FERC 2007) and approximately 98 percent of active storage (Greimann 2011). Neither Link River nor Keno Dams are being considered for removal. As a result, the removal of the Four Facilities will not negatively affect the water supply for Reclamation's Klamath Project. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes the KBRA as a connected action to Alternatives 2 and 3. Water supply and water rights effects of the KBRA are analyzed on p. 3.8-18 to 3.8-24. As discussed on p. 3.8-18, a primary purpose of the KBRA is to increase water supply reliability. The KBRA would establish water diversion limitations that would be more reliable in the long term and simultaneously develop programs to address decreased diversions. The KBRA would include the Water Use Retirement Program (WURP), a voluntary program for the purpose of supporting fish populations restoration by permanently increasing inflow to Upper Klamath Lake by 30,000 acre-feet per year. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes impacts from the WURP on p. 3.8-21 and 3.8-22, and concludes that "Implementation of the WURP is anticipated to have a less than significant impact to water rights because rights would be voluntarily retired. Implementation of the WURP is expected to have no effect to water supply because there would be no changes to diversions."	No

Comment Author	Nippe, Andree
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_729-5	Under KBRA Section 34.1, a petition for the Klamath Tribes' Interim Fishing Site is intended to be filed within three months of the Effective Date. The interim fishing site would provide that Chinook salmon fishing in this reach of the river would be open to the Klamath Tribes each salmon season immediately after the hatchery at Iron Gate Dam achieves egg take goals. The Klamath Tribes negotiated this section to allow the Tribe to start harvesting fish for ceremonial purposes immediately following approval of the Agreement and prior to dam removal and the start of restoration activities. Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.12.3.1 describes the positive effects dam removal and establishment of an interim fishing site between Iron Gate Dam and the I-5 Bridge and implementation of the KBRA will have on the Klamath Tribes and the fishery. As described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3 (p. 3.3-95 to 3.3-96), under the Proposed Action, removal of the Four Facilities would allow fall-run Chinook salmon to gain access to the upper Klamath River upstream of J.C. Boyle Reservoir. The access would expand the Chinook salmon's current habitat to include historical habitat along the mainstem Klamath River, upstream to the Sprague, Williamson, and Wood Rivers (Hamilton et al. 2005). This would be a potential increase in access to 49 significant tributaries in the Upper Klamath Basin, comprising 420 miles of additional potentially productive habitat (U.S. Department of the Interior [DOI] 2007), including access to groundwater areas resistant to climate change (Hamilton et al. 2011). Poor water quality (e.g., severe hypoxia, temperatures exceeding 25°C, high pH) in the reach from Keno Dam to Link Dam might prevent fish passage at any time from late June through mid-November (Sullivan et al. 2009; USGS 2010; both as cited in Hamilton et al. 2011). However, evidence indicates that Upper Klamath Lake habitat is presently suitable to support Chinook salmon for at least the October through May period (Maule et al. 2009). Summer poor water quality conditions, may necessitate seasonal trap and haul around Keno Impoundment for some life stages of Chinook until Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) and total maximum daily load (TMDL) implementation improve water quality. This is consistent with the fish way prescriptions of DOI and U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC) (DOI 2007; NOAA Fisheries Service 2007).	No

GP_WI_1121_853

From: Jesusweptanamericanstory@gmail.com[SMTP:JESUSWEPTANAMERICANSTORY@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 5:32:19 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Billie Nix
Organization: http://jesusweptanamericanstory.blogspot.com/

Subject: Dam removal

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Body: Please DO NO remove our dams

There is NO good reason to destroy these strategic, economically sound dams.

The science is flawed that supports removal. Removal will not save the fish.

80% of the local population has voted against removal. They're interests should be heard.

One dam in S. Oregon recently removed is DAMAGING THE FISH AND HABITAT!
The environmental consequences of removal is more damaging than leaving them alone.

HYDRO ELECTRICITY..our cleanest, cheapest, best renewable resource.....we need the dams.

Speaking as people with Native American ancestry, we believe it is time that we all have the same rules and rights. A majority of citizens have spoken against removal. The removal of these dams cannot and will not make the Karuk or any tribe 'whole' again. History is history. The 21st century needs the dams.

Thank you,
Billie NIx
Danny Milich
12114 Ponderosa St.
Hornbrook, Ca. 96044
http://jesusweptanamericanstory.blogspot.com/

Comment Author	Nix, Billie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1121_853-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information. Master Response FERC-1 FERC Process Status.	No

GP_WI_1112_588

From: npcl2004@yahoo.com[SMTP:NPCL2004@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2011 12:27:29 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: steelhead salmon
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Noel
Organization:

Subject: steelhead salmon

Body: let's do everything to ensure prolific availability of salmon fish for all times.

Comment 1 - General/Other

Comment Author	Noel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1112_588-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_WI_1121_852

From: redwoodpost@suddenlink.net[SMTP:REDWOODPOST@SUDDENLINK.NET]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 5:15:03 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dams on the Klamath Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Cynthia Noel
Organization: RRAS

Subject: Dams on the Klamath

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Please remove the dams on the Klamath!
Thank you

Comment Author	Noel, Cynthia
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1121_852-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_829

From: Norma[SMTP:NJARTENO@ATT.NET]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 6:59:50 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: THE DAMS
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

What an idiotic move this is!!!

GOTTA GET RID OF THE FOLKS WHO ARE BEHIND THIS. ITS THE ULTIMATE "DESTROY AMERICA" Lets see it for what it is!

Comment Author	Norma
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_829-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Recode.	No

GP_MC_1019_175

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM

---o0o---

CHILOQUIN, OREGON

OCTOBER 19, 2011

---o0o---

MR. KIRK OAKES: Kirk Oakes, O-a-k-e-s.

Comment 1 - Approval of Dam Removal

Having read the report as much as I could, I

was very, very supportive of where you are going with the

selections to take out all of the dams and restore the

basin to the way it was ninety, a hundred years ago.

Comment 2 - Sediment Toxicity

I had some very serious concerns originally,

going back a year and a half or so, to removal of the dams

or whether or not there would be heavy metal contamination

in the sediment; that was a primary concern of mine.

I did sufficient research, talked to some of

the gentlemen in your department, and was put at ease that

we are not going to have issues like mercury contamination

and things of that nature.

So I do believe that that's been discussed and,

at least to my satisfaction, that's not going to be an

issue.

Comment 3 - Fish

I was very concerned by the fact that, um,

there is no way to mitigate the fact that we are going to

have some kill-off after the dams are removed,

particularly the low levels of dissolved oxygen. That's

going to have an impact. I was very heartened by the fact that you have taken that into account and seem to have

plans in place to deal with the fact that no matter what

we do, we are going to have a kill-off, it's going to

occur, and that may prove to be a public relations issue,

used out of context, but --

So you stepped forward, um, identified the

kinds of issues that we are going to have, and it looks

like you've done that very straightforwardly and very

fairly, and you've put together some -- some plans to

address those issues.

So I was very pleased with what I read so far

-- still studying because there's a lot of information

there -- but the fact of the matter is that I would stand

in favor of removing all of the dams, and based on some of

the impact studies that you have done, I think we are well

prepared for that.

Thanks.

Comment Author	Oakes, Kirk
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1019_175-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1019_175-2	Master Response WQ-1 B-G Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants.	No
GP_MC_1019_175-3	We thank you for input for the Secretarial Determination for the removal of four dams on the Klamath River. It is important to note that fish kills have also occurred in the past, and are likely to occur in the future if the dams are left in since the dams create conditions that perpetuate parasites and diseases that cause fish mortality (Section 3.3.4.3). The Secretary of the Interior will consider the environmental consequences described in Chapter 3 before selecting an alternative to implement. The Secretary may also choose the No Action/No Project Alternative.	No

GP_EM_1120_818

From: Dale300@aol.com[SMTP:DALE300@AOL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 6:03:19 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: RE: Kalamath River Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

It is sad that you don't respect our American history and against individualism and wanting in the end result by destroying the dams in N. California and Oregon etc. so you can hasten us into this horrendous Agenda 21. If you go along with this, we know where your heart is and that you want no more private ownership of lands everywhere. Don't pretend it is for the environment because what you are doing is destroying the environment and will cause flooding etc. I feel it is a sham that you are pulling this over on us and we are going to spread the word far and wide what is taking place. I beg you as an American please reverse your thinking. If you do, I would whole heartedly thank you!!!!

Dale Oakley, Knoxville, TN

Comment Author	Oakley, Dale
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_818-1	Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21.	No

GP_EM_1119_777

From: Beth Oehlert[SMTP:BETH@BETHOEHLERT.COM]
Sent: Saturday, November 19, 2011 12:06:34 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath River Dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule
To whom it May Concern,

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I was a guest of a rancher in Yreka in Siskyou county last month. I came up from the Bay Area because I was concerned with what I was hearing. After spending a weekend up there and hearing from the community I am amazed that the government would even consider blowing up some dams that provide affordable water and power to thousands of customers in the area and Oregon. It isn't about the salmon at all because there are fisheries that are producing thousands of salmon. It's about the rights of property owners. Why is our government thinking about taking down these dams to the peril of the community? The spotted owl destroyed the timber industry, the smelt destroyed the agricultural business in central California and now we have the Coho Salmon that are destroying the agriculture and livelihoods of these wonderful people who are the true conservationists and caretakers of the rural lands. Please, please give these people a chance. This is not fair and seems so unbelievable that I can't believe we have to fight this. I am really afraid for our country if this happens because this is the template for other rural areas.

If this really IS about the Coho salmon, then the agency needs to investigate and study the alternative plan presented by the residents of Siskiyou county that would be less costly so that the salmon can proliferate.

Comment 2 - Alternatives

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Oehlert
Montara, CA 94037

Comment Author	Oehlert, Elizabeth
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1119_777-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response AQU-23 Agenda 21.	No
GP_EM_1119_777-2	Master Response ALT-2 Elimination of Alternative 10 - Fish Bypass: Bogus Creek Bypass and Alternative 11 - Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing from Detailed Study.	No

GP_MF_1025_240

Klamath Settlement EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) Chet Egan

Representing myself.

Comment 1 - Approves Dam Removal

Notes: 1 FOR DAM REMOVAL ALT 2

Comment 2 - Proposed Project/Action

2 FOR ~~Restoration~~ Functional restoration of the ecosystem using best management practices and adaption management.

3 Concerns about water allocations

*Please read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

28

Comment Author	Ogan, Chet
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1025_240-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MF_1025_240-2	The Proposed Action incorporates best management practices whenever possible, to reduce or avoid adverse environmental effects. Adaptive management will also be incorporated, when necessary, to ensure long-term restoration of salmonid fisheries in the Klamath Basin.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1026_329

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Name: Chet Ogan

Organization: Individual – myself

Title: Retired Wildlife biologist

Address: 811 "O" ST EUREKA CA 95501

Email: ogan@sbcglobal.net

Comments: 1. Remove the dams Alt 2 or 3

2. Restore the function of the ecosystem using best management practices and adaptive mgmt.

Comment 2 - Hydrology

3. ~~There~~ have concerns about long-term good quality water allocations in light of global climate change.

4. Provide functional restoration of the Shasta and Scott Rivers

Comment 3 - Out of Scope

I will be commenting on the DEIR/DEIS

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Ogan, Chet
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 26, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1026_329-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MF_1026_329-2	The KBRA includes a Climate Change Evaluation to determine how climate change could affect fisheries and communities in the Klamath Basin. The findings could trigger a re-negotiation of the KBRA.	No
GP_MF_1026_329-3	Actions on the Scott and Shasta Rivers are not part of the Proposed Action.	No

GP_WI_1112_586

From: lmo@efn.org[SMTP:LMO@EFN.ORG]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2011 12:54:02 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Remove Klamath Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Laura M. Ohanian
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Remove Klamath Dams

Body: I support Alternative 2, FULL dam removal. We need to increase the autumn Chinook runs, alleviate the massive blooms of toxic algae that occur now, and create more jobs -- it's a win-win-win proposal for the area.

Comment Author	Ohanian, Laura
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1112_586-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1116_708

Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, Cal 95825

Dam removal on the Klamath River: **10 Nov. 2011**

Comment 1 - KBRA

Comment 2 - Sediment Transport

The process that took place with the project Irrigators, Tribes, and some fishing men from the coast, to come up with KBRA was unconstitutional as it was done behind closed doors and the general public did not have a chance to vote on the issue.

The only people that benefit from this is the project Irrigators who will get cheaper power rates, the tribe will get 90,000 acres of timbered land paid for by tax payers and there is the fishing industry that is hoping that more salmon will come into the rivers.

With all the sediment going down the river and lodging in the gravel , all the way to the coast the spawning beds will be ruined for years and the salmon will not have a place to lay their eggs.

In the mean time all the rest of the population ends up paying for the removal of the dams. There is no gain for those rate payers and the dollar value loss of the property around those dams is not even figured in the cost of removal. The property around the dams will be worthless. So, is the Government prepared to buy the property that will be affected? Is it worth the loss of power providing dams just to satisfy the want of Indians, fishermen and a few Irrogators?

Comment 3 - Real Estate

I did not have a choice and I am already paying more money on my power bill to pay for the removal of the dams. The Constitution states that all citizens are to be treated equally. Making rate payers pay for the removal of the dams to satisfy the three groups that will gain is not being treated equally.

We the citizens of Oregon and of this great country of America send representatives to Washington DC to protect our Constitutional Rights. We depend on those representatives to treat all citizens on an equal basis. Removing dams to satisfy a group of three and making the rest of the population pay for the removal is not giving equal representation from our politicians we sent to Washington.

I would like to hear from you and read how you can justify backing the dam removal.

Your Constituent

Gordon W. Ohman

Gordon W. Ohman
3610 Pine Grove Rd.
Klamath Falls, Or 97603
ph 541-882-6803

Comment Author	Ohman, Gordon
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1116_708-1	Master Response KBRA-5 KBRA and Klamath Tribes. Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA.	No
GP_LT_1116_708-2	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging.	No
GP_LT_1116_708-3	Master Response RE-1E Real Estate Evaluation Report. Master Response RE-3A Landowner Compensation. Relicensing of the dams would result in costs to ratepayers as well. The economic reality of implementing fishways and meeting Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401 Certification at the Four Facilities, combined with the prospect of an annual loss of power revenue and the protection of prudent and reasonable utility rates for its customers, encouraged PacifiCorp to enter into collaborative discussions with other basin stakeholders to identify ways to improve basin fisheries while limiting liabilities to PacifiCorp ratepayers. PacifiCorp recognized that the terms of the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) “provide significant benefits to PacifiCorp’s customers” (quote from the California Public Utilities Commission [PUC)] hearing, February 2011). The cost cap protects ratepayers from the uncertain costs of relicensing, litigation, decommissioning, and removal that customers may be responsible for absent the KHSA. Among the benefits of the KHSA, PacifiCorp recognized “cost protection regarding dam removal cost, liability associated with dam removal, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) relicensing costs, and possible litigation due to controversies in the Klamath Basin region regarding the operation of the dams as benefits of the KHSA” (quote from the California PUC hearing, February 2011).	No

GP_MC_1026_317

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 26, 2011
PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA

MS. OLDFATHER: Felicia Oldfather, F-e-l-i-c-i-a O-l-d-f-a-t-h-e-r. I'm speaking for myself. I'm a resident of Humboldt County since 1972 and a former member of the North Coast Environmental Center Board and the domestic partner of a commercial salmon fisherman.

When I first heard about the KBRA process and the other things going on, I was pretty cynical because I had watched these water wars going on. And then, gradually, I came to realize that a real serious effort was going on from farmers, fishermen, and tribes to try to actually get out of the dead end of lawsuits and contentious things that, you know, came to some agreement, but nothing really changed very much. And they worked through many, many complex issues.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I'm supporting Alternative D -- excuse me -- Alternative 2. I don't think this is a perfect solution. It doesn't solve the problems of the Trinity River, the Shasta River, the Scott River, the Upper Klamath Basin, or a lot of other things, but it will provide more water for the refuges. It will provide more security for the farmers. It will provide a great deal more fish for the river and a great deal more healthy water system.

And I am extremely grateful to the people who

gave their time and energy over the years to work on both these Agreements, and I hope, in my lifetime, to see the dams come out. Thank you.

MS. JONES: Thank you.

Comment Author	Oldfather, Felicia
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 26, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1026_317-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1117_736

From: senchoo@sisqtel.net[SMTP:SENCHOO@SISQTEL.NET]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 11:15:43 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Ken Oliver
Organization:

Subject: Klamath dam removal

Body: Leave the Dams as they are! I beleive that not enough consideration on the Shasta tribes proposal for mitigation,by putting a fish passage tunnel in. Not enough study on the effects of silt and debris behind the dams and what it will do!

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment 2 - Alternatives

Comment 3 - Sediment Toxicity

Comment Author	Oliver, Ken
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1117_736-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_1117_736-2	Master Response ALT-2 Elimination of Alternative 10 - Fish Bypass: Bogus Creek Bypass and Alternative 11 - Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing from Detailed Study.	No
GP_WI_1117_736-3	Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants. There is expected to be a significant amount of woody debris behind the dams as well. However, the woody debris would have a positive habitat effect by supply wood to the main channel and creating fish habitat. There is extensive monitoring of the downstream channel that will identify any negative consequences of the woody debris, such as snagging of woody debris on bridge piers. Appropriate measures will be taken by the DRE to avoid any significant flooding impacts associated with woody debris.	No

GP_EM_1212_1031

From: Dick Olson[SMTP:FISHINGFOOL.OLSON@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 7:09:31 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath Dams DEIS
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Addressed to

Ms. Elizabeth Vasque
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I support Alternative #2 (preferred alternative) - Full facilities (dam) removal and implements the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA)

- The Klamath Agreements are good for family farmers and ranchers and represent a locally devised plan.

- 80% of the Pacific flyway's migratory waterfowl stop in the Klamath basin. It is one of the premier waterfowl hunting locations in North America. The Klamath Agreements will help water conditions in the refuges, improve habitat and enhance hunting opportunities.

- The Klamath Agreements will improve the salmon and steelhead fishery.

- The Klamath Agreements will help a teetering commercial fishing industry and coastal towns because they will increase salmon and steelhead runs.

- According to the Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, hunting, fishing and wildlife viewing infuses $23 million annually into the Klamath County economy. The Klamath Agreements will enhance this while providing greater security for farmers!

- Millions of tax dollars have gone to farmers, ranchers, tribes and commercial fisherman because of drought and disaster assistance. The approach of The Klamath Agreements will save taxpayers money and improve water distribution for all.

- The agreements are good for people, fish and wildlife and are fiscally responsible compared to the costs of continued conflict in the basin.

Thanks for helping and being a part of this historic effort!

Richard Olson, Central Oregon Flyfishers -- Past President Bend, Oregon

Comment Author	Olson, Dick
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1212_1031-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1115_684

From: Jon Olson[SMTP:JONOLSONENGINEER@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 7:46:30 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath Dam Removal and Environmental report
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear sir,

Comment 1 - NEPA

Please do not consider the piecemeal approach to environmental impacts that has been taken with the various documents surrounding the planned removal of the Klamath Dams. Please keep the dams in place. A complete EIR that includes all aspects, especially economic, must be considered.

Comment 2 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment 3 - NEPA

Jon Olson
201 wheeler lane
Crescent City CA 95531

Comment Author	Olson, Jon
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 15, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1115_684-1	The Draft EIS/EIR was developed to analyze the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and alternatives to the KHSA, and the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) as a connected action. The Lead Agencies have used their best efforts to identify and disclose as much relevant information as possible in the EIS/EIR based on the review of the best available information at the time of the issuance of the Notice of Intent (NOI), as well as, new information developed to support the Secretarial Determination process. Mitigation is proposed for all impacts determined to be significant. However, it is important to note that the KHSA and KBRA do not solve all water quality issues in the Klamath Basin. Master Response N/CP-26 KHSA and KBRA Settlement Parties.	No
GP_EM_1115_684-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1115_684-3	The Draft EIS/EIR includes a socioeconomic analysis in Section 3.15.	No

GP_WI_1116_724

From: iriejen@hotmail.com[SMTP:IRIEJEN@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 11:13:49 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Support dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jennifer Ortega
Organization:

Subject: Support dam removal

Body: As a fisheries major from Humboldt State University and former biologist for NMFS I am in support of the dams being removed. I will never forget the pictures of massive fish kills due to increase water temperature. These situations are preventable. Step one is to remove the dams.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Ortega, Jennifer
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_724-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1018_082

Elizabeth Vasquez MP150
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95501

October 18, 2011

RE: Draft EIS/EIR –Klamath River dam removal

%Dennis Lynch
Program Manager
Klamath Secretarial Determination

To whom it may concern

Comment 1 - Economics

Comment 2 - Hydropower

Having farmed in Klamath County, OR and Modoc County, Tulelake , CA for 65 years, I am dismayed after reading the recently published EXECUTIVE SUMMARY on removal of our dams. This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS/EIR) appears to be a job creator for the radical environmentalist movement and will be a disaster for farmers in the Basin. The major cost of removal would be borne by power users and tax payers of the Upper Klamath Basin

Comment 3 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Logic is against dam removal in general and John Boyle Dam in particular especially as according to your own draft the total production of clean hydro-power can generate 75% of the total power generated on the river. The fish ladder on the John Boyle is designed for trophy sized rainbow trout and possibly salmon in the future.

Comment 4 - Water Rights/Supply

Oregon's adjudication of the waters of Upper Klamath Basin with it's many beneficial uses must be protected under the Klamath River Compact before Oregon's dam is removed.

PLEASE, KEEP THE JOHN BOYLE DAM.

Sincerely,

James R. Ottoman

James R. Ottoman
3910 Mazama Drive
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

Comment Author	Ottoman, James
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1018_082-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_LT_1018_082-2	Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_LT_1018_082-3	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_LT_1018_082-4	(A) Oregon's adjudication of the waters of the Upper Klamath Basin is based on Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) Chapter 539 for water uses that were begun prior to February 24, 1909 or for water use on federal reservations. The Klamath Basin Compact was ratified in 1957 and is codified in the statutes under ORS 542.620. The Compact pertains to water uses that were permitted after its effective date. The Oregon Water Resources Department is tasked with distributing water to water right holders according to the records of the Department which includes the rights established either in an adjudication process or through the permit process. (B) The water right for the J.C. Boyle Project enjoys a priority date of April 17, 1951. This right is subordinated to other water rights in the Klamath basin by the following condition: "The water right granted under this license shall be subject and subsequent in point of right of use to any prior appropriation of the waters of the Klamath River or its tributaries, and to any permits granted by the State Engineer of Oregon, or his successor having jurisdiction in the matter, to the use of the waters of the Klamath River and its tributaries for domestic, stock or irrigation purposes on or after April 17, 1951." (C) Therefore, extending the hydroelectric license for this project or canceling the license will not affect either junior or senior water rights holders in the basin. (D) The proposed dam removal is not expected to directly impact any part of the adjudication. Information about the status of the adjudications process and individual claims and/or contests is available at: http://www.wrd.state.or.us/OWRD/ADJ/index.shtml	No

GP_MC_1018_113

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter

MR. JIM OTTOMAN: Thank you. My name is James R. Ottoman.

I want to thank -- I'm a retired farmer, and I

would like to thank all the Department of Interior federal

employees that are participating in this area. It's

really an honor to have a hearing in the upper Klamath

Basin.

I have farmed in Klamath County, Oregon, and

Modoc County, California, and Tulelake, California, for 65

years. I am dismayed after reading the recently published

executive committee draft, summary draft, on removal of

our dams.

Comment 1 - Economics

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement

appears to be a job creator for the radical environmental

movement and will be a disaster for farmerS in the basin.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

The major cost of removal will be paid by our

users and taxpayers of the upper Klamath Basin, as they

are the ones that pay their power bills and the costs are

already in their bills.

Comment 3 - Hydropower

Logic is against dam removal in general, and

John Boyle Dam, in particular, especially since, according

to your own draft, the total production of clean

hydroelectric power on the John Boyle dam generates 75 percent of the total power generated on the river, and to take out that dam is a miscarriage of justice.

The fish ladder also is on the John Boyle Dam and is designed for trophy-sized rainbow trout. And at the time -- I remember the construction of it -- there was some question on: Why does this dam have a fish ladder? And they said, well, maybe, possibly, someday in the future, salmon would come up there. But it isn't being used, I don't believe, today.

Comment 4 - Water Supply/ Water Rights

Another one that is very important to the state of Oregon is Oregon's adjudication of the water in upper Klamath Basin with its many beneficial uses -- while I could just go on, everyone knows what they are, there are many, many of them. But the beneficial uses must be protected under the Klamath River Compact. Even though the compact has had a minor position in this, there has not been any meetings held for folks up here of the general public for participation under the Klamath River Compact. And I --

Comment 5 - Water Supply/Rights

Oh, one more thing: Therefore, in conclusion, your draft gives little, if any, consideration to the ten years of drought conditions in this upper Klamath Basin watershed, and anybody who's lived here long knows that we

Comment 5 cont. - Water Supply/Rights

do have the drought and the wet cycles. Of course, some of these droughts have been caused by economic or environmental positions, but still, if you look at the eight or ten suggestions in the summary page up here, most every one of those are from 2001 to 2010, and so that's a ten-year cycle that you are basing this whole draft on, is in drought conditions. And if anybody remembers Jim Kerns' map of the water in Klamath County, the Klamath River, it goes like this (indicating) for a hundred years, for a thousand years, probably, but we have only kept records for a hundred.

Comment 6 - Alternatives

So anyway, therefore, I believe, in the escalation of -- I mean, in explanation, that the number 6.1 alternative should be followed as the better alternative. But please keep the John Boyle Dam.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Ottoman, Jim
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_113-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1018_113-2	Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_MC_1018_113-3	Comment noted. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_MC_1018_113-4	(A) Oregon's adjudication of the waters of the Upper Klamath Basin is based on Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) Chapter 539 for water uses that were begun prior to February 24, 1909 or for water use on Federal reservations. The Klamath Basin River Compact was ratified in 1957 and is codified in the statutes under ORS 542.620. The Compact pertains to water uses that were permitted after its effective date. The Oregon Water Resources Department is tasked with distributing water to water right holders according to the records of the Department which includes the rights established either in an adjudication process or through the permit process. (B) The water right for the J.C. Boyle Project enjoys a priority date of April 17, 1951. This right is subordinated to other water rights in the Klamath Basin by the following condition: "The water right granted under this license shall be subject and subsequent in point of right of use to any prior appropriation of the waters of the Klamath River or its tributaries, and to any permits granted by the State Engineer of Oregon, or his successor having jurisdiction in the matter, to the use of the waters of the Klamath River and its tributaries for domestic, stock or irrigation purposes on or after April 17, 1951." (C) Therefore, extending the hydroelectric license for this project or canceling the license will not affect either junior or senior water rights holders in the basin. (D) The proposed dam removal is not expected to directly impact any part of the adjudication. Information about the status of the adjudications process and individual claims and/or contests is available at: http://www.wrd.state.or.us/OWRD/ADJ/index.shtml (E) The Klamath River Basin Compact led to the creation of the Klamath River Compact Commission. The Commission holds an annual meeting to promote intergovernmental cooperation on water related issues in the Klamath Basin. However neither the Compact nor the Commission dictate water releases on the Klamath River.	No

Comment Author	Ottoman, Jim
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_113-5	The hydrologic and hydraulic modeling did not only consider a ten year drought cycle. The model considers a period of 1961-2009 because historic data was available to develop the model.	No
GP_MC_1018_113-6	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_EM_1119_1112

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 9:32:52 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Removal of the Klamath dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> dan owen <djowen@harborside.com> 11/19/2011 4:02 PM >>>

Dear Sirs:

Comment 1 - Recreation

Just how much more damage does your agency want to inflict on the citizens of California? The dam removal is just a "cover" for your agenda of destroying any recreational opportunities that are left in California. At best, the fishing opportunities on the Klamath are limited, (if one reads your worthless regulation books). Has anyone, (other than your legal department), figured out how to decipher anything out of that book? Your "Mission statement" says it all. You need to remember who pays your wages. It is the tax payers of California and the sportsman who purchase their fishing license. If you continue angering the tax payers for your stupidity and sportsman, by limiting the locations then can fish, and the quotas they are allowed to catch, you might make them stop buying a license. No licenses, no funding!

Comment 2 - Fish

You know, and each and every one of you in your agency knows, that removing the dams on the Klamath will not improve the spawning numbers. Your own historical data, (dating back to 1913), proves my point.

The only thing that it will do is require more money for more research, more restoration, and more restrictions. I have never sees an agency with such a self-preserving agenda. Only wanting to add more research staff, while at the same time reducing field staff who help produce a product necessary for recreational opportunities in California, is not a worth while use of limited tax dollars.

You need to change your focus and try to find ways to add recreational opportunities in California. Adding these activities will draw more visitors to California, which will add more revenue, which will benefit the State, not the other way around. If you succeed in getting the dams are removed, and if this experiment turns out to be a farce, (which I know it will), everyone at the DF&G agency should be held criminally accountable for destroying the environment on the Klamath River, destroying property values, and move California lower in solving it's financial problems. Stop the damn dam removal project.

Comment 3 - Recreation

Sincerely,

Dan Owen
730 P.J. Murphy Memorial Dr.
Klamath, Ca. 95548

Comment 4 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Owen, Dan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1119_1112-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_EM_1119_1112-2	Master Response AQU – 5 Will Benefit all Salmonids. Access to habitat within the Hydroelectric Project reach would benefit coho salmon by: a) extending the range and distribution of the species thereby increasing the coho salmon's reproductive potential; b) increasing genetic diversity in the coho stocks; c) reducing the species vulnerability to the impacts of degradation; and d) increasing the abundance of the coho population (Administrative Law Judge Decision at 86, Ultimate Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law 9: Administrative Law Judge Decision at 36, FOF 7-16)(Administrative Law Judge 2006). Master Response AQU-6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook. Master Response AQU-7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success. Master Response AQU-23 Evaluation of Dam Removal and Restoration Anadromy (EDRRA) Model. Master Response AQU-26 Increased Abundance for Harvest and Tribes.	No
GP_EM_1119_1112-3	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The actions proposed in the comment are outside the scope of this project.	No
GP_EM_1119_1112-4	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_1072

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 10:02:00 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Public comment concerning proposed dam removal.
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> David Oxley <dboxley1@gmail.com> 11/21/2011 7:01 AM >>>

To whom it may concern,

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I am strongly against taking out four perfectly good dams on the klamath river. When did we all lose the ability to reason with common sense?

Comment 2 - Alternatives

All the alternatives except alternative one defy all logic and frankly cannot be afforded. Why not take alternative one and spend a little money and modern the dams. ie. Better fish passages, modern more efficient fish friendly turbines, ect. (I believe some of this has already been done).

Attached is a list of questions and concerns being raised by myself and many in my area. Please answer all these, in written form, so we can get a better understanding of your thinking process. In the meantime save the farmers and ranchers and power rates (which will necessarily skyrocket!) within the klamath basin watershed and leave the dams in.

David Oxley a Poe Valley rancher and farmer.

Comment Author	Oxley, David
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_1072-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1121_1072-2	Appendix A of the Draft EIS/EIR includes a wide range of alternatives representing diverse viewpoints and needs based on internal and public scoping. The alternatives that moved forward for more detailed analysis in this EIS/EIR are those that best meet the NEPA purpose and need and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, are feasible, and represent a range of reasonable alternatives (see Appendix A for more information). Alternative 4 would construct fish passage facilities at the existing dams, as suggested in the comment, and this alternative was carried forward into the Draft EIS/EIR for additional analysis. Further modernizing the dams was not included because it would not add to the ability to pass fish.	No

GP_EM_1122_898

From: LaVerne Oyarzo[SMTP:CAVANNA@ATT.NET]
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2011 10:17:22 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Cc: CALIFORMIS DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
Subject: STOP DAM REMOVAL ON THE KLAMATH OR ANY OTHER DAMS IN OUR STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR IN OREGON
Auto forwarded by a Rule

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

PLEASE NOTE THAT I AM HERE TO SUPPORT ALL THE RANCHERS AND FARMERS OF OREGON AND

NORTHERN CALIFORNA. THESE PEOPLE NEED OUR HELP IN THIS UGLY SITUATION GOING ON THERE

AND I DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHY OUR GOVERNMENT WOULD GO TO THE MEASURES IT HAS PLANNED TH HURT GOOD PEOPLE BARELY MAKING A LIVING OFF THEIR LAND.. REMOVAL OF ANY OF THESE DAMS WILL DESTROY AFFORDABLE ELECTRICAL POWER TO MANY HOMES IN BOTH NORTHERN CALIFORNIS AND OREGON.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

DO NOT OPEN THE DOORS FOR THE FUTURE FOR "THE U.N."S AGENDA 21" , TAKING AWAY PROPERTY RIGHT FOR OUR PEOPLE BY THE YEAR 2030. PUT EVERY MOVE UP TO THE VOTE OF OU PEOPLE. REMEMBER YOU WORK FOR THE PEOPLE OF THIS GREAT COUNTRY, THEY DO NOT WORK FOR YOU.

LA VERNE OYARZO

FORMER MAYOR OF THE CITY OF CALISTOGA,CA.

1907 GRANT STREET

CALISTOGA, CA. 94515-1321

707-942-6645

Comment Author	Oyarzo, LaVerne
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1122_898-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increase. Master Response GHG-3 Power Replacement.	No

GP_MC_1027_312

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 27, 2011
PUBLIC TESTIMONY
KLAMATH, CALIFORNIA

MR. PACE: My name is Felice Pace. That's spelled F-, as in Frank, e-l-i-c-e P-, as in Paul, a-c-e. I represent myself and KlamBlog.

I want to thank the Yurok Tribe for allowing us to meet here. And I want to thank all the peoples, native indigenous peoples of the Klamath Basin, the Yurok, Klamath Tribes, Hupa, Shasta, all, Karuk, for taking care of this river for so many thousands of years. Thank you. Wohklew.

Also, thanks to the rivers and mountains for the benefits and knowledge that they offer to all of us. And we need to pay attention to that.

Comment 1 - Costs

I want to tell the people here the dams are going to come out. It's not an issue. The dams are going to come out, because once the administrative law judge found that they had to put in the fish ladders and that they had to change the flows between the dams, they became uneconomical. And so, it's in the interest of the company, its shareholders, that they come out.

The only thing still to be decided and to wait for you people to weigh in on, really, is what else goes with us, who pays, and what else gets packaged with it on

the dam removal train. Because one way or another, they're going to come out. It's economics. It's pure economics.

KlamBlog -- I run KlamBlog at blogspot, and I also have a hand mail; it's an analysis of the facilities removal EIS key issues. There's really four key issues. And if anybody wants this paper, it's online or I have some here afterwards.

Comment 2 - Water Rights/Supply

But one of them, it's not dam removal. That's not a big issue. Dennis presented the -- in his first slide, if you remember, he presented the Basin-wide hardships, that list of problems, large reductions in farm water deliveries. Not true. One year partial. Otherwise, those guys have gotten all the water that they desired, up there in the Upper Basin. So, that was, I believe, a false statement and should be corrected.

One year that they got only partial deliveries, and then the State gave them all these wells so they could pump the groundwater. And they still were able to irrigate.

So, the major -- that is one thing. He also said ongoing water shortages for the wildlife refuges. That's absolutely correct. But those will continue under this plan. Well, they projected less years, but it still keeps those wildlife refuges under the Bureau of Reclamation for water and dependent on them.

It says dam economics for the company, and that's really -- really true. It's the economics that is making them get out of this dam.

Comment 3 - Fish

Also, in recent history but ignored in the proposed action and in the KBRA, is the National Research Council, the highest science body in the country, did a report on the Klamath, its second report. And it said, "We haven't" -- "we don't have the information yet to set the flows that fish need." It said, "We need to look at a Basin-wide assessment, a Basin-wide assessment that continues the Shasta" -- "that includes the Shasta and the Scott and the Trinity, before we can set the flows that fish need."

That's what the independent scientists have said. It's been ignored by the tribal biologists, for the most part. It's been ignored in this EIS/EIR. It needs to be addressed.

Comment 4 - Water Rights/Supply

Dennis talked about assurances for farms and refuges. It's not true for the refuges. They will be -- they're subject, still subject, to the irrigators get the water first, and if there's any left over, then the refuges get it.

The secretarial decision should, instead, make the refuges an A user. In the Klamath Irrigation Project, they got A users; they have the highest priority. The refuge should have equal priority with

those users.

Comment 5 - General/Other

One of the problems in the KHSA is that it would allow -- it will allow PacifiCorp to just walk away, not just from the dams but from those powerhouses. What toxic legacies are around those powerhouses for the last 100 years? Why didn't the EIS/EIR assess that? And that issue is missing in there. It needs to be addressed, toxic legacies around the powerhouses. And Congress should not allow the Company to get out of responsibility for those, because then they become our responsibility.

Target -- oh, I got 28 seconds. So, I better tell you that any agreement, okay -- and I'm addressing you guys, not these guys up here. But any agreement that favors some tribes over other tribes, some irrigators over other irrigators, some environmental interests over other environmental interests, that will not create peace on the river and it will not create restoration of our river. It's a problem.

Comment 6 - KBRA

This Agreement, there is -- there is -- agreement is good, and compromise is good, but there's good agreements and bad agreements. And we need to get rid of this bad Agreement -- that's the KBRA -- because it won't restore our river.

MS. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Pace.

Comment Author	Pace, Felice
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1027_312-1	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No
GP_MC_1027_312-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1027_312-3	The KBRA, under Part III Fisheries Program, acknowledges that need for development of a comprehensive basin wide fisheries restoration, reintroduction, and monitoring program which includes an assessment of the environmental factors that impact fisheries populations within the Klamath River (KBRA, Section 9.2). The Fisheries Program would use collaboration, incentives, and adaptive management as preferred approaches to achieve fisheries restoration objectives. The geographic scope of the program would include the entire Klamath Basin with the exception of the Trinity River sub-basin where a large scale restoration program, The Trinity River Restoration Program, is already in progress. The Environmental Water Program (KBRA, Section 20), consistent with the Fisheries Program Goals, is intended to contribute to the natural sustainability of fisheries by improving the management of water within the basin. As noted on p. 3.3-99 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Proposed Action would establish a flow regime that more closely mimics natural conditions in the Lower Klamath River.	No
GP_MC_1027_312-4	Master Responses WSWR-5 Klamath Adjudication. Master Response WSWR-11 Effects on Refuge Water Supply.	No
GP_MC_1027_312-5	EIS/EIR Section 3.18, Public Health & Safety, evaluates public health and safety and Section 3.21, Toxic Hazardous Materials, evaluates toxic and hazardous materials.	No
GP_MC_1027_312-6	The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the KHSA and KBRA.	No

SCANNED GP_LT_1024_255

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION FILE COPY

October 20, 2011

Elizabeth Vasquez
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Re: Klamath River Dam Removal

Dear Ms. Vasquez:

Comment 1 - NEPA

The environmental impact assessment to remove four Klamath River hydroelectric dams was nothing more than "junk science" with political motivation. It most certainly was not based on economics.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

Hydroelectric dams provide clean renewable energy which is very efficient and inexpensive. Hydro turbines can convert 90% of the available energy to electricity. Fossil fuel plants are only about 50% efficient and cause major air pollution problems. Biomass wood burning plants are about 20% efficient and also cause air pollution.

Comment 3 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

There is widespread public opposition to dam removal. Many of our Klamath County elected officials are opposed as are public officials in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties.

Anadromous fish species have never existed in the Klamath Basin and never will, even if the dams are removed. Upper Klamath Lake and Agency Lake were changed from mostly marshes to a large water reservoir in 1917. At that time the Bureau of Reclamation started controlling water levels for agricultural purposes.

Comment 4 - Fish

The water in those two lakes is warm, polluted with algae and nitrates. It has very low dissolved oxygen. Most certainly, not an environment conducive to salmon survival.

Any effort to improve water quality in these lakes would be futile. Both lakes are very shallow which cause the warm water conditions and algae bloom.

Klamath River dams are not causing water quality problems, the warm polluted water originates at the Klamath River headwaters--Upper Klamath Lake and Agency Lake.

Comment 5 - Water Quality

The public message is: "Re-license these dams do not remove them." Please convey that message to Secretary Salazar. Thank you.

SCANNED

Comment 6 - Opposed to Dam Removal

Sincerely,

Howard Paine
34939 Sunset Place
Chiloquin, OR 97624

Folder ID
Date Input & Initials 10-24-2011

Comment Author	Paine, Howard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 24, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1024_255-1	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information. The economic impacts associated with the alternatives are analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 3.15, Socioeconomics.	No
GP_LT_1024_255-2	Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases. The Agencies note that efficiencies are highly dependent upon the specific power resource project, appurtenant facilities, location, and delivery.	No
GP_LT_1024_255-3	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_LT_1024_255-4	Historical distributions of anadromous fish are described in the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 3.3.3.1, Aquatic Resources. Historical records reviewed by Hamilton et al. (2005) and information obtained from archaeological sites analyzed by Butler et al. (2010) indicate that prior to the construction of Copco 1 Dam, Chinook salmon and steelhead spawned in the tributaries upstream of Upper Klamath Lake, including the Sprague, Williamson, and Wood rivers. The question regarding the historical distribution of salmon and steelhead above Iron Gate Dam was also addressed in proceedings before Administrative Law Judge Honorable Parlen L. McKenna who concluded that agencies had met their burden of proof on this issue (EIS 1.2.6.2, Federal Energy Commission Relicensing). Among other findings, Judge McKenna determined (Administrative Law Judge 2006) that: o While the precise geographic distribution is uncertain, historical records and Tribal accounts demonstrate that anadromous fish (Chinook salmon, Coho salmon, and steelhead trout) migrated past the present site of Iron Gate Dam which provided a viable ecosystem and habitat for those stocks of fish (Findings Of Fact (FOF) 2A-3, p. 12). o Chinook salmon (both spring and fall-run) were abundant in the tributaries of the Upper Klamath Basin, including Jenny, Fall, and Shovel Creeks, as well as the Wood, Sprague, and Williamson rivers (FOF 2A-4, p. 12). o Steelhead trout utilized habitat in Spencer, Shovel, Fall, Camp, and Scotch creeks, and they were likely distributed as far upstream as Link River (FOF 2A-5, p. 12).	No

Comment Author	Paine, Howard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 24, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	o Coho salmon spawned in Fall Creek (FOF 2A-6, p. 12). o The record shows that those anadromous fish proximate to Iron Gate Dam are genetically most similar to those populations that existed in the Upper Klamath Basin prior to the construction of the dams (FOF 2A-22, p. 15). Additionally, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC 2007) concluded that anadromous fish occurred historically above IGD. Evidence documented in Section 3.3.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR indicates the Upper Klamath Lake habitat is suitable to support salmonids for at least the October through May period (Maule 2009; Draft EIS/EIR 3.3-54). To assess whether current conditions would physiologically impair Iron Gate Hatchery Chinook salmon reintroduced into the Upper Klamath Basin, juveniles were tested in cages In Upper Klamath Lake and the Williamson River in 2005 and 2006. These juveniles showed normal development as smolts in Upper Klamath Lake and survived well in both locations (Maule et al. 2009). The comment, as written, provides no evidence to support the argument that anadromous fish did not occur upstream of Iron Gate Dam or that current conditions would not support the reintroduction of anadromous salmonids to those locations today.	
GP_LT_1024_255-5	Concern #1: “The water in those two lakes is warm, polluted with algae and nitrates. It has very low dissolved oxygen. Most certainly, not an environment conducive to salmon survival.” A summary of existing poor water quality in the Upper Klamath Basin is described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.1 Existing Conditions (p. 3.2-19 to 3.2-33) and Appendix C (p. C-1 to C-86). Additionally, information presented in Section 3.3.4.3 indicates that Upper Klamath Lake habitat is suitable to support salmonids for at least the October through May period (see also Maule 2009, cited in the Draft EIS/EIR). To assess whether current conditions would physiologically impair Iron Gate Hatchery Chinook salmon reintroduced to the Upper Klamath Basin, juveniles were tested in cages in Upper Klamath Lake and the Williamson River in 2005 and 2006. Results of the tests indicated normal smolt development in Upper Klamath Lake and good survival in both locations. The authors concluded that there was little evidence of physiological impairment or significant vulnerability to C. Shasta (a fish parasite) that would preclude this stock from being reintroduced to the Upper Klamath Basin. The life history of fall-run Chinook salmon generally does not include a freshwater phase from June through	No

Comment Author	Paine, Howard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 24, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	September and spring inputs on the west side of Upper Klamath Lake likely provide some thermal refuge year round for migrants. Thus, conditions for fall-run Chinook migration through Upper Klamath Lake appear favorable. Due to the timing of the migration period for spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead, these runs would generally avoid the period of poor water quality in Upper Klamath Lake. Master Response AQU – 25 Habitat Upstream of Iron Gate. Concern # 2: “Any effort to improve water quality in these lakes would be futile. Both lakes are very shallow which cause the warm water conditions and algae bloom. Klamath River dams are not causing water quality problems, the warm polluted water originates at the Klamath River headwaters--Upper Klamath Lake and Agency Lake.” Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements.	
GP_LT_1024_255-6	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_063

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: JOHN PANDOZZI

Organization:

Title:

Address: 1238 Buck Is. DR., Klamath Falls OR 97601

Email: NONE

Comments: Return the Holy water of the Trinity

Comment 1 - Alternatives

The true answer to the success of the Klamath system is the "Trinity River restoration" + dam removal. Never any mention of restoring that water regime. 109 mi of spawning habitat was removed with Trinity dam construction. Klamath water was never high quality, Trinity was. Mix of the 2 is the Key.

(OVER)

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Please place first class postage here

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Comment 2 - Cost

Harvest all the gold in the sediment behind the dams to pay!

Comment Author	Pandozzi, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_063-1	The Trinity River enters the Klamath River close to the Pacific Ocean; changes to Trinity River would affect only a relatively small segment of the Klamath River. The Trinity River has been the subject of a separate restoration study resulting in the Trinity River Restoration Program. Changes to the Trinity River would not address the NEPA purpose and need or CEQA project objectives; therefore, they were not included as alternatives to the Proposed Action.	No
GP_MF_1019_063-2	Section 3.11.3.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR provides information on the composition of the reservoir sediments - no gold is indicated in the reservoir sediments.	No

GP_WI_1111_568

From: jpp@paoluccio.com[SMTP:JPP@PAOLUCCIO.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 8:28:03 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Joseph P. Paoluccio
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Dam Removal

Body: I favor the removal of the four dams.

Comment Author	Pailuccio, Joseph
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_568-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1209_1007

From: NOEL PARK[SMTP:NOEL@JDCORVETTE.COM]
Sent: Friday, December 09, 2011 9:44:03 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Cc: KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov
Subject: Support Klamath River Restoration Project
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I STRONGLY support the proposed dam removals, river restoration, and river management project.

Clearly there will be some short term negative impacts caused by the construction/demolition operations. Some people will lose whatever recreation benefits are afforded by the arguably silted up and algae bloom prone lakes. Obviously in the West, "Water is for fighting over". So the issues of the irrigators will always be loudly heard. Nevertheless, it must be obvious on the face of it that the overall environmental benefits of such a project will/would be profound, and far outweigh the parochial issues of all of the many, and often competing groups who have financial interests at potential risk.

I am a great believer in, and supporter of, the Endangered Species Act. As time has passed, I have become ever more convinced that man drives species into extinction at his own grave risk. I really believe that there is potential tipping point in the destruction of the natural world which, when passed, will result in man's following into extinction all of the species he has previously driven there. That said, anything we can do to not only stop this destruction, but actually restore some of it, will be to our massive credit as a people.

Not to restate the obvious but, as much of a profound triumph the implementation of this project would be, there is also great value in its example for what can be done, and a beginning for even more spectacular efforts in the future.

I suppose that the evaluators and sort of referees of this project must remain neutral, so I hope that this final bit is not inappropriate. Still, I cannot let this opportunity pass without offering my heartfelt thanks to everyone involved in trying to take this project forward. You are, without a doubt, doing the Lord's work. I honor you for it.

Comment Author	Park, Noel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 09, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1209_1007-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1112_572

From: Dennis Parkhurst[SMTP:PATZANDDENNIS@SBCGLOBAL.NET]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2011 9:27:52 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd

Subject: Dams

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Auto forwarded by a Rule
Don't remove these dams! They serve a purpose, and removing them will hurt too many people and cost way too much money. We are already paying too high electric rates, and no one cares! Pat Parkhurst, Mt. Shasta, Ca.

Comment Author	Parkhurst, Dennis
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1112_572-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increase. Master Response GHG-3 Power Replacement.	No

GP_WI_1018_039

From: steve@goldinwater.com[SMTP:STEVE@GOLDINWATER.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2011 2:57:17 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: KBHA and KBRA
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Steven Parrett
Organization: GOLDINWATER

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: KBHA and KBRA

Body: I believe that restoration of the Klamath River Basin ecosystem including removal of the mainstem dams is a once-in-a-century opportunity that must not be missed.

Comment Author	Parrett, Steven
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1018_039-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1120_884

From: Pascoe Carol[SMTP:ANNCD1@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 6:25:20 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov
Subject: Removal of dams on the Klamath River - Comments Regarding the DEIR and DEIS
Auto forwarded by a Rule

To: **- Bureau of Reclamation**

- California Department of Fish and Game - Mr. Gordon Leppig

Sirs:

Comment 1 - KHSA

I am writing to let you know that I am adamantly opposed to your efforts to remove the dams on the Klamath River. Your first and most important duty as government officials is to uphold and protect the unalienable rights of all citizens to Life, Liberty and Private Property. In fact, by destroying the dams which sustain the surrounding populations, you are doing just the opposite---in violation of your oath to uphold the constitutional rights of the citizens. Moreover, why were the 40,000 Siskiyou County residents (as well as the Shasta Indian tribe whose burial grounds would be destroyed) and their local elected representatives not included in the meetings you held?? These folks should have been included as major "stakeholders" when meetings about dam removal were held**.**

Furthermore, the reasons you give for removing the dams are highly questionable if not outright wrong. You say it is out of concern for the Coho. But the Coho are not indigenous to the Klamath and were planted there some time back; so they are not natural to the Klamath. Thousands of beautiful Chinook Salmon are produced by the Iron Gate Hatchery each year; yet you refuse to count them in the river population because they are not considered natural! The location of this hatchery right below the dam would mean it would be totally destroyed by the removal of that dam. The Coho also spawn within 30 miles of the ocean, and the first dam on the Klamath is 187 miles upstream!

These four dams provide clean, economical energy for the people of Siskiyou County, enough to power 70,000 homes! Why would you want to take this affordable energy away and how could it possibly be replaced? This idea to remove the dams is quite irrational! All the dams on the Klamath work in perfect harmony for the benefit of both people and fish. By taking down the dams, toxic sediment would be released into the river ecosystem that would pollute water, banks, riparian plant life, fish and underground aquifers, which could last for 100 years or more, and would make the river less reliable for irrigation. So much for protecting the environment!

One reason California is in such bad shape economically is because of government policies in our rural areas. These damaging policies are now being ramped up because of the President's Executive Order on Rural Initiatives in which most Departments of the Federal Government are being used to work against private property rights and thus try to force

Comment 1 cont.

people off their lands and into packed "transit towns" that are simultaneously being planned in urban areas. (Government policies have already removed miners and loggers from most rural areas.) This all is being done in compliance with "Sustainable Development," which is another term for Agenda 21. Agenda 21 is the United Nations's plan for the world's populations for the 21st Century. Since it emanates from a foreign entity, was never ratified by the U.S. Senate and is a blatant attack on rights guaranteed by our Constitution , the policies implementing this plan are highly treasonous! And those who are helping to carry out this attack should be brought up on charges of treason! There is a plethora of information about this movement to control all human behavior and take away private property rights. Therefore, those who are involved in this movement cannot plead ignorance about what they are truly engaged in.

The American People will NOT stand for the destruction of rural America and the water rights/property rights of our fellow citizens!

November 20, 2011

Comment Author	Pascoe, Carol
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_884-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Disapprove of Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA. Master Response AQU-4 Coho are Native. Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21. The Four Facilities have had substantial long-term negative impacts on fish and water quality in the Klamath Basin. Removal of the Four Facilities will also result in impacts to fish and water quality in the basin, though these impacts are primarily short-term. The water quality and fisheries effects of the Four Facilities remaining in place and of their removal are analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR Sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4. The potential impacts to Indian Tribes burial grounds are analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.13.	No

Klamath Settlement EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_069

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Jesse Patterson

Organization:

Title: Mr

Address: 15411 Greenwing Loop Keno Or 97627

Email: catalina27us@yahoo.com

Comments:

We PAID to put them place. We did this for a REASON, Flood Control! Plus they got power out of controling the Flow.

Comment 1 - Hydrology

None of this is changed If fish are the problem build fish ladders. Don't make us pay to remove them for no good reason

Comment 2 - Alternatives

Jesse Patterson

541 882 5377

No to the Damn Removal!

Comment 3 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Patterson, Jesse
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_069-1	Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection.	No
GP_MF_1019_069-2	The Draft EIS/EIR considers construction of fish ladders in Alternative 4, Fish Passage at Four Dams.	No
GP_MF_1019_069-3	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1120_1023

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 9:40:34 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Save Klamath Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> <ntp2002@aol.com> 11/20/2011 5:54 PM >>>

Officials,

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

The dams are to important to the ranchers, farmers and all the people of Siskiyou County. Their rights are more important than a fish that is not even native to the area. What kind of government do we have to through out the rights of it's citizen without any representation.

Nancy Patty
ntp2002@aol.com

Comment Author	Patty, Nancy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_1023-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection. Master Response AQU-4 Coho are Native.	No

GP_EM_1018_041

From: Helen Paul[SMTP:HELENPAUL_CANAM@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2011 3:47:42 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd

Subject: Klamath Dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

We own property located on the shore of Copco Lake. The following are the items we are concerned about if the dam was to be removed:

Who will own the property currently under the lake? Comment 1 - Land Use
If this property is to be owned by a govt or non-profit agency how will they maintain it? Comment 2 - Land Use
Will public access/use be allowed? Comment 3 - Land Use
Will the property be kept cleared in line with fire control guidelines? Comment 4 - General/Other
Are any flood control measures going to be put in place? Comment 5 - Hydrology

These are concerns we would like to have addressed.

Helen Paul

301 Tunitas Creek Road
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
650-712-0844

Comment Author	Paul, Helen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1018_041-1	According to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) (Section 7.6.4), Parcel B lands, which include the property under the reservoirs, would be transferred to the respective state (Oregon or California) or a designated third party before facility removal. The lands would then be managed for public interest purposes such as fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement, public education, and public recreational access.	No
GP_EM_1018_041-2	Master Response RE-6A and C Disposition of Parcel B Lands.	No
GP_EM_1018_041-3	According to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) (Section 7.6.4), Parcel B lands would be transferred to the respective state (Oregon or California) or a designated third party before facility removal. The lands would then be managed for public interest purposes such as fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement, public education, and public recreational access. Master Response RE-6A, C and D Disposition of Parcel B Lands. Mitigation Measure REC-1 in Chapter 3.20 would also address the use and access to these lands in the future. REC-1 – At least 1 year before starting dam removal activities, the Dam Removal Entity (DRE) will prepare a plan to develop new recreational facilities and river access points along the newly formed river channel between J.C. Boyle Reservoir and Iron Gate Dam. The plan will be developed in consultation with appropriate state and federal agencies (e.g., Bureau of Land Management [BLM] and California Department of Fish and Game [CDFG]) and stakeholder groups, and will include an implementation schedule for construction of recreational facilities and river access areas.	No
GP_EM_1018_041-4	The detailed plan for dam removal describes revegetation of the reservoir areas. Under this plan, the Copco lake area as well as the other reservoir areas would be revegetated with native species within 5 years after dam removal. This would include control of invasive species. We are unaware of any fire control guidelines that would apply to this property. Cal Fire's Defensible Space requirements only apply to reduction of fuels surrounding residences and would not be applicable in this situation.	No
GP_EM_1018_041-5	Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection.	No

GP_WI_1116_717

From: mtrmark@sonic.net[SMTP:MTRMARK@SONIC.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 1:23:23 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Un-dam The Klamath River Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Mark Paul
Organization:

Subject: Un-dam The Klamath River

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Dams on the Klamath River must be removed to restore Coho and Chinook salmon and steelhead runs. Removing the 4 lower dams will open up historic spawning grounds, improve water quality, and restore natural flows.
I support removal of all dams on the Klamath River and its tributaries, restoration of the wetlands and marshes in the upper Klamath basin, including Lower Klamath Lake, Tule Lake, and Upper Klamath Lake, minimum water flows for fish that will comply with the Endangered Species Act and Biological Opinions, and release of the 50,000 acre feet promised to Humboldt County from the Trinity River to benefit salmon and other species.
Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Mark D. Paul

Comment Author	Paul, Mark
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_717-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_531

From: ben.c.paull@gmail.com[SMTP:BEN.C.PAULL@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 3:39:02 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Take the dams down Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Ben Paull
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Take the dams down

Body: I support the removal of the Klamath River dams. Please do what is right for wild fish, a healthy river system and sustainable economic opportunities. Let's make the 21st century an opportunity to undo some of the damage of the 20th. Wild salmon are central to the identity, economy and well being of the west coast. Do the right thing. Take the dams down!

Comment Author	Paull, Ben
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_531-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1104_355

From: Ken Paxton[SMTP:PAXTON3X@ATT.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 1:34:53 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath Ca Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Mrs Vasquez,

I do not understand the removal of dams, especially when the people have voted for them to remain intact. It seems the government does not what to listen to the people, this has to change. I do not want the dams removed.

Ken Paxton

Comment Author	Paxton, Ken
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 04, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1104_355-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1122_892

To the Bureau of Reclamation,

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I think it is wrong for taking these dams out on the Klamath River . The energy produced by the hydro electric production cannot be replaced. Damage to the river after the dams are removed and the loss to the community.

Please let it be.
Ken Paxton

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
NOV 22 '11

1731 Maryland St
Redwood City, CA 94061-3205

SCANNED

Classification PES-13.00
Folder I.D.
Date Input & Initials

Comment Author	Paxton, Ken
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1122_892-1	Section 3.18, Public Health & Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR describes the replacement of electricity supplies. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-22 Willingness-to-Pay Survey.	No

GP_WI_1222_1163

From: lecontecrater@gmail.com[SMTP:LECONTECRATER@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2011 1:37:01 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam Removal Klamath River Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Frank Payne
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Dam Removal Klamath River

Body: I am writing to urge the Federal government to remove all dams along the Klamath river. A native Oregonian for 50 years, I have personally witnessed the rapid decline of salmon along the Columbia River basin, as well as the sharp decline on the Klamath River. This fall has witnessed the decommissioning and current removal of two dams in the Pacific Northwest, including the Conduit Dam on the White River in Washington.

The time has come for the removal of all dams along the Klamath and its' tributaries. Salmon, and other fish, are a national resource for all people to enjoy,or at least protect, while these dams are used solely for irrigation purposes.Do we choose to face the elimination of all salmon runs because farmers are choosing to grow crops that they cannot sustain without irrigation on their own in their current climate and geographical location? That is the issue and question we face here.

Comment 2 - Water Rights/Supply

Lastly, the government needs to ensure adequate water stores for the Klamath river system so that salmon can return to spawn during the dry periods in the fall. This includes minimum flow rates at Iron Gate and also the Trinity River.

Several summers ago many salmon were killed due to the choose of irrigation over salmon runs during a low water period. Wetlands restoration and dam removal are the correct, long term, solution to making sure that this never happens again.

Thank you for your time.

Comment Author	Payne, Frank
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1222_1163-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_1222_1163-2	The purpose and need/project objectives establish the Lead Agencies' desires to restore fisheries. The alternatives are designed to address fish needs. The Endangered Species Act process and consultation will determine if the preferred alternative is acceptable for endangered species or if additional flows are needed.	No

GP_WI_1203_966

From: russau@yahoo.com[SMTP:RUSSAU@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Saturday, December 03, 2011 4:29:55 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: russ pearce
Organization: retired

Subject: dams

Comment 1 - Hydropower

Body: what kind of controlling fools are you anyway? these dams prduce power for many business and homes all over the area.they dont use fuel/coal or any other substance that dirtys the air. it would be smarter/cheaper to build a fish ladder instead of removeing the dams. what kind of fool would even think this one up??

Comment 2 - FERC

Comment Author	Pearce, Russ
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 03, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1203_966-1	Comment noted.	No
GP_WI_1203_966-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. The effects of each Alternative with regard to enhancing fish passage are disclosed in Section 3.3 (Aquatic Resources) as well as Section 4.4.2 of the EIS/EIR.	No

GP_EM_1121_837

From: Rhiana Martha Pearson[SMTP:NEALNRHIANAP@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 9:53:59 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear Ms. Vasquez,

Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_836

I am writing to let you know my opposition to the Klamath Dam removals. This is an unnecessary and expensive endeavor that can be accomplished in a much better way. Specifically the "Shasta Nation anatropous tunnel by pass alternative to dam removals"

Dam removals will destroy an established 100 year old aquatic and waterfowl habitat in the river and reservoirs, not to mention the long term sediment impacts which to this date have not been addressed. The cost of the Tunnel By-Pass proposal is estimated to be $50 million, or 1/6 (17%) of the cost of fish ladders and 1/20 (5%) of the cost of dam removals. A few of the goals of this project which I support are to

To prevent the destruction of the Shasta Nation's aboriginal cultural, heritage and burial sites under water behind the dams; Maintain clean Hydro-Electric Power for 70,000 homes; Maintain flood protection for downriver cities, roads, bridges, and private property; Protect property owners and property values adjacent to the river and reservoir; and to redirect funding proposed for dam removals to this project, which will have positive economic and environmental benefits for Northern California and Southern Oregon.

PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS DAM REMOVAL PROJECT TO GO FORWARD! The voters agree by 80% with this opinion. please hear and represent the people.

Respectfully submitted,

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Martha Pierce, Sprague River,OR

Comment Author	Pearson, Rhiana
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded - GP_EM_1121_836. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_EM_1121_836. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_EM_1121_836 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_837-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_497

From: RPBorrego@aol.com[SMTP:RPBORREGO@AOL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 6:01:05 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Removeing dams from Klamath River Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Ralph Penfield
Organization:

Subject: Removeing dams from Klamath River

Body: It is long past time to allow the Klamath River to flow freely. This issue has been going on to long. It is long pass due to restore the salmon and allow enough water for this to occur. Theirs been to much talk and no action. Please have the dams removed now.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Penfield, Ralph
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_497-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_848

From: Susan Penn[SMTP:SUSANPENN60@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 3:27:02 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear Ms. Vasquez,

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I am writing to express my support for alternative 2, removal of the four dams and restoration of the Klamath River.

The Native American tribes, who managed to maintain robust salmon runs for 8000 or so years before they were decimated, were some of the most prosperous tribes in North America.This wealth was created largely by the bountiful salmon runs that provided both sustenance and the basis for trading.

In the 150 years since the arrival of the Caucasians, various short-sighted practices have transformed the landscape from one of great plenty to one of unsustainability. Extensive gold mining and logging silted in many of the creeks. The dams, built to extract electricity, ensured that the pulses of water from winter storms were not strong enough to wash that silt out to the ocean. They also created water temperatures downstream that increase the risk of disease in salmon and mortality for many juveniles.

These extractive practices were put into place without a clear understanding of the devastating results. Today, however, we are beginning to comprehend the extent of the damage we have caused. We understand that another 50-year license to operate the dams would doom one of the greatest salmon runs on the earth. Forever. It would also leave the people of this region impoverished for the long run.

It is time to try to reverse this process before it is too late. I request that you remove the dams **and** restore the river.

Adopt alternative 2. Now, before it is too late.

Sincerely,
Susan Penn
PO Box 1036
Eureka, CA 95502

Comment Author	Penn, Susan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_848-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1205_968

From: gpenso@epiphany2000.com[SMTP:GPENSO@EPIPHANY2000.COM]
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2011 11:26:14 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: gail penso
Organization:

Subject: Klamath River dam removal

Body: When I lived near the Klamath River I loved to watch the salmon runs. I also loved eating locally caught salmon. Of course I haven't been able to eat or watch salmon for years since the devastating salmon die off.

As a 30 year registered nurse I write to ask for health care for the salmon and the Klamath River. The river is sick and needs healing infusions of clean water in order to survive. That means the dams blocking the flow of water must be removed as soon as possible or the river will die. The salmon will be unable to recover and we will have another eco disaster to mourn.

It's not that complicated. It has to do with private ownership of hydropower and greed. The rivers belong to the earth and all the species that thrive from its nourishment.

The dams on the river are the equivalent of jailing The Klamath. Remove the dams. Set the river free. Allow life to thrive.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Sincerely hoping for an enlightened decision,

Gail Penso, RN

Comment Author	Penso, Gail
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 05, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1205_968-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Priority / MP-180

GP_LT_1206_1172

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
DEC 06 2011
CODE | ACTION | SURNAME & DATE

October 29, 2011

Dear Director Salazar,

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I beg you to reject the Klamath Basin Recovery Agreement and Klamath Hydropower Settlement Agreement (KBRA and KHSA). Though I am firmly and emphatically in favor of dam removal and restoration, these efforts fall far short of both what is needed and the best way to achieve it.

Comment 2a - FERC

Recent events clearly show that via the FERC relicensing process, the economic reality of having to comply with the ESA will cause PacifiCorp to remove the Klamath dams, just as they have removed the Condit dam.

Under KBRA and KHSA, the FERC process for the Klamath dams has been derailed and in its place a long slow process which does not promise water for fish or dam removal has taken its place. Under the KHSA process, if dam removal comes to pass, many years down the road, it will be taxpayer subsidized. What a nice gift for PacifiCorp.

Comment 3 - KBRA

Further, the two agreements (KBRA/KHSA) are unnecessarily linked; the former has NOTHING to do with dam removal and is basically a water and power giveaway to Upper Basin farming interests, locking in farming for 50 years on Refuges which desperately need restoration to their original size and function.

Comment 4 - KHSA

Though well intentioned at the outset, these stakeholder agreements, which do NOT include ALL stakeholders and disenfranchise those who do not agree, need to be abandoned.

There needs to be a return to the FERC process regarding the Klamath dams, and PacifiCorp needs to be held responsible for its knowing purchase of a system which needs extensive change to stop the extinction of salmon.

Comment 2b - FERC

In the Upper Basin, farmers who lease refuge land for farming need to be offered "buyouts" of their leases and these public properties returned to their actual purposes for wildlife.

Comment 5 - Real Estate

These things can be accomplished using current laws and regulations without taxpayer giveaways to private parties and decades of subsidies which are at cross purposes with environmental recovery.

Thank you for your attention to my thoughts.

Sincerely,

Claire S. Perricelli

Claire Perricelli
2259 16th
Eureka
CA

SCANNED

RECEIVED
2011 NOV -3 PM 2:53
OFFICE OF THE EX

506497

Project
Control No. 11070706
Folder I.D.
Data Input & Initials

Comment Author	Perricelli, Claire
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 06, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1206_1172-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_LT_1206_1172-2	Master Response FERC-1 FERC Process Status.	No
GP_LT_1206_1172-3	Master Response ALT-8 Elimination of Alternative 8 - Dam Removal Without KBRA from Detailed Study. Commercial farming on the refuges is part of the existing conditions on the refuges. Management of all aspects of the Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuge Complex, would remain subject to its Comprehensive Conservation Plan (currently in progress), National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act, the Kuchel Act, and all other applicable laws, regulations and policies. This EIS/EIR analyzes the effect of removing the Four Facilities consistent with the KHSA and the connected KBRA. KBRA provides more reliable access to water and funds for additional wildlife habitat conservation and management, but does not predetermine refuge management. Future refuge management decisions with respect to lease land farming would be speculative and are beyond the scope of the analysis of this EIS/EIR. Though the KBRA does not dictate management of commercial farming on the refuges, the KBRA will change water delivery to irrigated agriculture and the refuges. A full analysis of the impact of Alternative 2 and 3 on waterfowl, nongame waterbirds, and habitat management by refuge is found in EIS/EIR Section 3.5. Using the Water Resource Integrated Modeling System (WRIMS), the USFWS (2012) conducted an analysis of the effects of Water Diversion Limitations, On-Project Plan, WURP, and Interim Flow and Lake Level Programs on the three National Wildlife Refuges. Generally this analysis showed that water management which would lead to additional water supply would be expected to increase the number of waterfowl using the National Wildlife Refuges. The analysis of these water management programs under KBRA found beneficial effects to the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge waterfowl, nongame waterbirds, and habitat management, and beneficial effects to Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge waterfowl, nongame waterbirds, and habitat management. For Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, the analysis indicated that overall there would be a less than significant impact as there is an adverse effect on wetland habitat and some waterfowl; however, there is a beneficial effect on other waterfowl and nongame waterbirds. For a full description of this analysis please see Draft EIS/EIR 3.5-76 to 3.5-80.	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1206_1172-4	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, and Others Oppose Dam Removal. The Klamath agreements are examples of negotiations designed to resolve longstanding legal battles over the use of water resources in the Klamath Basin. PacifiCorp, tribes, environmental, fishing and agriculture interests are using these agreements to avoid litigation. Signing the KHSA was voluntary for all signatories and no signatory was required to sign to make KHSA a valid agreement.	No
GP_LT_1206_1172-5	The Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) does not require the Lower Klamath Lake and Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges (NWR) to allow or continue lease land farming. The KBRA provides for an allocation of water to the refuges. Water required for lease land farming does not count against the Refuge Allocation (KBRA Section 15.1.2.D.i). See Klamathrestoration.gov for a copy of the KBRA. Future refuge management decisions with respect to lease land farming would be speculative and are beyond the scope of the analysis of this EIS/EIR.	No

GP_MC_1026_316

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 26, 2011
PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment 2 - Alternatives

MS. PERRICELLI: C-l-a-i-r-e P-e-r-r-i-c-e-l-l-i. I'm just a member of the public, and I would like to acknowledge the tremendous effort of scores of individuals and organizations to bring this plan forward. And while I am emphatically in favor of removal of all four dams, I'm very concerned about aspects of the Agreement which would lock in unsustainable uses of the Headwaters for the next two generations. It seems to me that we should be able to effect dam removal through the FERC relicensing process and address the upper watersheds separately, phasing out incompatible uses of the wildlife refuges as a start.

Director Salazar wants to know if dam removal is in the public interest. Aren't healthy, functioning watersheds in the public interest? I think that one is pretty much a no-brainer, but I'm not sure at all about this Agreement. Thank you.

Comment Author	Perricelli, Claire
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 26, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1026_316-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1026_316-2	Master Response ALT-4 Elimination of Alternative 8 - Dam Removal Without KBRA from Detailed Study.	No

GP_WI_1120_828

From: missfran512@aol.com[SMTP:MISSFRAN512@AOL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 9:57:15 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Fran Perry
Organization:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Subject: Dams

Body: I support Alternative 1, which says leave dams in place.

Comment Author	Perry, Fran
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1120_828-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1118_798

november 16th, 2011

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OREGON FIELD OFFICE
RECEIVED
NOV 1 6 2011
CODE | ACTION
132 | V/my 11/18

Dear Sir or madam,

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I'm writing this letter to object to the proposed removal of four dams on the Klamath River: Iron Gate, Copco I, Copco II and the JC Boyle Dams

Comment 2 - Costs

The total cost of dam removal and implementation after removal exceeds $1.9 billion. Irresponsible expenditures during a national economic crisis. Also some of the $1.9 billion will need to be paid by the State of California which itself is bankrupt, not a good or wise use of funds.

Comment 3 - Economics

The result of removing dams will have the effect of putting over several hundred farms and ranches out of permanent food production and destroy one-third (1/3) of the economic base of the County. Shasta Valley agricultural operations in 2006 ($95.15 million) amounted to 56% of total economic output for Siskiyou County.

The ripple effect of destroying food production in rural areas is not just economic, but food shortage, thus causing prices and starving the people. Also being that would be this productive land to grow on cities would not be able to grow

SCANNED
PRT-13.00
12
TIMC301
1153134
11/18/2011

food because there isn't any open space.
It seems that the true goal is to destroy the economy, starve the people, take over the land and destroy the environment; which removing dams would do.
I guess this further agenda 21 doesn't it?

God only knows when you got the idea that the only option is to remove the dams because "maintaining THE DAMS AS THEY ARE TODAY IS simply NOT A LEGAL OPTION." I wonder who decided this and if it is "law" just because something is a law doesn't mean its right moral or ethical.

Comment 4 - KHSA

In closing you could say I definitely am opposed to dam removal.

Sincerely
Meredith Perry
Yreka, Ca USA

450 N. Foothill Drive # 223
Yreka, CA 96097-2664

Comment Author	Perry, Meredith
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1118_798-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_LT_1118_798-2	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No
GP_LT_1118_798-3	Estimated changes to agricultural employment relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative are discussed in Section 3.15. Over the period of analysis, employment in the agricultural sector is anticipated to be an important part of the regional economy.	No
GP_LT_1118_798-4	Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response GEN-13 Range of Alternatives Considered. Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information.	No

GP_WI_1118_762

From: npeters@karuk.us[SMTP:NPETERS@KARUK.US]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 9:53:29 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: ALTERNATIVE 2: FULL DAM REMOVAL.
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Norlyn Peters
Organization: Karuk Tribe

Subject: ALTERNATIVE 2: FULL DAM REMOVAL.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I support Alternative 2 – full dam removal. I like fish, I like jobs, and I want to solve the Klamath Crisis!

Comment Author	Peters, Norlyn
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1118_762-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

PETERSON DESIGNWORKS 530 468 5561 11/16/11 10:59pm P. 001

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1117_750

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION OFFICIAL FILE COPY NOV 17 2011

152 Reply m 11/17

Name: Jo Peterson

Organization:

Title:

Address: PO Box 26, Fort Jones, CA 96032

Email: jo@sisgtel.net

Comments: Too often litigation is used to determine the management of our resources. The scope of the arguments is narrow leading to additional conflicts over unresolved issues. In each case there are winners and losers where hard feelings, resentment and distrust are nurtured. Repeat. The Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) attempts to do something different. I support both and the efforts put forth by many organizations of varied interests, who have come together to negotiate a solution to our dwindling fish populations in a dying river.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I support Alternative 2 - full facilities removal of 4 dams on the main stem of the Klamath River.

Thank you.

ENV-6.00
12
1190948
11/17/2011 JS

SCANNED

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Peterson, Jo
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1117_750-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1201_951

From: mev@pmpstuff.com[SMTP:MEV@PMPSTUFF.COM]
Sent: Thursday, December 01, 2011 2:09:49 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam removal on Columbia River Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Mevanwie Peterson
Organization: Peterson Metal Products

Subject: Dam removal on Columbia River

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Body: The dams on the Columbia River are serving a very valuable purpose. They help to keep our power bills reasonable, they help keep the water levels even and consistent, and they help to bring recreational dollars to local communities in the way of camping, fishing, skiing, hunting, and etc. Leave the dams in place! Enough already!

Comment Author	Peterson, Mevanwie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 01, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1201_951-1	The Proposed Action included removal of four dams on the Klamath River, not the Columbia River.	No

GP_EM_1121_840

From: Bob Petesch[SMTP:CHEMBOB@EARTHLINK.NET]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 10:54:35 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Draft EIS re: Klamath Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

November 21, 2011

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Re: Klamath Dams

Comment 1 - FERC

Dear Ms. Vasquez,

I write to you today to express my dismay that there is a plan to remove the lower four Klamath Dams and to implore you to use whatever influence you can to bring this plan to a halt.

The Dept. of Interior's Draft EIS makes a very compelling case for keeping the dams in place and enhancing fish passage systems. Favoring Alternative 4, to leave the dams in place and create fish passages, is the sensible thing to do in light of the positive environmental impact it will have. Favoring Alternative 4 will also leave the regional tribal burial sites intact and facilitate affordable clean energy to the surrounding communities.

I support Alternative 4 and urge you to do so as well. Thank you for your attention, consideration, and support.

Sincerely,
Robert Petesch

Comment Author	Petesch, Bob
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_840-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. The effects of each Alternative in regard to enhancing fish passage are disclosed in Section 3.3 (Aquatic Resources) as well as Section 4.4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The effects of each Alternative in regard to tribal burial sites are disclosed in Sections 3.13 and 4.4.12. The effects of each Alternative in regard to Greenhouse Gasses/Climate Change are disclosed in Sections 3.10 and 4.4.9.	No

GP_WI_1114_659

chembob@earthlink.net

Name: Robert Petesch
Organization:

Subject: Re: Plan to Remove Lower Four Klamath Dams

Comment 1 - FERC

Body: Dear Sirs,
I believe that the Draft EIS/EIR makes a compelling case to keep the dams in place in order to preserve and enhance safe passage for the fish and other life there. I support Alternative 4 – the NO dam removal/fish passage option. I believe that fish are an essential component of the environment there. I also want to leave the tribal burial sites intact, AND I want affordable clean energy. Please support and vote for Alternative 4.

Comment Author	Petesch, Robert
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1114_659-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. The effects of each Alternative in regard to enhancing fish passage are disclosed in Section 3.3 (Aquatic Resources)as well as Section 4.4.2 of the EIS/EIR. The effects of each Alternative in regard to tribal burial sites are disclosed in Sections 3.13 and 4.4.12. The effects of each Alternative in regard to Greenhouse Gasses/Climate Change are disclosed in Sections 3.10 and 4.4.9.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1025_243

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Ken Pough

Organization:

Title:

Address: Po Box 201 Orleans CA

Email:

Comments:

#(1) Health Safety People Propty along River.

Comment 1 - General/Other

Fix (Provid Insurance To Rive People) Need you To Fix the Propty that mest up it this projic mess up

The Change To River proble Be OK But Some one Need To Be Acountable if IT Dose Not work in latter years: Gov Agence is Doing this is one side.

you need slow Down a little look at the projick along River How Job work Deliver.

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Peugh, Ken
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1025_243-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_MC_1025_304

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 25, 2011

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ORLEANS, CALIFORNIA

MR. PEUGH: I'm Ken Peugh, K-e-n P-e-u-g-h, a resident of Orleans. I have lived in Humboldt County all my life. I lived in the lower part of the Klamath and Orleans a majority of it.

Comment 1 - Other/General

Two things I got to say, is public safety; when you remove the dams, I'm concerned because I'm a retired person and I don't have a lot of money and I'm not able to afford to buy insurance. So, what type insurance are we going to get out of you guys if this project is going to work, and if you're going to take care of it if I happen to lose my house?

Comment 2 - Out of Scope

And I've been affected, my family has been affected by the Redwood National Park in a big way. And they said they were going to provide the jobs, and they condemned our property, and they said that all these jobs are going to happen. Nothing happened. Nobody got jobs. Everybody is unemployed. They haven't developed the Redwood National Park.

Comment 3 - General/Other

So, what's going to happen is, it doesn't matter, because if the dam is out, I just want to make sure we, as the public, have our safety. And safety is a

Comment 4 - Economics

big concern of mine. And you may have addressed that and I haven't had a chance to read the report or anything else. And you already may have answered that problem. But jobs is an important thing, and where is the guarantee? That's another thing. Where is the guarantee?

And good luck on doing that, if you do that. Government agencies are government agencies. I've seen them come in Orleans and -- just like this meeting here, and they leave, and six weeks later you found out it's too late. They already did it. So, good luck.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

Comment Author	Peugh, Ken
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1025_304-1	The dams themselves do not act as flood control, and only slow the flood peaks down rather than lowering the high water mark. However, some minimal changes to the 100 year flood plain have been identified in the document. Structures subjected to increased risk as a result of these changes have been identified in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.6, Flood Hydrology, p. 27-31. Mitigation measures H-1 and H-2 are provided in Section 3.6, p. 39 and 40. Dam removal will be completed according to current U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) safety and engineering standards. Flows from the drawdown of the reservoirs will be kept within the range of historic flows will pose minimal safety risks to downstream homes.	No
GP_MC_1025_304-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1025_304-3	EIS/EIR Section 3.18, Public Health & Safety, addresses public health and safety effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives. Section 3.6, Flood Hydrology, addresses flood hydrology effects, including the proposed reservoir drawdown, subsequent changes to the 100 yr flood plain, and proposed mitigation measures.	No
GP_MC_1025_304-4	The regional economic effects analyzed within Section 3.15, including employment impacts, are estimates. The estimated employment impacts are modeled to occur in the identified economic regions and would be available to residents in the region. Estimated jobs include full time, part time, and temporary positions. Full realization of employment changes may not occur to the extent that businesses deal with changes in spending by adjusting the workload of existing employees or increasing their use of capital relative to labor. The purpose of the Draft EIS/EIR is to display impacts, not to guarantee employment.	No

GP_EM_1121_858

From: Pam Phelps[SMTP:PAMPAM1956@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 5:49:31 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Dear Department on the Interior and Bureau of Reclamation:
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

We do not support removing the Klamath River Dams for the following reasons:

- The sediment will destroy salmon runs, spawning holes, and other prime wildlife habitats.
- Hydro power is clean and renewable energy that provides jobs for locals.
- It will cut hundreds of millions of tax dollars at a time of great time of financial crisis in California.
- It will cause millions more to be spent on grants for fake and fraudulent restoration.

Please rule in favor of alternative one, no action, or alternative four, keep dams with fish ladders.

Comment 2 - FERC

Thank you,
Todd and Pam Phelps

Comment Author	Phelps, Pam
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_858-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Property taxes currently paid are described in EIS/EIR Section 3.15, Socioeconomics. Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No
GP_EM_1121_858-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1218_1088

From: rawdirt@easystreet.net[SMTP:RAWDIRT@EASYSTREET.NET]
Sent: Sunday, December 18, 2011 10:57:10 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: return the salmon rivers Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: robert m phillips
Organization:

Subject: return the salmon rivers

Body: I was born in Medford. I believe that the dams were a short sighted action which has caused great harm to salmon.

I fully support removal of the dams.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Phillips, Robert
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1218_1088-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_836

From: lildan7@juno.com[SMTP:LILDAN7@JUNO.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 9:51:36 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: No Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment 2 - Alternatives

Dear Ms. Vasquez,

I am writing to let you know my opposition to the Klamath Dam removals. This is an unnecessary and expensive endeavor that can be accomplished in a much better way. Specifically the "Shasta Nation anatropous tunnel by pass alternative to dam removals"

Dam removals will destroy an established 100 year old aquatic and waterfowl habitat in the river and reservoirs, not to mention the long term sediment impacts which to this date have not been addressed. The cost of the Tunnel By-Pass proposal is estimated to be $50 million, or 1/6 (17%) of the cost of fish ladders and 1/20 (5%) of the cost of dam removals. A few of the goals of this project which I support are to prevent the destruction of the Shasta Nation's aboriginal cultural, heritage and burial sites under water behind the dams; Maintain clean Hydro-Electric Power for 70,000 homes; Maintain flood protection for downriver cities, roads, bridges, and private property; Protect property owners and property values adjacent to the river and reservoir; and to redirect funding proposed for dam removals to this project, which will have positive economic and environmental benefits for Northern California and Southern Oregon. please do not allow for the removal of these dams. Thank you for your serious contemplation and understanding in the VERY sensitive issue.

Respectfully submitted,

@

Dianne Pierce, Klamath Falls,OR

Comment Author	Pierce, William
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_836-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1121_836-2	Master Response ALT-2 Elimination of Alternative 10 - Fish Bypass: Bogus Creek Bypass and Alternative 11 - Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing from Detailed Study.	No

GP_EM_1121_1073

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 10:00:32 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: : Dams on the Klamath
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> william pisani <wap1@pacbell.net> 11/21/2011 3:53 AM >>>

The Liberals are screaming "people before profits", when the idiots start tearing out dams you are tearing down real people. People before some frikken fish, unless of course the fish has a cure for cancer or some magic to make Liberals just go away.

Bill Pisani
clayton, CA

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Pisani, William
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_1073-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_WI_1111_499

From: helenpitre@hotmail.com[SMTP:HELENPITRE@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 9:52:53 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River restorationn Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Helen Pitre
Organization:

Subject: Klamath River restorationn

Body: I am old enough to remember when the Klamath was a mighty river, filled with fish.The changes to the river that have occurred over my lifetime are tragic. It is time to correct the damage in as far as possible.
I support removal of all dams on the Klamath and its tributaries as soon as possible. And I urge immediate policy change to minimum flow at the Iron Gate gauge of 1300 cu ft/sec. I support all efforts to restore wetlands in the upper Klamath Basin, and measures to improve condition on the Trinity, the Scott and the Salmon rivers as well.
Sincerely, Helen Pitre

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment 2 - KBRA

Comment Author	Pitre, Helen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_499-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_1111_499-2	The KBRA contains a variety of restoration programs for wetland restoration and habitat restoration that includes the Scott and Shasta Rivers as well as the mainstem of the Klamath River. The Trinity River has been specifically excluded from the KBRA as there is already a Trinity River Restoration Program. Please see Klamathrestoration.gov for a copy of the KBRA. The EIS/EIR analyzes the potential effects of these restoration activities programmatically.	No

GP_MC_1020_233

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. GARETH PLANK: Gareth Plank, G-a-r-e-t-h

P-l-a-n-k, and I'm probably going to irritate all of you.

Do I get counted until I start getting the mic

working here?

Comment 1 - KHSA

We shouldn't be here. This is advertised as a

Klamath settlement. 40 percent of the tribes aren't on

board, two farmers from the upper basin were on board, the

farmers and ranchers from out of the basin were

systematically excluded, the Trinity River is

systematically excluded, one of the prime hatcheries,

prime breeding ground for salmon, excluded. And this is

called a settlement.

We shouldn't be talking about dams yet. This

is -- what is his name -- Pope Louis the 23rd -- a little

schism taking place in the fifteenth century?

I don't know, let's talk about and do a little

trial against Hoosh for blasphemy. No, they wanted to get

rid of a dirty pope.

We should not be talking about settlement until

there is a settlement.

I met with Mr. Tucker, Mr. Reed, the folks --

the Yurok, the Klamath, the Hoopa -- there should be a settlement. Let's get a settlement where we have stakeholders involved and then talk about what we are going to do. Let's don't talk until there is actually people coming together.

Two dozen environmentalists, two ranchers, and 60 percent of the tribes does not make a settlement.

Comment 2 - Other/General

What I brought here today is the paper. This is an advertisement you sent out to this community that says: Come join us, we want to hear what you have to say. Could you tell me what time it says to show up on this?

40 years ago, we went to the moon. Why can't, today, our government tell us what time to attend a meeting to talk about something that affects all of our lives from Retwill (phonetic) to Chiloquin. No time lot, come show up, be here, come share with us.

What I would like to do is I would like to thank Mr. Spain for talking about honesty and facts. Intellectual honesty is what we need to do first so I want to applaud him.

And the other thing I would like to do is, on behalf of Berkshire, Hathaway, and Mr. Buffett, thank Craig Tucker, because Craig Tucker said that the poor

people of California will disproportionally pay to remove the dam and Mr. Buffett can take his extra three- or four hundred million dollars and double up on his investment at Goldman Sachs.

How did he get it? Because they got blackmailed, and the state department says, we will give you quid pro quo, get rid of the dams, save some money.

So on behalf of Berkshire Hathaway, thanks for putting a couple hundred billion bucks in Mr. Buffett's pocket to buy more Goldman Sachs. That's very thoughtful.

Again, we shouldn't be here until we do have a settlement. Let's get together and finish up the settlement process before many stakeholders were excluded, and then go forward from there. So I think somebody has commented prematurely, but let's have a settlement before we start talking about what we are going to do.

Thank you very much.

Comment Author	Plank, Gareth
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_233-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No
GP_MC_1020_233-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_WI_1112_582

From: sparhawk84@hotmail.com[SMTP:SPARHAWK84@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2011 6:59:47 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Non-Support Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Ralph Pohlman
Organization:

Comment 1 - FERC

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal Non-Support

Body: I support Alternative 4- NO dam removal/ Fish passage option.
I want to leave the tribal burial sites intact by doing so.
I want affordable clean energy.

Comment Author	Pohlman, Ralph
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1112_582-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. The effects of each Alternative in regard to enhancing fish passage are disclosed in Section 3.3 (Aquatic Resources) as well as Section 4.4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The effects of each Alternative in regard to tribal burial sites are disclosed in Sections 3.13 and 4.4.12. The effects of each Alternative in regard to Greenhouse Gasses/Climate Change are disclosed in Sections 3.10 and 4.4.9.	No

GP_EM_1020_077

From: kirsten potter[SMTP:KPOTTERMOM@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2011 3:29:29 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: 2 for dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

To U.S. Bureau of Reclamation,

Please place these comments in the Public Comments file regarding Klamath River dams removal.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

My wife, Kirsten E. Potter, and I feel it is by far the best action to remove all 4 dams.

Comment 2 - Costs

Comment 3 - Water Quality

It would be cheaper for us rate payers than building the fish ladders [that were supposed to be there decades ago.] It will improve the environment by ending the high water temps producing toxic algae blooms and disease organizims that kill salmon. It will improve our jobs picture by the construction work, short term, and better commercial fishing and better tourism for sport fishing. It will be better for wildlife in general restoring river habitat in a river canyon with a real river, not a series of scummy, hot lakes. It will help the majority of farmers by stopping the lawyers fighting and give more stability for water deleiveries. It goes with what our community voted on that the majority want the KBRA to happen.

Comment 4 - Economics

Comment 6 - Other/General

Comment 5 - Terrestrial/Wildlife

Comment 7 - Water Supply/Rights

Dave and Kirsten Potter
3930 Rio Vista Way
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

Comment Author	Potter, Dave & Kirsten
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1020_077-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1020_077-2	Master Response COST-2 Cost of FERC Relicensing.	No
GP_EM_1020_077-3	Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. Master Response AQU-27 Disease.	No
GP_EM_1020_077-4	Section 3.15 of the Draft EIS/EIR evaluates potential increases in jobs as a result of construction for dam removal and long-term positive economic effects to the commercial and sport fishing industries under the Proposed Action.	No
GP_EM_1020_077-5	Master Response TERR-4 Terrestrial Resource Mitigation.	No
GP_EM_1020_077-6	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_EM_1020_077-7	In Section 3.8, Water Supply/Water Rights, the EIS/EIR describes water rights and supplies in the study area. P. 3.8-9 shows the water rights associated with the Four Facilities. These rights are held by PacifiCorp for power generation, a small agricultural operation, and fish propagation at the hatchery. Because the Four Facilities do not provide other water supply for municipal and agricultural use, removal would not directly affect agricultural or municipal water supply. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes the potential for indirect effects from removal, such as sedimentation of diversion pumps downstream from Iron Gate Dam or changes in surface water flows (p. 3.8-14 through 3.8-17). These impacts were found to be less than significant. The KBRA would improve the reliability of water deliveries through several programs (see p. 3.8-18 through 3.8-24).	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1020_288

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathRestoration@

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Anna Powell
Organization: Klamath River resident
Title: concerned citizen
Address: 505 Weitchpec CA 95546
Email: N/A

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comments: It is not financially ~~Pleasb~~ or economically smart to keep the Dams in or relisence the Dams and build fish latters. Make a good bussiness decision. Removal of the Dams would generate a strong local economy by creating jobs for local people.

The Dams are old, not generating much electricity, take them Down.

they are not good for people or fish!

— Make a good bussiness decision —

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Powell, Anna
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1020_288-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

NOV-19-2011 16:08 FROM:DEMUTH WINERY 707 575 7247 TO:19169785055 P.1/1

GP_LT_1123_926

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
NOV 23 2011

CODE	ACTION	SURNAME & DATE
150	✓	my 11/29

To: Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825
Fax: 916.978.5055

Subject: Klamath River Restoration

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

This comment is in support of taking all measures necessary for increasing the run of wild salmon on the Klamath River. Remove ALL the dams and restore the wetlands and marshes that will improve conditions and increase water flows so that salmon can once again flourish and swim freely in their natural habitat.

When I grew up in Del Norte County, it was noted for its "salmon season" activities. Businesses affiliated with the fishing industry hummed. Motels and RV parks were full as people from outside the county came to partake, observe, and enjoy the area for all that it has to offer. One could always go to a fish market in Crescent City and buy the days catch. Today local fish markets in the area are gone and salmon from the Klamath has become a rare treat.

Restoring the Klamath River salmon runs will result in an improvement in both fishing and related economies within its area. Why should we have to import salmon from fish farms outside the United States and from Alaska when salmon fishing for Coho and Chinook salmon was a way of life in Del Norte County before the river water was diverted? Fishing is the culture of Del Norte County. I urge you to restore the Klamath River and return this culture to the county.

Lyn Pozzi Demuth
Email: demuth@sonic.net

SCANNED

Comment Author	Pozzi Demuth, Lyn
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 23, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1123_926-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1223_1171

23 December 2011

Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento CA 95825

Re: Klamath DEIS/DEIR Comment

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I am in favor of removal of Iron Gate, Copco 2, Copco 1 and J. C. Boyle dams, as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3. Complete removal as proposed in alternative 2 is preferable unless the availability of sufficient funds precludes this option.

My support is tempered by the failure of these proposals to fully address the problems of the Klamath Basin. I feel that this is a lost opportunity that is unlikely to present itself in the foreseeable future.

Removal of these four "middle" dams will certainly open the potential for free fish passage over large stretches of the system, but without addressing the upper basin, this will be literally a "road to nowhere." Anoxic conditions above Keno Dam, which are caused largely by agricultural activities in the upper basin – are not at all adequately addressed here. For this reason, it is likely this will be a rather hollow victory for the fish in the basin and those that depend on them.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

Tom Pratum
4733 Aster Ave.
McKinleyville, CA 95519
tkp@whatcomssl.org

Comment Author	Pratum, Tom
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 23, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1223_1171-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_565

From: tprice41@gmail.com[SMTP:TPRICE41@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 7:49:56 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Tony Price
Organization: personal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath River dam removal

Body: Overwhelming evidence supports removal of the four dams. It will save money for local and state governments, help restore an endangered species in this area, and promoted recreational opportunities for this area and the local communities.

Comment Author	Price, Tony
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_565-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1114_662

From: gq140@yahoo.com[SMTP:GQ140@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 2:36:29 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: EIS/EIR
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Geoff Pryor
Organization:

Subject: EIS/EIR

Body: These dams on the Klamath must be removed for future generations of fish to achieve their full potential. The fact is keeping the dams is not sound financially.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Pryor, Geoff
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1114_662-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1223_1167

From: jeremyquinlan@yahoo.com[SMTP:JEREMYQUINLAN@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2011 8:26:39 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jeremy Quinlan
Organization: Weight Forward Films

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Dam removal on the Klamath watersheds is of upmost importance to the anadromous fish of the Klamath watershed, including Shasta, Scott, Salmon and Trinity Rivers along with a host of smaller streams.
The dams currently block fish passage to over a hundred miles of spawning habitat, greatly reducing Salmonids ability to return to their abundance of the past.
This would rejuvenate the fishery, enhance tourism and stimulate the economics in the counties in which the watershed flows.
Please consider removing the dams at an earlier period, so that the Klamath watershed can return to it's once great, free-flowing stature and Salmonid runs.

Comment Author	Quinlan, Jeremy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 23, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1223_1167-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_146

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING
(Directly to Court Reporter

MR. KEVIN QUINN: Q-u-i-n-n, Kevin.

Comment 1 - Hydropower

I find this process bewildering. The same federal government that is trying to encourage energy and sustainable energy sources seems to be recommending removal of the dependable, green energy source that serves 70,000 households. I'm bewildered by the failure to incorporate, by KBRA, the impact of warming temperatures and changing rainfall patterns on the fish population. No guarantee from KBRA supporters or the government can be enforced between them and the climate. Any potential, possible, and speculative benefits from dam removal could be easily eliminated by escalating temperatures and the return to the declining annual rainfall patterns that have characterized the recent years.

Comment 2 - Fish

Comment 3 - Global Climate Change/GHGs

The benefits of dam removal to the fish population appear to be optimistic beyond all reason. Despite the hopes of the Klamath Tribes and the hopes of KBRA supporters, dam removal will not return the river to pre-dam conditions. The many decades of accumulated sediment that is stored behind the dams will not be washed downstream in two or three months unless those two or

Comment 4 - Fish

Comment 5 - Sediment Transport

three months include rainfall of Biblical proportions.

Unless KBRA supporters can prove that the

rainfall volume of one average year can disperse a

sediment accumulation of 90 years, the more likely result

will be that that sediment will slowly move downstream as

a semi-toxic sludge field, destroying what remains of the

downstream fish habitat forever.

Comment 6 - Water Supply/Rights

So I'm bewildered that in an area described as

high desert, anyone should even be considering removal of

the one means of regulating our water supply.

Dam removal can and will be a success if the

basin urban and agricultural communities that are

dependent upon them are removed at the same time. That

may not be the stated objective of the KBRA, but it

appears to me to be the most likely result.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Quinn, Kevin
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_146-1	Comment noted.	No
GP_MC_1018_146-2	The Chinook salmon Expert Panel assessment was that the Proposed Action [Alternatives 2 and 3] offers greater potential than the Current Conditions for Chinook salmon to tolerate climate change and changes in marine survival (Goodman et al. 2011; p. 19). The Draft EIS/EIR discusses the impacts of global warming in Chapter 3, Affected Climate Environment/Environmental Consequences and Chapter 4, Cumulative Effects. The KBRA provides for an assessment of how long-term climate change may affect fisheries and communities in the Klamath Basin (KBRA Section 19.4). The technical assessment of climate change is scheduled to occur in 2013 (KBRA Appendix C-2).	No
GP_MC_1018_146-3	Projected future climate changes scenarios are included in the impact analysis of all the alternatives. Climate change scenarios are included in the analysis of the benefits of the Proposed Action. As described in 3.10.3.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, “The Proposed Action is better positioned to respond to the changes in climate conditions compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative”. The Chinook salmon Expert Panel assessment was that the Proposed Action [Alternatives 2 and 3] offers greater potential than the Current Conditions for Chinook salmon to tolerate climate change and changes in marine survival (Goodman et al. 2011; p. 19). The Draft EIS/EIR discusses the impacts of global warming in Chapter 3, Affected Climate Environment/Environmental Consequences and Chapter 4, Cumulative Effects. The Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) provides for an assessment of how long-term climate change may affect fisheries and communities in the Klamath Basin (KBRA Section 19.4). The technical assessment of climate change is scheduled to occur in 2013 (KBRA Appendix C-2).	No
GP_MC_1018_146-4	The effects of each of the Alternatives on fish populations are described in Section 3.3 of the EIS/EIR. Access to habitat within the Hydroelectric Project reach would benefit coho salmon by: a) extending the range and distribution of the species thereby increasing the coho salmon’s reproductive potential; b) increasing genetic diversity in the coho stocks; c) reducing the species vulnerability to the impacts of degradation; and d) increasing the abundance of the coho population (Administrative Law Judge Decision at 86, Ultimate Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law 9: Administrative Law Judge Decision at 36, FOF 7-16)(Administrative Law Judge 2006). Master Response AQU-5 Will Benefit all Salmonids.	No

Comment Author	Quinn, Kevin
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Master Response AQU-6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook.	
	Master Response AQU-14 Expert Panel Resident Fish.	
	Master Response AQU-15 Expert Panel for Lamprey.	
	Master Response AQU-7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success.	
	Master Response AQU-23 Evaluation of Dam Removal and Restoration Anadromy (EDRRA) Model.	
	Master Response AQU-26 Increased Abundance for Harvest and Tribes.	
GP_MC_1018_146-5	Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants.	No
	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish.	
	Master Response AQU-20 Bedload Sediment and Fish Habitat.	
	Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging.	
GP_MC_1018_146-6	Master Response WRWS-1 Effects to Agricultural Water Supply.	No

GP_MC_1018_117

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---
STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. ANDREA RABE: I'm Andrea Rabe, R-a-b-e.

I'm Upper Basin Klamath irrigator.

I take exception to the purpose of these statements. I would agree with the gentleman from Siskiyou County that the purpose of these statements is predisposed to come to the conclusion of dam removal. If you read the need for the proposed action it's to advance the restoration of some salmonid fisheries in the Klamath Basin consistent with the KHSA and connected KBRA. Now, while I would agree that the need to advance restoration of salmonid fisheries in the Klamath Basin is probably appropriate, the second half of that need statement makes it so that the only conclusion you can come to is to implement the KHSA and the associated KBRA, otherwise you will not satisfy the need of that statement. Therefore, as I said, I will say again tonight, I think you need to go back and look at the need statement and make an appropriate need for the environmental and social issues that you're trying to address through the advancement of restoration of the salmonid fisheries in

Comment 1 - NEPA

the Klamath Basin and leave out those conditions.

If you wrote the alternative based on the need to advance water restoration and the KHSA and KBRA were the best alternative, those would rise to the top in the list of alternatives. They don't need to be preconditioned in the needs statement.

Furthermore, if you look at the need for process, it also talks about looking at associated cumulative actions. I'm concerned when you look at what will happen in some of the alternatives of the Keno Dam, you talk about returning it to the Department of the Interior. But it doesn't talk about as to what cost, what will happen to it, how will the fish passage be taken care of, will the dam be removed, will the dam have fish passage added to it, if that's appropriate, and what costs and impacts are associated with that.

Comment 2 - Keno Transfer

If that action of returning it to DOI and leads to further action of the dam, is a cumulative action, those impacts and those economics need to be included in this analysis.

Comment 3 - NEPA

And so I would encourage you to go back and look at the entire NEPA regulations. And the intent is to have a non-biased scientific process by which we can have public input and go through procedures to have the best

scientific conclusion.

Unfortunately, when you predisposition your need

and purpose statement the rest of the process becomes

flawed. Thank you.

Comment Author	Rabe, Andrea
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_117-1	Master Response N/CP-16 Purpose and Need/Project Objectives. Master Response N/CP-18 Process to Select Alternative for Detailed Analysis.	No
GP_MC_1018_117-2	According to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA Section 7.5.2), if the Secretary of the Interior makes an Affirmative Determination (decides it will advance salmonid restoration and is in the public interest to remove the Four Facilities), the Secretary shall then accept transfer of the title to the Keno facility. The transfer would take place at the time of removal of the Four Facilities. There would be no cost to transfer other than fees for document recording. Following the transfer, Interior shall operate Keno Dam in compliance with Applicable Law and to provide water levels upstream of Keno Dam for diversion and canal maintenance consistent with Contract #14-06-200-3579A executed on January 4, 1968, between the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and PacifiCorp (then COPCO) and historic practice. In plain language, the operation of Keno Dam will not change from the current operation and the dam will not be removed. There is currently a functional fish ladder on Keno dam. Should there be any future modifications to the ladder by the federal government or with the use of federal funds, that modification would be a separate federal action subject to appropriate law including the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Considering any future action is not a part of the Proposed Action in this EIS/EIR it is not a cumulative effect. Other cumulative effects of the transfer of Keno Dam are discussed in EIS/EIR Chapter 4, Cumulative Effects.	No
GP_MC_1018_117-3	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No

GP_MC_1020_196

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. REA: My name is James Rae, J-a-m-e-s R-e-a.

I came to Siskiyou County in 1975 and we lived

on the river in Horse Creek. I think that what I might

add to the discussion tonight might create some more light

rather than heat, but I would respond a little bit to the

previous speaker in saying that the supreme law of the

land, according to the Constitution, is the Constitution

of the United States.

I would like to bring to the attention of

anyone that is interested, a book that I began to study in

1960, and I found it helpful with regard to the problems

we are trying to address here. It's called Multiple

Purpose River Development; the authors are Krutilla and

Eckstein, and I recommend the book to anybody that is

interested in our problem, because they describe a river

basin problem in many, many ways, and there are many, many

considerations.

I'd like to read a little bit from something in

that book -- it won't take long -- it says: We are

maximizing the value of a system -- meaning the river

system -- output requires a high degree of coordination in

reservoir operations. Institutional arrangement to permit

this degree of integrated management must be provided.

I would add, the American way to do something

as complicated as this is, as we have seen, to have a

whole bunch of experts put together a lot of ideas and

then try to make a sensible, simple arrangement about it.

But the American way is, after you have done that, let the

people vote on it.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

You are in the Yreka area, people have voted on

it, and I think most people are aware the result is

emphatically to not remove the dams.

That is not the whole answer and I recognize

that, but that answer needs to be heavily considered when

the American way is to put something up for a vote and,

basically, we allow our elected representatives to make

the decisions -- hopefully, they are informed and we are

informed -- but by a vote. I think that's the essence of

my response.

Comment Author	Rae, James
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_196-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1107_392

From: ramage@cruzio.com[SMTP:RAMAGE@CRUZIO.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2011 12:38:18 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Remove Klamath Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Kelsey Ramage
Organization:

Subject: Remove Klamath Dams

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Be on the right side of history.
Remove the dams.

Restore this river to functioning, living habitat for the fish, the people and all the creatures.

Restore the beauty of this river, welcome the salmon finally returning and re-establishing, marvel at the many tourists coming to savor the healing of this magnificent river.

Comment Author	Ramage, Kelsey
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 07, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1107_392-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_116

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---
STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MR. STEVE RAPALYEA: Steve Rapalyea, R-a-p-a-l-y-e-a.

Comment 1 - Water Quality

My biggest comment here I guess tonight, I don't know that I find any reference in the studies to the Klamath River's history before the existence by the settlers and the gold miners. The journals from the expeditions of McLoughlin, Peter Skene Ogden, Ray Mcgee, and others, indicated the Klamath River is not this pristine gem as far as mainstream goes as we were led to believe. At times they couldn't even let their horses drink water from the Klamath River. This was before there were any impacts.

These people had no axe to grind whatsoever. They were just writing down their observations of the conditions that surrounded them as their expeditions went on.

Comment 2 - Fish

As far as the amount of fish flow in the river, the early records from the commercial fisheries indicated there were almost no spring run fish before Copco Dam was built and very few Coho. There is so few they couldn't economically fish for spring run fish, and after I think

it was one year discontinued fishing for it.

Those might have been the only fish that could get

to the Upper Basin because at times the Klamath River was

dry in the fall before the Klamath River Dam was built.

Comment 3 - Alternatives

Then we have the study that was recently done from

the geologists that were up here. They figured how few

fish came to the Upper Basin or how irregular, irregular

periods they occurred here, they should make passage for

those fish.

Comment 4 - Fish

But for a period of 6900 years they found 15,000

bones; only 191 were identifiable as salmonid bones. And

the only evidence they had that they maybe didn't walk

here or swam here is because they found smear (sic) bones.

So they are making the assumption the fish swam to the

Upper Basin. But they have no way to factually prove

that.

There is other stuff like from California Fish &

Game Report No. 34, produced in 1930, that tells about

transplants to the Klamath River. It also gives the end

counts. This last year, according to the Fish & Games'

website, they had enough female salmon, using the lower

egg count for Klamath River salmon, which average

something like 3768 versus almost twice that much for

Sacramento River fish. They had enough females return

this year for the Klamath systems, that includes the

Trinity, for something like 47,600,000 eggs.

Before any of the dams were built, the most eggs

they ever took, and had stations on both rivers, was 50

million eggs.

I will kind of let some of the time back. I'm

done.

Comment Author	Rapalyea, Stephen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_116-1	Master Response WQ-16 Upper Klamath Basin Historically Productive but Land Use Exacerbates Problem. Master Response WQ-4B Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. Along with KBRA and TMDL implementation, dam removal will improve water quality in the Klamath River and support numerous designated beneficial uses.	No
GP_MC_1018_116-2	Historically, spring-run Chinook salmon in the Klamath Basin were very important (Myers et al. 1997, National Research Council 2004, Snyder 1931) and, according to some sources, substantially outnumbered fall-run Chinook salmon (Gatschet 1890; Spier 1930). Currently, in contrast to fall-runs, spring-run abundance is at only 10 percent of historical levels (Myers et al. 1997). Huntington (2006) reasoned that they likely accounted for the majority of the Upper Klamath Basin's actual salmon production under pristine conditions, but were apparently in substantial decline by the early 1900s. The cause of the decline of the Klamath River spring-run Chinook salmon prior to Copco 1 Dam has been attributed to dams, overfishing and irrigation, and largely to hydraulic mining operations (Coots 1962; Snyder 1931). With hydraulic mining operations now outlawed, spring-run Chinook salmon would no longer be subject to one of their most significant past threats in the Klamath River (Hamilton et al. 2011). [Note: Other citations in this paragraph are included in Hamilton et al. 2011]. With regard to numbers of coho, Snyder 1931 states that in 1925 and 1926, 295 and 1,608 silver [coho] salmon appeared at the Klamathon Racks (p. 16 and p. 91). The Klamathon Racks were located near the historic town of Klamathon (approx. river mile 183). Snyder, (1931) also reports canneries operating at the mouth of the Klamath captured and processed coho salmon between 1914 and 1918 (pg 88) and that no effort has been made to catch these fish (coho) since 1919 (p. 16). Earlier egg take records from the Klamathon Racks document over 2.1 million coho eggs were collected in 1910 (CFGC 1913). Larger numbers of coho eggs were reported taken at the Klamath Racks between 1913 and 1916 (CFGC 1913; Cobb 1931; Fortune 1966). The Lead Agencies are aware that under historical conditions, prior to the development of the Klamath Irrigation Project, there were rare occasions when strong southerly winds at Upper Klamath Lake created seiches that greatly reduced flows at Link River. Estimates of the unimpaired or natural flow in the Klamath River have been developed by Reclamation (2005) and Hardy et	No

Comment Author	Rapalyea, Stephen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	al. (2006a). Reclamation (2005) estimated that in critically dry water years, for the months of August and September, mean monthly flows at Keno Dam (90 percent exceedence) would be 520 cfs and 560 cfs, respectively. Review of historical flow data at Keno Dam (USGS Gage # 11519500) for water years from 1905 through 1913 show that the lowest mean daily flow recorded never fell below 755 cfs. Following the construction of Copco 1 Dam in 1918, hydroelectric peaking operations reduced the mean daily flows in the Klamath River near Fall Creek (USGS Gage# 11512500) to levels below 100 cfs on 50 occasions between water years 1931 and 1937. Instantaneous flow levels may have been lower. Thus, hydropower peaking between 1918 and the construction of Iron Gate Dam to re-regulate flows in 1962 likely explain reports of the lower river "running dry". Under the Proposed Action a more natural hydrograph and elimination of peaking means these extreme low flows would not occur. Upper Klamath Lake holds 83 percent of the total storage capacity of the reservoirs on the Klamath River (FERC 2007) and approximately 98 percent of active storage. Link Dam controls Upper Klamath Lake and would remain under all alternatives. Associated reservoirs for J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams contain 14 percent of the total storage capacity and only 2 percent of the active storage on the river. The purpose for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project facilities is power generation, and although the operation of these facilities can alter flow patterns (power peaking) with in this reach, the operation of these facilities does not create additional storage of water that could be used to supplement flows in the river downstream. The total amount of active storage available within the four hydroelectric reservoirs is only 11,749 acre-feet and release of this pool would eliminate the ability of these projects to generate hydropower. The presence of the reservoirs actually reduces the annual volume of water that would otherwise flow downstream because of evaporative losses related to the large surface area created by the impoundments. Removal of the hydroelectric project reservoirs will result in a slight increase in flow as the evaporative losses would be reduced. Evaporation from the surface of the reservoirs is currently about 11,000 acre-feet/year and after dam removal the evapotranspiration in the same reaches is expected to be approximately 4,800 acre-feet/year, resulting in a gain in flow to the Klamath River of approximately 6,200 acre-feet/year (Reclamation 2012d).	

Comment Author	Rapalyea, Stephen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	The presence of the lower four dams on the Klamath River does not increase the amount of flow that would otherwise be available to anadromous fish.	
GP_MC_1018_116-3	Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information.	No
GP_MC_1018_116-4	The comment refers to the document titled "The Use of Archaeological Fish Remains to Establish Predevelopment Salmonid Biogeography in the Upper Klamath Basin" by Virginia L. Butler, Alexander E. Stevenson, Jessica A. Miller, Dongya Y. Yang, Camilla F. Speller and Nicole Misarti (Butler et al., 2010). The authors explain the rationale and steps taken to determine if the fish were caught locally or transported to the area from outside locations (Butler et al. 2010, p. 43-47). To summarize, authors used: • Ethnographic records. Records of Salmon butchering in the Pacific Northwest included descriptions on preparing the carcass for storage. Although there was variation in techniques used to preserve salmon, most practices were guided by the concern to reduce the amount of oil and fat in the carcass to prevent spoilage. One primary technique involved removing the fattiest portions of the body and then cooking and consuming these portions immediately or processing and storing them apart from the rest of the body. The head is particularly fatty and apparently for this reason was generally processed differently and apart from the trunk. Heads required longer drying times, more heat to dry them and were stored separately from the trunk when they were preserved. These records suggest fish traded in to the Upper Klamath Basin would not be moved whole, but rather in parts. Given transport costs and spoilage concerns, the head would tend to be less commonly transported than the paired fins or vertebrae, which might move with dried fillets. The archaeological fish record resulting from fish transported to the area would tend to have disproportionate frequencies of elements associated with the head and relatively more elements associated with the trunk or paired fins. Locally caught fish should have much more even representation of body parts. Despite small sample sizes, site collections generally contain skeletal elements from all parts of the body, while vertebrae tend to be underrepresented. • Site function. Ethnographic and archaeological studies of hunter-gatherer landuse have demonstrated that occupation duration (all-year vs. seasonal) and the nature of use (residential village vs. specialized camp) accrue different types of materials. Residential sites with longer-term occupation are points on the	No

Comment Author	Rapalyea, Stephen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	landscape where local and foreign goods tend to accumulate. Short-term camps (such as fishing camps) would tend to reflect a much narrower range of activities than residential villages, and therefore, would not tend to accrue goods from far afield. Archaeological remains from such sites should reflect processing of local resources. The expectation is that there to be differences in body part representation between residential bases (suggesting fish brought in to the area) versus fishing camps (suggesting local capture and processing). Comparison of body part representation however, between the four residential bases and the two specialized fishing camps did not suggest any differences. The authors concluded “In sum, while small sample sizes make it difficult to rigorously evaluate whether salmonids were caught locally or not, the presence of all body parts at project sites is consistent with local procurement. The most probable explanation for the presence of salmonid remains in Upper Klamath Basin archaeological sites is that they were caught in local rivers and streams.” (Butler 2010 p. 47)	

GP_EM_1015_266

From: Stephen Rapalyea, rapalyea@wildblue.net

Comment 1- Water Quality

I find no reference in the studies to the Klamath River's history before it was influenced by settlers or gold miners.The journals from the expeditions of McLaughlin,Freemont,Peter Skene Ogden, the Redick McKee treaty expedition and other early writings present us with an entirely different picture of the main stem Klamath than what is envisioned in the draft EIS/EIR. These writings show us a river with extremely poor water quality.

Comment 2 - Fish

There is no evidence of salmon making it to Upper KLamath Lake on any regular basis. Further, the early catch records for the in stream commercial fishery show a very small spring run and almost no coho. This in stream fishery was below the confluence of the main stem and the Trinity River. (see Division Fish and Game of California Bulletin #34,"The Salmon and Fishery of the Klamath River" by John O. Snyder,Stanford University)

I believe if the dams are removed, beside removing valuable infrastructure, the results will be worse than disappointing and result in the eventual removal of Keno and Link River dams in an effort to reach un-achievable water quality do to naturally occurring back ground levels of phosphorous in Upper Klamath Lake.

Comment 3 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Rapalyea, Stephen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 15, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1015_266-1	Master Response WQ-16 Upper Klamath Basin Historically Productive but Land Use Exacerbates Problem. Water quality in the Klamath River is linked to that of Upper Klamath Lake; as presented in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.3 to 3.2.3.7 (p. 3.2-23 to 3.3-30) and Appendix Section C.2 to C.6 (p. C-8 to C-63), extensive monitoring and research has been conducted for development of the Upper Klamath Lake TMDLs that shows the lake is a major source of nitrogen and phosphorus loading to the Klamath River and this nutrient loading can negatively affect other water quality parameters such as dissolved oxygen, pH, chlorophyll-a, and algal toxins in the river.	No
GP_EM_1015_266-2	There is ample evidence and documentation regarding the fact anadromous salmonids historically occurred above Iron Gate Dam (River Mile 190) in the mainstem Klamath River and several tributaries. There is also ample evidence and documentation regarding anadromous salmonids, native to the Klamath River, will recolonize this historical habitat given the opportunity. Evidence includes several published reports which provide a sound basis for the occurrence and distribution of salmon (including Chinook and Coho) and steelhead above Iron Gate Dam. Reports include: • Hamilton et al., 2005 • Butler et al., 2010, which corroborates findings of Hamilton et al. On October 16, 2006 Administrative Law Judge Honorable Parlen L. McKenna's Decision included the following findings of fact (FOF) in his decision: • While the precise geographic distribution is uncertain, historical records and Tribal accounts demonstrate that anadromous fish (Chinook salmon, Coho salmon, and steelhead trout) migrated past the present site of Iron Gate Dam which provided a viable ecosystem and habitat for those stocks of fish. (FOF 2A-3, p. 12). • Chinook salmon (both spring and fall-run) were abundant in the tributaries of the Upper Klamath Basin, including Jenny, Fall, and Shovel Creeks, as well as the Wood, Sprague, and Williamson rivers. (FOF 2A-4, p. 12). • Steelhead trout utilized habitat in Spencer, Shovel, Fall, Camp, and Scotch Creeks, and they were likely distributed as far upstream as Link River. (FOF 2A-5, p. 12). • Coho salmon spawned in Fall Creek. (FOF 2A-6, p. 12).	No

Comment Author	Rapalyea, Stephen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 15, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	• The record shows that those anadromous fish proximate to Iron Gate Dam are genetically most similar to those populations that existed in the Upper Klamath Basin prior to the construction of the dams. (FOF 2A-22, p. 15). • Anadromous fish are highly adaptive to differing conditions typically can readily migrate into and colonize new habitat or recolonize historic habitat. FOF 6-3, p. 32). Historically, spring-run Chinook salmon in the Klamath Basin were very important (Myers et al. 1997; National Research Council 2004; Snyder 1931) and, according to some sources, substantially outnumbered fall-run Chinook salmon (Gatschet 1890; Spier 1930). Currently, in contrast to fall-runs, spring-run abundance is at only 10 percent of historical levels (Myers et al. 1997). Huntington (2006) reasoned that they likely accounted for the majority of the Upper Klamath Basin's actual salmon production under pristine conditions, but were apparently in substantial decline by the early 1900s. The cause of the decline of the Klamath River spring-run Chinook salmon prior to Copco 1 Dam has been attributed to dams, overfishing and irrigation, and largely to hydraulic mining operations (Coots 1962; Snyder 1931). With hydraulic mining operations now outlawed, spring-run Chinook salmon would no longer be subject to one of their most significant past threats in the Klamath River (Hamilton et al. 2011). [Note: Other citations in this paragraph are included in Hamilton et al. 2011]. In regard to numbers of coho, Snyder 1931 states that in 1925 and 1926, 295 and 1,608 silver [coho] salmon appeared at the Klamathon Racks (p. 16 and p. 91). The Klamathon Racks were located near the historic town of Klamathon (approx. river mile 183). Snyder, (1931) also reports canneries operating at the mouth of the Klamath captured and processed coho salmon between 1914 and 1918 (pg 88) and that no effort has been made to catch these fish (coho) since 1919 (p. 16). Earlier egg take records from the Klamathon Racks document over 2.1 million coho eggs were collected in 1910 (CFGC 1913). Larger numbers of coho eggs were reported taken at the Klamath Racks between 1913 and 1916 (CFGC 1913; Cobb 1931; Fortune 1966). While the in-river fishery Snyder wrote about in 1931 may have focused on conditions primarily below the confluence of the main stem and the Trinity River, available historical information clearly documents salmon were migrating past this location headed for upstream areas. The comment, as written, provides no evidence to support the argument that salmon did not use the Klamath River above the Trinity River confluence.	

Comment Author	Rapalyea, Stephen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 15, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1015_266-3	Removal of Keno and Link River Dams is not part of the Secretarial Determination. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1116_701

From: Terry Rapoza[SMTP:TERRYRAPOZA@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 9:53:05 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath River Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1a - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Dear Sirs,

Please do NOT destroy the Klamath River Dams! After viewing the destruction of the Conduit Dam in Washington State, and all of the sediment, loss of property values, and loss of clean hydroelectric power--what could possibly be the reasons *for* removal?

Comment 2 - Alternatives

There are alternatives to aid returning salmon past the dams BUT the federal agencies and CA DFG will not consider them.

Not to mention the millions of taxpayer dollars that will be spent for restoration--the people have voted overwhelmingly against dam removal--listen to the people!

Comment 1b - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Sally Rapoza
Shasta County Resident

Comment Author	Rapoza, Terry
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_701-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No
GP_EM_1116_701-2	The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes two alternatives in detail that include fishways (Alternatives 4 and 5) to allow returning salmon to pass the existing dams. Additionally, Appendix A includes Alternatives 10 and 11, which would construct bypasses around the Four Facilities. Alternatives 10 and 11 did not meet any elements of the purpose and need or project objectives; therefore, they were not carried forward for further analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) conducted a preliminary analysis of the Hart Bypass (also known as the Bogus Creek Bypass) proposal, and concluded it would not provide an effective alternative for passage of adult salmon and steelhead populations for the upper Klamath River (CDFG 2009). Alternatives 10 and 11 also had independent reviews that concluded that the bypass systems do not comport with known salmonid migratory behavior and do not include provisions for outmigrating juvenile salmonids (Mefford 2011 and White 2011). Mr. Mefford states that the tunnel alternative provides no ecological benefit for the river, and, to a degree, further degrades the ecology of the Klamath River within this reach by diverting water. Alternatives 10 and 11 would not provide a simple alternative for passage of salmon and steelhead populations past the lower four dams in the Klamath River.	No

GP_EM_1117_744

From: Terry Rapoza[SMTP:TERRYRAPOZA@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 2:09:30 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: An Alternative to Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Alternatives

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to you concerning the Klamath River Dams, Copco 1and 2 and Irongate. Perhaps you didn't that there is a viable alternative to dam removal which would provide a safe passage for the fish and leave the clean hydorelectric power plants in place.

The alternative to which I refer to is called the Fish Bypass Tunnel. It will not harm the environment and will cost less that 1/6 of the cost.

This alternative would use a combination of natural drainages and a constructed tunnel to provide a passage for fish around Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams while leaving the dams in place. This alternative also includes improvements to fish passage facilities at J.C. Boyle Dam to allow upstream and downstream passage. This alternative would allow continued power generation at the Four Facilities, but the Hydropower Licensee would need to obtain a new FERC license to continue operations.

It seems that if the issue were really about the fish, this alternative would satisfy all stakeholders. I strongly encourage you to consider this alternative.

Sally Rapoza
2825 Balaton Ave.
Redding Ca. 96001

Comment Author	Rapoza, Terry
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_744-1	Appendix A in the Draft EIS/EIR, the Alternatives Formulation Report, documents the efforts to identify alternatives and determine which alternatives should move forward into the EIS/EIR for additional analysis. Two alternatives that moved forward, Alternatives 4 and 5 include fish passage as suggested in the comments. Master Response ALT-2 Elimination of Alternative 10 - Fish Bypass: Bogus Creek Bypass and Alternative 11 - Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing from Detailed Study.	No

GP_EM_1120_824

From: Marillyn Ratliff[SMTP:MRATLIFF@CALWISP.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 8:36:43 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Save the river, save the dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Please do not remove dams that have been there for years. The Klamath provides irrigation water, hydro electric power and recreation to the area. All are needed for the area.

Comment 2 - Fish

The Coho is not native to the area and removing the dams is too high a price to pay for a non native fish that doesn't spawn that far up river anyway. This is pure craziness.

Stop with trying to remove these dams.

Thank you,

Marillyn Ratliff

A concerned citizen.

Comment Author	Ratcliff, Marillyn
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_824-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection.	No
GP_EM_1120_824-2	Master Response AQU-3 Coho Native Status not Critical to NEPA or CEQA. Master Response AQU-4 Coho are Native. Master Response AQU-5 Will Benefit all Salmonids. Master Response AQU-6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook. Master Response AQU-7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success. Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate. Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA/CEQA process. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Action. The Lead Agencies have complied with NEPA and CEQA at all stages of the process, and gave the public the opportunity to provide input.	No

GP_LT_1020_267

October 20, 2011

I lived on the Klamath River from 1975 until 1989. I have seen it during flood stage, and I have studied "Multiple Purpose River Development" Krutilla & Eckstein (1957)

Comment 1 - KHSA

The proposed removal ignores the principles (pages 268-273) of relating integrated values of flood control, power generation, water supply, and monetary benefit to the political entities in the basin covered by the California-Oregon Interstate Compact.

James A. Rea
6214 Quail Run
Yreka CA 96097

Comment Author	Rea, James
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1020_267-1	The Klamath Basin Compact assigns uses of water on a priority system. Domestic use and irrigation use are superior in right to the generation of hydroelectric power, which is the lowest use, except for “such other uses as are recognized under the laws of the state involved.” P.L. 85-222, Art. III, Sect. B1. Article IV of the Compact addresses the states’ objectives to provide for low cost electricity for water pumping and irrigation. The KBRA includes a “Power for Water Management Program” which states: “A general policy of furthering low-cost power for irrigation use is consistent with provisions of the Klamath Basin Compact.” KBRA, Sect. 17.1. KBRA is included and analyzed as a connected action in Alternatives 2 and 3. The Klamath Basin is on the regional electrical grid. Removal of the dams will not affect electricity availability or significantly change electrical rates. p. 3.18-23 and 3.18-24 of the Draft EIS/EIR describe how the loss of hydropower from dam removal would be replaced. P.3.15-63 of the Draft EIS/EIR describes the potential changes in energy rates for PacifiCorp customers with dam removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_556

From: phre.agan@gmail.com[SMTP:PHRE.AGAN@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 6:11:29 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Alternative 2 for the Klamath River Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Pamela H Reagan
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Alternative 2 for the Klamath River

Body: I support Alternative 2 for the Klamath River....thus removing the dams that prevent salmon and steelhead from migrating and spawning.
These fisheries are important as they provide jobs, recreation and food for many.

Comment Author	Reagan, Pamela
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_556-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1227_1170

From: gary.reedy@gmail.com[SMTP:GARY.REEDY@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2011 11:48:56 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: In support of Alternatives 2 and 3 Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Gary Reedy
Organization:

Subject: In support of Alternatives 2 and 3

Body: As a former resident of the north coast of California, and an environmental scientist with 15 years of experience working on rivers of northern California and Oregon, I am writing in support of Alternatives 2 and 3 from the Klamath Facilities Removal EIS/EIR. As best summarized in Table ES-6, only Alternatives 2 and 3 provide for sufficiently comprehensive restoration of water quality and river process necessary to secure a healthy Klamath River in the near term. Moreover, Alternatives 2 and 3 are the only alternatives that provide for a clear long-term solution to maintaining healthy anadromous fisheries in the Klamath River without large maintenance costs and uncertainties associated with engineered structures. Finally, I believe that only Alternatives 2 and 3 provide sufficient cultural and economic benefits when measure over the long-term. Thank you for providing this thorough analysis for dam removal options. Godspeed for the restoration of the Klamath River.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Reedy, Gary
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 27, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1227_1170-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Comment Noted. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).	No

GP_WI_1204_976

From: mosey_9@yahoo.com[SMTP:MOSEY_9@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 4:07:24 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Daniel Reid
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I support Alternative 2: full removal of 4 dams.

Comment Author	Reid, Daniel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 04, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1204_976-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1206_972

From: ralexandrareid@gmail.com[SMTP:RALEXANDRAREID@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 3:52:12 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Javan & Alexandra Reid
Organization:

Subject: Klamath dam removal

Body: We support alternative 2 for full dam removal. Thank you for your hard work.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Reid, Javan & Alexandra
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 06, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1206_972-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1213_1034

From: tavasmomlr@gmail.com[SMTP:TAVASMOMLR@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2011 3:02:52 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath project
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Lynn Reid
Organization:

Subject: Klamath project
Body: I support Alternative 2 - full removal of 4 dams. We need to save the Klamath!
Thank you

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Reid, Lynn
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 13, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1213_1034-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_158

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011
---o0o---
STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING
(Directly to Court Reporter)

MR. WERNER RESCHKE: My name is Werner Reschke.

Last name is spelled R-e-s-c-h-k-e. First name is Werner, W-e-r-n-e-r.

I just have a few questions. I'm going to make

this a little interactive because I'm a question guy.

So I've got the Herald News from today, and if they

misquoted you, I'm sorry, but I'm going to go through a

few things here.

There were five alternatives that were thought up;

is that correct? By alternatives, what we are doing?

Yes? No?

How long is that for?

THE FACILITATOR: Sir, we are recording this,

transcribing. Their responses are not going to be on.

MR. WERNER RESCHKE: He said yes. Go ahead. How

long has the study been going for?

THE FACILITATOR: This isn't a question and answer.

We would like your testimony. It is too difficult for the

transcribers --

MR. WERNER RESCHKE: I would like some of my time

back then.

THE FACILITATOR: We will give you some time.

MR. WERNER RESCHKE: Thank you. There are five things here. I've been told that this study has been going on for at least a year or more than a year. And I would like to add a sixth alternative.

Comment 1 - Alternatives

Because these alternatives are oral alternatives. They do pit White Man against Native American. They put men and women against fish, they put dams against nature. Alternative No. 6, remove the licensing fees for the dams on the condition that Pacific Power will make the dams more efficient to produce more power and -- and this is the sneaky word -- and make them fish friendly.

Comment 2 - KHSA

I'm going to quote you here, Mr. Lynch, Secretary Salazar's tarnation is on whether dam removal will advance fisheries and also reference in the public interest. What if the public interest is to not only create 168 megawatts of power but 268 megawatts of power or 468 megawatts of power. This is nowhere in the study.

Comment 3 - Costs

I also wanted to ask how much money has been spent on this study for environment because there is another component here that hasn't been dealt with, and that's economics.

Comment 4 - Economics

I don't see any economic people on the commission. And I would like to see an economic study of what dam removal will do.

Comment 5 - Economics

This here is -- I'm going to say, I will be kind -- somewhat laughable to say full dam removal could create 1400 jobs and over 15 years raise that to 4600 jobs, but we will only lose 49 full-time jobs. Let's multiply the 49 jobs out as far as how much income they generate over the 15 years versus the income generated over the 15 years for 4600 maybe jobs. And then we have something that we can really weigh.

This is, this is disingenuous the way it is written here. Also all the fish currently protected under the Endangered Species Act could reclaim -- perhaps if they don't, who is penalized for that? Who loses their job because they were wrong? This is accountability here. And we would like that.

Comment 6 - Other/Gen.

Thank you for your time.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_158-1	The comment suggests an alternative with reduced fees, more efficient power production, and fish passage at the dams. The primary element of this alternative that would result in environmental effects is construction of fish passage at the Four Facilities. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes these impacts as part of Alternative 4 - Fish Passage at Four Dams. Because the Draft EIS/EIR includes these impacts and benefits, this information is already available for decision-makers when selecting which alternative should move forward.	No
GP_MC_1018_158-2	Both NEPA and CEQA include provisions that the draft environmental review analyze a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the purpose and need/project objections, and are potentially feasible (40 CFR § 1502.14; 43 CFR § 46.420(b); Pub. Resources Code, sec. 21002; CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a), (c), (f).). Alternatives should be limited to ones that avoid or substantially lessen the Proposed Action's significant environmental effects. (CEQA Guidelines Sections. 15126.6(a), (c), (f), sec. 15204(a); Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.3.) The Lead Agencies are not required to consider all conceivable alternatives to the Proposed Action. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21091(d)(2)(B); CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a); sec. 15204(a).) Nor are the Lead Agencies required to analyze an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(f)(3).) Also, the Lead Agencies are not required to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or requested by comment authors; instead, the Lead Agencies are to focus on significant environmental issues. (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15204(a).) The Lead Agencies developed a list of 18 preliminary alternatives that were screened down to five. The Lead Agencies fully analyzed the five alternatives in the Draft EIS/EIR because they best meet the NEPA purpose and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, and are potentially feasible (Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.3). (A full description of the alternatives and the rationale for screening the alternatives is presented in Appendix A, the Alternatives Formulation Report). Increased power generation does not meet the NEPA purpose and need or the CEQA objectives; therefore, it was not considered in the Draft EIS/EIR.	No
GP_MC_1018_158-3	The Bureau of Reclamation and the US Fish and Wildlife Service received line item funding for this project in Fiscal Years 2009, 2010 and 2011, totaling approximately $20 million, including the payment of the contractor to prepare the Draft EIS/EIR. Funding from Fiscal Year 2009 to Reclamation using Recovery investments is described at	No

Comment Author	Reschke, Wener
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	http://www.usbr.gov/newsroom/newsrelease/detail.cfm?RecordID=31604	
GP_MC_1018_158-4	Section 3.15 of the Draft EIS/EIR evaluates economic effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives. The section is primarily based on multiple economic studies posted at http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies under Economic Studies and Information. Economic effects were evaluated relative to: • Dam decommissioning, O&M, mitigation • Commercial fishing • Reservoir recreation • Ocean sport fishing • In-river sport fishing • Whitewater recreation • Tribal economies • Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) Fisheries, Water Resources and Tribal Programs • Irrigated agriculture related to KBRA actions • Refuge recreation related to KBRA actions • Local government revenues, including property and sales taxes • Property values • Utility rates	No
GP_MC_1018_158-5	Section 3.15.4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR discusses estimated changes in jobs and labor income as a result of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would both create temporary and long-term jobs and remove some long-term jobs in the region's economy. There would be similar effects to labor income. Section 3.15 describes the timing and duration of the employment impacts associated with the Proposed Action. Considering all economic impacts, the Proposed Action, including implementation of the KBRA, would result in a net increase in jobs and labor income in a 15 year period during and after dam removal. These effects would occur in all economic regions defined in Section 3.15. Table 3.15-41 shows potential jobs created and labor income of dam decommissioning construction activities. Dam decommissioning would result in 1,423 jobs, including full-time and part-time jobs, for an 18-month period and about $59.7 million in labor income. These jobs and labor income would not continue into the long-term. There are also jobs associated with mitigation activities after construction that would continue for approximately 10 years and generate 217 jobs and about $10 million in labor income (Table 3.15-44). Dam decommissioning would result in a loss of 49 jobs relative to operation and maintenance of the existing facilities. Table 3.15-41 shows this would decrease labor	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	income by about $2.1 million annually for the long-term or about $31.5 million over 15 years. The Proposed Action would result in a net increase in jobs and labor income in fishing and recreation industries which will continue over the long term; effects on specific fishing and recreational activities (positive and negative) are described on p. 3.15-56 through 3.15-61. Implementation of the KBRA would also result in positive economic effects to jobs and labor income in the region, as described on p. 3.15-66 through 3.15-79.	

GP_EM_1116_694

From: john cece reuter[SMTP:JCREUTER@SISQTEL.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 9:08:03 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov
Subject: no dam removal!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Please do not remove these any of the Klamath River Dams! The people of Siskiyou County will forever be adversly affected, our economy reuined, and will not help the salmon. Removing the dams will KILL ALL FISH, ENDANGERED EAGLES, BIRDS, PLANT LIFE , BUSINESSES AND OUR WAY OF LIFE!

In the late 1800's the Surgeon General ordered a investigative survey of this region. It was found that in the summer months the water levels were so low and warm that the river was called "STINKING RIVER" by the native people because of the dead and rotting fish and vegitation!

The Natives moved away until the water level came back up in the fall. I am sure you could find this report in the government archives.

I THINK YOU SHOULD LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THIS AREA, NOT WASHINGTON BUREAUCRATS, ECO TERRORISTS, and BRIBED AND BRAINWASHED KLAMATH TRIBES.

Thank you, Cecelia Reuter

Comment Author	Reuter, Cecelia
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_694-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish.	No

GP_MC_1020_204

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MS. CHRISSIE REYNOLDS: Chrissie Reynolds, C-h-r-i-s-s-i-e, R-e-y-n-o-l-d-s.

Mr. Salazar, members responsible for making this monumental, thank you for this opportunity to speak. I will try to say what I mean, mean what I say but not say it mean.

When I say you I am not meaning it personally.

This is just such an emotional time for me that I could not think of another pronoun. So if I stumble, I apologize in advance. I don't mean to hurt or insult anyone personally.

Comment 1 - Disapproves Dam Removal

Today I lay my heart on the line for all to hear. If you can convince me that dam removal was the right decision to make us all whole, I would most certainly agree. But there have been so many injustices and wrong actions and behaviors behind this process, that I just can't agree that this is in the best interest of everyone.

Comment 2 - ITAs

If the highest good cannot be reached, then this is not a good decision. If this process were federally recognized, the Shasta people, who have been tremendously wronged since the beginning by our government, then I

could get behind it.

But by continuing to deny them and give land

water and fishing rights to other tribes that had no prior

claim to them is wrong and only perpetuates the crimes

against them.

Comment 3 - Marine Life

If this process took into consideration oceanic

conditions that play a major part in the quality of the

salmon returning, I might be able to consider it.

If this process really took a look at the

emotional, spiritual and financial impact that this

decision for dam removal has on the people of this county

and the residents who live from Copco to the site, I might

be able to support it.

Over 80 percent of this county has already

declared to you our feelings against dam removal. If you

can right the wrongs of the past by honoring the people

today, you have a moral obligation to do so. But not

Comment 4 - Economics

honoring the spiritual value of these reservoirs and the

recreational value they provide for people from all over,

you will only aid in promoting more crime, poverty and

depression.

Comment 5 - Other/General

By not listening to the many small communities

that have united and come together to ask for

coordination, you disrespect those that live here.

By not listing to the people's wishes and then

asking us to foot the bill, you trample on our rights to

the pursuit of happiness.

Comment 6 - Recreation

By robbing us of all the other sport fishing

these lakes provide, you deny us the simple pleasures of

taking our kids and our grandkids out on the lake to catch

priceless memories.

Comment 7 - Hydropower

By eliminating an entirely free green renewable

source of power for 70,000 homes, you show us your lack of

conservation energy awareness. If 70,000 homes were

without power due to an outage, it would be considered a

tragedy on the news. You're talking about putting that

power out permanently, forever.

I would ask that you consider this. I know what

it is like for there to be a movement by the government

that at the time seems like a good idea. All the right

arguments have been made and all the results seem in the

best interests of the people, only to find out down the

road, oops, we have made a mistake.

My parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles were

all placed in internment or concentration camps not that

long ago because at the time it seemed like the right

decision. They lost their homes, their businesses and

their lives for four years.

Comment 8 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

If you can honestly say that we know for a fact

this is absolutely going to work, that no one would be

harmed, then I say go for it. But if you can honestly say

that 60, 70 years from now this wasn't a mistake, then by

all means okay.

But from what I have seen so far, to me dam

removal would be a crime against the people and wildlife

that live here and making us pay for it, too, is the

ultimate injury.

Comment Author	Reynolds, Chrissie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_204-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
GP_MC_1020_204-2	The Shasta Nation is not currently recognized by the federal government as a sovereign entity and therefore has no federally recognized trust resources that the federal government is required to protect/conserve. The current process for federal recognition, found in 25 C.F.R. 83, is a rigorous process requiring the petitioning tribe to satisfy seven mandatory criteria, including historical and continuous American Indian identity in a distinct community. Each of the criteria demands exceptional anthropological, historical, and genealogical research and presentation of evidence.	No
GP_MC_1020_204-3	Master Response AQU-13 Ocean Conditions. The Proposed Action [Alternatives 2 and 3] offers greater potential than the Current Conditions for Chinook salmon to tolerate climate change and changes in marine survival (Goodman et al. 2011; p. 19). Master Response AQU-23 Evaluation of Dam Removal and Restoration Anadromy (EDRRA) Model. Master Response AQU-26 Increased Abundance for Harvest and Tribes.	No
GP_MC_1020_204-4	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1020_204-5	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1020_204-6	Master Response REC-8 Flat Water Fishing.	No
GP_MC_1020_204-7	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_MC_1020_204-8	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No

GP_EM_1116_706

From: Sarge Reynolds[SMTP:YOLOSARGE@PACBELL.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 4:46:36 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Scott Valley
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Out of Scope

Gentlemen:

I have only recently become aware of what has been proposed for the general Scott Valley region. As one who was fighting the environmental battle long, long before it was the politically correct thing to do I am, frankly, aghast at what has been planned. This assault on private property rights will be detremental to the environment after is said and done. I close in the sincere hope that sanity will prevail in this matter.

Yours truly,

Sargent T. Reynolds
Past President Fly Fishers of Davis
Past President Northern California Council of Fly Fishers

Comment Author	Reynolds, Sarge
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_706-1	Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No

GP_EM_1212_1201

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 8:59:53 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Scott Valley/KSD
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> Sarge Reynolds <yolosarge@pacbell.net> 11/16/2011 3:57 PM >>>
Gentlemen:

It has been only recently that I have become aware of the KSD. As one who was a fighter in environmental battles long, long before it was the politicially correct default setting for a "concerned" citizen I am aghast at this assault on private property rights.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Further it is apparent to me that the projects proposed would in the final analysis be detremental to the ecology and environment of the greater Klamath region. As one who in the past had many positive interactions with the D.F.&G. I close in the sincere hope that sanity will prevail in this matter.

Yours truly,
Sargent T. Reynolds
Past President Fly Fishers of Davis
Past President Northern California Council of Fly Fishers Recipient of the Reno Fly Fishers award for environmental action

Comment Author	Reynolds, Sarge
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1212_1201-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_834

From: Ina Rhea[SMTP:BANDIVANHULZEN@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 9:01:58 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath River Dam destruction?
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

The Coho Salmon will adapt. Lrave the dams alone.
Spend the monies on cleaning up the yrappef trapped sedimente 4G Network Sent by Samsung Mobile

Comment 2 - Alternatives

Comment Author	Reha, Ina
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_834-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Following completion of Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) in 1966, and Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) in 1963 adult Coho returns were typically less than 500 and 1,000 fish, respectively. Efforts to increase returns to IGH and TRH started when Coho stocks from outside the basin were imported beginning in 1964 and which continued until 1970 (California Department of Fish and Game [CDFG] 1994). Since Coho salmon were well documented in the Klamath prior to the construction of the hatcheries, the intent of these out-of-basin transfers was to supplement already existing, albeit dwindling, natural Coho populations. In 1997 the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) determined Coho salmon which occupy the Klamath River system, known as the southern Oregon/northern California ecologically significant unit (SONCC ESU), were threatened with extinction. These fish were given protection under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). CA listed the SONCC ESU as endangered in 2003 under the California ESA. These determinations shows the fish would likely go extinct before they would be able to adapt to current river conditions absent the conservation of the species in accordance with the ESA.	No
GP_EM_1121_834-2	The comment author's suggestion for an alternative is unclear. The authors of the Final EIS/EIR do not understand the concept for removing trapped sediment to implement project objectives, and more information would be needed to incorporate this alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR considered alternatives raised during scoping or in previous documents, and this alternative does not appear to be included in any of these sources. Removing the sediment trapped behind the dams would not meet the NEPA purpose and CEQA objectives. Removing the sediment trapped behind the dams would also not be a feasible method to avoid or substantially lessen the Proposed Action's significant environmental effects (http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/lynch.memo.8.30.11.mech.dredge..pdf).	No

GP_WI_1109_414

From: watershedbob@gmail.com[SMTP:WATERSHEDBOB@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 4:21:17 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Support Alternative 2 Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Robert Rohde
Organization: Klamath River Resident

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Support Alternative 2

Body: I am in support of Alternative 2 - Full Dam Removal on the Klamath River. The Klamath River and fishery is in desperate need of our help. Full dam removal will increase salmon populations throughout the entire Klamath River Basin, create jobs and help resolve the Klamath Crisis.

Mailing Address different than above:

Bob Rohde
P.O. Box 342
Orleans, CA 95556

Comment Author	Rhode, Robert
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 09, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1109_414-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1020_199

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MS. LEE RICKARD: My name is Lee Rickard, L-e-e R-i-c-k-a-r-d.

Comment 1 - Real Estate

You are wrong in saying that the dam values above -- are -- the house values above the dams will decrease. Our home value at Copco Lake has decreased, and most of the people that live there, if they are trying to sell their homes, they are not having any luck at all. We do not -- we do not have to sell at this point, but if we did, according to current values, we would get about half of what we just built our home for ten years ago.

You claim that when the dams come out, downstream values -- downstream values will increase before dams -- I can't read my own writing -- the summer of -- the downstream would increase before the dams when the summer flow is very low in summer, often flooded in winter, and it would continue to do so if the dams did come out.

Comment 2 - Hydrology

Comment 3 - Economics

You claim the loss of jobs in the Copco area due to the loss of reservoirs, that -- that we will not lose jobs. Before you announced the dam removal, we had many people that came to stay and recreate in Siskiyou

County, for the lakes, the fishing and boating, and all of the other things that we offer here. We see as many as 18 or 20 boats by the Klamath River right now because the salmon run is very, very good this year. I feel that after taking out the dams, all of this would disappear from the area around our homes.

Comment 4 - Water Quality

After testing, we were advised by the state that Copco Lake contained no microcystin or blue-green algae, less than two percent, and the water temperature is decreased by the absence of dams, especially, versus the low river runs.

Our family has vacationed here since 1977 and enjoyed the recreation and the fishing and the hunting. My husband and I moved here in 2002 to stay permanently, and we find many of your claims to be unbelievable.

Comment 5 - Hydropower

However, the loss of clean power for over 70,000 homes used here, and throughout the U.S., as needed, when there is overflow of electricity, there are no clean replacements being offered.

Your agenda makes no sense. What about our tribe?

Comment Author	Rickard, Lee
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_199-1	Master Response RE-1E Real Estate Evaluation Report. Master Response RE-2B Changes in Property Values.	No
GP_MC_1020_199-2	Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection. Master Response WSWR-4 Summary of Effects to Water Rights/Water Supply for Alternatives 2 and Alternative 3 for Municipal, Agricultural, and Tribal Use.	No
GP_MC_1020_199-3	Section 3.15 of the Draft EIS/EIR discusses regional economic effects of changes to reservoir recreation and in-river recreational fishing as a result of the project alternatives. The analysis concludes that 4 jobs related to reservoir recreation would be lost after the dams are removed. Salmon abundance would increase under the Proposed Action, which would increase annual salmon fishing effort in the river and would result in additional fishing on the river relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative. The analysis estimates that about 3 jobs would be created as a result of increased salmon fishing effort under the Proposed Action. Populations of steelhead and redband trout would also increase, which would subsequently increase sport fishing effort for these species. The economic analysis does not quantify the increase in jobs related to increased sport fishing effort for steelhead and redband trout; however, effects are described qualitatively. It is expected that fishing effort and jobs would increase over the No Action/No Project Alternative. The total economic effect on in-river sport fishing for salmon, steelhead, and redband trout of the Proposed Action would be positive and long-term.	No
GP_MC_1020_199-4	As detailed in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.7 (p. 3.2-29 to 3.2-30), Section 3.4.3.4 (p. 3.4-6 to 3.4-7), and (Appendix) C.6.1.4 (p. C-56 to C-59), the Klamath's Copco and Iron Gate reservoirs, and downstream river reaches, annually experience blooms significantly exceeding World Health Organization (WHO) and CA Draft Voluntary Statewide Guidance for both cell densities and toxin thresholds during summer months, resulting in posting of public health advisories. Master Response WQ-19 Water Temperature Models and General Predictions. Master Response WQ-15 Klamath Dams Do Not Supply Cool Summertime Water to Downstream River Reaches.	No
GP_MC_1020_199-5	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1020_271

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@us

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Lee Rickard

Organization:

Title:

Address: 21036 Ager Beswick Rd - Montague CA 96064

Email: leerickard@hughes.net

Comment 1 - Real Estate

Comments: You are wrong in saying that home values above the dams WILL decrease - ours (home or ranch) already have in reality. We do not have to sell at this point - but if we did according to current actual values we would lose at least 1/3.

Comment 2 - Algae

* You claim that when the dams come out downstream values would increase - below dams the rivers stay very low in summer - and often flooded in winter.
* You claim the loss of 4 jobs due to loss of the reservoirs - before you announced the dam removal we had many people stay and recreate in Siskiyou for the lakes for fishing and boating in our lakes & rivers. We see as many as 18-20 boats on the Klamath Lake.
* After testing we were advised by the state that Copco Lake contained no myerosistic blue green alga (-39). The water temperature is decreased by the action of the dams - especially versus low river runs.
* Our family has vacationed at Copco Lake since 1971 and enjoyed the recreation here. Swimming - fishing hunting - My husband and I moved here permanently in 2002. We find many of your claims to be unbelievable. However the loss of clean power for 70,000 homes and here and throughout the US as needed, to be unacceptable. There are no "clean" replacements being offered. Your agenda makes no sense! What about our tribe

Comment 3 - Hydropower

ed that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Rickard, Lee
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1020_271-1	Master Response RE-1E Real Estate Evaluation Report. Master Response RE-2 Changes in Property Values.	No
GP_MF_1020_271-2	As detailed in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.7 (p. 3.2-29 to 3.2-30), Section 3.4.3.4 (p. 3.4-6 to 3.4-7), and (Appendix) C.6.1.4 (p. C-56 to C-59), the Klamath's Copco and Iron Gate reservoirs, and downstream river reaches, annually experience blooms significantly exceeding WHO and California Draft Voluntary Statewide Guidance for *Microcystis aeruginosa* cell densities and microcystin toxin thresholds during summer months, resulting in posting of public health advisories. Bloom dynamics can be variable in space and time. They are especially susceptible to wind, and can move around a water body. It is not unusual to have toxic algae and associated toxins above action levels in one location in a water body and not detectable elsewhere. Likewise, testing is conducted frequently during the summer because blooms can generate rapidly; a negative result at one time does not guarantee that a lake will be bloom or toxin-free for the summer. The toxic blooms in the Project reservoirs have a well-documented history of late summer and fall blooms that create toxins. It is prudent to check the advisory status regularly when recreating on the reservoirs. Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.1.1. (p.3.2-36) and Appendix D.1 (p. D-1 to D-8) provide a detailed review of the numeric models developed to analyze the effects of each project alternative on Klamath River water temperatures. The models used in the analysis are capable of providing water temperatures for multiple locations between Link River Dam and the Klamath River Estuary on a daily basis and for multiple flow regimes (i.e., low, median, and high water years). Model output for the Proposed Action is described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2.1 (p. 3.2-76 to 3.2-83). While model output indicates that, compared to existing conditions, there are times and locations where water temperatures would be warmer if the dams were removed (i.e., summer/fall in J.C. Boyle bypass reach, springtime in Hydroelectric Reach and downstream of Iron Gate Dam), there are also times and locations where water temperatures would become cooler in the absence of the dams (i.e., summer/fall in J.C. Boyle peaking reach, Hydroelectric Reach, and downstream of Iron Gate Dam).	No
GP_MF_1020_271-3	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No

GP_MC_1020_191

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. TOM RICKARD: My name is Tom Rickard, T-o-m R-i-c-k-a-r-d. I'm a resident of Copco Lake and one of the major homeowners that will be affected when the dams come out if they do.

Comment 1 - Real Estate

Some of the concerns I have are out of the EIS study. One was the real estate value and the way it was put together that was covered by Mr. Kent, and I think is absolutely absurd that you would evaluate property without counting the homes and the buildings on the property. You can go anywhere in California and buy a piece of property including Los Angeles, Balboa, or anywhere else and buy a piece of property for a pretty cheap price without the homes on it.

Comment 2 - Alternatives

The other issues is one of the statements made was we have five options. One was considered not taking out the dams at all, and yet when this was presented by Dennis, it was the first thing on the thing. Status quo is not an option because it's not working. It doesn't seem to me like we have five options. It seems like it is down to four. As I mentioned before, Secretary Salazar I think has already made up his mind.

This is a shame, because the people of Siskiyou County

voted to keep the dams, 80/20.

Comment 3 - Water Rights/Supply

I don't understand either how we keep hearing

about the fact the farmers and the ranchers, everyone is

going to have more water if the dams come out. Rainfall

is rainfall.

Where are we going to get more water if the dams

come out? It seems to me the dams help control the water

and store it in times of drought, not the other way

around.

PacifiCorp was also mentioned by Mr. Spain that

they want the dams out. They only want the dams out

according to Toby Freeman who is in charge of this whole

area because they have had so many lawsuits brought

against them they could no longer afford to take action on

it.

They wrote up a $300 million offer for fish

ladders in order to make this work. It was turned down,

no one would even consider it. So it is not the fact that

Pacific Power wants the dams out. They have no option

left.

The last thing is the fact that the mention of

tribal benefits are very important. They are. And I

don't disagree with that at all. But what about the

important rights of the homeowners, the ranchers and the

farmers?

Thank you.

Comment Author	Rickard, Tom
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_191-1	Master Response RE-1B and C Real Estate Evaluation Report.	No
GP_MC_1020_191-2	The No Action/No Project Alternative, as presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, is a requirement of NEPA (Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations for Implementing NEPA , 40 CFR Part 1508.25(b)(1)) and CEQA (Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines) and must be analyzed in an EIS or an EIR. The purpose of describing and analyzing a No Action/No Project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the Proposed Action with the impacts of not approving the Proposed Action.	No
GP_MC_1020_191-3	Master Response WSWR-4 Summary of Effects to Water Supply/Water Rights for Alternatives 2 and Alternative 3 for Municipal, Agricultural, and Tribal Use.	No

GP_EM_1117_753

From: tom rickard sr[SMTP:TRICKARD@HUGHES.NET]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 5:44:38 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; KSDcomments@dfg.gov
Cc: Debbie Bacigalupi; dbaci@surewest.net; Jennifer and Jon Burke; viking@toast.net; hspannaus@snowcrest.net; wezgliatto@nctv.com
Subject: EIR report on Klamath Basin Restoration (Dam Removal)
Auto forwarded by a Rule
November 17,2011

Attention: Bureau of Reclamation, and DFG: Gordon Leppig

My wife and I live on 22 acres bordering Copco Lake. We have been very active in attending all of the meetings that have been available regarding the proposed removal of the four dams on the Klamath River.

It is with great disappointment that we write this letter to you and the Department of Fish and Game. When we were growing up, the Bureau of Reclamation and Fish and Wildlife or Fish and Game were our heroes. They took care of the hunters and fishermen and made things better for them. As time has passed, we have seen the steady decline of these two great agencies, going from people who really cared about the people and their rights to a group that is totally controlled by special interests.
We the people, used to be true environmentalists, we were and still are good stewards of the land and follow all of the laws put down by the DFG on limits, times, dates, reports etc. It has now come down to a group of people that have the money and political power to buy your loyalties and are able to push things through like KBRA that make us very sad.

Comment 3- ůłĞđŶĂłŝĞ

Where are the people that used to stand up for the citizens and animals of this country?
The EIR report that was published has many flaws in it and looks like it was just thrown together to complete an obligation. We attended both meetings, one hear at Copco Lake Community Club and the other at the Yreka Fairgrounds and listened to the people tell you where the problems were in this report. It did not seem like there was anyone listening.

Comment 1 - Real Estate

- What about the appraisals that were run by a Sacramento appraisal firm. How can you possibly use an outside firm who knows nothing about the area and them tell them that they cannot include "improvements" just the land value. If you were selling your house, would you sell it for the price of the lot or would you include the house that is sitting on the property. Absolutely ridiculous.
- What about all of the statements about damage that will be done to the land and wildlife? Everything is understated, you know it as well as you know your names that there will be major damage and years of recovery, if ever.
- What about the alternative plans that were presented, a very doable fish passage that would cost less than a 1/6th of taking the dams out and not destroy the land and the people.
- What about the Shasta Nations concerns about their tribal burial grounds?
- What proof do you have that any of this is going to work? Who is going to put it back together if it does not?

Comment 2 - E W

Comment 5 - General/Other

Comment 4 - Cultural Resources

Comment 6 - Hydropower

- What about the loss of Clean Green energy? There is no plan on how or what is going to replace the hydro power. Do you even care? Where do you live? Would you be sitting on your duffs and not fighting back if someone was depreciating your property, raising your power bills, trying to take your water, increasing costs on your ranch so much and with so many restrictions that it would drive you off of the land? I hardly think so.
- No wonder the American people are so disgusted with our government. Nothing but corruption from one end to the other. If you have the money and the political clout, then you can do what you want?

Our only hope is that you fail and that the little guy wins out!!!!!!
You have to live with yourselves and I am glad that we are no younger and have to witness the destruction of our great country by folks like you.

Tom and Lee Rickard

Comment Author	Rickard, Tom
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_753-1	Master Response RE-1A, B and C Real Estate Evaluation Report.	No
GP_EM_1117_753-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	Yes
	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish.	
	Master Response TERR-1 Terrestrial Benefits of Restoring Salmon Passage.	
	Master Response TERR-2 Reservoir Habitat.	
GP_EM_1117_753-3	Master Response ALT-2 Elimination of Alternative 10 - Fish Bypass: Bogus Creek Bypass and Alternative 11 - Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing from Detailed Study.	No
GP_EM_1117_753-4	Master Response CUL-1 Shasta Nation Participation.	No
GP_EM_1117_753-5	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	
GP_EM_1117_753-6	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities.	No
	Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	

GP_WI_1111_566

From: tdr08@comcast.net[SMTP:TDR08@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 7:58:24 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: north coast
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Thomas Ritchie
Organization: davis fly fishing club

Comment 1 - General/Other

Subject: north coast

Body: We must save one of our best fishing areas,I live several miles away but some time I do travel to the north coast to fish its a wounderful place to visit and fly fish.

Comment Author	Ritchie, Thomas
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_566-1	EIS/EIR Section 3.15, Socioeconomics, evaluates economic effects to in-river fishing. Section 3.20, Recreation, evaluates effects to recreation.	No

GP_MC_1020_228

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MS. KRISTEN RITER: Kristen Riter, K-r-i-s-t-e-n R-i-t-e-r.

So I just acknowledge everybody here for

contributing to this discussion tonight, and, uh, it's

been wonderful to hear all sides, and I do mean that.

Um, so first off, my concerns -- my concerns,

I'm a quality auditor, I audit biotech companies, I audit

the validity of studies.

I read the KBRA, and I keep hearing that this

is all science -- I have a lot on Copco Lake I'd like to

sell you -- and it is good science but there's a lot of

holes in that science, there's a lot of holes, and I think

we kind of know that because we heard tonight that you

mentioned that the science is new, this is based on new

stuff just released, so just kind of discredit the old

stuff because there were a lot of holes that we submitted

volumes of comments to the KBRA, showing where the holes

were. And I think that's well accepted that there are

holes in the science.

Comment 1 -Disapproves of Dam Removal

There are concerns because Salazar was quoted,

um, saying that, don't waste an economic crisis, that is

the best time to buy land and turn it into parks. And he

quoted several past presidents when that was done before,

and so it's clear what the intention is, here.

Um, so the document states that this is to find

the best public interest and the best interest for the

fisheries. So the best public interest has been well

documented tonight about the vote for the public here, and

also, if you look in the Congressional records, our

Congressmen have been debating this in Congress and they

have also told Congress how they feel and how their people

feel. Their people do not want this.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

So you look at why this is happening. This is

happening because PacifiCorp -- I mean it's -- this is no

longer a good deal for them, they are exposed, there is a

lot of litigation they are exposed to, and I was fortunate

to talk with them a little bit about it.

I can't quote them, but they will still be

supplying you energy, it will be hydroelectric energy from

somewhere else, from wind sources.

By the way, the windmills in the bay area are

threatening the birds and the people want those out.

And you also get your energy from coal.

So in the EIR/EIS, it also states that they

have already started to implement some of this. We know

that because we know that land is being bought from

farmers and ranchers and it's being coerced out, deals are

being made. If you look at how much money is being sent

to buy -- spent to buy up land and drive people off their

land --

Comment 3 - Terrestrial Wildlife

And one last thing I wanted to quote is in the

KBRA, it states that during the rehabilitation period, you

will be able to take eagles, falcons, fish -- other

endangered species will be up for take while you are

trying to rehabilitate these salmon, so it's not all about

the animals.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_228-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).	No
GP_MC_1020_228-2	Comment noted.	No
GP_MC_1020_228-3	See Klamathrestoration.gov for a copy of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA). The KBRA does not describe a “rehabilitation period” nor does it allow for the take of listed species. The KBRA does not supersede existing laws or regulations and does not exempt any actions from compliance with Endangered Species Act (ESA) or California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Project level actions and decisions will continue to be made in compliance with existing laws and regulations. KBRA Section 22 identifies the development of either a General Conservation Plan or a Habitat Conservation Plan as a means to secure an incidental take permit under Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA. This would be one way to avoid or minimize regulatory burdens or costs arising from the reintroduction of fish species to the Upper Basin. The habitat conservation plan would also include measures to protect and minimize impacts to bald eagles.	No

GP_LT_1020_268

KRISTEN RITER 10-20-2011

Comments: Fact Fish are in record numbers in Alaska. Our waters are too warm.

Comment 1 - FERC

There are more than 5 options.
Pacific Corp wants to avoid litigation
Govt. is willing to spend billions —
Govt. should spend those billions
to put in fish ladders - in the name
of fish & help clean rivers and
fix dams.

This is what our govt. should
be spending this money on.

Not fulfilling on massive land
grabs and being aggressive towards
land owners. Not increasing fees
and creating hardships on its people.

Fact 85% of coho salmon spawn within
(twenty) 20 miles of coast.

Govt. should not own fisheries &
land it created hardships for locals
and then overtook.

Comment 2 - KHSA

KHSA is not signed by all required parties.

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1020_268-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. The question of whether the government should pay for installation of fish ladders is beyond the scope of this document. The hydropower facilities on the Klamath are privately owned. Under current federal laws and regulations, the owner of privately held facilities is responsible for the cost of complying with terms and conditions required as part of the relicensing process. Authorization of federal funds to construct fish ladders on a private facility would require an act of Congress.	No
GP_LT_1020_268-2	The Klamath agreements are examples of negotiations designed to resolve longstanding legal battles over the use of water resources in the Klamath Basin. PacifiCorp, tribes, environmental, fishing and agriculture interests are using these agreements to avoid litigation. Signing the KHSA was voluntary for all signatories and no signatory was required to sign to make KHSA a valid agreement.	No

GP_LT_1230_1218

Date: December 27, 2011

To:
Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 05825
fax 916-978-5055; email: KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Gordon Leppig
California Department of Fish & Game
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501
fax (707) 441-2021; email: KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov

Regarding: ***Comments to the*** **Klamath Facilities Removal Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR)**

I am hereby submitting my comments to the *Klamath Facilities Removal Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR)*, dated September 2011. I would greatly appreciate a thorough response to concerns raised.

The summary points below are supported by references within the EIR/EIS, identified adjunct programs or documents within the study, or records easily accessible with a Google search. Due to the volume of material to review and comment on, the examples below represent only a sampling of the supporting documentation.

Comment Summary	Source	**Comment Supporting Claims, Examples, and Further Comment.** *(Note; examples are not a complete list of examples obtained from the EIR/EIS and only represent a portion of the evidence).*
Comment 1 - Alternatives The success of the Proposed Actions, and all dam removal alternatives proposed critically hinge on a multitude of other actions not fully presented or studied in this report. As stated through out the EIR/EIS, the Proposed Actions alone cannot reach the desired outcomes. Thus this EIR/EIS cost, resource, impact and time estimates are incomplete and misleading in stating the ability of the immediate decisions ability to achieve the stated program goals. Additionally, as some claims made were found to be	EIR/EIS pages 4.72, 4.74, 4.76, 4.77, 4.78, 4.79, 4.81, 4.86, 4.87, 4.88, 4.91, 4.92, 4.93, 4.94, 4.122, 4.123, 4.129, 3.14.25,	a. In addition to the +1850 page EIR/EIS, programs noted as essential or beneficial for the success of the proposed action include: Mitigation Measures AR-1-4, 6 Fisheries Reintroduction and Management Plan Water Use Retirement Program Water Diversions Limitations Power for Water Management Mazama Forest Project Klamath Tribes Forest Management Plan Emergency Response Plan Reclamation's Klamath Project

Comment 2 - NEPA/ CEQA

Comment 2 cont.

false and misleading, it becomes essential to also review the regulations associated with the project.	3.14.29, 3.8.17	Climate Change Assessment and Adaptive Management Trinity River Restoration Program Five Counties Road Management Program Klamath Basin Conservation Area Construction of Trap and Haul Facilities Restoration Program Water Diversion Limitations The Northwest Forest Plan Klamath TMDLs: Upper Klamath Lake TMDL Interior Flow Fish Entrainment Reduction Program On-Project Plan Drought Plan Future Storage Opportunities WURP Off-Project Water Settlement (OPWAS) negotiations KHSA and Interim Measures KBRA and associated documents Relocation of the City of Yreka's water supply pipeline (plans) CEQA, NEPA, Williamson Act, BLM Wildlands Project, 1957 Klamath Basin Compact b. "Implementation of restoration action, programs, and/or plans presented in the KBRA would accelerate restoration action currently underway throughout the Klamath Basin and reduce nuisance and/or noxious phytoplankton blooms through their beneficial effects on flow and water quality." Noted "Significance" is "B" or beneficial. c. Mitigation Measure AR-3 would be implemented to reduce the short-term impacts of suspended sediment concentrations on green sturgeon adults post-spawning; however, there would still be short –term impacts to green sturgeon including lethal and sub lethal effects. d. The proposed Action's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect on steelhead would be cumulatively considerable; however it would be reduced by the implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-2 and AR-3. In addition, some portion of the progeny of those adults that spawn successfully would rear in tributaries long enough to not only avoid the most serious impacts of the Proposed Action in 2020, but may also not return for up to two years, when any suspended sediment resulting from the Proposed Action should be greatly reduced... the Proposed Action's incremental contribution to the significant cumulative effects on summer and winter steelhead would be cumulatively considerable even with mitigation measures AR-2 and AR-3. No other feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact." e. "Some ongoing actions would also benefit Coho salmon in the long-term include the implementation of Klamath Basin TMDLs to improve water quality, the Trinity River Restoration Program, the Five Counties Road Management Program, and the Klamath Basin

Comment 3 - NEPA/CEQA		Conservation Areas Restoration Program., which would improve water quality and habitat in the Klamath River. The Northwest Forest Plan would reduce impacts from timber harvesting and road construction on aquatic species and habitat..... Based on increased habitat availability and improved habitat quality, the Proposed Action's incremental contribution to the significant long-term cumulative effect on oho salmon would be beneficial for the Coho salmon from the Upper Klamath River, Lower Klamath River, Shasta River, Scott River, and Salmon River population units in the long-term and would not be considerable for Coho salmon from the three Trinity River population units in the long term." f. "Reservoir removal associated with dam removal could alter habitat availability and affect lost river and shortnose suckers." Significance to CEQA is "S" or significant. Proposed mitigation is "AR-6: Sucker rescue and relocation"
Inadequate review time was allotted for a proper review of this critical issue and actions proposed even though the EIR/EIS comment period was extended to December 30th2011. This decision has monumental impacts on our state, environment and the species within, our rights and our family's future.	EIR/EIS	See 1.a. Comment 5 - Water Rights/Supply
The EIR/EIS and "reclamation" actions are aggressive towards California citizens who are legal land and business owners and residents of the impacted area and vicinity. The EIR/EIS exhibits the involved agencies abuse of power and destabilizes and threatens the local communities welfare and economy. The primary agencies involvement and gains from provoking and steering the "settlement" outcomes are exhibited throughout the reference material, media, "settlement agreements" and the EIR/EIS. The KBRA and KHSA threaten the U.S. citizens' Constitutional rights and undermine the 3rd, 5th and 10th Amendments to the Constitution. Comment 4 - Real Estate	4.122-123, 3.8.1, 3.8.3, 3.8.7, 3.8.13, 4.86, 4.87, 4.94, SONCC	"For the purposes of this EIR/EIS, impacts would be significant if they would result in the following: Causing injury to existing water rights or adjudication claims. Decreasing water supplies beyond what is needed for public health and safety (i.e. needs for drinking water and fire suppression) for the current population" "Implementation of Off-Project Water Settlement (OPWAS) negotiations could affect the exercise of certain water rights and adjudicated rights upstart of Upper Klamath Lake. The intent of the OPWAS is to negotiate a settlement of long-standing water disputes between the Upper Klamath Water Users Association, Klamath Tribes and Bureau of Indian Affairs... The KBRS's incremental contribution to the significant cumulative effects on water supply and water rights would be beneficial". This argument omits the Federal and State agencies role, stake and gains in the outcome. Per the EIR/EIS, "Water right claims have been filed by private water users, the Klamath Tribes, Klamath allottees, and the United States (for Indian and other federal reservations of land and the Reclamation's Project Klamath." "The USFWE has claimed vested water rights under the Reclamation's Klamath Project for two of the refuges, the Lower Klamath and Tule Lake NWRs, as well as federal reserved water rights for the two refuges. Water rights for these four refutes are being quantified in the Klamath Basin Adjudication." "The Reserved Rights Doctrine" ... provides that when lands are set aside as Indian or other federal reservations, sufficient water to fulfill the purposes of the reservation is reserved as well. Federal reserved water rights arise expressly or by implication from federal treaties, statutes, and executive orders, and vest no later than the date the reservation was established. Unlike state appropriative rights, federal reserved water rights are for present and future uses and may be exercised at any time and are not lost through non-use. While federal reserved water rights may be quantified and administered by states in the context of comprehensive state water adjudication, they

are otherwise governed by federal, not state, law." This EIR/EIS presents that water rights available to the Klamath Basin residents and available for downstream flow will be diminished and unaccounted for due to enormous amount of land and rights provided to Indian and "other federal reservations."
"Federal reserved water rights vest no later than the date of the reservation, and as early as 'time immemorial,' regardless of whether they have been used."
Non-Indian residents of California and Oregon are omitted from the discussions of water rights. Example: Klamath Basin Compact.
"Reclamation purchased the Agency Lake and Barnes Ranches adjacent to Agency Lake ... and is currently using portions of the ranches as pumped storage.... USFWS is studying the possibility of breaching the dikes which would convert the 63,770 acre-feet storage from pumped storage to passive storage in the Upper Klamath Lake. The Agency Lake/Barnes Ranch Project would go through separate NEPA evaluations as plans are developed for future restoration activities. Future changes would not substantively change the quantity of storage or water supply yield associated with that storage and therefore, there would be no change from existing conditions."

Comment 6 - Water Rights/ Supply

Relocation of the Yreka water supply pipeline after drawdown of the Iron Gate Reservoir could affect water supply... The pipeline would either be suspended from a pipe bridge across the river near its current location (new construction), or rerouted along the underside of the Lakeview Bridge just downstream of Iron Gate Dam... The relocation of the Yreka Pipeline would result in no change from existing conditions." Activities included actually includes new roads, deconstruction and construction activities on and near the river, disturbance to trees, property lines, nest and endangered birds, interruption of water supply (pending local storage capacity, and fees associated with this project. Siskiyou County has not signed the KHSA, KBRA and has not approved of this plan.
"Associated reservoirs for J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams contain 14% of the total storage capacity and 2% of the active storage on the river. However, these dams were not designed for water supply storage purposes and are most often operated as run-of-the-river facilities." Also, "Three additional Pacific Corp water rights list Copco 1 Reservoir as the water source. Each is for 3,200 and they are associated with power generation and impoundment of water... PacificCorp files Statements of Diversion and use for pre-1914 claims with the CA SWRCB to use water at Iron Gate Dam for hydropower activities... claims are for 1,800 cfs for power generation, 50 cfs for fish propagation facilities, 3,300 cfs to refill regulatory storage space in Iron Gate Reservoir, and 48 cfs for fish culture."
"Three water rights listings upstream of Iron Gate Development (and within the state of CA) that listed the Klamath River as their water source. These are held by PacificCorp for irrigation and stock watering for a total of 5,475 acre-feet during April 1-Oct 31."
"Activities associated with Interim Measures (IMs) could result in changes to PacifiCorp's water right. Prior to construction, "Interim Measures" as described in the KHSA would be implemented and would control operations of the hydroelectric facilities... While this measure would require a change to PacifiCorp's water rights, it would not affect the exercise of the water right (i.e. the quantity of water diversions) or flow in the Klamath River..." YET per the

KHSA, "PacifiCorp shall assign its revised hydroelectric water rights to the OWRD for conversion to an in stream water right pursuant to ORS 543A.305, and OWRD shall take actions to effect such conversion, in accordance with the process and conditions set forth in *Water Right Agreement between PacifiCorp and Oregon* (Exhibit 1). Nothing in this Section 7.6.5 or Exhibit 1 is intended in any way to affect, diminish, impair, or determine any federally reserved or state law-based water right that the United States or any other person or entity may have in the Klamath River... Except as provided in this paragraph, within 90 days of completion of Facilities Removal at the Copco No. 1, Copco No. 2 and Iron Gate Facilities, respectively, PacifiCorp shall submit a Revocation Request to the California State Water Resources Control Board for License No. 9457 (Application No. 17527), and shall notify the State Water Resources Control Board of its intent to abandon its hydroelectric appropriative water rights at the Copco No. 1 and Copco No. 2 Facilities, as applicable, as identified in Statement of Water Diversion and Use Nos. 15374, 15375, and 15376. Should ongoing operations of the Iron Gate Hatchery or other hatchery facilities necessitate continued use of water under License No. 9457 (Application No. 17527) beyond 90 days after completion of Facilities Removal, PacifiCorp shall consult with the Department of Fish and Game and the State Water Resources Control Board and shall take actions directed by such Department and Board as are necessary to ensure a sufficient water supply to the Iron Gate Hatchery or other hatchery facilities under License No. 9457."

Per the signed KHSA, **EXHIBIT 2 Sequence of Performance Chart,** "PacifiCorp applies for leases authorizing occupancy of submerged and submersible lands by the J.C. Boyle Dam, J.C. Boyle Powerhouse, and Keno Dam PacifiCorp and the Secretary enter into contract to permit entry onto PacifiCorp lands

Per the signed KHSA, **EXHIBIT 2 Sequence of Performance Chart, within 30 days of the settlement agreement,** "PacifiCorp files Economic Analysis and requests the Oregon and California PUCs to establish customer surcharges"

Per the signed KHSA, **EXHIBIT 2 Sequence of Performance Chart:** within 30 days of the settlement agreement, before January 31, 2012 "Identify proposed transfer of Parcel B Lands"

PacifiCorp conveys Parcel B Lands

FERC issues Order approving transfer of the Iron Gate hatchery from PacifiCorp to CDFG FERC resumes timely consideration of pending FERC licensing application for Fall Creek Development

PacifiCorp transfers title in the Facilities to the DRE

Complete AIP for Keno transfer; complete Keno transfer agreement

PacifiCorp transfer Keno Development to the United States

Commencement of Decommissioning Completion of Facilities Removal, PacifiCorp assigns its hydroelectric water rights to OWRD for conversion to an in stream water right

PacifiCorp submits a Revocation Request to California SWRCB and notification of intent to abandon its water rights

Comment 7 - NEPA/CEQA

n. The BLM control of the Klamath Reclamation (water and land in the area) expires on March 31, 2012. The BA and BO programs run out at this time. The Secretary of the Interior has set the date for his decision as March 12, 2012. It is clear that he has already approved the Proposed Actions and risks loss of control as the KBRA and KHSA are all or nothing determinations. Multiple agencies,

		corporations, NGO's and tribes are lined up to participated in the upside of dam removal. Too much hinges on making a factual, scientific decision that is best for the species, residents and environment. o. *"The effects of the fisheries managed by the State of California and the Yurok and Hoopa Tribes, on the continued existence of the SONCC Coho salmon ESU have not been formally evaluated by NMFS."* SONCC 40-21, line 1-6. p. *"NMFS has determined that federally managed fisheries in California do not jeopardize the continued existence of the SONCC Coho salmon EUS (Appendix B). The effects of fisheries managed by the state of California and tribal governments on the continued existence of the SONCC Coho salmon ESU have not been formally evaluated by NMFS."*
Comment 8 - NEPA/CEQA 4. The EIR/EIS is written in such a manner as to misinform decision makers and the public, with the outcome of pitting groups (Indians, fishers, farmers, ranchers, land owners, foresters, miners) against each other and creating local and national conflicts. False claims are made, data is omitted or misrepresented and misconstrued. Strong conclusions are drawn with little or no factual supporting data. A. Critical factors killing salmon are overlooked and not presented such as: todays warmer climate, changes in ocean conditions, the rise of competing fish, the rise of salmon predators and parasites, how protected marine mammal populations are decimating salmon, the overwhelming dominance of natural and varied cycles of salmon and rivers. B. Critical non-natural factors killing salmon are overlooked and not fully presented or covered including gill netting, releases for cultural celebrations triggering early entry upstream, commercial fishing advances, hatchery and fishery mismanagement. C. Natural limitations of the environment to provide for the Proposed Actions including the fact that there is no salmon habitat above Keno Dam due to a natural, impassable reef at Keno. Comment 10 - Fish Comment 9 - Fish Comment 11 - Fish	ES-17, ES-1, 3.8.11, 3.8.9, 3.8.7, 4.74, 4.75, 4.71, 4.72, 4.73, 4.75, 4.76, 4.77, 4.78, 4.79, 4.82, 4.83, 4.84, 4.88, 4.90, 4.91, ,The Great Salmon Hoax.	*I. Misleading promises and claims include:* *a. "NEPA Purpose and Need:* The need for the Proposed Action is to advance restoration of the salmonid fisheries in the Klamath Basin consistent with the KHSA and the connected KBRA. The purpose is to achieve a free flowing river condition and full volitional fish passage as well as other goals expressed in the KHSA and KBRA. By the terms of the KHSA, the Secretary will determine whether the Proposed Action is appropriate and should proceed. In making this determination, the Secretary will consider whether removal of the Four Facilities will advance the restoration of the salmonid fisheries of the Klamath Basin, and is in the public interest, which includes but is not limited to consideration of potential impacts on affected local communities and Tribes." *b. "CEQA Project Objectives:* As required by CEQA, a lead agency must identify the objectives sought by the proposed project. For this project, CDFG as lead agency has identified the following objectives: 1. Advance restoration of the salmonid fisheries in the Klamath Basin. 2. Restore and sustain natural production of fish species throughout the Klamath Basin in part by restoring access to habitat currently upstream of impassable dams. 3. Provide for full participation in harvest opportunities for sport, commercial, and tribal fisheries. 4. Establish reliable water and power supplies, which sustain agricultural uses and communities and NWRs. 5. Improve long-term water quality conditions consistent with designated beneficial uses. 6. Contribute to the public welfare and the sustainability of Klamath Basin communities. 7. To be consistent with the goals and objectives of KHSA and KBRA." c. The Layman's Guide to the Klamath Basin, distributed at EIR/EIS hearings in the Klamath Basin (Oct. 20, 2011). A multi-page glossy color misrepresentation of fisheries, the impacts of agriculture, dams and recreation on the environment, without presenting agency mismanagement and natural factors impacting fisheries.

		b. The Hoopa Boat festival, a newly created festival at an unnatural time of the year for salmon, ramped the Trinity River for the festival in 2002 triggering a Salmon run in which over 20,000 fish were killed. While a normal run begin with the natural fall cooling of the river temperature, the water was cut off by prematurely decreasing the river temperature. c. The Executive Summary starts with the claim that *"Due to these unresolved issues, during the previous ten years, the federal government has faced events and taken unprecedented and extraordinary actions in the Klamath Basin. The following are examples of some of these events and actions:* *In spring of 2001, the federal government announced there would be no deliveries of water from Upper Klamath Lake or Klamath River to Reclamation's Klamath Project due to Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) concerns - the first time project water deliveries were not made at a Reclamation project (very limited deliveries occurred later in the summer).* *In 2002, there was a major fish die-off in the Klamath River of adult fall-run Chinook salmon (at least 30,000 fish). In 2005, warnings of contact with water in Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs due to toxic algae blooms began being posted annually.* *In 2006, low abundance of Klamath Basin Chinook salmon lead to severe restrictions on commercial and recreational harvest along 700 miles of the California and Oregon coast, as well as major reductions in Klamath River recreational and tribal fisheries. In 2009, Klamath area commercial salmon harvest was closed.* *In 2010, there was a significant reduction in water deliveries to Reclamation's Klamath Project due to dry hydrologic conditions. In 2010, the Klamath Tribes limited their harvest of suckers to ceremonial use for the 25th consecutive year and experienced their 92nd year without access to salmon."* YET, according to the Announcement of U.S. Support for the United Nations Declarations on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Initiatives to Promote the Government-to-Government Relationship & Improve the Lives of Indigenous Peoples, *"President Obama announced that "the United States supports the Declaration, which – while not legally binding or a statement of current international law – has both moral and political force." He further stated that "The United States is therefore pleased to support the Declaration's call to promote the development of a new and distinct international concept of self-determination specific to indigenous peoples." "Sixteen different tribes, from Maine to Alaska, participated this summer in the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs Water Training Program. The Training Program is taught by instructors from several Department of the Interior bureaus. The program strengthens tribal government employees who have the necessary expertise to help alleviate the shortage of technical expertise on Indian reservations." President Obama signed the Presidential Memorandum on the implementation of Executive Order 13175, "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments" and directed all federal agencies to develop detailed plans of action to implement the Executive Order.... U.S. Government efforts in this area are numerous..." including creating the new Office of Tribal Relations in the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Energy found it appropriate to establish a Tribal Steering Committee. "Some agencies have experimented with "webinars"*

and other online technology to permit tribal leaders to participate in consultations without incurring the costs and time commitments of in-person sessions." In addition, the Administration is continuing its multi-agency collaborations with tribal governments to develop comprehensive policy for Indian Country.

Comment 12 - Water Rights/Supply

d. The 1956 Klamath Shasta Transfer and 2007 study done by Fish and Game and RCD was not analyzed and adequately discussed in section 3.8. This study enacts Application A016958. Similarly, "In 1905, Reclamation filed a formal application with the State of Oregon to secure a water supply for the lands within the project area (Reclamation 2000)."

e. http://klamathrestoration.gov/ "WELCOME This is the official website of the Department of the Interior, and other federal and state agencies that are involved in carrying *out obligations set forth in the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement,* including the Secretarial Determination on Klamath River dams. Use this website to stay up to date on issues surrounding the Secretarial Determination and the environmental analysis that will be conducted pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Comment 13 - KHSA

f. The fact that the KHSA is unsigned by all stakeholders is misrepresented.

Comment 14 - KHSA

g. Pacific Corp, while eventually agreeing to the KHSA purely because they will be released from pending environmental laws and litigation (a fact found on-line by Pacific Corp employees and in private conversation), is being coerced to pass land over to the government. According to the KHSA, Interim Measure 21: BLM Land Management Provisions "Beginning in 2010 and continuing until transfer of the J.C. Boyle facility, PacifiCorp shall fund land management activities by the Bureau of Land Management as specified in this interim measure. BLM will provide PacifiCorp an annual Work Plan for the management measures described below for road maintenance, invasive weed management, cultural resource management, and recreation. The Work Plan will include the status of Work Plan tasks from the prior year, a description of the prioritized tasks for the upcoming year, and their estimated costs. PacifiCorp or BLM will mutually establish the annual delivery date of the Work Plan taking into consideration fiscal and maintenance calendars and may request a meeting to coordinate the content of the plan. PacifiCorp will provide funding within 60 days of concurring with the Work Plan. Administrative services, environmental review or permitting efforts, if necessary, to implement actions under the funds shall not require additional PacifiCorp funding beyond the amounts specified below.

A. PacifiCorp shall provide up to $15,000 per year to BLM towards projects identified through the coordination process described above for the purpose of road maintenance in the Klamath Canyon. This funding will be used to annually maintain the access road from State Highway 66 to the J.C. Boyle Powerhouse and terminate at the BLM Spring Island Boat Launch. Remaining funds will be used to do non-recurring road maintenance work on roads within the Canyon as mutually agreed upon in writing by BLM and PacifiCorp.

Comment 14 cont.

		B. PacifiCorp shall provide up to $10,000 per year to BLM for use by the Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) towards projects identified through the coordination process described above for the purpose of integrated weed management of invasive weed species along the road system and river corridor within the Klamath Canyon. Noxious weed control projects will be coordinated with Siskiyou County to ensure that weeds are controlled along the river corridor from the Oregon-California boundary to the top of Copco Reservoir. C. PacifiCorp shall provide up to $10,000 per year to BLM towards projects identified through the coordination process described above for the management of the following 5 BLM cultural sites which are within, or partially within, the T1 terrace of the J.C. Boyle full flow reach: 35KL21/786, 35KL22, 35KL24, D-735KL558, and 35KL577. Management of additional sites with these funds can occur with mutual written agreement between PacifiCorp and BLM. D. PacifiCorp shall provide up to, but no more than, $130,000 in funding for the development and implementation of a Road Management Plan to be implemented during the Interim Period. The Road Management Plan shall be developed by BLM and PacifiCorp and will determine priorities for operation and maintenance, including remediation or restoration of redundant or unnecessary facilities, of the shared BLM/PacifiCorp road system within the Klamath River Canyon from J.C. Boyle Dam to the slack water of Copco Reservoir."
5. According to the KHSA, Purpose of Settlement, "The Parties have entered into this Settlement for the purpose of resolving among them the pending FERC relicensing proceeding by establishing a process for potential Facilities Removal and operation of the Project until that time." The "parties" who have signed the KHSA are not the appropriate stakeholders to make such a decision. Several identified parties did not sign the KHSA, yet the Lead Agencies proceeded without addressing their concerns and without all critical stakeholders involved in the process or proposal.	Comment 15 - KHSA Comment 16 - Economics	See above.
6. If you follow where land, water rights and money is going in this program you will easily find the redistribution of wealth (land, water rights, contracts), dismissal of the requirement to comply with local and federal regulations to program insiders, and pandering of US tax dollars to prepare misleading propaganda and false promises of jobs a boon to the local economy.		See 4. a. Jobs creation fails to identify the fact that the only job gains will be governmental, and most of these will not be given to local residents due to education requirements. The Basin Monitoring Jobs are created for the government employment. There is no private sector growth. Source of funding of these new positions is not identified – but as these are government jobs the will be state of federal expenses, and the impact of these new resources has not been vetted in the EIR/EIS. These positions have not be justified.
7. The EIR/EIS cost/benefit analysis of the removal of the dams is biased and omits considerations. The financial impact is grossly underestimated and the quantification of gains exaggerated. The	3.8, SONCC page 194-203, 3.8.7, 4.71, 4.73, 4.74, 4.77-	3.8.3.2 Lower Klamath Basin. As described above, the Lower Klamath Basin includes seven sub-watersheds downstream of Iron Gate Dam. The area of analysis does not include the Shasta, Scott, Salmon, and Trinity Rivers (see Figure 3.8.1)". YET Per the Expert Panel, Water quality problems are NOT solved by the KBRA. Expert Panel: "Monitoring programs should be planned,

Comment 17 - Costs

Comment 20 - Water Quality

Comment 18 - KBRA

Comment 20 cont.

Comment 21 - Alternatives

EIR/EIS assumes that the KBRA aggressive tactics to overtake water rights have been approved, yet not all stakeholders have signed. Several critical stakeholders refused to sign because the impact was unknown and too great. Other signers of the KHSA/KBRA are not truly stakeholders but NGO's with special interests and benefits from the outcome. The use of the term "stakeholder" and "Agreement" are thus misleading. Siskiyou County has not signed on as a critical Stakeholder and the residents voted to not remove dams in Measure G by 79%. This is not mentioned in the EIR/EIS yet is known by the lead agencies. Public testimony on Oct. 20th, 2011 to the Lead Agencies included county officials who noted grossly overlooked analysis of the impact to the community, jobs, schools, fire and police access to land, water, threat of fire due to timber restrictions, cutting off public access to public lands, and drug cartels operating on tribal land.

Comment 19 - Other/ General

82, 4.78, 4.82, 4.88

Constructio n: 4.73, 4.83, 4.86, 4.88, 4.95, SONCC

Klamath River Expert Panel, FINAL REPORT, Scientific Assessmen t of Two Dam Removal Alternative s on Coho Salmon and Steelhead, April 25, 2011.

coordinated, and implemented now for effective and timely detection of the consequences for the salmon of the grand experiment comprising the dam removal and KBRA program".
Comment: "The technical approach embraced by the KBRA will not likely be sufficient and the cost of treatment and/or umping associated with such actions is likely to be prohibitive..." Expert Panel Responses include: "The information referred to by this commenter is what led the Panel to express its frustration with the lack of details in the KBRA." Further Expert Panel Response: "The Panel stated that changes in flows would be small under dams-out with KBRA."

Comment 392; "The Executive Summary hints, but offers no resonating answer, to the question: Would keeping the dams guarantee failure?" Expert Panel Response: "The report has been revised in response to this comment. The Panel responds that, of course, the Panel could not answer that exact question, and as many of the comments suggest its task was to compare the two alternatives."

Comment 391; "Dam removal will open the door to innovative solutions, even if data and the existing integration have not provided a convincing trail. However, a stronger assertion that the future will require options is needed from the Panel." Panel Response: "The Panel discussed the need for flexibility and targeted modeling and data collection into the future. Indeed, other commenters said these discussions were out of scope."
"The KBRA's incremental contribution to the significant cumulative effects on fisheries would be beneficial."
"Dam removal could change surface water flows available for diversion downstream of Iron Gate Dam... The results showed either a slightly higher or slightly lower flow rate on the Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Flows under the Proposed Action could change both because of the dam removal activities and the KBRA diversion and in stream flow requirements and these effects are combined in these figures... The modeling results show that at Seiad Valley, approximately 62 miles downstream from the Iron Gate Dam, the flow rates would be nearly identical." The KBRA diversion actions have not been approved and are incorporated into the No Action models. Siskiyou County has not approved or signed on the KHSA or KBRA and are Stakeholders.

Comment 22 - Water Rights/Supply

"The USFWS has claimed vested water rights under the Reclamation's Klamath Project for two of the refuges, the Lower Klamath and Tule Lake NWRs, as well as federal reserved water rights for the two refuges. Water rights for these four refuges are being quantified in the Klamath Basin Adjudication."
Per the signed KHSA, **EXHIBIT 2 Sequence of Performance Chart,** funding of the "Proposed Action" relies on actions that have not yet been fully vetted in a California election. Per the "Enactment of California Bond Measure Passed in November 2009, to be voted on before March 31, 2012"

Comment 23 - Water Rights/Supply

Per the signed KHSA, "**Value to Customers**" means potential cost reductions described in Section 7.3.8. These cost reductions would (1) decrease the customer contribution for Facilities Removal, (2) decrease the costs of ongoing operations, (3) decrease the costs of replacement power, or (4) increase the amount of generation at the Facilities, as compared against the assumptions contained in PacifiCorp's Economic Analysis." Frank and factual value to

Comment 23 cont.

		customers is not addressed through out the document. "Implementation of Water Diversion Limitations could result in decreased summer water temperatures in the Klamath River upstream of the Hydroelectric Reach." Significance is noted as NCFEC (no change from existing conditions) for short term and B (beneficial) for long-term. Mitigation: None. "Implementation of the Water Use Retirement Program could result in decreases in summer water temperature and nutrient inputs to Upper Klamath Lake." Significance is noted as NCFEC (no change from existing conditions) for short term and B (beneficial) for long-term. Mitigation: None. *"Roads are a high threat to all life stages of Coho salmon in the Shasta River population because most roads in the watershed are unpaved. Road density if very high (>3 miles of reads/sq. mile) in the following tributary sub-basins, where high IP reaches predominate: upper Shasta River, Boles Creek, lower Whitney Creek, upper Springs Creek, the upper Little Shasta River, upper Ricky Gulch, and Yreka Creek and high (2.5 to 3.0 miles of roads/s. mile) in Eddy Creek, upper Parks Creek, Carrick Creek, Willow Creek and upper Juniper Creek.... Erosion potential from unmaintained roads is greatest in the upper portions of these sub-basins where heavy rain and rain on snow occur in areas containing roads from past timber harvest activities."* This is in contradiction with one of the major action Plans proposed in this report. While report is proposing to wash 20 cubic yards of sediments and contaminants down the river while dams are removed and allow erosion to occur during this process, a plan that may never allow the river to recover, the concerns above are of little or no impact in comparison. This plan should put as a feasible priority to clean up state owned roads and update road maps so that people looking for passage may choose on their right to take paved roads over unmaintained roads through federal land. Traffic is very low in these areas and with the apparent unlimited budget of this program, money should be spent aiding all landowners in improving culverts, bridges, and eroding dirt roads. Such actions would support the stated ultimate goals of this plan and save taxpayers 100s of millions of dollars. Multiple governmental programs overlap and a lack of accountability for results is rampant! *According to the* SONCC, Volume I, Appendix C, "*strides have been made in acquiring big springs complexes that are the key to survival in the Shasta River basin"* and taking or disrupting privately owned land/businesses. The cost of "recovery" in the Shasta River Population alone is grossly estimated to be $90,786,729. This is without dam removal.
8. The threat to endangered and non-endangered animal and plant species is a violation of those laws and does not justify the "potential" outcomes of the goals. Double standards and disregard for the natural environment are again prevalent. The agencies own Expert Panel's decisions are dismissed if they do not support the Lead Agencies desired outcomes – this act of repeatedly dismissing your independent scientific panels opinion (in both the Coho and	4.81, 4.82, 4.83, 4.72, 4.73, 4.74, 4.75, 4.78, 4.79, 4.84, 4.85, 4.89, 4.96, FINAI REPORT in response to minor errors in the literature cited and	"Overall, the effects of the Proposed Actions are most likely to include physiological stress, inhibited growth, and high mortality for some portion of the age 0-2020 cohort and age 1 2019 cohort." "Up to 100% mortality is predicted for incubating eggs and larval life stages, and up to 20% percent mortality is predicted for rearing juveniles under a most-likely-to occur scenario, or up to 40% mortality under a worst case scenario." Yet conclusions are "The Proposed Action's incremental contribution to the long-term significant cumulative effects on green sturgeon would not be cumulatively considerable." "Redband trout in riverine reaches between the reservoirs in the Hydroelectric Reach would be vulnerable to sub lethal and lethal

Comment 24 - Transportation

Comment 25 - Fish

Comment 26 - Fish

Comment 27- Fish

Comment 25 cont.

Chinook studies) illegitimizes the agencies use and definition of "science".

several comments inadvertently omitted from the final report dated June 13, 2011

FINAL REPORT: Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives on Coho Salmon and Steelhead (April 25, 2011)

Comment 27 cont.

effects of sediments released during dam removal and bed load deposition." Yet conclusions are: "The Proposed Action's contribution to cumulative effects on redband trout would be short-term and minimal."

"Steelhead: Reservoir drawdown associated with dam removal under the Proposed actions could alter SSCs and bedload sediment transport and deposition and affect steelhead. Effects of suspended sediment resulting from the Proposed Action on steelhead are likely to be high for the portion of the population that spans in tributaries upstream for the Trinity River. For that portion of the population, effects are anticipated for at lease 6 year classes, including on adults, run-backs, half-pounders, an juveniles rearing in the mainstream, and out-migrating smolts... The proposed Action's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect on steelhead would be cumulatively considerable; however it would be reduced by the implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-2 and AR-3. In addition, some portion of the progeny of those adults that spawn successfully would rear in tributaries long enough to not only avoid the most serious impacts of the Proposed Action in 202, but may also not return for up to two years, when any suspended sediment resulting from the Proposed Action should be greatly reduced... the Proposed Action's incremental contribution to the significant cumulative effects on summer and winter steelhead would be cumulatively considerable even with mitigation measures AR-2 and AR-3. No other feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact."

"Bull trout populations in the Klamath Basin have been severely reduced and fragmented." "Dam removal associated with the Proposed Action could alter habitat availability for anadromous fish, which could affect bull trout. Bull trout upstream of Upper Klamath Lake could be affected by increased predation from reintroduced salmonids, but this loss might be offset by an increase in available food sources (e.g. eggs, fry, and juveniles of reintroduced salmonids) (Hamilton et al. 2010)."

Comment 28 - Fish

"The Proposed Action would release dam-stored sediment downstream to the Lower Klamath River. Adult eulachon entering the Klamath River after January 2020 might be exposed to elevated suspended sediment concentrations for a portion of their migration period. Short-term decreased in water quality associated with the Proposed Action might affect adults and larvae in the mainstream Klamath River." "Euchalon abundance in the Klamath River is in decline and eulachon spawning populations have severely declined and may become endangered in the future." Per the EIR/EIS, they are impacted by "in-water construction or alterations, road building and maintenance and pollution and runoff from industrial activities..." all actions that will be taken along with blasting in the Proposed Actions.

Comment 29 - Fish

The Proposed Actions would eliminate habitat for the introduced resident species in the Hydroelectric Reach. Because these species were introduced and they occur in other nearby water bodies, their loss would not be considered significant from a biological perspective,.." YET the conclusion is "There would be no significant cumulative effects associated with the loss of habitat for introduced resident species."

		"Longfin smelt entering the Klamath River after January 2020 might be exposed to elevated suspended sediment concentrations."
		Comment 30 - Other Aquatic Life The Proposed Action could affect fresh water mussels through the release of sediments during reservoir drawdown. Very little information exists on population trends in the Klamath River; therefore, it is difficult to determine if other cumulative actions or projects have contributed to significant cumulative effects on freshwater mussels... The suspended sediment concentrations would cause major physiological stress to freshwater mussels and might result in substantial mortality. The most significant impacts would occur downstream of Iron Gate Reservoir, especially to those individual freshwater mussels or freshwater mussel beds upstream of Orleans and closest to Iron Gate Dam." "Due to the extended time it takes for freshwater mussels to reach sexual maturity (4 years or more...), the reestablishment of freshwater mussel populations within affected reaches might be slow and might not be readily noticeable for some time, possibly a decade or more." Yet the conclusion is drawn that "The Proposed Action's incremental contribution to the long-term cumulative effects on freshwater mussels would be beneficial."
		"Green Sturgeon: Up to 100 percent mortality is predicted for incubating eggs and larval life stages, and up to 20 percent mortality is predicted for rearing juveniles under a most-likely-to-occur scenario, or up to 40 percent mortality under a worst case scenario. Overall, the effects of the Proposed Action are most likely to include physiological stress, inhibited growth, and high mortality for some portion of the age 0 202 cohort and age 1 2019 cohort.... the Mitigation Measure AR-3 would be implemented to reduce the short-term impacts of suspended sediment concentrations on green sturgeon adults post-spawning; however, there would still be short –term impacts to green sturgeon including lethal and sub lethal effects." Comment 31 - GHGs EPA greenhouse gas emissions are not addressed. Comment 32 - Economics Economic impacts to the area are not addressed by loss of agriculture. Comment 33 - Economics Economic impacts to the area to have to import fuel and the associated export of wealth, is not addressed.
9. Scientific data and arguments for dam removal and listing of species are weak and historically unsupported. Scientific testimonies in multiple steps in this process were ignored and are omitted from consideration, such as the expert panels. Contradictions are throughout the EIR/EIS and supporting reports and studies. Books such as "*The Great Salmon Hoax*" and its large bibliography, have well documented scientific data that dam removal will not bring back the fish and that better management of commercial fishing, gill netting and fish stock management are the best keys to the survival of the species the agencies claim to care so much about. The	Coho Page 179-180, 182, 4-78, 4-83, 4-84, 4.72, 4.74, 4.75, 4.78, 4.79, 4.81, 4.82, 4.83, 4.84, 4.85, 4.88, 4.90, 4.91, 4.93, 4.94, SONCC	While it is sad to see an indigenous species disappear – although historic and current data reveal that these fish are not truly indigenous to the Klamath basin. As the Department of Fish and Game documentation establishes, salmon were planted in the Klamath River in 1895. Record numbers of salmon have since been released by state, Indian and privately fun hatcheries. Expert Panel discussions provided as scientific evidence in the EIR/EIS packet clearly dismiss the science around the Coho salmon, yet are ignored. Comment: "This entire discussion seems to be based on the discomfort the Panel has with nonspecific nature of the KBRA management to the point that it ignores the dam removal part of the alternative. The habitat connectivity response to the question is missing." Panel Response: "The report has been revised in response to this comment. The Panel responds that the commenter is correct. If KBRA is critical to the program, which the Panel was told it was, then it seems logical that lack of specifics about KBRA would make an expert panel charged with offering their

Comment 34 - NEPA/CEQA

Comment 35 - Fish

Comment 34 cont.

continuing dismissal of such well established independent science is unacceptable in the scientific world and leaves one to believe that a political agenda is driving this process, not science.		opinions quite uncomfortable. There is too much 'trust me', and the Panel's experience with other large-scale restoration projects supports the Panel's discomfort; often the general descriptions of restoration plans are much more optimistic and grandiose than the actions that are implemented." Expert Panel discussions, comment 344; *"if the habitat added or improved is sufficient to affect steelhead,...* Wouldn't having dams out provide another option for O. myskiss and increase the number of life histories available to species and population?" Panel Response: This comment is noted. The Panel responds that the answer to the commenter's question is, maybe." Expert panel discussions, comment 381; "since temperature of spring and groundwater input to rivers typically approximates mean annual air temperature.' This assumption needs a citation." Panel Response: "The Panel responds that it is a general world-wide approximate rule for well-understood physical reasons. Temperatures are slightly warmer in volcanic and tectonically active regions, but then the Panel inserted the relevance of that statement for the lower Klamath, one of the reviewers above did not like that either." Expert panel discussions, comment 386; Comment: "Depending on who is reading the Panel report, a 'small' short-term improvement for Coho salmon... can be considered highly significant or highly insignificant. I think 'small' will be highly significant long-term, notwithstanding the scarcity of data and analysis..." Panel Response: "The Panel agrees with this comment..." "It is anticipated that as a result of the Proposed Action the Upper Klamath River, Mid-Klamath River, Shasta river, Scott River, Salmon River, and Lower Klamath River Coho salmon population units would have an increase in abundance, productivity, population spatial structure, and genetic diversity." "Significant adverse cumulative effects on longfin smelt have occurred from... predation, and bycatch in a commercial fishery." "The main cumulative impacts that threaten eulachon are identified by NOAA Fisheries Service as climate change impacts, ocean conditions, eulachon bycatch, dams/water diversions, water quality, dredging, and predation (NOAA Fisheries Service 2010). Other substantial cumulative impacts include in-water construction or alterations, including channel modifications, shoreline stabilization, sand and gravel mining, and road building and maintenance and pollution and runoff from industrial activities, urbanization, grazing, agriculture, and forestry operations (NOAA Fisheries Service 2010)." Noted impacts are not investigated or quantified for impact and potential mitigation or in lieu of the proposed actions including; climate change, ocean conditions and natural migration, predation (including predation by protected species, gill netting and commercial fishing, channel modifications). "Dam removal associated with the Proposed Action could alter habitat availability for anadromous fish, which could affect bull trout. Bull trout upstream of Upper Klamath Lake could be affected by increased predation from reintroduced salmonids..." "The Proposed Action's contribution to the significant cumulative effects on predation of bull trout would be counteracted by the increase in food source that would become available from eggs, fry, and

		juveniles of reintroduced salmonids." Additionally... "the Proposed Action provides promise for preventing the extinction of bull trout and for increasing overall population and abundance and distribution. Therefore the Proposed Action's incremental contribution to the significant cumulative effect on bull trout would not be cumulatively considerable in the short –term or long-term." In addition to the above contradictions and circular argument, bull trout are noted in this document as currently facing "high risk of extirpation" and susceptible to the very same actions that dam removal will expose them to, only in magnitude: habitat degradation (blasts, road construction, bridges etc....), diversions, reduced water quantity and quality, and sedimentation. The Proposed Actions should be considered cumulatively significant in both the short and long term. Per the EIR/EIS, "Coho salmon population levels have declined significantly over the last 100 years, and currently a substantial number of Chinook salmon and Coho that return to spawn in the Klamath Basin were spawned in hatcheries (NOAA Fisheries Services, 2009). Yet according to the NOAA website on 12/27/2011, scientific studies for salmon recovery are incomplete (in draft) and **Priority Recovery Actions Needed differ from the KBRA/KHAS/EIR/EIS. Per NOAA,** "Several priority recovery actions are needed for the SONCC Coho salmon ESU, including the following: Complete the recovery plan and begin to implement recovery actions; Research and monitor distribution, status, and trends of salmon; Complete and fund a population-monitoring plan; Promote operations of current recovery hatcheries and develop HGMPs to minimize negative influences of hatcheries; Improve freshwater habitat quantity and quality; Conduct focused freshwater habitat restoration in anadromous salmonid streams (e.g., erosion control, bank stabilization, riparian protection and restoration, and reintroduction of large woody debris); Balance water supply and allocation with fisheries needs through a water rights program, designate fully appropriated watersheds, develop passive diversion devices or off-stream storage, eliminate illegal water diversions, and improve criteria for water drafting and dam operations; Improve agricultural and forestry practices, in particular, riparian protections, road construction, and road maintenance; Improve county and city planning, regulations (e.g., riparian and grading ordinances), and county road maintenance programs; Remove/upgrade high-priority man-made fish passage barriers (e.g., watercourse crossings and non-hydropower dams); Implement screening of all water diversion structures; Replace existing, outdated septic systems and improve wastewater management; Identify and treat point and non-point source pollution of streams from wastewater, agricultural practices, and urban environments; Modify channel and flood control maintenance and eliminate artificial breeching of sandbars for improvements in channel and estuarine habitats." Dam removal is not expressly called for! According to "A Biological Needs Assessment for Anadromous Fish in the Shasta River Siskiyou County, California" published by the Fish and Game in July 1997, the report data demonstrates that the construction and raising of Dwinnel dam did not impact Coho Salmon counts. *"The Shasta Valley RCD continues it's streambank protection program, has revived its riparian planting program, and is*

		investigating irrigation tailwater reduction strategies. Efforts have started to fund the lease/purchase of cold water for dedication to the Shasta River and Parks Creek. Finally, efforts are underway to expand accessible SONCC Coho salmon habitat, especially in the Big Springs Complex area, Little Shasta River, and Upper Parks Creek." There should not be any efforts to expand Coho salmon habitat in areas that did not ever have Coho salmon. Has a study been made to determine the amount of water required for a stream bank rehabilitation program and where will this additional water come from? All existing programs should be reassessed, results quantified, and fully utilized or closed if ineffective. I gladly volunteer my services as a quality auditor to ensure that synergy, integrity and efficiency is being served our tax dollars. *"Hatchery Coho salmon adults currently comprise 16 percent of adult carcasses recovered in the Shasta River basin and these data suggest that hatchery effects may be excessive (Ackerman and Cramer 2006)."* The past practice and effects of removing or killing all unmarked, natural reared, returning Coho to the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery has not been addressed. This has skewed data as thousands of fish were killed by the agencies and records to such effect are public.
Comment 36 - CEQA 10. The impacts of dam removal are inconsistently stated and under reported. Risks to the public are not fully disclosed. Many are unknown even to the agencies. CEQA requires each public agency to mitigate or avoid the significant effects of projects that it carries out or approves whenever it is feasible to do so (Pub. Res. Code 21002.1(b). Mitigation throughout the EIR/EIS is minimal and of little impact to the cumulative affects of the Proposed Actions impact.	4-28, 4-79, 4-61, 4-29, 4-31, 4-54	"Water Quality: Cumulative effects on water quality could be caused by short-term and long-term water quality impacts of the project, combined with other projects/action in the Klamath Basin that could contribute to adverse water quality effects. The timeframe for **short-term water quality effects related to reservoir drawdown is up to two years after construction**, although modeling suggests most water quality effects would be negligible after a year. The time frame for **long-term cumulative water quality effects extends from 2 to 50 years,** which includes the remainder of the Project analysis period and applies for the majority of the available numeric models of future water quality in the Klamath River." Therefore, long-term effects could extend beyond 50 years. "In addition, some portion of the (steelhead) progeny would rear in tributaries long enough to not only avoid the most serious impact of the Proposed Actions in 2020, but may also not return for up to two years, when any suspended sediment resulting from the Proposed Action should be greatly reduced." Aquatic Resources: Cumulative effects on aquatic resources could be caused by short-term and long-term effects on water and quality and habitat associated with the project, combined with other projects/actions in the Klamath Basin that could contribute to adverse aquatic resources effects. The timeframe for **short-term construction related cumulative effects analysis is the duration of deconstruction and up to 10 months after reservoir drawdown,** as suspended sediments are expected to remain elevated. The timeframe for **long-term cumulative effects is indefinitely after construction, as conditions for aquatic species would be permanently altered** with implementation of any of the proposed alternatives.
Comment 37 - Fish		"Reservoir drawdown associated with dam removal could alter SSCs and bedload sediment transport and deposition and affect redband trout" Significance is "B" or beneficial.
Comment 38 - NEPA/ CEQA		Cumulative Effects are listed by area of analysis but details of impacts are absent. Toxic/Hazardous materials (the proposed deconstruction areas surrounding the four facilities, transportation

		routes and disposal points for toxic hazardous materials… this is the area where exposure to toxic or hazardous materials could occur during deconstruction, transport, and/or disposal activities). Noise and Vibration (The region surrounding the Four Facility and the haul grounds in Klamath and Jackson Counties, Oregon and Siskiyou and Shasta Counties, California… this is the extent of where deconstruction and restoration activities would produce noise and vibration). Utilities and Public Services, Solid Waste, Public Health and Safety, Power… Public Health and Safety: The proposed dam deconstruction areas surrounding the Four Facilities (for deconstruction safety issues), downstream of the dams (for flooding impact), and the associated reservoirs (for impacts related to wildfires and public health issues). Power: Existing generator facilities, employees and local customer base in Siskiyou and Klamath Counties and other potential power supply sources used to service the existing customer base (Other sources of power will be needed to replace lost service)." Draining the reservoirs and sediment release could cause short-term human exposure to contaminants from contact wit deposited sediments on exposed reservoir terraces and river banks within the Hydroelectric Reach." Significance "S" (significant): Mitigation: None "Dam removal and/or elimination of hydropower peaking operations at J.C. Boyle Powerhouse could cause short-term and long-term alterations in daily water temperatures and fluctuations in the J.C. Boyle bypass and peaking reaches… Significance "S" (significant): for springtime, "B" (beneficial) for late summer/fall. Mitigation: None. "Dam removal and conversion of the reservoir areas to a free-flowing river could cause short-term and long-term increases in spring time water temperatures and decreases in late summer/fall water temperatures in the Hydroelectric Reach downstream of Copco 1 Reservoir". Significance "S" (significant): for springtime, "B" (beneficial) for late summer/fall. Mitigation: None. Lower Klamath Basin: "Draining the reservoirs and release of sediment could cause short-term and long-term increases in sediment deposition in the Klamath River or Estuary that could alter morphological characteristics and indirectly affect seasonal water temperatures." Significance "NCFEC" (significant): No Change From Existing Conditions. Mitigation: None. Upper Klamath Basin: "Draining the reservoirs and release of sediment could cause short-term increases in suspended material in the Hydroelectric Reach downstream of J.C.Boyle dam". Significance "S" (significant): Mitigation: None. "Dam removal could eliminate the interception and retention of mineral (inorganic) suspended materials behind the dams and result in long-term increases in suspended material in the Hydroelectric Reach". Significance "LTS" (Less Than Significant): Mitigation: None. "Dam removal could eliminate the interception and retention of algal-derived (organic) suspended materials behind the dams and result in long-term increases in suspended material in the Hydroelectric Reach". Significance "LTS" (Less Than Significant): Mitigation: None. "Draining the reservoirs and release of sediment could cause short term increases in suspended material in the lower Klamath River and the Klamath Estuary". Significance "S" (Significant): Mitigation:

		None. Draining the reservoirs and release of sediment could cause short-term increases in sediment loads from the Klamath River to the Pacific Ocean and corresponding increases in concentrations of suspended material and rates of deposition in the marine nearshore environment." Significance "LTS" (Less Than Significant): Mitigation: None. Dam removal and sediment release could cause short-term increases in oxygen demand (Immediate Oxygen Demand and Biological Oxygen Demand) and reductions in dissolved oxygen in the lower Klamath River, the Klamath Estuary, and the marine nearshore environment." Significance "S" (Significant for lower Klamath River from Iron Gate Dam to Clear Creek, NCFEC, or No Change From Existing Conditions, from Klamath Estuary or Marine Nearshore Environment): Mitigation: None.
Comment 39 - NEPA/CEQA 11. Coho Salmon are being used as a pawn as this document is clearly for the redistribution of land and water rights to appease a multitude of deals made past, present and future with the local Indian tribes and the government while the access and management of the land, water and fishing in many of these deals is un-quantified and unchecked.	3.8.12	Comment 40 - ITAs "The federal courts have confirmed that the U.S. reserved fishing rights for the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Tribes when it set aside reservations along the Klamath and Trinity Rivers DOI has found that the origin orders setting aside the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Reservations also reserved rights for in stream flows sufficient to sustain fish within the reservation Although the State of CA has not commenced an adjudication to determine the quantity of water to which the Tribes have a right to support their reserved fishing rights, the recognition of such rights is consistent with the federal precedent set in U.S. v. Adair." The Rancheria Reservation was purchased by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1938 under the authority of the Indian Reorganization Act, and proclaimed an Indian reservation by Secretarial Order in 1939. Any fishing and concomitant water rights associated with the Resighini Rancheria have not yet been determined." Yet "The Lead Agencies used this data to assess whether changes to in-stream flows as a result of the project would be adequate to meet water right requirements." With un-quantified rights being promised to some of the Indian tribes (and not all) and additional land and water rights being promised the tribes in the KHSA/KBRA, it would be impossible to do this unless unpublished deals have been made with such tribes.
Comment 41- Fish		It is well documented that dam removal will threaten the existence of salmon, opening the river to flooding and drought. "Once the eggs are deposited in the redds, they are relatively safe from predators. However, one of the largest sources of mortality in the redds is flooding. The flooding can scour out the redds entirely, or bury them in silt that restricts the ability of water to percolate through the gravel. Very high flows can cause survival rates for eggs to fall by a factor of ten or more. Alternatively, redds can dry out if river levels drop, whether the cause is natural or the product of river regulation by dams. Some juvenile salmon have a tendency to burrow in and hide under gravel in the riverbeds, and sometimes, juvenile salmon trapped by falling water levels can dig deep to keep wet. (G. Easterbrook, *A Moment on the Earth* 144, 328) The sediment will be washed out by first heavy rains and runoffs – washing the redds out.
Comment 42 - Fish		The EIR/EIS fails to consider the following reasons as to why fish counts are "low": 1) Actually fish counts are high… record runs are in Alaska as the ocean waters are 7 degrees warmers and the salmon have moved North. 2) Indians are gill netting with improved nets spanning the rivers reaches. The numbers are unverified. 3) Sea

Comment 42 cont.

		lions are protected –recent documentary and news – they are at the river and taking fish from fishers in record numbers. 4) 85% of Coho only spawn 20 miles up the river. Healthy Coho salmon won't be seen up the river as promised. 5) Coho should not be listed as an endangered species as they are not indigenous. Chinook are most likely the fish from tribal lore and they are a more hearty fish. 6) Both Chinook and Coho salmon are being released in records high above the any historic records by the fish hatcheries in the area. 7) The water sources in Oregon are warm water (and it is actually filtered and cleaner after passing through the dams).
Comment 43 - Fish		The claim is made that *"data suggests the 2004 adult returning brood year class is the strongest in recent years, although still lower than historic numbers"* and *"Coho salmon runs in the Shasta Valley probably averaged a little more than 1,000 fish annually."* ... *"returns for the 2005 and 2006 brood classes were extremely depressed."* It is impossible to make a conclusion based on data that does not exist. Government agency generated data accessible on the internet suggest that Coho salmon were never indigenous to these waters and a natural migration to Alaska has been underway for decades due to ocean waters warming (volcanic and earthquake action being primary natural causes to this warming). Even in reports submitted to the Bureau of Reclamation Klamath Basin Area Office, on November 2, 2006 (Cramer Fish Sciences, *Estimation of Returns of Naturally Produced Coho to the Klamath River*) a study to conduct Coho Salmon counts in the Klamath basin "used the cumulative portion of the run passed by date in the Shasta in 2003 to estimate the number of Coho that passed the SRFCF in 2001-2002 and 2004, following removal of the counting equipment. This method assumes that the pattern of entry between years is the same. This is not likely because timing of entry may be influenced by flow.... Brown et al. (1994) estimated an average of 13,000 naturally produced Coho spawned in all of northern California in the period of 1987-1991, and of these only 1,860 returned to the Klamath. This estimate is equivalent to the smallest of run size estimated generated here for the period of 1999-2005. When the estimate of Brown et al. (1994) is compared to our "best estimates, there has been a 7-8 fold increase in naturally produced Coho returns to the Klamath between the period of 1987-1991 and 1999-1995. This is consistent with large increases among Coho returns to the Oregon coast in the same period (ODFW 2005) and likely was driven by significant changes in ocean conditions in the late 1990's complied with sharp reductions in ocean harvest of Coho (Nicholas et al. 2005)." The claim is made that *"adult Coho salmon have been observed spawning in the Shasta River Canyon, lower Yreka Creek, throughout the Big Springs Complex area, and in lower Parks Creek. Juvenile Coho salmon have been observed rearing in these same areas, continuing further upstream (Mount et al. 2008), and in the upper Little Shasta River."* These claims are not supported and there is data showing the planting of salmon in these areas, skewing the ability to make such claims are historic and factual. Salmon have never been seen in the upper Little Shasta River and no such reports exist to reasonable confer this to be the case. The source of data presented in this report is questionable. According to the SONCC Appendix C, C-21: *"Staff discussed the fact that viability in the Shasta River will be very difficult given the low number of fish..."*
Comment 44 - ITAs 2. The removal of dams can be partially	3.8.6,	According to the January 2011 Announcement of U.S. Support for

whittled down to a total mismanagement of Indian affairs and water rights in the basin and a redistribution of rights and resources to attempt to correct these problems. Select Indian tribes are being used to further the DOI agenda, and non-Indian residents and Indian tribes not supporting these dam removals are being removed, over run and dis-enfranchised. The result of this mismanagement is the igniting of local Indian conflicts as each Tribe fights for their potential stake and against current land owners and irrigators. Other legal water rights are threatened in the attempt to make tribes and Lead Agency's gains formidable. The problems seem to all arise from the DOI and CDFG starting to take over land under the name of the United States Government for "reclamation" and "conservation" programs, thus taking away land that was legally intended for tribes or under private ownership. Rather than manage the over 40-60% of the land up there that they have already claimed well, they have chosen an agenda to expand under the DOI's lead. Proceeding with this EIR/EIS when the foundation documents were not only not signed by all parties (KHSA/KBRA) has not only been reckless, it has cost the agencies, states of CA and Oregon and entire community money and grief.	3.8.7. Times-Standard	the United Nations Declarations on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Initiatives to Promote the Government-to-Government Relationship & Improve the Lives of Indigenous Peoples, the U.S. recognizes that some of the most grievous acts committed by the U.S. and many other States against indigenous peoples were with regard to their lands, territories, and natural resources." It is "for this reason that the U.S. stresses the importance of lands, territories, resources and redress provisions of the Declaration in calling on all States to recognize the rights of indigenous peoples to their lands, territories, and natural resources." "Recovering and protecting the tribes' land base is a hallmark objective of this Administration. After the recent Supreme Court decision in Carcieri v. Salazar, Congress introduced, and the Administration has fully supported, legislation to reaffirm the authority of the U.S. to take land into trust on behalf of all federally recognized Indian tribes. In 2010, The DOI provided grants worth more than $7 million through the Tribal Wildlife Grants Program for 42 Native American tribes to fund a wide range of conservation projects in 16 states. The Tribal Wildlife Grants program has provided more than $50 million in the past 8 years for 400 conservation projects administered by 162 federally recognized tribes.... DOI has also engaged in numerous cooperative resource protection efforts with tribes, including... restoration of the Klamath River through possible dam removal and in partnership with the Klamath River Basin Tribes..." The Klamath Tribes: In 1864 Treaty, of the 20 million acres ceded over US, 2 million acres retained by tribes and is known as the Klamath Reservation. In General Allotment Act of 1887, tribal lands were allotted to individuals within tribes. In 1954, Congress terminated recognition of Klamath Tribes and condemned remaining land not sold by tribes to non-tribal entities. The Klamath Termination Act preserved the Tribes' water rights and fishing rights. U.S. v Adair, held Tribes have water rights sufficient to support their treaty fishing, hunting and gathering rights with a priority date "time immemorial – thus senior to all other users in the basin. The courts also recognized a tribal water right for agrarian purposes, with a reservation date (1864) or prior." "All water right users in the Klamath Basin are subject to the senior federal reserved Tribal in stream flow rights that may reduce the available water to junior water rights users." Times-Standard 11-19-2011 "Members of the Resighini Rancheria strongly object to the approach taken by the federal government and the state of CA for Klamath River dam removal. We are a small, federally recognized Indian Tribe with a reservation in Del Norte County upstream of Hwy 101 on the Klamath River... The KBRA is very damaging to Indian rights and will not bring about restoration of the Klamath River. We were excluded from Klamath settlement discussion that lead to the KBRA and KHSA, as were the federally recognized Quartz Valley Indian Reservation and Del Norte County. The Hoopa Valley Tribe participated in the settlement talks but refused to sign the KBRA because they would have to expressly give up their water rights. Both our rights and theirs to protect our fisheries and water quality will be terminated by the secretary of the Interior if he makes an affirmative decision (KBRA 15.3.9). Those who are not KBRA and KHSA signatories (parties), such as nonparty tribes and Del Norte County, will be unable to participate

	in committees that govern the management of the Klamath River until 2062. This arrangement is undemocratic and of questionable legality under the Federal Advisory Committee ACT."
Comment 45 - Cultural Resources	Future unknown also exist with The Shasta Nation Tribe, whose burial grounds are documented as being under the current lakes. The Shasta Nation Tribe was not included in the "Settlement" agreement and they are arguably the most impacted tribe by the Proposed Action, KHSA and KBRA. They are against the dams being removed per public Testimony at the DOI/CDFG October 20, 2011 hearing on the EIR/EIS.
	"The members of the Quartz Valley Indian Community are of upper Klamath (Karuk) and Shasta Indian ancestry. The 174-acre Quartz Valley Indian Reservation is in Siskiyou County near the community of Fort Jones with in the Klamath watershed and area of study. Any fishing and concomitant water rights to which the Quartz Valley Community may be entitled have not yet been determined. According to the, Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA), "the Tribal Parties and the Federal Parties agree that this Settlement advances the trust obligation of the United States to protect Basin Tribes' federally-reserved fishing and water rights in the Klamath and Trinity River Basins" *"The effects of the fisheries managed by the State of California and the Yurok and Hoopa Tribes, on the continued existence of the SONCC Coho salmon ESU have not been formally evaluated by NMFS."* SONCC 40-21, line 1-6
Comment 46- Hydropower 3. The Proposed Actions are using salmon listing and creating water wars while promoting the Obama Administrations program to expand favored energy programs to favored parties, over renewal of the license for the existing clean hydroelectric energy. The EIR/EIS examined biomass facilities, the Ruby Pipeline and wind generation. Signers on the KBRA/KHSA show program intentions. The cost/benefit analysis did not review impacts of the replacement of the existing hydroelectric dams (which cost near to nothing and take few personnel to operate). Increased CO2 output from the proposed actions and the biomass facilities and Ruby Pipeline are not analyzed nor mentioned. The threat to endangered birds and the Klamath bird estuaries are not analyzed nor mentioned.	According to the Presidents January 2011 Announcement of U.S. Support for the United Nations Declarations on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Initiatives to Promote the Government-to-Government Relationship & Improve the Lives of Indigenous Peoples, "the Department of Energy provides grants to many Indian communities to allow them to develop renewable energy resources and energy efficient measures in their communities in ways that benefit not only those communities, both the whole planet, while servant as models for other U.S. communities. With DOE assistance, tribes are developing a wide-range of renewable energy resources and conservation measures, including geothermal, solar energy, wind and biomass technologies and comprehensive recycling programs. These programs reduce the carbon foot of tribal communities, while creating jobs and reducing costs." Projects considered in Cumulative Effects Analysis included only two private projects: The Ruby Pipeline L.L.C. (gas pipeline) implementation time frame of July 2010 to June 2011 AND Klamath Falls Bioenergy L.L.C. (electric facility generating facility burning biomass (wood), 38.5 megawatts. Implementation date is stated as unknown.

Comment 47 - Alternatives

My hope is that we stop now and make a well-balanced, state level business assessment of the scope, feasibility, legal and fiscal impact of this plan with particular focus on data integrity and redundant or unsuccessful study results. This is an opportunity to make something right for California, not run wild with the biggest program fathomable. There are alternative solutions that are less costly, legal and some seemed already underway that are overlooked in the EIR/EIS. Studies and results that demonstrated that many programs within are clearly not working and

Comment 47 cont.

failed to produce their intended results are not addressed, making expanding such programs a theoretical exercise with a multi-billion dollar price tag.

Comment 48 - NEPA/CEQA

In general, this document's distribution to the public was limited and to the extent available it was presented without adequate time for review or proper evaluation.

Comment 49 - Costs

It is irresponsible to validate this document. There are glaring deficiencies of extremely critical information regarding costs/benefit analysis, including the quantity of private property impacted, cost effective alternatives, and the effectiveness of previous projects throughout. Pursuant to the current U.S. and California fiscal crisis, the commitment of millions and more adequately billions of dollars over the next few decades (the proposed span and cost of this program is a few months to 50 years to indefinitely) is irresponsible - it borders on criminal to the extent of some of the actions considered (e.g. prohibiting access on privately owned land and purchasing ranches and above market prices using taxpayer dollars). To quote the report, "the total cost to recovery is challenging to reliably estimate because ***biological response of recovery actions is uncertain.***" With other state priorities such as education and social services in critical condition, this unsubstantiated and ill-intended plan exposes itself as an enormously wasteful use of public resources based on unsupported science to a hopeful but uncertain result of a few thousand fish.

No private business enterprise would execute on such a massive plan without proof that a smaller project demonstrated success to further invest in a scale up. Such an analysis would include the effectiveness of programs completed and underway (intrinsic reviews). The customers and/or clients, although never identified in this report, include not only its funding partners (government agencies, non-profits and tax payers I presume) but also the residents of Northern California and owners of land impacted by each and every step of this project. I presume that the producers of this report either do not own impacted land themselves or do not value this gift of our democracy or the fiscal well being of our state.

Comment 50 - Proposed Action/Project

This recovery program goes straight into legal and aggressive action: blowing up dams, buying land, forcing the fencing of all waterways to prevent passage in waters this report deems a Coho path (contradicting reports exist), removing roadways and increasing the threat of wildfires.

This recovery plan also demonstrates multiple double standards, where studies are done on private land with a lower or no standard required for state owned/run programs. Some of the responsibility for the current conditions is the state agencies due to mismanagement - those areas should be the primary focus in Phase I restoration.

According to the Southern Oregon Northern California Coho Salmon Recovery Program (Draft), SONCC 40-13, line 36-37, *"Of the six flashboard summer irrigation dams on the mainstem Shasta River, four have been removed, locally improving the function and condition of the mainstem river."* **As this is basically the recovery plan in a nutshell (remove dams to restore water ways), there is a critical data missing here to show that salmon access increased and population growth resulted. This should either sink or support the overall recovery plan - but data is not presented. The report failed to identify and deal with the fact that the return of Coho salmon has continued to decline since these actions were taken.** *Further, on* 40-17, line 8-9, Table 40-5 List of dams/diversion barriers in the Shasta River basin, *"adult radio tagging information since 2004 confirms that most Coho salmon tracked in the upper Shasta River prefer*

Comment 50 cont.

lower Parks Creek (CDFG 2008b)." **It would seem reasonable to keep the program where there is success, and focus initial efforts there before expanding or removing dams. Being cognizant that these reports will also cost money and the whole logic of a simple bypass for the fish in 1 critical areas should be looked at prior to the waste, contamination, and cost caused by damn removal.**

It is evident that the agencies scientist are well aware of the likelihood of failure to see an increase in salmon up the Klamath reaches, yet the agencies clearly debunked their expert panel testimonies. Further, the SONCC, Volume I, Appendix C, C-21 states that *"Staff discussed the fact that viability in the Shasta River will be very difficult given the low number of fish, and while this selection of core populations may not get us to viability quickest, it would be the best overall selection....Also, the staff believed that given the high percentage of federal land ownership in the basin that recovery and habitat improvement are liable to occur without selection as a core population."* There is no proof that recovery on federal lands will be "*liable and occur without selection of a core population*" and this further shows that this is about expanding control with no budget or requirement for data and results. The agencies seem to have carte blanch approval to spend money and aggressively take over land, often hand-in-hand with an NGO in buying land rather than improving and managing what they have.

A primary goal of the government should be to educate and support landowners, not to overtake and consume ranches and demolish clean hydroelectric dams at the ultimate expense of the state and citizens of CA. To my knowledge, this has been done minimally, covertly and disingenuously to date.

Examples: Among actions deemed "essential for the Coho salmon population in the Shasta River alone to "recover" to the extent necessary..." in supporting programs such as the SONCC. Note: This does not include the removal of Dwinnel Dam, home to 22,000 residents that is certain with a general decision to remove dams.
"Strides have been made in acquiring big springs complexes that are the key to survival in the Shasta River basin."
"Develop and implement a conservation banking program that finances purchase of land parcels, easements, and water rights/leases."
"Identify, design, permit and construct projects that will reduce tailwater input without putting more land into production and that will not increase diversions."
"Develop and implement plans to restore full passage for all life stages throughout the Shasta basin."
"Investigate opportunities to increase spatial structure of Shasta River population into all accessible area."
"Implement ITP program throughout basin."
"Provide enforcement and verify legal water use."
"Dedicate as much cold water from Big Springs (e.g. 40cfs), Hole in the Ground Creek, Shasta Springs, Clear Springs, Kettle Springs, Bridgefield Springs and any other available source of cold water to support all life stages of Coho salmon."
"Cattle exclusion fencing...." *"Conduct riparian fencing projects at all spring complexes to completely remove livestock from in stream channel areas, spring complexes, and riparian areas."*
"Provide sufficient flow for migration of adults below Dwinnel Dam to all accessible habitats, including the mainstem Shasta River and all tributaries."
"Secure dedicated unused water diversion rights".
"Establish and expand a water trust that uses secured funding and prioritized actions to sustain/reestablish flow connectivity."

Comment 50 cont.

"Beginning in 2010, the Watershed Wide Permitting Program (WWPP) includes the implementation and effectiveness monitoring of restoration activities associated with each landowner sub permit. These include: riparian fencing, livestock and vehicle stream crossings, riparian planting, installation of approved head gates and measuring devices to verify compliance with water rights, water diversion fish exclusion screens, irrigation tail-water reduction, fish passage assessments, and spawning gravel assessments." Verify the legality of actions taken within this program and the integrity of the organization. Landowners are often lead blindly into these programs, fees are assessed that damage landowners ability to keep their land. If this program has the money apparent by the girth of this proposed plan and truly care about the Coho salmon first and foremost, all such aid should be free of charge.

Comment 51 - NEPA/CEQA

The report looses credibility where it is inconsistent and does not include the assessment of the effectiveness and impact of Federal and State agency actions and State and tribe run fisheries in addition to opportunities and fair treatment of California small businesses.

For example: *"timber harvest is a medium threat to all life stages of Coho salmon, due primarily to residual impacts from logging-derived sediment mobilization... The volume of timber harvested on national forest land diminished in the early 1990's, and has remained low since the implementation of the Klamath National Forest's Land and Resource Management Plan in 1994 (USFS 1994b)."* In the past, the impact of poor logging management on federal land would be classified as critical due to poor road construction, water crossing blocking flow, erosion in to waterways. The effects can still be seen in federal land and should be addressed. Impacts were felt for years in the waterways and studies from impacted waterways should be considered. If the roads and logging are truly the impacts claimed in the report, improvements should have been measureable since timber harvesting and road use in these areas is greatly reduced. It must be noted that private land owners are subject to fees, studies, approvals that the federal agencies are not subjected to... there fore their harvesting activating should be rated as a low threat (unless these programs are publically deemed ineffective).

Comment 52 - Alternatives

As a general recommendation, this report should remove over reaching, aggressive recommendations and re-approach working with land owners to honor their rights as hard working, tax paying U. S. citizens.

I am grateful for your consideration of all of these important issues and look forward to finding out the direction you take in these matters. If further input is requested, I am happy to oblige.

Sincerely,

Kristen Riter
ASQ Certified Quality Auditor, BAS Biology/Political Science UC Davis
1836 Fallbrook Drive
Alamo, CA 94507
kristen_riter@yahoo.com

E'lan Bacigalupi Riter
William Steele Riter
1836 Fallbrook Drive

Alamo, CA 94507

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1230_1218-1	The EIS/EIR analyzes the impacts of the removal of the Four Facility and connected actions as part of the Proposed Action. These actions are analyzed at a programmatic level based on the extent that information is known at this time. The comment author did not specify the "multitude of other actions" that are "not fully presented or studied in this report."	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-3	Master Response N/CP-12 Public Record. The Lead Agencies have exceeded the minimum review period for an EIS/EIR in an effort to allow additional review and provide the opportunity for more comments.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-4	Master Response RE-4 Takings. The Supreme Court has held that the construction, operation, and removal of dams does not violate State sovereignty under the Tenth Amendment, as the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) derives its authority from validly-exercised Congressional Acts. However, the dams being considered for removal are not under the authority of Reclamation, and the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) is currently not authorized to direct their removal. Legislation has been introduced into both houses of Congress, which would grant such authority to the Secretary. Nothing in the Proposed Action regards the quartering of soldiers, with which the Third Amendment of the Constitution is concerned. Lastly, the Proposed Action in the EIS/EIR was developed from settlement agreements involving many stakeholders, including stakeholders with the welfare of local communities in mind. The settlement agreements strive to achieve a result based on consensus, and are not an exercise of abused power as the comment author suggests. As laid out in the Statement of Purpose and Need, the Secretary, in making his determination, will weigh whether dam removal is in the public interest.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-5	Responses to specific comments by letter as listed in the original comment letter: b. The "Off-Project Water Settlement" (OPWAS) is upstream from Upper Klamath Lake and therefore does not directly include issues associated with diversions out of Upper Klamath Lake for the refuges. Tribal issues in this region would be managed in negotiations by the tribal representatives and Bureau of Indian	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Affairs. If no settlement is achieved, then the adjudications process in Oregon will determine the priority of water rights for this area. The settlement actions would be developed with the potential to provide an amicable and quicker solution for those who are affected by the ongoing Klamath Basin Adjudication. d. This statement is accurate. e. The Klamath Basin Compact is discussed in Section 3.8, p.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR. f. This statement is accurate.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-6	The cited text is from the Water Supply/Water Rights resource area; however, the City of Yreka water supply pipeline relocation is analyzed throughout the document. Some of the elements, such as access facilities, are considered together with dam removal.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-7	Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantial Information.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-8	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-9	The Draft EIS/EIR notes that watershed problems in the Klamath Basin are caused by many factors and likely will not all be solved by just removing dams. As a result, the Proposed Action includes the KHSA and KBRA. In broad terms, the KHSA speaks to removal of hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River; the KBRA speaks to the settlement of long-running disputes concerning the use of Klamath Basin water for irrigation, fish and wildlife. Combined, both agreements seek to advance the restoration of salmonids in the Klamath Basin. The central issue in both agreements is removal of the 4 Klamath River hydroelectric dams. The Draft EIS/EIR describes and analyzes 4 Action Alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative (Alternative 1). Alternatives 2 and 3 implement the KBRA and KSHA, including complete or partial dam removal. Alternatives 1, 4 and 5 do not implement the KBRA and KHSA and do not remove the dams. The Secretary may select the No Action/No Project Alternative one of the action alternatives or a combination of alternatives. Effects on fish of dam removal (Alternatives 2 and 3) and not removing dams (Alternatives 1, 4 and 5) are addressed in Section 3.3.4.3 Effects Determinations, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Expert Panel Reports addressing the likely response of fish populations are included in the sections on coho, Steelhead, and Chinook salmon respectively.	No

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Master Response AQU-6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead, and Chinook. Master Response AQU-7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success. Climate Change The Draft EIS/EIR discusses the impacts of global warming in Chapter 3, Affected Climate Environment/Environmental Consequences and Chapter 4, Cumulative Effects. The KBRA provides for an assessment of how long-term climate change may affect fisheries and communities in the Klamath Basin (KBRA Section 19.4). The technical assessment of climate change is scheduled to occur in 2013 (KBRA Appendix C-2). Master Response AQU-24 Chinook Climate Change and Marine Survival. Master Response AQU-22 Expert Panel Considered in Entirety. Ocean conditions and Marine Mammals Master Response AQU-13 Ocean Conditions. Although beyond the scope of this EIS/EIR, predation by marine mammals at the mouth of the Klamath River was considered. Alternative 17 (EIS/EIR Appendix A, 3.17) was developed specifically in response to the assertion that fish populations are depressed because of predation. This alternative would include control of seal, sea lion, and cormorant populations at the mouth of the Klamath River as an alternative to dam removal. It has been suggested that predation of anadromous salmonids by these marine species is having a major effect on the salmonid population as they return to the Klamath River to spawn. A number of seal and sea lion haul outs and sea bird colonies exist in the vicinity of the mouth of the Klamath (Figure 3-10, p. 3-27). Since the passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act in 1972, marine mammal populations have recovered, and are considered ¨healthy and robust" (NOAA Fisheries Service 2008). Proponents of predator control claim that the recovered predator population is increasing the pressure on salmonids because of unbalanced numbers of predators compared to the still depressed salmonid population numbers. Salmon waiting to enter the Klamath for their upstream migration congregate at the mouth of the river, where the marine predators are able to feed easily on the schools of fish (EIS/EIR Appendix A, 3.17).	

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Control of predation could advance restoration of salmonids since predation by marine mammals does occur however control of marine mammal populations would be very difficult to accomplish for biological reasons. While ocean conditions and predation are a factor in anadromous salmonid returns to their natal streams, so are the condition of out-migrating juvenile salmonids (smolts) and the condition of freshwater habitat. Reducing predation of salmonids at the mouth of the Klamath River would address only one factor that could affect fish and would not improve any of the upstream conditions necessary for restoration of fish in the Klamath Basin. Implementation of this alternative would not result in a free-flowing river, provide full volitional passage of fish or access to habitat, nor would the water quality and quantity objectives of the KHSA and KBRA be accomplished (EIS/EIR Appendix A, Section 4.2.17). Expert Panels (Dunne et. al. 2011, Goodman et. al. 2011) convened to address restoration of salmonids in the Klamath Basin did not identify marine mammal predation as a major factor that limited populations of anadromous fish in the Klamath Basin. With respect to human consumption, recreational and commercial fishing for salmon are tightly regulated on an annual basis by State, Federal and Tribal fishery managers. Annual catch limits are set based on annual population surveys. Parasites The Draft EIS/EIR acknowledges that parasites and disease are harmful to fish however warm water is only one of several issues associated with this topic. Parasites have on occasion proven to be devastating to salmonids in the mainstem Klamath, particularly in the Lower Klamath downstream of Iron Gate Dam (IGD). High parasite prevalence in the lower Klamath River is considered to be a combined effect of high spore input from heavily infected, spawned adult salmon that congregate downstream of IGD and Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) and the proximity to dense populations of polychaetes (Bartholomew et al. 2007). The highest rates of infection occur in the Klamath River downstream of IGD (Stocking and Bartholomew 2007; Bartholomew and Foott 2010) (EIR/S 3.3.3.2). Master Response AQU-27 Disease. Water temperatures in the Klamath, including the Trinity River are described in Section 3.2.3.2 – Water Temperature. The effects of the 5 alternatives on water temperature are documented in Section 3.2.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR.	

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	The No Action/No Project Alternative was most likely to perpetuate the current C. shasta and P.minibicornis problems and other disease issues because it perpetuates the factors that contribute to high infection rates (Draft EIS/EIR 3.3.4.3).	
GP_LT_1230_1218-10	The Draft EIS/EIR notes that watershed problems in the Klamath Basin are caused by many factors which likely won't all be solved by just removing dams. As a result, the Proposed Action includes the KHSA and KBRA. In broad terms, the KHSA speaks to removal of hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River; the KBRA speaks to the settlement of long-running disputes concerning the use of Klamath Basin water for irrigation, fish and wildlife. Combined, both agreements seek to advance the restoration of salmonids in the Klamath Basin. The central issue in both agreements is removal of the 4 Klamath River hydroelectric dams. The Draft EIS/EIR describes and analyzes 4 Action Alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative (Alternative 1). Alternatives 2 and 3 implement the KBRA and KSHA, including complete or partial dam removal. Alternatives 1, 4 and 5 do not implement the KBRA and KHSA and do not remove the dams. The Secretary may select the No Action/No Project Alternative one of the action alternatives or a combination of alternatives. Effects of dam removal on fish (Alternatives 2 and 3) and not removing dams (Alternatives 1, 4 and 5) are addressed in Section 3.3.4.3 Effects Determinations, of the Draft EIS/EIR. The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) was established by the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 and has regulatory jurisdiction over salmon fishing within the 317,690 square mile exclusive economic zone from 3 miles to 200 miles off the coast of Washington, Oregon and California. Jurisdiction over commercial and recreational salmon fishing regulations in nearshore areas, within 3 miles of shore, lies with the respective States. However, the States generally adopt regulations consistent with those established by the PFMC. The Salmon Fishery Management Plan developed by the PFMC describes the goals and methods for salmon management. Management tools such as season length, quotas, and bag limits vary depending on how many salmon are present. There are two central parts of the Plan: Conservation objectives, which are annual goals for the number of spawners of the major salmon stocks ("spawner escapement goals"), and allocation provisions of the harvest among different groups of fishers (commercial, recreational, tribal, various ports, ocean, and inland). The PFMC must also comply with laws such as the ESA.	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Declines in salmon runs are caused by several factors. These include loss and degradation of freshwater habitat, low ocean productivity, and over-exploitation of fish populations. With respect to fish harvest, ocean recreational and commercial as well as tribal commercial and subsistence fishing activities for salmon are tightly regulated by the PFMC. Annual catch limits are set based on annual population surveys. Since 1987, based on recommendations from the Klamath Fishery Management Council, the PFMC amended the spawning escapement goal for fall Chinook salmon within the Klamath Basin. Rather than establishing a fixed numerical ocean escapement goal, the PFMC adopted a policy of "Harvest Rate Management". Under harvest rate management the overall goal is to allow a fixed percentage of all salmon from each brood year to spawn. The allocation method allows the spawning escapement to fluctuate. In high population years the escapement would be larger than if the stock was fished down to a fixed numerical escapement and in low year's fisheries would not be closed to meet an escapement that was not attainable. By allowing a wide range of escapements, fishery managers may be able to determine the actual carrying capacity of the river system. To protect the salmon stocks in very low abundance years, an escapement floor is established to insure that an adequate number of spawning salmon return each year (Kope 1992, Prager and Mohr 2001, PFMC 2011). The comment as submitted provides no evidence to substantiate the claim that the fish problem is a result of overfishing. The Proposed Action would restore a more natural Klamath River flow regime and improve and expand spawning and rearing habitat for salmon on the Klamath River, which would benefit salmon populations. Commercial and traditional cultural uses of salmon would benefit as a result. Commercial fishing landings would increase because of increased salmon abundance, which would increase fishing revenues (EIS/EIR Section 3.15.4.2). Increased salmon populations would attract more ocean recreational fishing effort, which would increase spending in the regional economy. (Bureau of Reclamation [Reclamation] 2012a, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association Fisheries Service [NOAA Fisheries Service] 2012, cited in EIS/EIR Section 3.15.4.2). Dam removal would increase fish harvest for subsistence, cultural practices and commercial uses and provide economically beneficial opportunities for Indian Tribes residing on the Klamath River (EIS/EIR Section 3.15.4.2). These conditions are likely to result in increased opportunities and revenue for guides. Master Response AQU-19 Chinook Expert Panel Proposed Action Better Than No Action.	

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Master Response AQU-7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success. Master Response AQU-23 Evaluation of Dam Removal and Restoration Anadromy (EDRRA) Model. Hatchery operations are only one of the factors impacting fisheries in the Klamath Basin. The Klamath dams are affecting salmonid fisheries by blocking access to at least 420 miles of potential river habitat, by affecting downstream water quality (specifically, dissolved oxygen, water temperature, and algal toxins), and altering flows in sections of the mainstem of the river (Hamilton et. al. 2011, Draft EIS/EIR Chapter 1). Altering hatchery management will not resolve any of these other issues because Iron Gate Hatchery is below the dams. Master Response AQU-32 IGH Alternative 1, 2, 3 and Conservation Hatchery. The Draft EIS/EIR strives to provide a thorough, science-based review of implementation of the KBRA and restoration of salmon populations in the Klamath Basin. Section 11 of the KBRA describes the process for development of the Fisheries Reintroduction and Management Plan. A Fisheries Reintroduction Plan is part of Alternatives 2 and 3 under the KBRA (Draft EIS/EIR Section 2.4.3.9, p. 2-44). While the Proposed Action and Alternatives affect commercial and recreational fishing, management of fishing regulations is beyond the scope of this document. Master Response AQU–11 A, B, NOAA Fisheries BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-11	Regarding the historical distribution of anadromous fish above Keno Reef, the historical distributions of anadromous fish are described in the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 3.3.3.1, Aquatic Resources. The occurrence of steelhead as well as spring-run and fall-run Chinook salmon above Keno Reef is documented in the Final EIS/EIR in Section 3, Aquatic Resources, Physical Habitat Descriptions and in Attachment B of the Final Alternatives Report in Appendix A. Historical records reviewed by Hamilton et al. (2005) and genetic information obtained from archaeological sites analyzed by Butler et al. (2010) show conclusively that Chinook salmon spawned in the tributaries upstream of Keno Reef in the Upper Klamath Lake, including the Sprague, Williamson, and Wood Rivers. The question of whether or not anadromous fish utilized available habitat above Keno Reef was also addressed in proceedings before Administrative Law Judge Honorable Parlen L. McKenna who concluded that agencies had met their	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	burden of proof on this issue (EIS 1.2.6.2, Federal Energy Commission Relicensing). Among other findings, Judge McKenna determined that: • Chinook salmon (both spring and fall-run) were abundant in the tributaries of the Upper Klamath Basin, including the Wood, Sprague, and Williamson rivers as well as Jenny, Fall, and Shovel Creeks (Administrative Law Judge 2006; FOF 2A-4, p. 12). • Steelhead trout utilized habitat in Spencer, Shovel, Fall, Camp, and Scotch Creeks, and they were likely distributed as far upstream as Link River(Administrative Law Judge 2006; FOF 2A-5, p. 12). The comment provides no evidence to support the argument that salmon did not occur upstream of Keno Reef. This statement is factually incorrect. Regarding the lack of suitable habitat above these locations, the Administrative Law Judge found that expansive bottomland areas with abundant low-gradient channels, which are preferred salmon habitat, are more common in the Upper Klamath Basin than in the remainder of the Klamath system. Such areas are particularly extensive above Keno Dam and Upper Klamath Lake, where spring-fed streams include the Williamson and Wood Rivers, smaller springbrooks flowing into these two rivers, Sprague River, and various streams (Administrative Law Judge 2006; FOF 6.9, pg 33). The comment as written provides no evidence to support the argument that significant salmon habitat does not occur upstream of Keno Reef. This statement is factually incorrect.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-12	Application A016958 is described under the Shasta Valley Irrigators section. The presence of the dams is not necessary for the irrigators to continue with this water rights process.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-13	Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-14	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-15	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Klamath agreements are examples of negotiations designed to resolve longstanding legal battles over the use of water resources in the Klamath Basin. PacifiCorp, tribes, environmental, fishing and agriculture interests are using these agreements to avoid litigation. Signing the KHSA was voluntary for all signatories and no signatory was required to sign to make KHSA a valid agreement.	No

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1230_1218-16	The comment author has not provided information in support of assertions made in the comment nor is information of this type known of or available to the authors of this Final EIS/EIR. Absent any additional information regarding how and to whom wealth is being redistributed and which local and Federal regulations are not being followed by whom to substantiate this comment, no response is required.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-17	The purpose of the Draft EIS/EIR is to display environmental impacts to the affected region and thus it does not contain a benefit-cost analysis. 40 CFR Sect. 1502.23 states that if a benefit-cost analysis relevant to the choice among environmentally different alternatives is being considered for the Proposed Action, it shall be incorporated by reference or appended to the statement as an aid in evaluating the environmental consequences. A benefit-cost analysis was undertaken and is summarized in the Secretarial Determination Overview Report. Additional details on the benefit-cost analysis can be found in the Economics and Tribal Summary Technical report prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation (available on Klamathrestoration.gov).	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-18	Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA. P. ES-46 through ES-48 and Table ES-7 describe the “areas of known controversy” raised by the public and agencies during development of the EIS/EIR. Opposition to the KHSA and KBRA could include, to a greater or lesser degree, many of the issues described in Table ES-7.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-19	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-20	The comment author is citing the area of analysis described for Section 3.8, Water Supply/Water Rights. The description of the area of analysis presented in Section 3.8.1 does in fact note the seven hydrologic sub-basins downstream of Iron Gate Dam. Analysis of the environmental effects and benefits of the KBRA on water supply and water rights are presented in Section 3.8.4.3 and on water quality in Section 3.2.4.3.2.10.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-21	The purpose of this Draft EIS/EIR was to analyze and disclose potential environmental impacts pursuant to NEPA and CEQA rather than answer the described question. The impacts and benefits to fish from the No Action and action alternatives (including fish passage) are fully analyzed in Section 3.3.	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1230_1218_22	The KBRA diversion actions were not included in the analysis of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The No Action/No Project Alternative would continue current operations with the dams remaining in place and PacifiCorp operating under the current annual license. The existing license has no requirements for additional fish passage or implementation of the prescriptions that are currently before FERC in the relicensing process. Flows would remain similar to current flows. Modeled hydrologic conditions for the No Action/No Project Alternative utilized both the USFW 2008 and NOAA Fisheries Service 2010 biological opinions (BO) for the Reclamation's Klamath Project. The Lead Agencies acknowledge that these BO may change in the future as understanding of species or their populations change; however, these changes are unknown at this time and are not included in the hydrologic assumptions. See Chapter 2, p. 16, Figure 2-7 of the Draft EIS/EIR for modeled future flows. More information about the detailed models is described in: Reclamation 2012d. Hydrology, Hydraulics and Sediment Transport Studies for the Secretary's Determination on Klamath River Dam Removal and Basin Restoration," Technical Report No. SRH-2011-02. Prepared for Mid-Pacific Region, Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, CO.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-23	While the cost of the alternatives is an important factor during decision-making, it is not included as part of the CEQA and NEPA requirements that guided the development of the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR does discuss some effects related to those suggested in the comment. Section 3.15 discusses potential effects to electricity bills of PacifiCorp customers as a result of the Proposed Action and alternatives, specifically on p. 3.15-48 for the No Action/No Project Alternative, 3.15-63 for the Proposed Action, 3.15-81 for the Partial Facilities Removal Alternative, 3.15-84 to 3.15-85 for the Fish Passage at Four Dams Alternative, and 3.15-87 for Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Iron Gate and Copco 1 Alternative. PacifiCorp considers many factors in setting customer rates which in turn are subject to Oregon Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and California PUC approval; therefore, it is difficult to assess the size of potential rate effects or even the extent to which rates might increase at all under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Utility rates under the dam removal alternatives are not expected to increase above the existing surcharges as a direct result of dam removal costs. For the fish passage alternatives, customer rates would likely increase above	No

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	the existing surcharges as a direct result of construction, operations and maintenance costs for fish passage facilities. The degree to which the cost could be passed to the ratepayers is not known and would be subject to Oregon and California PUCs. PacifiCorp will be providing replacement power from hydropower facilities at Bonneville on the Columbia River and sources in the east. Currently, the dams only provide regionally important peaking power but do not provide a baseload source for the area. Power is currently transmitted to the region from sources in the east and north to cover baseload requirements. PacifiCorp is already upgrading transmission and generating infrastructure to meet the expected demand in the Klamath region in 2018. These upgrades are being done now to cover power needs in 2018 and beyond, and are unrelated to the proposed removal of the Klamath Dams. These planned upgrades are described in the Draft EIS/EIR on p. 3.18-13 to 3.18-14, and 3.18-23 to 3.18-24. Analysis of the funding for existing power plant upgrades and new power plant construction is outside of the scope of this EIS/EIR.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-24	As described in Section 3.22, Traffic and Transportation, p. 3.22-10, of the Draft EIS/EIR, no long-term or permanent traffic volume increases or long-term changes in traffic patterns are expected as a result of the Proposed Action. Therefore, any transportation impacts associated with the Proposed Action would be limited in duration to the proposed deconstruction or construction period. The deconstruction and reservoir restoration schedule for the Proposed Action extends 18-months starting in May 2019. Work completed in 2019 would include small scale construction staging activities and analysis of road and bridge condition and any repair work that might be identified during this analysis. Also, as described on p. 3.22-15 of the Draft EIS/EIR, while many of these roads and bridges were put in place to facilitate the construction of the Four Facilities, it is unknown whether they are in good enough condition to withstand the weight and frequency of trips during deconstruction. As part of the development of the construction plan, an in depth analysis of bridge and road capacity and state of repair would be conducted by the dam removal entity (DRE), with remedial actions taken prior to the commencement of facility deconstruction. Following completion of dam deconstruction additional analysis of road condition would be completed and where needed, as a result of wear generated by deconstruction repairs and or replacement actions would be completed. Potential impacts related to scour and erosion in culverts under the roadways would be analyzed in greater detail as part of the construction plan developed by the DRE.	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1230_1218-25	Master Response AQU-22 Expert Panel Considered in Entirety. Master Response AQU-6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook. Master Response AQU-7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success. Master Response AQU-17 Expert Panel Second Line of Analysis, Not the only line of Evidence. Master Response AQU-17 Expert Panel Second Line of Analysis, Not the only line of Evidence. Master Response AQU-33 ESA Compliance.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-26	The comment refers to information taken out of context from the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR (p. 3.3-123 and 3.3-124) states: "Southern Green Sturgeon may enter the Klamath River estuary to forage during the summer months. They would not be present when the most severe effects of dam removal are occurring, and are not expected to be affected by the Proposed Action. The remainder of this section focuses on the effects of the Proposed Action on the Northern Green Sturgeon DPS. Northern Green Sturgeon do not occur upstream of Ishi Pishi Falls and would not be affected by Proposed Action effects that do not extend downstream past these falls. Downstream of Iron Gate Dam The Proposed Action would release dam-stored sediment downstream to the lower Klamath River in the short term, and restore a flow regime that more closely mimics natural seasonal flow patterns in the long term. Suspended sediment effects on green sturgeon under the Proposed Action are described in detail in Appendix E, and summarized here. Under the most-likely-to-occur scenario or worst-case scenario no effect relative to existing conditions is predicted for adults (Table 3.3-10), mostly because green sturgeon distribution within the mainstem Klamath River is primarily limited to areas downstream of Orleans, where the effects of SSC resulting from the Proposed Action are more diluted from tributary accretion. Up to 100 percent mortality is predicted for incubating eggs and larval life stages, and up to 20 percent mortality is predicted for rearing juveniles under a most-likely-to-occur scenario, or up to 40 percent mortality under a worst-case scenario. However, around	No

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	30 percent of juveniles rear in the Trinity River and would not be exposed to SSC from the Proposed Action. Bedload sediment effects related to dam-released sediment would not extend as far downstream to Ishi Pishi Falls and would not affect green sturgeon. The Proposed Action would establish a flow regime that more closely mimics natural conditions in the lower Klamath River and would improve water quality and reduce instances of algal toxins. These long-term effects would benefit green sturgeon using the lower Klamath River reach. The Proposed Action is not expected to substantially change or affect estuarine habitat. Sediment, flow, and water temperature effects resulting from the Proposed Action would likely not extend downstream to the estuary. Reservoir drawdown associated with dam removal under the Proposed Action could alter SSCs and affect green sturgeon. Overall the effects of the Proposed Action are most likely to include physiological stress, inhibited growth, and high mortality for some portion of the age-0 2020 cohort and age-1 2019 cohort. However, effects on salmonids likely overestimate those on sturgeon. To summarize, green sturgeon in the Klamath Basin have the following traits likely to enhance the species' resilience to impacts of the Proposed Action: Most of the population (subadult and adult) would be in the ocean during the year of the Proposed Action (2020) and would be unaffected (Appendix E). The approximately 30 percent of the population that spawn and rear in the Trinity River would be unaffected. Much of the spawning and rearing of green sturgeon occurs downstream of the Trinity River, where sediment concentrations would be similar to existing conditions and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Green sturgeon are long-lived (>40 years) and are able to spawn multiple times (~8 times) (Klimley et al. 2007), so effects on two year classes may have little influence on the population as a whole." The comment as presented is factually incorrect.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-27	The Proposed Action would have short term effects related to suspended sediment and bedload movement. Based on a small proportion of the population with a potential to be exposed to short-term effects, the effect of the Proposed Action would be less-than significant for redband trout in the short term. Dam removal would increase connectivity between Upper Klamath Basin and the Hydroelectric Reach and would create additional riverine habitat within the Hydroelectric Reach. Based on increased habitat availability and improved habitat quality, the	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	effect of the Proposed Action would be beneficial for redband trout in the long term. (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-129).	
GP_LT_1230_1218-28	Because eulachon occur far downstream in the river, mixing and inflows from Intervening tributaries would reduce poor water quality conditions originating in the dams (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-169). Based on short duration of poor water quality during reservoir drawdown in the estuary, the Proposed Action would have a less-than-significant effect on eulachon in the short and long term (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-130). Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of the Record.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-29	The Draft EIS/EIR discusses potential effects to introduced resident fish on p. 3.3-130 of the Draft EIS/EIR. From Upstream End of J.C. Boyle Reservoir to Iron Gate Dam The Proposed Action would eliminate reservoir habitat upstream of Iron Gate Dam, and thus the abundance of these species would decline substantially or be reduced to nothing, as their preferred reservoir habitat would be eliminated (Buchanan et al. 2011). In the Lower Klamath River, downstream of Iron Gate Dam, a few introduced resident species occur in the lower Klamath River, but habitat conditions there are generally not suitable for these species. Under the Proposed Action, conditions would be expected to become less suitable. Because these species were introduced and they occur in other nearby water bodies, their loss would not be considered significant from a biological perspective, and would benefit native species. Their loss would, however, decrease opportunities for recreational fishing for these species, as discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 3.20, Recreation.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-30	The Draft EIS/EIR acknowledges the relative lack of information for freshwater mussels (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-131). For freshwater mussels, dam removal would as is noted in the Draft EIS/EIR after implementation of Mitigation Measure AR-7 (Freshwater Mussel Relocation) generate a significant short term impact. The Draft EIS/EIR describes that in the long term increased connectivity between Upper Klamath Basin and the Hydroelectric Reach and would create additional riverine habitat within the Hydroelectric Reach. Based on increased habitat availability and habitat quality in the long term, the effect of the Proposed Action would be beneficial for mussels in the long term (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 132).	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-31	Section 3.10, Greenhouse Gases, of the Draft EIS/EIR discloses potential impacts associated with GHG emissions and global climate change. The analysis reviewed GHG emissions that could occur from construction or demolition activities, as well as those	No

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	that could occur from replacing hydroelectricity produced by the Four Facilities with non-renewable sources. Specific rules and regulations, such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) mandatory GHG reporting program were not discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR if they were not relevant to the analysis.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-32	Estimated economic impacts including those related to agricultural employment, relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative are discussed in Section 3.15.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-33	The IMPLAN model was used to evaluate economic impacts. IMPLAN is a standard, widely used input-output model used for regional economic impacts analyses. IMPLAN measures the impacts generated from expenditures made inside a defined study area. The model also recognizes leakages from the defined region resulting from purchases made outside the defined study area. Section 3.15 and the economic technical reports available on http://klamathrestoration.gov further describe the IMPLAN model and discuss methods to evaluate regional economic impacts.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-34	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-35	Master Response AQU-3 Coho Native Status not Critical to NEPA or CEQA. Master Response AQU-4 Coho are Native. The comment, as submitted, provides no evidence to support the claim that coho salmon are not native to the Klamath River. Master Response AQU-22 Expert Panel Considered in Entirety. Master Response AQU-6A Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead, and Chinook. Master Response AQU-17 Expert Panel Second Line of Analysis, Not the only line of Evidence.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-36	The Lead Agencies have made every effort to disclose all environmental effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives. Risks to the public are described throughout the Affected Environment/ Environmental Consequences chapter, including Section 3.6, Flood Hydrology, 3.18, Public Health and Safety, Utilities and Public Services, Solid Waste, Power, and 3.21, Toxic/Hazardous Materials. As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), mitigation has been provided for all significant environmental impacts identified in this Draft	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	EIS/EIR. These mitigation measures are described in each applicable resource section after the discussion of Alternative 5: Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate. Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR examines the cumulative effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives. Mitigation measures are proposed for all significant cumulative effects at the end of each resource section.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-37	The statement referenced in the comment , “Reservoir drawdown associated with dam removal could alter SSCs and bedload sediment transport and deposition and affect redband trout” Significance is “B” or beneficial.’,’ can be found in Table 5-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts p. 5-24 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The significance in Table 5-1 however, is not “B” or beneficial as the comment suggests, rather “LTS” or Less than Significant. The “LTS” or Less Than Significant finding as depicted in Table 5-1 is reflected in discussion on p. 3.3-192 of the Draft EIS/EIR, “As described for the Proposed Action, reservoir drawdown associated with dam removal under the Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate Alternative could alter SSCs and affect redband trout. Based on a small proportion of the population with a potential to be exposed to short-term effects, the effect of the Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate Alternative would be less-than-significant for redband trout in the short term.”	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-38	Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR presents cumulative effects by resource area. Whenever feasible, mitigation measures are described for all cumulative effects determined to be significant. a. Section 4.4.2 presents the area of analysis for cumulative effects. Cumulative impacts are then described in detail in Section 4.4. Please note Tables 4.5 to 4.24 summarize the environmental effects described in Chapter 3; they do not summarize the significance determinations for cumulative effects. For significant impacts listed in these tables, mitigation is described in Chapter 3 in the associated resource section. The cumulative effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives are described in the text (not in the tables) and appropriate mitigation is provided, when feasible. b. The comment author states that: Draining the reservoirs and sediment release could cause short-term human exposure to contaminants from contact with deposited sediments on exposed reservoir terraces and river banks within the Hydroelectric Reach.”	No

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Significance "S" (significant): Mitigation: None. This is incorrect. Table 4.5, p. 4-36 states this impact is Less than Significant (LTS); therefore no mitigation is required. c. The comment author states that: "Dam removal and/or elimination of hydropower peaking operations at J.C. Boyle Powerhouse could cause short-term and long-term alterations in daily water temperatures and fluctuations in the J.C. Boyle bypass and peaking reaches… Significance "S" (significant): for springtime, "B" (beneficial) for late summer/fall. Mitigation: None This is incorrect. Table 4.5 on p. 4-29 under Water Temperature states that it would be significant for J.C. Boyle bypass reach; and beneficial for J.C. Boyle peaking reach. No feasible mitigation is available to reduce this significant impact; therefore it remains significant. Please see the impacts and mitigation discussions in Section 3.2 Water Quality. d. The comment author states that: Dam removal and conversion of the reservoir areas to a free-flowing river could cause short-term and long-term increases in spring time water temperatures and decreases in late summer/fall water temperatures in the Hydroelectric Reach downstream of Copco 1 Reservoir". Significance "S" (significant): for springtime, "B" (beneficial) for late summer/fall. Mitigation: None No feasible mitigation is available to reduce this significant impact; therefore it remains significant. Please see the impacts and mitigation discussions in Section 3.2 Water Quality. e. The comment author states that: Lower Klamath Basin: "Draining the reservoirs and release of sediment could cause short-term and long-term increases in sediment deposition in the Klamath River or Estuary that could alter morphological characteristics and indirectly affect seasonal water temperatures." Significance "NCFEC" (significant): No Change From Existing Conditions. Mitigation: None This is incorrect. Table 4.5 on p. 4-39 states NCFEC, which stands for No Change From Existing Conditions and means there would be no impact. It does not mean the impact is significant. Mitigation is not required. Please see the impacts and mitigation discussions in Section 3.2 Water Quality. f. The comment author states that: Upper Klamath Basin: "Draining the reservoirs and release of sediment could cause short-term increases in suspended material in the Hydroelectric Reach downstream of J.C. Boyle dam". Significance "S" (significant): Mitigation: None No feasible mitigation is available to	

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	reduce this significant impact; therefore it remains significant. Please see the impacts and mitigation discussions in Section 3.2 Water Quality. g. The comment author states that: "Dam removal could eliminate the interception and retention of mineral (inorganic) suspended materials behind the dams and result in long-term increases in suspended material in the Hydroelectric Reach". Significance "LTS" (Less Than Significant): Mitigation: None This impact is Less Than Significant and does not require mitigation. Please see the impacts and mitigation discussions in Section 3.2 Water Quality. h. The comment author states that: "Dam removal could eliminate the interception and retention of algal-derived (organic) suspended materials behind the dams and result in long-term increases in suspended material in the Hydroelectric Reach". Significance "LTS" (Less Than Significant): Mitigation: None This impact is Less Than Significant and does not require mitigation. Please see the impacts and mitigation discussions in Section 3.2 Water Quality. i. The comment author states that: "Draining the reservoirs and release of sediment could cause short term increases in suspended material in the lower Klamath River and the Klamath Estuary". Significance "S" (Significant): Mitigation: None Table 4.5 on p. 4-31 states that this impact would be significant. No feasible mitigation is available to reduce this significant impact; therefore it remains significant. Please see the impacts and mitigation discussions in Section 3.2 Water Quality.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-39	Master Response N/CP-26 KHSA and KBRA Settlement Parties.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-40	Master Response TTA-1 Federal Trust Responsibility and the KBRA. Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiation in Private.	Yes
GP_LT_1230_1218-41	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-20 Bedload Sediment and Fish Habitat. Master Response AQU-9 Minimum Flows for Fish. As discussed in Section 3.6.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams are not designed or	No

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	operated as flood control facilities, although they do provide some incidental flood protection during flood events. Specifically, Table 3.6-9 shows peak flood flows and indicates that the 100-yr flood is attenuated less than 7 percent by Iron Gate and Copco 1 Dams under the No Action/No Project Alternative, with J.C. Boyle and Copco 2 providing negligible flood attenuation. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 3.6.4.3, p. 3.6-30.). Under the Proposed Action, the facilities would not be in place to provide this temporary reduction in flow and depending on the time of year, there would be a minor increase in the 100-yr flood elevations as the result of dam removal from Iron Gate Dam located at River Mile 190 to Humbug Creek located at RM 172. The peak flow will also occur a few hours sooner after the dams are removed. Ultimately, during high flow periods, the existing flood control capacity of the four dams would do little to reduce flood damage. Therefore, there would be little change to flood control capacity after the four dams are removed. Master Response AQU-5 Will Benefit all Salmonids. Master Response AQU-6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead, and Chinook. Master Response AQU-7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success. Master Response AQU-25 Habitat Upstream of Iron Gate Dam.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-42	The Draft EIS/EIR provides extensive analyses to address the seven issues raised in this comment. These include: 1) Fish have moved north because ocean conditions are warm and counts are actually high. Anadromous salmonids have a strong affinity to return to their natal river of origin to spawn. Although some straying of adults can occur, the population does not exhibit nomadic wanderings to the extent described in the comment. The Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 1531 ct seq. (ESA) defines "species" to include any "distinct population segment of any species of vertebrate fish or wildlife which interbreeds when mature." An ESU, or evolutionarily significant unit, is a Pacific salmon population or group of populations that is substantially reproductively isolated from other conspecific populations and that represents an important component of the evolutionary legacy of the species. The ESU policy (56 FR 58612) for Pacific salmon defines the criteria for identifying a Pacific salmon population as a distinct population segment (DPS), which can be listed under the ESA. The Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast (SONCC)	No

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	coho salmon ESU includes all naturally spawned populations of coho salmon in coastal streams from the Elk River, Oregon, through the Mattole River, California. It also includes three artificial propagation programs: Cole River Hatchery in the Rogue River Basin, Trinity River and Iron Gate Hatcheries in the Klamath-Trinity River Basin. The SONCC coho salmon ESU was listed as threatened in 1997 (62 FR 24588; May 6, 1997), and that status was reaffirmed in 2005 (Good et al. 2005) and 2011 (Ly and Ruddy 2011). The following limiting factors are prevalent throughout the range of this ESU and affect most populations. These limiting factors include: • Altered hydrologic function (timing and volume of water flow) • Lack of floodplain and channel structure (including both instream structure e.g., large wood and pools, and floodplain structure, e.g., off-channel ponds). • Riparian forest conditions (Trees next to the river or stream) • Water Quality (especially water temperature) • Altered sediment supply (amount of dirt that gets into streams) • Fish Passage (barriers from structures such as culverts as well as thermal, flow, and sediment barriers) • Impaired Estuarine/Mainstem Function (amount and condition of habitat in estuaries, and in mainstem areas of large rivers) • Disease/Predation/Competition (resulting from invasive species, native species, and hatchery-origin fish) • Hatchery-related Effects (detrimental genetic and ecological effects) Master Response AQU-13 Ocean Conditions. 2) Lower Klamath River Tribal Fishery. With respect to fish harvest, ocean recreational and commercial as well as tribal commercial and subsistence fishing activities for salmon are tightly regulated on an annual basis by State, Federal and Tribal fishery managers. Annual catch limits are set based on annual population surveys. The comment as submitted provides no evidence to substantiate the claim that catch estimates are unverified.	

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	3) Predation by Marine Mammals. Although ocean conditions are beyond the scope of this EIS/EIR, predation by marine mammals at the mouth of the Klamath River was considered. Alternative 17 (Draft EIS/EIR Appendix A, 3.17) was developed specifically in response to the assertion that fish populations are depressed because of predation. This alternative would include control of seal, sea lion, and cormorant populations at the mouth of the Klamath River as an alternative to dam removal. It has been suggested that predation of anadromous salmonids by these marine species is having a major effect on the salmonid population as they return to the Klamath River to spawn. A number of seal and sea lion haul outs and sea bird colonies exist in the vicinity of the mouth of the Klamath (Figure 3-10, p. 3-27). Since the passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act in 1972, marine mammal populations have recovered, and are considered ¨healthy and robust" (NOAA Fisheries Service 2008). Proponents of predator control claim that the recovered predator population is increasing the pressure on salmonids because of unbalanced numbers of predators compared to the still depressed salmonid population numbers. Salmon waiting to enter the Klamath for their upstream migration congregate at the mouth of the river, where the marine predators are able to feed easily on the schools of fish (Draft EIS/EIR Appendix A, 3.17). Control of predation could advance restoration of salmonids since predation by marine mammals does occur however control of marine mammal populations would be very difficult to accomplish for biological reasons. While ocean conditions and predation are a factor in anadromous salmonid returns to their natal streams, so are the condition of out-migrating juvenile salmonids (smolts) and the condition of freshwater habitat. Reducing predation of salmonids at the mouth of the Klamath River would address only one factor that could affect fish and would not improve any of the upstream conditions necessary for restoration of fish in the Klamath Basin. Implementation of this alternative would not result in a free-flowing river, provide full volitional passage of fish or access to habitat, nor would the water quality and quantity objectives of the KHSA and KBRA be accomplished (EIS/EIR Appendix A, Section 4.2.17). Expert Panels (Dunne et. al. 2011, Goodman et. al. 2011) convened to address restoration of salmonids in the Klamath Basin did not identify marine mammal predation as a major factor that limited populations of anadromous fish in the Klamath Basin. The comment as submitted provides no evidence that control of predators would result in the restoration of salmonids in the Klamath Basin.	

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	4) Coho Salmon Distribution in the Klamath Basin and 5) Coho Salmon are not native. Master Response AQU-4 Coho are Native. The comment, as submitted, provides no evidence to support the claim that 85 percent of the coho salmon spawn in the lower 20 miles of the Klamath River and/or coho salmon are not native to the Klamath River. 6) Hatchery Production of Salmon. Master Response AQU-18 Fate of Iron Gate Hatchery under Alternatives. 7) Water Quality Master Response WQ 15 Klamath Dams Do Not Supply Cool Summertime Water to Downstream River Reaches. Master Response WQ 27 Nutrient Retention With Dams, Nutrient Release Without Dams, and Periphyton.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-43	Removal of the Klamath River Dams as proposed in Alternatives 2 (the Proposed Action) and 3 is intended to benefit all salmonid species, not just coho salmon. Numbers of anadromous fish within the Klamath River Watershed as presented in the Draft EIR/EIS, Table3.3-1 (p. 3.3-5) are nearly all in decline. Section 3.3.4.3 of the EIS/EIR addresses the likely impacts of each alternative on aquatic habitat and various fish species. Master Response AQU-3 Coho Native Status not Critical to NEPA or CEQA. Master Response AQU-4 Coho are Native. The comment, as submitted, provides no evidence to support the claim that coho salmon are not native to the Klamath River. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-44	National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)0 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) both require the Lead Agencies to respond to comments on significant environmental issues related to the Draft EIS/EIR. Because the comment does not address the content and analysis of the Draft EIS/EIR, no additional response is provided. Nevertheless, your comment regarding the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and/or the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA)	No

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Action.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-45	Master Response CUL-1 Shasta Nation Participation. Master Response CUL-2 Federal Recognition.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-46	Comment noted. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-47	Both NEPA and CEQA include provisions that the draft environmental review analyze a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the purpose and need/project objections, and are potentially feasible (40 CFR § 1502.14; 43 CFR § 46.420(b); Pub. Resources Code, sec. 21002; CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a), (c), (f).). Alternatives should be limited to ones that avoid or substantially lessen the Proposed Action's significant environmental effects. (CEQA Guidelines secs. 15126.6(a), (c), (f), sec. 15204(a); Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.3.) The Lead Agencies are not required to consider all conceivable alternatives to the Proposed Action. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21091(d)(2)(B); CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a); sec. 15204(a).) Nor are the Lead Agencies required to analyze an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(f)(3).) Also, the Lead Agencies are not required to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or requested by comment authors; instead, the Lead Agencies are to focus on significant environmental issues. (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15204(a).) The Lead Agencies developed a list of 18 preliminary alternatives that were screened down to five. The Lead Agencies fully analyzed the five alternatives in the Draft EIS/EIR because they best meet the NEPA purpose and need or CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, and are potentially feasible (Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.3). (A full description of the alternatives and the rationale for screening the alternatives is presented in Appendix A, the Alternatives Formulation Report). This analysis is thorough and includes alternatives suggested during internal and external scoping for the EIS/EIR.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-48	As described in the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 7.9 Document Availability, hard copies of the Draft EIS/EIR were made available	No

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	for viewing at Federal, State, and public libraries in California and Oregon. Hard copies were made available at cost to the requestor, online via the Reclamation Klamath Project Web site. Electronic copies (on CD) of the EIS/EIR were mailed to the public upon request, at no cost. An electronic version of the Draft EIS/EIR was posted to the Reclamation Klamath Project Web site http://klamathrestoration.gov . Notifications of the release of the Draft EIS/EIR and the locations where it could be viewed were mailed to over 4,000 businesses, organizations and individual members of the public. Master Response N/CP-12 Comment Period. Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement.	
GP_LT_1230_1218-49	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate. Section 3.15 of the Draft EIS/EIR evaluates economic impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives. The section is primarily based on multiple economic studies posted at http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies under Economic Studies and Information. Economic effects were evaluated relative to: • Dam decommissioning, O&M, mitigation • Commercial fishing • Reservoir recreation • Ocean sport fishing • In-river sport fishing • Whitewater recreation • Tribal economies • Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) Fisheries, Water Resources and Tribal Programs • Irrigated agriculture related to KBRA actions • Refuge recreation related to KBRA actions • Local government revenues, including property and sales taxes • Property values • Utility rates The purpose of the Draft EIS/EIR is to display environmental impacts to the affected region and thus it does not contain a benefit-cost analysis. 40 CFR Sect. 1502.23 addresses benefit-cost analysis, and states that if a benefit-cost analysis relevant to the choice among environmentally different alternatives is being considered for the Proposed Action, it shall be incorporated by reference or appended to the statement as an aid in evaluating the environmental consequences.	No

Comment Author	Riter, Kristen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	A benefit-cost analysis was undertaken and is summarized in the Secretarial Determination Overview Report. Additional details on the benefit-cost analysis can be found in the Economics and Tribal Summary Technical report prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation (available on Klamathrestoration.gov).	
GP_LT_1230_1218-50	The changes to the recovery plan described by the comment author would be an alternative to the KBRA. This Draft EIS/EIR considers the KBRA as a connected action, as described on p. 2-37 and as discussed in: Master Response ALT-4 Elimination of Alternative 8 - Dam Removal Without KBRA from Detailed Study. Master Response ALT-8 Inclusion of Alternatives Solely Based on Cost.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-51	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_LT_1230_1218-52	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_LT_1230_1211

November 17, 2011

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, Calif. 95501

U.S. Department of Interior
Ken Salazar

California Department of Fish & Game
Area Director Mark Stoffer

RE: Comments to Klamath Facilities Removal EIR/EIS

Dear Mr. Salazar and Mr. Stoffer,

Comment 1 - NEPA/ CEQA

I am a property owner in Siskiyou County. Below please find my comments to the above referenced document to be considered as evidence to refute the completeness of the document and to further reject the findings and conclusions of the report prepared.

1. The comment period must be extended for an additional 60 days to allow fair input to the public to review the report. The document was scoped and prepared by the lead agencies over a period of 5 years. The report is over 2000 pages, too extensive to allow reviewers sufficient time to respond to findings of the report and/or to engage consultants to peer review the report.
2. NEPA and CEQA requires the lead agency to measure the significance of impacts in terms of the conditions existing where the impacts fall—not in terms of conditions that exist where the impacts do not fall or in terms of hypothetical or highly generalized conditions. Each area of inquiry has a measure of significance against which the potential environmental effects of the project are compared. Thus, for example a project may result in significant adverse land use impacts if it: (1) substantially disrupts or divides the physical and economic arrangement of an established community, or (2) has a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity. In the case of the EIS/EIR significant cultural and economic impacts to the Siskiyou County and its communities has not been considered. As an example the scientific assessment of impacts to salmonid populations consider the vast area of Klamath Basin including the ocean. However, with respect to the affected communities of Siskiyou County insufficient research was prepared to assess the long term impact resulting from loss of jobs, property values, and economic vitality resulting from removal. As Mr Salazar is making a determination of the public interest of the local communities the EIR/EIS did not meet the minimum threshold of study of the disruption to Siskiyou County. These disruptions include a) economic loss of reliable inexpensive power provided by the dams, b) loss of storm water flood control, c) loss of

Comment 2 - Economics

Comment 2 cont.

recreation areas of the reservoirs to the public as well as the economic benefits derived by the community from commerce generated by the public use of recreation, d) the loss of water for agricultural use, e)

Comment 3 - Cultural Resources

3. The NEPA – *Purpose and Need*, and CEQA - *Project Objectives*, both speak to the project objectives to be in the "public interest" and "public welfare" of the local communities. The EIR/EIS did not meet the minimum required threshold of study to **all** the affected public interests. The EIR/EIS was exhaustive in its study of hand selected Klamath Tribes, which serve to gain direct financial benefit resulting from removal of the dams and implementation of the KBRA. It did not review of the welfare of the Shasta Tribes historical presence under the waters of the dams, nor to their exclusion as a party to the settlement agreement. The study did not include analysis of long term economic loss to the communities resulting from potential loss of water retention and storage for emergency drought years to farming and agriculture, loss of storm water protection. Moreover, it does not address the cumulative effect of job losses to the communities of support services that will be unsustainable without a commercial critical mass.

Comment 4- Economics

4. NEPA and CEQA requires the lead agency to identify alternatives that are environmentally preferable alternatives that would result in the fewest adverse effects to the biological and physical environment in determining the best course of action. The report did not fulfill this requirement and in fact played both sides of the coin. As an example the report placed heavy emphasis on the short-term socioeconomic changes in economic output, employment and labor income from construction and mitigation spending of the project. It does not address the long term effects of the loss of farming, ranching, recreation and support services to the local communities.

Comment 5 - Alternatives

5. The findings and conclusions of benefit to andronomous fish species (ie coho, steelhead, chinook) under the dam removal, which are combined with the undertakings of the "unspecific" programs in the KBRA, can only be made under the realization of expected outcomes resulting from the entirety of the KBRA programs. The report does not include an analysis of the cumulative impacts should the programs for fish restoration be abandoned, delayed, ineffectively managed, or terminated. Although the KBRA programs are intended to provide a complete solution set to the problems of the Klamath Basin, which include 28 separate programs (ex. Trinity River Restoration Plan, Water Use Retirement Plan, Fisheries Program, Northwest Forest Plan, Drought Plan, On-Project Plan, KHSA Interim Measures, Restoration Program, etc), there are no assurances that the full implementation of the KBRA programs will ever occur. Moreover, as further qualification of the outcomes of the KBRA the programs are merely stated as "goals". The programs are unspecific and susceptible to funding constraints and other CEQA legal challenges and hurtles that cannot be addressed under this programmatic EIR. Therefore, the conclusions and findings presented are speculative or hopeful at best. The Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives on Coho Salmon and Steelhead – April 25, 2011 (SA) was prepared by the Expert Panel which expressed serious misgivings about the nonspecific nature of the KBRA implementation and management. Missing from the information provided to the Panel was a detailed plan of implementation of the KBRA. To quote the Panel *"If KBRA is critical to the program, which*

Comment 6 - Fish

Comment 6 cont.

the Panel was told it was, than it seems logical that lack of specifics about KBRA would make an expert panel charged with offering their opinions quite uncomfortable. There is too much "trust me", and the Panel's experience with other large-scale restoration projects supports the Panel's discomfort; often the general descriptions of restoration plans are much more optimistic and grandiose than the actions that are actually implemented." Comment # 337, pg 179-180, (ref p. 50, para 2, line 6).

Comment 7 - Fish

6. The findings of Klamath River Expert Panel – Final Report – Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives on Coho Salmon and Steelhead, April 25, 2011 refute any conclusion or finding by Secretary Salazar that the project will advance the restoration of salmonid fisheries of the Klamath Basin. The following sections of the report are cited to demonstrate the lack of support to make a finding of dam removal. (Italicized refers to direct quotes from Final Report)
    A. The Panel only met for 5 funded days and was provided an enormous amount of material from many documents. The tight deadline *limits the opportunities to follow a trail of scientific evidence back to its source in original data.* There was no peer review of the original source data provided. Given that the material was sourced by Agencies in favor of dam removal the opportunity for bias is plain – garbage in garbage out. *The Panel recommends that its statements not be used in lieu of doing the necessary and feasible data collection, analyses, and modeling recommended below. (*Page i)
    B. The Panel did not have the time or resources to examine original data or re-do analyses, even when such actions seem straightforward and warranted for the assigned task. (Page 8)
    C. Details of the KBRA plan of implementation were missing, an integrated view of how the two alternatives might affect specific life stages was not determined. The question becomes, how can components of life stages be left out and hope to derive an accurate coho population response? (Page i)
    D. The manifold KBRA actions are unspecific in terms of location, timing, duration, extent, expected use by species and life stage, and resultant changes in reproduction, growth, and survival. In light of the absence of KBRA specifics and the uncertainty that these will ever be implemented due to the vicissitudes of long term permitting, processing and funding *the Panel can make only qualitative statements conditional on assumptions about the missing pieces of the puzzle.*
    E. The population effects to the coho, which are central to findings by the Secretary *are not answerable in quantitative terms. The Panel was provided qualitative information and asked to respond to questions requiring quantitative answers.* This is not possible. The Panel identified 6 obstacles to drawing conclusions between the alternatives, therefore the Panel's findings *should not be used as a substitute for scientific analysis of solid data.* Moreover the Panel offered recommendations on how to ensure the best scientific information could be brought to bear. These recommendations were not initiated by the Agencies. (Page iii)

Comment 7 cont.

F. The Panel confirmed that even with the limitations referred to above *the difference between the Proposed Action and Current Conditions is expected to be small, especially in the short term. (*Page ii)

G. The comparison between Proposed Action and Current Conditions from a "Baseline" perspective is not rational since there is no likelihood that the Current Conditions will persist. The continued operation of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project is subject to FERC relicensing. It would in any case be subject to new operating requirements. New operating requirements would at the very least require mitigation measures to be implemented by PacificCorp or the dam owner for the benefit of the coho. Therefore, it is entirely possible that the small gains in coho population suggested by the Panel under the Proposed Action would be less than those achievable under a relicensing agreement.

Comment 8 - Proposed Action/Project

7. The conclusions made of the benefits of the Proposed Action Alternative #2 are not supported by the evidence, and the study fails to demonstrate that the action will "do no harm" to the fish populations or the health and safety of the local economy. In the opening executive summary of the Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives on Coho Salmon and Steelhead – April 25, 2011 (SA) the expert Panel expressed its difficulty in speaking to the conclusions made by the proponents of the Proposed Action. "The proponents … provide no single synthesis or overview document compiling their conclusions along with supporting scientific evidence. The panel furthermore was funded to meet for only 5 days. Although Current Conditions will likely continue to be detrimental to coho, the difference between the Proposed Action and Current Conditions is expected to be **small**. Moderate responses are possible … if the KBRA is fully and effectively implemented. The more likely small response will result from modest increases in the habitat area…, small changes in the mainstem, positive but unquantified changes in tributary habitats where most coho spawn and rear, and the potential risk for disease and low ocean survival to offset gains in production in the new habitat. The high uncertainty

8. Alternatives 4 and 5 have been proposed under the pretext that "other alternatives" have been duly considered in the EIR/EIS. This is not the case but rather only the Dams Out Alternatives 2 & 3 were considered. Therefore the EIR/EIS study is not valid as it did not undertake to study other feasible alternatives. The KHSA was developed for the benefit of select beneficial stakeholders to the detriment of the larger public interest as a "fait de compli" for dam removal. The terms of the agreement have the intentional effect of rendering all other Dams In alternatives as "non-starters". Therefore, other alternatives are conveniently dispatched as alternatives that can never be implemented in the report. The report concludes that Alternative 4 – Fish Passage at Four Dams and Alternative 5- Fish Passage at JC & Copco2 do not satisfy the conditions of the KHSA and the Hydropower Licensee (PacificCorp) would therefore need to re-enter the FERC process to implement this alternative. Notwithstanding the evidence that PacificCorp sought to renew its license but under threat and duress of ongoing litigation by environmental groups and the California resource agencies of Regional Water Quality Control

Comment 9 - Alternatives

Comment 9 cont.

Board and California Department of Fish and Game, PacificCorp is effectively indemnified by the Federal Government from ongoing exposure and will not pursue re-licensing. Therefore, alternatives 4 & 5 are prejudiced and altogether precluded from consideration. As an example the Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives 4/25/11 (SA) only reviewed Current Conditions and the Proposed Action. Alternatives 4 & 5, which many parties assert have greater potential to remedy existing conditions, were not considered by the Panel. Again the lead agency and selected stakeholders' strategy was to preclude the study of other preferred and viable alternatives. This is violation of the minimum threshold requirements of an EIR/EIS.

9. Failure to base findings on evidence that is accurate, complete and relevant. The EIR/EIS fails to recognize the complete picture of the Coho Salmon in a global perspective; it ignores facts and evidence that point to a resurgence and migration of coho populations in the northern hemispheres due to effects of El Nino and other warming trends and forecasts the futilely of grand restoration plans of the KBRA; it rejects the earliest historical evidence that the presence of coho and other andronomous salmonid populations in the upper Klamath basis was rare and extremely limited in the Indian diet and culture.

Comment 10 - Fish

I respectfully request your consideration of the above comments.

Sincerely,

Steve Riter

1836 Fallbrook Drive

Alamo, CA 94507

Cc: Siskiyou Board of Supervisors

US Congressman Tom McClintock

Free Rural Economy

Comment Author	Riter, Steve
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1230_1211-1	Master Response N/CP-12 Public Comment.	No
GP_LT_1230_1211-2	Siskiyou County is included in the economic region for dam decommissioning, operation and maintenance, mitigation, irrigated agriculture, in-river sport fishing, refuge recreation, whitewater boating, and KBRA effects. Estimated economic impacts including those related to reservoir recreation and agricultural employment, as well as effects on property values and local government revenues, relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative are discussed in Section 3.15. Further details of these analyses are provided in the "Economics and Tribal Summary Technical Report For the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon" found on www.klamathrestoration.gov Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases. Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection. Master Response REC-2 Recreational Use at Restored River. Master Response WSWR-1 Effects to Agricultural Water Supply. The "public interest" component of the Secretary's decision relates to more than Siskiyou County -- it relates to the nation as a whole.	No
GP_LT_1230_1211-3	EIS/EIR Section 3.13, Cultural and Historic Resources, addresses potential impacts and mitigation for all activities associated with dam removal to submerged village sites. The Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) is analyzed as a connected action in this EIS/EIR. Master Response CUL-1 Shasta Nation Participation. Master Response CUL-2 Federal Recognition.	No
GP_LT_1230_1211-4	Sections 3.6 and 3.8 evaluated effects of water supply and flood hydrology. Section 3.15 evaluated economic effects of Reclamation's Klamath Project alternatives. Master Response WSWR-1 Effects to Agricultural Water Supply. Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection. Section 3.15 analyzes the estimated economic changes to the agricultural sector. Over the period of analysis, employment in the agricultural sector is anticipated to be an important part of the regional economy. Some KBRA actions would change agricultural	No

Comment Author	Riter, Steve
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	water supply, on-farm pumping costs, and water acquisitions in Reclamation's Klamath Project area, which would affect irrigated agriculture and farm revenues (see p. 3.15-50 and 3.15-71). Additional details on the methodology and results of the economic analysis are in Reclamation 2012a and the Irrigated Agriculture Economics Technical Report (Reclamation 2012f). Section 4.4.14 of the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated socioeconomic cumulative effects. The analysis considers general plans, other existing planning and management documents, and the unemployment and industry trends within the counties in the area of analysis in the cumulative condition. The analysis identifies positive and adverse cumulative effects of the Proposed Action on jobs in the counties.	
GP_LT_1230_1211-5	Both NEPA and CEQA include provisions that the draft environmental review analyze a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the purpose and need/project objections, and are potentially feasible (40 CFR § 1502.14; 43 CFR § 46.420(b); Pub. Resources Code, sec. 21002; CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a), (c), (f).). Alternatives should be limited to ones that avoid or substantially lessen the Proposed Action's significant environmental effects. (CEQA Guidelines secs. 15126.6(a), (c), (f), sec. 15204(a); Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.3.) The Lead Agencies are not required to consider all conceivable alternatives to the Proposed Action. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21091(d)(2)(B); CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a); sec. 15204(a).) Nor are the Lead Agencies required to analyze an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(f)(3).) Also, the Lead Agencies are not required to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or requested by comment authors; instead, the Lead Agencies are to focus on significant environmental issues. (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15204(a).) The Lead Agencies developed a list of 18 preliminary alternatives that were screened down to five. The Lead Agencies fully analyzed the five alternatives in the Draft EIS/EIR because they best meet the NEPA purpose and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, and are potentially feasible (Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.3). (A full description of the alternatives and the rationale for screening the alternatives is presented in Appendix A, the Alternatives Formulation Report). This analysis is thorough and includes alternatives suggested during internal and external scoping for the EIS/EIR.	No

Comment Author	Riter, Steve
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	In response to the specific example, the socioeconomic section analyzed both short-term and long-term effects. It also included both beneficial and adverse effects for all alternatives.	
GP_LT_1230_1211-6	The cautions concerning the KBRA expressed by the Expert Panels (Dunne et al, 2011; Goodman et al. 2011) are noted in the EIS/EIR (EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3). While the long-term success of recovering salmonids in the Klamath Basin would be enhanced by the full implementation of the KBRA, there are many benefits of the Proposed Action that are likely to occur whether the KBRA is implemented or not, because dam removal affects all of the reservoir reaches of the Klamath River below Keno Dam independently of the KBRA to some degree. For example: • The Chinook Panel predicted that, based on the information provided to them (which contained only a programmatic discussion of the KBRA), it was possible that the Proposed Action would provide a substantial increase in the abundance of naturally spawned Klamath River Chinook salmon above that expected under existing conditions in the reach between Iron Gate Dam and Keno Dam. While the Panel agreed that there was also evidence for dramatic increases in abundance associated with the Proposed Action upstream of Keno Dam, they cautioned that achieving substantial gains in Chinook salmon abundance and distribution in the Klamath Basin is contingent upon successfully resolving key factors (discussed in this report in detail) that will continue to affect population, such as water quality, disease, and instream flows (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-94). • Modeling dam removal without implementation of the KBRA suggests that dam removal would substantially increase numbers of spawners over a 50-year period (Oosterhout 2005). Additional production modeling efforts support this conclusion (Huntington 2006, Dunsmoor and Huntington 2006) (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-95). • After dam removal and flushing winter flows (expected to occur within 5 years after removal) riverine sections between reservoirs would be expected to provide the preferred substrate size range for fall-run Chinook salmon, with very little sand, suggesting that high-quality spawning habitat would be created (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-96). • The reservoir drawdowns would allow tributaries and springs such as Fall, Shovel, and Spencer Creeks and Big Springs to flow directly into the mainstem Klamath River, creating patches	No

Comment Author	Riter, Steve
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	of cooler water that could be used as temperature refugia by fish. Access to the cooler waters associated with spring inputs in the Hydroelectric Reach would benefit coho salmon rearing in the mainstem (Hamilton et al. 2011 cited in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-107). • The removal of the four dams would likely reduce habitat availability for the polychaete host for C. shasta and P. minibicornis. Drawing down the reservoirs would reduce the amount of lentic habitat available, and increased flow variability would reduce the stability of pools, eddies, and low-velocity habitats. These changes would result in more favorable water temperature for salmonids, as well as improve water quality and reduce the incidence of disease and algal toxins (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, 3.3-96, 107). • Dam removal would also cause water temperatures to become warmer earlier in the spring and early summer and cooler earlier in the late summer and fall, and to have diurnal variations more in sync with historical migration and spawning periods (Hamilton et al. 2011). These changes would result in water temperature more favorable for salmonids in the mainstem (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-99). • Incidence of disease are expected to be reduced by enhancing the scour capabilities of flow by uninterrupted sediment transport, a flow regime that more closely mimics natural conditions, thereby disturbing the habitat of the polychaete worm that hosts C. shasta. Reducing polychaete habitat will likely increase abundance of smolts by increasing outmigration survival, particularly for Chinook Type I and Type III life-histories (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-99). • Master Response AQU-16 Benefits to Coho. Under the KHSA and KBRA (Agreements) the United States will be a party to the KBRA at the time of a Secretarial Determination under the KHSA, and obligated to implement the KBRA according to its terms (Draft EIS/EIR, p. ES-2). The Federal Lead Agency, the DOI, is analyzing the KBRA as a connected action. NEPA defines connected actions as those actions that are closely related or cannot or will not proceed unless other actions are taken previously or simultaneously (40 CFR 1508.25(a)(1)(ii)).3 Some actions or component elements of the KBRA are independent obligations and thus have independent utility from the KHSA, but the implementation of several significant elements of the KBRA package would be different, if the determination under the KHSA is not to pursue full dam removal. Recognizing that implementation of many elements of the KBRA are unknown and not reasonably	

Comment Author	Riter, Steve
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	foreseeable at this time, the connected action analysis is being undertaken at a programmatic level (Draft EIS/EIR, p. ES-3). CDFG, as Lead Agency under CEQA, is analyzing relevant parts of the KBRA in a programmatic fashion, as described in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. This decision was made because many of KBRA's component elements have not been specified to a degree where the associated impacts would be reasonably foreseeable for purposes of this environmental analysis. The parties recognize that future project-specific analysis may be required for various components of the KBRA as they become more clearly defined and when a public entity, as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15379, identifies a discretionary approval pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 which would obligate subsequent review. A program-level document is appropriate when a project consists of a series of smaller projects or phases that may be implemented separately (Draft EIS/EIR, p. ES-5). The extent of cumulative effects of actions associated with the KBRA is defined in Table 4.2 and in the EIS/EIR Section 4.4, Cumulative Effects Analysis. Removal of the Four Facilities without implementation of the KBRA was considered as a part of Alternative 8, which was developed but was not brought forward for analysis in the EIS/EIR because it did not meet the purpose and need under NEPA or contribute to the project objectives under CEQA (Draft EIS/EIR Appendix A, Section 4.2.8, p. 4.8). The comment as stated does not accurately represent the findings of the Expert Panels. None of the Expert Panels concluded that implementation of the KBRA in its entirety is necessary for dam removal to benefit salmonids in the Klamath Basin. There are effects of dam removal that will facilitate the restoration of salmonids in the Klamath Basin without implantation of the KBRA. With full implementation of the KBRA, as noted by the Expert Panels, those restoration efforts are likely to be more successful.	
GP_LT_1230_1211-7	The points raised in the comment are selective references to the coho Expert Panel's Executive Summary, not the EIS/EIR. Notwithstanding the Panel's work, multiple lines of evidence are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR to support findings. The Panel's reports one of many sources of information documented in the Draft EIS/EIR. Master Response AQU–5 Will Benefit all Salmonids. Master Response AQU–6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead, and Chinook.	No

Comment Author	Riter, Steve
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Master Response AQU–7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success. The comment as offered does not accurately represent the findings of the Expert Panels. Master Response AQU–17 Expert Panel Second Line of Analysis, Not the only line of Evidence. Master Response AQU–9 Minimum Flows for Fish. Master Response AQU–11B NOAA Fisheries Service BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	
GP_LT_1230_1211-8	The Draft EIS/EIR acknowledges and discloses potential adverse impacts on Klamath River fish, particularly over the near term following dam removal as sediment now behind the dams is washed downstream. NEPA and CEQA do not require agencies to select alternatives that have no adverse environmental impacts. The comment author excerpts only a portion of the Expert Panels' findings; Master Response AQU-6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead, and Chinook, more fully summarizes the findings of the Expert Panels.	No
GP_LT_1230_1211-9	The KHSA Section 3.2.1(iii), signed by the Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar on February 18, 2010, directs the Secretary to undertake environmental review in support of the Secretarial Determination. All alternatives carried forward for further analysis in the EIS/EIR were analyzed using existing studies and other appropriate data as suggested in KHSA Section 3.2.1 (i), where such analysis met criteria in (40 CFR 1502.22 and 43 CFR 46.125) to incorporate available information. Appendix J of the KHSA outlines the Science Process for development of the Secretarial Determination. Appendix J specifies peer review of the scientific studies for the Secretarial Determination process using subject-matter experts to maintain a high level of scientific integrity in the technical information developed as part of that process. The Expert Panels were not part of the EIS/EIR process, and only included Alternative 2 in detail (although most of this information is also applicable to Alternative 3). The Lead Agencies have used their best efforts to identify and disclose as much relevant information as possible in the Draft EIS/EIR from the Secretarial Determination process.	No

Comment Author	Riter, Steve
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	As described in KHSA Section 3.2.1(i), the FERC record is used to form the project description for Alternatives 4 and 5. Alternatives 4 and 5 were analyzed to ensure that the review of reasonable fish passage alternatives was comprehensive. In addition, at the time of developing a reasonable range of alternatives, the Lead Agencies recognized that the inclusion of Alternatives 4 and 5 would provide an assessment of the short- and long-term effects from a broader range of reasonable alternatives. Alternatives 4 and 5 are outside the authority of the Department of the Interior, the four facilities proposed for removal are privately owned structures, and there was no provision in the KHSA to include them in the Detailed Plan. The result is differing levels of available information for alternatives carried forward in the EIS/EIR consistent with the elements of each action alternative.	
GP_LT_1230_1211-10	There is ample evidence and documentation regarding the fact that anadromous salmonids historically occurred above Iron Gate Dam (river mile 190) in the mainstem Klamath River and several tributaries. There is also ample evidence and documentation regarding anadromous salmonids, native to the Klamath River, will recolonize this historical habitat given the opportunity. Evidence includes: • Several published reports which provide a sound basis for the occurrence and distribution of salmon (including Chinook and coho) and steelhead above Iron Gate Dam. These include: o Hamilton et al., 2005 o Butler et al., 2010, which corroborates findings of Hamilton et al. • On October 16, 2006 Administrative Law Judge Honorable Parlen L. McKenna's Decision included the following findings of fact (FOF) in his decision: o While the precise geographic distribution is uncertain, historical records and Tribal accounts demonstrate that anadromous fish (Chinook salmon, coho salmon, and steelhead trout) migrated past the present site of Iron Gate Dam which provided a viable ecosystem and habitat for those stocks of fish. (FOF 2A-3, p. 12). o Chinook salmon (both spring and fall-run) were abundant in the tributaries of the Upper Klamath Basin, including Jenny, Fall, and Shovel Creeks, as well as the Wood, Sprague, and Williamson rivers. (FOF 2A-4, p. 12).	No

Comment Author	Riter, Steve
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	o Steelhead trout utilized habitat in Spencer, Shovel, Fall, Camp, and Scotch Creeks, and they were likely distributed as far upstream as Link River. (FOF 2A-5, p. 12). o Coho salmon spawned in Fall Creek. (FOF 2A-6, p. 12). o The record shows that those anadromous fish proximate to Iron Gate Dam are genetically most similar to those populations that existed in the Upper Klamath Basin prior to the construction of the dams. (FOF 2A-22, p. 15). o Anadromous fish are highly adaptive to differing conditions typically can readily migrate into and colonize new habitat or recolonize historic habitat. FOF 6-3, p. 32). Removal of the Klamath River Dams as proposed in Alternatives 2 (the Proposed Action) and 3 is intended to benefit all salmonid species, not just coho. The Draft EIS/EIR discusses the impacts of global warming in Chapter 3, Affected Climate Environment/Environmental Consequences and Chapter 4, Cumulative Effects. The KBRA provides for an assessment of how long-term climate change may affect fisheries and communities in the Klamath Basin (KBRA Section 19.4). The technical assessment of climate change is scheduled to occur in 2013 (KBRA Appendix C-2). Master Response AQU–13 Ocean Conditions. Master Response AQU–24 Chinook Climate Change and Marine Survival. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Science.	

GP_MC_1025_298

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 25, 2011

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ORLEANS, CALIFORNIA

MR. ROBBI: All right. Thank you. My name is Marc Robbi, M-a-r-c R-o-b-b-i.

Me, my wife, and three children live on our property that's on the Klamath River. We run a Web-based mail order nursery business from our property and employ three people year-round. Our lives are intimately linked to the river.

Comment 1a - Approves of Dam Removal

I would like to say we are completely in favor of removal of all four Klamath dams in question, as quickly as possible. As you know, our river is polluted and toxic. And, you know, though we have a beautiful beach, a swimming hole, we can't let our kids swim in it. Our fisheries are devastated, which has -- you know, impacts us personally, as well as having a hugely negative effect on our whole community.

Comment 2 - Real Estate

You have mentioned real estate values are -- you know, the loss up by the dams. But I would like to -- you know, I would like to see, in the Impact Statement, you know, something about the loss of property values

that we have, you know, suffered up here in our communities for a long, long time.

I mean, you know, there was a day when the banks would just be lined with people. It would be hard to find a spot on the river to fish. And, you know, our businesses thrived. You know, all the resorts, the cabin businesses, you know, as Chris was saying, you know, the stores. I mean, the impact is huge. You know, it's beautiful here, but we live on a river that is polluted, that you can't swim in, and has very limited fishing, you know, opportunities.

So, I think that, you know, you really need to address the real estate value, I think. You know, it's big. It's a long stretch of river. It's a lot of communities that is, you know, being depressed in a major way, due to the water quality and these dams.

Comment 1b - Approves of Dam Removal

So, we urge you to take these dams down as soon as possible. We are in full support for Alternative 2 and agree that it -- you know, taking these four dams down and allowing the river naturally to flush itself clean is the best action to take for river restoration and the subsequent renewal of our community.

I would also like to assert that dam removal and river restoration will also be a benefit to all the people of our country, as well as all the other creatures

and life forms that call this place home. You know, more salmon means, you know, more osprey, more bald eagles. That is our national bird. You know, they're all dependent on the salmon and the lifeblood of the area and just as one example of, you know, how we're all connected here and how the positive impacts will be major in many ways.

So, I would just like to thank you for your efforts and the good work you have done to enabling this restoration, and I would like to thank you for coming out and having this meeting here tonight. Thank you.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Marc.

Comment Author	Robbi, Marc
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1025_298-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1025_298-2	Master Response RE-1E Real Estate Evaluation Report. Master Response RE-2 Changes in Property Values.	No

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

GP_LT_1229_1212

12/5/11

Dear Ms. Vasquez and B.O.R. and Mr. Gordon Leppig and California Dept. of Fish + Game

Please consider my comments regarding the dams on the Klamath River.

I am in complete solidarity with the Siskiyon County Board of Supervisors and majority of citizens of Siskiyon County in their opposition to the removal of dams from the Klamath R.

The dams provide electricity and flood control. They provide recreation and irrigation. These benefits produce jobs which improves the economy and quality of life for citizens of Siskiyon County.

Comment 2 - Fish

Removal of the dams will not likely restore the Salmon to the Klamath River. Overfishing the ocean in international waters is decimating the Salmon population.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
SCANNED

Comment 3 - Costs

Dam removal is expensive. We have no money to pay for it.

Dam removal will result is loss of property value for many homeowners near the Klamath River and to a lesser extent to all of Siskiyon County property owners.

Comment 4 - Real Estate

Stop wasting taxpayer money.
Re license the dams.
Build fish ladders.
Restore the many fish hatcheries that have been shut down.

Comment 5 - FERC

Thank you,

Bruce M. Robison

brucemr40@hotmail.com
530-925-0145

BRUCE M. ROBISON
P.O. BOX 632
McCloud, Ca. 96057

Comment Author	Robinson, Bruce
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 29, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1229_1212-1	Master Responses GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection. Master Response HYDP-1 Reservoir Water Rights. Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response REC-1 Regional Recreation Resources.	Yes
GP_LT_1229_1212-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of the Record. The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) was established by the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 and has regulatory jurisdiction over salmon fishing within the 317,690 square mile exclusive economic zone from 3 miles to 200 miles off the coast of Washington, Oregon and California. Jurisdiction over commercial and recreational salmon fishing regulations in nearshore areas, within 3 miles of shore, lies with the respective states. However, the states generally adopt regulations consistent with those established by the PFMC. The Salmon Fishery Management Plan developed by the PFMC describes the goals and methods for salmon management. Management tools such as season length, quotas, and bag limits vary depending on how many salmon are present. There are two central parts of the Plan: Conservation objectives, which are annual goals for the number of spawners of the major salmon stocks (“spawner escapement goals”), and allocation provisions of the harvest among different groups of fishers (commercial, recreational, tribal, various ports, ocean, and inland). The Council must also comply with laws such as the Endangered Species Act. Since the management of salmon considers many factors that can fluctuate greatly from year to year (population abundance and environmental conditions) it is impossible to predict how future management decisions regarding the specific harvest of Klamath Basin salmon might change as a result of the Proposed Action.	No
GP_LT_1229_1212-3	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_LT_1229_1212-4	Master Response RE-1E Real Estate Evaluation Report. Master Response RE-2 Changes in Property Values.	No
GP_LT_1229_1212-5	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Comment Author	Robinson, Bruce
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 29, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	As an alternative to relicensing, numerous parties, including PacifiCorp, signed the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA), which looks at the possibility of decommissioning and removal of certain of Reclamation's Klamath Project dams. Alternatives 2 or 3 of this Draft EIS/EIR examine the possibility of dam removal occurring under the aegis of the Secretarial Determination and the KHSA (EIS/EIR Section 1.3.1.1., p. 1-19).	

GP_WI_1116_714

From: jasonthomasrobo@gmail.com[SMTP:JASONTHOMASROBO@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 1:51:40 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Pro-Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jason Robo
Organization:

Subject: Pro-Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I wanted to voice my opinion in favor of dam removal. Dams have choked off a major source of food, cultural subsistence and economic benefits. Dams, in this area more than most, perpetuate the legacy of abuse against indigenous tribes. Dams also strangle the ecological integrity out of the rivers and the surrounding vegetation.

Therefore, I support the immediate removal of all dams on the Klamath River and its tributaries. I also support the restoration of all historic wetlands and marshes in the upper Klamath basin, including Lower Klamath Lake, Tule Lake and Upper Klamath Lake.

Comment Author	Robo, Jason
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_714-1	Comment Noted. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_851

From: Greg Rodriguez[SMTP:CHEF_RODRIGUEZ@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 5:02:25 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: I Support Alternative 2 - Full Removal of 4 Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear Secretary Salazar:
I support alternative 2 within the draft dam removal EIS/EIR – full removal of four Klamath River dams. The draft EIS/EIR correctly shows that alternative 2 is the best option for fisheries restoration, job creation, and the reduction of toxic pollution. Option 2 is supported by a growing body of scientific research and best serves the public interest.

Greg Rodriguez

98144

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Rodriguez, Greg
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_851-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1123_908

From: Jim Roe[SMTP:JIM.ROE37@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2011 12:09:56 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Removing the dams on the Klamath river should not happen, saving the salmon is an excuse not for the good of the salmon.

Comment 2 - Economics

How many people will this disturb, and what will it do to food pricing when they can no longer farm this area, what about the ranchers?

I think this need a real rethink, and look at the ramifications to people, and it will make little difference to the salmon. They are better able to adjust that the people of the area.

Jim Roe, concerned citizen of government encroachment in our lives

.

Comment Author	Roe, Jim
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 23, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1123_908-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1123_908-2	None of the alternatives, including the No Action/No Project Alternative, will impact food prices. There are thousands of farmers and ranchers nationwide producing products which are also grown/raised in the Klamath Basin. Farmers and ranchers in the Klamath Basin supply a very small portion of commodities to the total market, which includes the rest of the United States and world markets. Therefore Klamath farmers and ranchers accept the market price of commodities and have no influence on market prices. The alternatives are anticipated, however, to have employment impacts. Section 3.15 analyzes the estimated changes to the agricultural sector which includes ranching. Section 3.15 also discusses the regions and counties where impacts are modeled to occur. Over the period of analysis, employment in the agricultural sector is anticipated to be an important part of the regional economy. With respect to the agricultural sector, employment impacts are anticipated to be positive over the period of analysis.	No

GP_WI_1116_700

From: ronhagg@hotmail.com[SMTP:RONHAGG@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 9:39:46 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: undam the Klamath
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: ron
Organization:

Subject: undam the Klamath

Body: Undam the Klamath.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Ron
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_700-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_062

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Garrett Roseberry

Organization: Rancher

Title: Owner.

Address: P.O. box 45 Bly, 97622

Email: pinendnco@aol.com

Comments:

Comment 1 - Economics

Temporary jobs will not stimulate the local economy. The Klamath Falls community saw this, with the natural gas pipeline. Pipeliners ~~came~~ worked for about 1 year. Worked in the community and sent money home to other areas. And now, the pipeline is installed, the jobs, the employees and the ~~money~~ income is gone from the area. The ~~KHSA~~ proposed action provides for maintenance of some ag and fishing jobs, whereas other ag and recreation jobs are lost. The temporary job gain does not offset the long term loss of agriculture and fishing jobs. The proposed action does not increase long-term employment and economic stability in the Klamath Basin. You need to consider irretrievable losses to the community before you implement the proposed action.

Comment 2 - Economics

Pu[illegible]quired that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Roseberry, Garrett
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_062-1	The temporary spending related to dam removal, mitigation, and KBRA will stimulate the regional economy, relative to the status of the regional economy absent such spending. This spending will create both temporary and longer-term employment. Temporary jobs created by construction would result in a short-term increase in local economic activity. These temporary jobs would provide some employment to local residents, which would increase local incomes and spending during the construction period. Some workers would also be brought into the region, which would also increase regional expenditures during the construction period. This would result in a temporary stimulus to the local economy. Section 3.15.4.2, p. 3.15-53 discusses the economic effects of construction activities.	No
GP_MF_1019_062-2	The Proposed Action would result in a net increase in fishing which will continue over the long term; effects on specific fishing activities (positive and negative) are described on p. 3.15-56 through 3.15-61. The Proposed Action would also result in a long-term net increase in jobs relative to irrigated agriculture. Tables 3.15-56 through 3.15-58 summarize job effects relative to irrigated agriculture effects of the Proposed Action.	No

GP_WI_1109_412

From: mwr@sisqtel.net[SMTP:MWR@SISQTEL.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 12:40:35 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: EIS/EIR Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: James C. Roseman
Organization:

Comment 1 - KHSA

Subject: EIS/EIR Dam Removal

Body: I've been following this issue for some time. It is my belief that beyond the advisory vote which resulted in a large majority against the dams removal, (no small feat), and the almost daily reiteration why the removal is harmful, what bothers me the most is how this situation came about. The process was deeply flawed, mostly due to it not being open to the public. When the general public was made aware of it, it seemed to be a done deal. Only an uproar from those folks affected brought it to a head and now, lo and behold, the citizen's are being asked for their input. Too little, too late in the trust department. For those of us that live in this rural area, our way of live will be forever negatively affected.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1109_412-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA.	No

GP_MC_1020_216

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. GENE ROSSINI: My name is Gene, G-e-n-e, Rossini, R-o-s-s-i-n-i.

Most of what I was going to say has been said,

but the board here has written this up, and I think what

I'm getting out of this meeting is you people are still

trying to put the hustle on Siskiyou County, who voted

AD-20, no. Why you are coming up with this, I have -- I

don't understand. A lot of things I don't understand.

Comment 1 - Fish

Concern about the fish going up another 40, 50

miles: Well, by the time the fish reach Iron Gate right

now, they are useless. You can't eat them unless you are

pretty hungry. You could smoke one or two, maybe, that's

it. How are they going to go another 40, 50 miles? I

don't understand it.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

Why you want to throw away good hydroelectric

power, I mean that's -- that's clean power, it's there,

it's working, all the generators are maintained. Why rip

it out?

And then they want to put this three or four

more dams in Southern California. It don't make sense. I

don't understand how your's a-comin' up with this.

Comment 3 - General/Other

Another thing good: I've lived 27 years on Iron Gate Lake; if it wasn't for the reservoirs and the lake, maybe I or other people in our homes wouldn't even be there anymore if it wasn't for the helicopters getting water out of them lakes to put out the fires four or five years ago. I mean, we couldn't even get to our houses for five, six days.

Oh, boy, I guess that's about it, I'm not much of a speaker. Thanks.

Comment Author	Rossini, Gene
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_216-1	There are many benefits from salmon and steelhead presence in the Upper Klamath Basin. Harvesting them as a food source locally is but one benefit. The larger value of access to historical spawning areas will be an increase in the salmon and steelhead harvest in commercial, Tribal, and recreational fisheries not only within the Klamath River watershed but in the ocean as well. The analysis of benefits of an increase in the salmon and steelhead harvest in commercial, Tribal, and recreational fisheries is presented in the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 3.15, Socioeconomics.	No
GP_MC_1020_216-2	Master Response GHG-1 Green Power.	No
GP_MC_1020_216-3	Master Response GEN-21 Access to Water for Fire Suppression.	No

GP_EM_1118_801

From: kerry russell[SMTP:RUSSELLKERRY@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 5:56:34 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Cc: KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov
Subject: The Governments Decision to remove Viable Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825
via fax (916) 978-5055
via email: KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Mr. Gordon Leppig
c/o California Department of Fish and Game
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501
via fax (707) 441-2021
via email: KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

To whom it concerns:

I would like you to explain how the Government can be so callus as to take down four perfectly functioning dams. I have my qualms regarding the reasons and have written the following challenges to the decision. Please see below.

Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800

WATER QUALITY

Challenge:

How will taking out dams improve water quality?

* Klamath is naturally warm and polluted up stream

* Area of headwaters is volcanic and rich in minerals, including basalt, magnesium and phosphorus

Duplicate cont.

* System of four dams filters out the minerals and allows the water to cool

POLLUTING SEDIMENTS from BREACH

Challenge:

How will the release of toxic sediment into the river ecosystem, caused by the breaching of the dams, be mitigated?

* Years of built up, toxic sediment will be released

* Toxic sediment will pollute water, banks, riparian plant life, fish and underground acquifers

* Toxicity of river and acquifers may last 100 years or more

GREEN and AFFORDABLE ENERGY

Challenge:

How will the green, affordable energy currently provided by the four, hydroelectric dams be replaced?

* Existing four dams provide hydroelectric power

* Hydroelectric power is both green and economical

* Current system provides enough electricity to power 70,000 homes

STAKEHOLDERS

Challenge:

How were "stakeholders" determined?

Duplicate cont.

* 40,000 Siskiyou County residents and their local, elected representatives were not included in the Klamath River Dam removal meetings

* Four tribes exist in the Klamath Basin - the Shasta, Karuk, Yurok, and Hupa; the Shasta have been left out of all agreements and their sacred burial grounds will be destroyed when the dams are breached

PROTECTING NON-NATIVE FISH
Challenge:

A major impetus for dam removal is concern over the Coho salmon, a non-native species to the Klamath River; why?

* Coho salmon are not native to the Klamath and were planted in the river in the late 1800's

* Coho are not natural to the Klamath and yet millions of fish produced at the Iron Gate fish hatchery are not included in the river population because they are not considered natural

* Coho typically spawn within 30 miles of the ocean; first dam on the Klamath is 187 miles upstream

I respectfully request that you reconsider this callus decision. I know several individuals that this project is going to effect personally and they were never brought into the decision to destroy their land and property in their possession for generations. Seriously, why do this type of thing?

Thank you for your consideration,

Kerry Russell-Patterson
372 Greenway Drive
Pacifica, California 94044
Home phone: 650-355-6252

Comment Author	Russell, Kerry
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded -GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_EM_1118_800 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1118_801-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MF_1025_239

Klamath Settlement EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) LYNN RYAN

Representing ANCIENT FOREST INTERNATIONAL, REDWAY, CA

Comment 1 - Approves Dam Removal

Notes:

WE SUPPORT FULL FACILITIES DAM REMOVAL, ALTERNATIVE 2.

*Please read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

26

Comment Author	Lynn, Ryan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1025_239-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1128_939

From: Lynn Ryan[SMTP:LYNNR8@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2011 10:55:18 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: personal comments on Klamath Dam Removal DEIS/DEIR Auto forwarded by a Rule

Elizabeth Vasquez
MP150
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA. 95825
Comments on the Klamath Facilities Removal Public Draft EIS/EIR Nov. 28, 2011

Comment 1a - Approves of Dam Removal

Dear Ms. Vasquez,

I support removal of the Klamath River Dams.

Comment 2 - Fish

I do not support the KBRA because I question if it provides enough water for natural fish, sufficient flow of water for general river ecosystem recovery, true Klamath basin restoration and I question if it negates or subordinates tribal water rights. The DEIR/DEIS allows enough water or ranches in the Klamath Basin but does not guarantee enough water in the river to provide for anadromous fish through a time period when fish are returning to spawning grounds.

Comment 3 - Water Quality

Comment 1b- Approves of Dam Removal

I want to see at least 4 of the Klamath Dams removed in order to provide a healthy eco region for support of salmon and other fish stocks and runs. The DEIR/DEIS does not provide for cleaning up the high nutrient load runoff from agricultural activities. The nutrient rich water contributes to pathogens in the chain that leads to disease and death of fish.

Comment 4 - Out of Scope

Comment 5 - NEPA

I support funding for willing seller buyout to permanently reduce irrigation water demand, be it ground water or surface water, to a level that will bring water back into balance with what is sustainable for healthy ecosystems. We question if this DEIS/DEIR is in compliance with the ESA and the Clean Water Act.

The DEIS/DEIR skips analysis if the cumulative effects of the KBRA, which is illegal under NEPA and CEQA.

Comment 6 - NEPA

Sincerely,

Lynn Ryan RN
1693 J. St.
Arcata,CA 95521
lynnr8@gmail.com

Comment Author	Lynn, Ryan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1128_939-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1128_939-2	Master Response AQU – 11 NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management. Master Response TTA-1 Federal Trust Responsibility and the KBRA.	No
GP_EM_1128_939-3	The Draft EIS/EIR addresses the issue of high nutrient loads from agricultural activities in the Upper Klamath Basin through inclusion of the Klamath River TMDLs as part of the set of reasonably foreseeable future actions that would be implemented under the Proposed Action and the other alternatives. Additionally, Section 3.2.4.3.2.10 KBRA (p. 3.2-125 to 3.2-132) presents a programmatic analysis of potential KBRA effects on water quality under the Proposed Action including wetland-related and water supply projects that would also affect nutrients in the Upper Klamath Basin. Under KBRA, wetland restoration projects such as the Wood River Wetland Restoration Project are included along with water supply projects like the Water Diversion Limitations program, the Water Use Retirement Program (WURP), and the Interim Flow and Lake Level Program (see also Section 3.8.4.3, p. 3.8-18 to 3.8-24), to address the challenges inherent in balancing environmental and agricultural needs for water in the Upper Klamath Basin. Resource management actions implemented under KBRA as part of the Proposed Action would accelerate long-term improvements in water quality (see further discussion below). The comment author appears to be linking increased nitrogen in the lower Klamath River following dam removal to increased periphyton growth, which in turn could provide additional habitat for the polychaete host of the C. Shasta and P. minibicornis parasites implicated in fish disease. Master Response WQ-27. Nutrient Retention With Dams, Nutrient Release Without Dams, and Periphyton. The anticipated increases in nutrients downstream of Iron Gate Dam would also be diminished by water quality improvements in Upper Klamath Basin, including those related to agriculture. Master Response WQ-4 C and D Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. Master Response WQ-6 Periphyton Growth and Fish Disease.	No

Comment Author	Lynn, Ryan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1128_939-4	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. The Proposed Action does include the Water Use Retirement Program (WURP) as part of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA). The WURP could alter water quantity and water quality and affect aquatic species. This component of the KBRA would increase inflow to Upper Klamath Lake by 30,000 acre-feet per year on average. A variety of mechanisms would be used to achieve this objective, including acquisition of water rights, forbearance agreements, water leasing, changes in agricultural cropping patterns, land fallowing, juniper removal, and forest thinning. The additional water provided would increase flows in tributaries to Upper Klamath Lake improving habitat for redband trout, shortnose and Lost River suckers, and bull trout. Anadromous salmon and steelhead that would have access to these tributaries as a result of the Proposed Action would also be expected to benefit.	No
GP_EM_1128_939-5	Effects relative to the Clean Water Act (CWA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA) are analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR in Chapters 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5.	No
GP_EM_1128_939-6	Master Response N/CP-22 How KBRA Was Analyzed.	No

GP_WI_1116_687

From: ssalo2@suddenlink.net[SMTP:SSALO2@SUDDENLINK.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 1:26:42 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Steven L. Salo
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath River Dam Removal

Body: I just want to add my voice to those who want to see the dams removed from the Klamath River as soon as possible.

Thank you for hearing me.

Steven L. Salo

Comment Author	Salo, Steven
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_687-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_622

From: hsandigo@gmail.com[SMTP:HSANDIGO@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2011 3:34:50 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Restoring the Klamath Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Henry
Organization:

Subject: Restoring the Klamath

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: By the continuance of restoring the great Klamath, we will bring back the great fishery the Klamath use to be for our fore bearers, and now can be for our own children

Respectfully

Henry Sandigo

Comment Author	Sandigo, Henry
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_622-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).	No

GP_EM_1117_1140

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 9:18:30 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: DAMS
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> Duane Sands <freedomusa7@earthlink.net> 11/17/2011 8:58 PM >>>

Please do not remove the dams on the Klamath River. Why try to fix something when it is not broken?

Duane Sands Crescent City, Calif.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Duane Sands
freedomusa7@earthlink.net
EarthLink Revolves Around You.

Comment Author	Sands, Duane
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_1140-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1227_1178

From: shumak13@aol.com[SMTP:SHUMAK13@AOL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2011 9:03:23 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: designed lifespan
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: ken sandusky
Organization: salmon liberation organization

Comment 1 - Other/General

Subject: designed lifespan

Body: These dams were meant to have passage from the beginning. The only allowance for our anadromous loss I can find was "clandestine." And no recompense ever applied. Now to keep these aged structures we will see our rates increase on top of the fiscal and social losses already endured? Seems right ridiculous to us... Salmon have immense value and we need ours back. We rely on natural resources in the NW. This one stolen lifetimes ago promises to help support a stronger service economy.

Comment Author	Sandusky, Ken
Agency/Assoc.	Salmon Liberation Organization
Submittal Date	December 27, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1227_1178-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1102_315

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011

(Please print legibly)

150 ✓

Name: Steve SanFilippo

Organization:

Title:

Address: PO Box 438 Yreka, Ca 96097

Email:

Comments:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I've lived and worked in Siskiyou county for 25 years and I would like to say, "I am opposed" to the removal of the dams.

Comment 2 - Costs

In these difficult economic times why should we be spending so much time and money to fix something that isn't broke. The dams provide green energy, are benificial for agriculture and recreation which brings in a lot of revenue to our county.

I enjoy fishing and kayaking in the river, and I can really appreciate the way the flows are regulated with the help of the dams. Please Do Not Remove them. Steve SanFilippo 10-26-11

Comment 3 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

SCANNED

Pd T-13.00
12
153137

...mit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at ... withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	SanFilippo, Steve
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 02, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1102_315-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MF_1102_315-2	The Draft EIS/EIR identifies the purpose and need and project objectives for the alternatives development and impact analyses. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Section 3.15 evaluates economic impacts on agriculture and recreation. The Proposed Action would result in a net increase in fishing and recreation industries which will continue over the long term; effects on specific fishing and recreational activities (positive and negative) are described on p. 3.15-56 through 3.15-61. The Proposed Action would also result in a net increase in jobs relative to irrigated agriculture. Tables 3.15-56 through 3.15-58 summarize job effects relative to irrigated agriculture effects of the Proposed Action.	No
GP_MF_1102_315-3	EIS/EIR Section 3.20, Recreation, describes effects to recreation as a result of the Proposed Action. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1102_314

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

150

Name: Teresa Sanfilippo

Organization: property owner along river

Title: Broker -

Address: ~~893~~ P.O. Box 438 Yreka CA 96097

Email:

Comments: Why are the votes of the people not worth anything? The people have voted to not remove the dams but I guess it doesn't really matter what the residents of Siskiyou County feel. Just another case of Bureaucratic mis spending, mismanagme and corruption.

Comment 1 - General/Other

Tm Sfilippo

SCANNED

PRT-13.00

1153134

11/21/2011

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	SanFilippo, Teresa
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 02, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1102_314-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_EM_1216_1086

From: Hyo Chung[SMTP:LEECHUNG@WISC.EDU]
Sent: Friday, December 16, 2011 3:34:10 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Cc: Adena Rissman
Subject: Klamath Dam Removal Public Recommendation Auto forwarded by a Rule

Hyo Sang Lee Chung
454 W. Dayton St. Apt. 208
Madison, WI 53703

December 8, 2011

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825
Dear Ms. Vasquez,

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

First, I would like to appreciate your acceptance of public comment on such important policy like removing Klamath dams, and considering them as an important recommendation source. I as an environmental study and international study student of University of Wisconsin - Madison, would like to recommend you to consider removing Klamath dams even stronger in order to preserve Salmon species without worries about jobs and economic impacts because there are much more benefits than losses that are generated by natural river way, and such losses are negligible due to the followed benefits and alternatives from dam removal.

While reading the announcement of public hearing on Klamath dam removal, it seems like that the greatest concern about the dam removal can be identified into 3 sources: loss of some jobs, loss of electric supply, and loss of recreational opportunities. However, when evaluating those negative impacts, my personal idea is that losses will not outweigh benefits of dam removal because those problems have alternative solutions or even negligible, while alternative way to get benefits from removal requires meaningful amount of funding.

The opposing position's one of the strongest arguments would be the loss of around 50 jobs in Klamath dams. Indeed, removing dam means removing their place of work, so there would be serious concerns about job loss of current working forces. However, compensating those people would not excess the funding needed to build alternative fish pathways and reservoir water management. Furthermore, while there are around 50 job losses, there would be about 450 estimated job support annually from fisheries occurred by dam removal. Therefore, the problem of loss of jobs is negligible considering compensation cost and additional benefits from improved fisheries.

Another argument about dam removal is the loss of electric supply. While 70,000 homes are concerned about loss of an electric source, according to removal plan report, those households should have to be also concerned about transferred public cost of building fish passage over dam. Therefore, the increased rate of

electricity bill would be negligible because of even higher public cost of building fish passage.

Finally, the loss of recreational support of water reservoir can also be neglected because naturally formed river by dam removal will also bring similar recreational support. The most recreational support of water reservoir would be fishing and boating. While such recreation would be also available in rivers, it can be neglected. Although loss of recreational support is negligible, some people might argue that unlike water reservoir, the natural river is a flowing water. However, in such case of concerns, small force of safety and security management would be enough to manage and deal with safety issues.

Beside such negligible negative impacts, there is a significant positive impact on salmon species. While salmon is not widely renowned as endangered species (and some dispute over whether salmon is endangered species or not), it is widely renown that dams are seriously threatening salmon's habitat because of blockade of their way back to home during spawning season. Therefore, I strongly urge you to consider positively about dam removal not only because to increase the salmon fishery range, but also to protect salmon habitat and species.

Similar case of salmon habitat reconstruction can be found on Japan, 2010. Last year December, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) recommended Japanese dam on Shiretoko peninsula with advice of preserving salmon habitat and species. While removal of some Shiretoko dam had high risk of flood, Klamath dam has relatively small risk of flood as reported on Red Lodge Clearinghouse. Moreover, the benefit of Salmon habitat restoring is expected greater than Shiretoko peninsula, I strongly support removing Klamath dam under proper compensation for possible job loss and security.

As described above, removing Klamath dam would bring some negative impacts, however, those impacts are negligible because of available compensation and even stronger reinforcement naturally followed after dam removal. Also, removing dam would bring improvement on Salmon habitat that would support improved fisheries and natural resource preservation. Furthermore, the cost of removing dam is expected as smaller than that of Shiretoko peninsula, I strongly support Klamath dam removal. The annexed link below is the report of Shiretoko peninsula, and hopefully, this would support your positive consideration of dam removal for natural preservation.

Again, thank you for your time for reading my recommendation and accepting public comments for such important policies.

Sincerely,

Hyo Sang Lee Chung

UW - Madison, Environmental study student.

Securing a safe passage for salmon, (2010). International Union for Conservation of Nature. Retrieved from

http://www.iucn.org/knowledge/focus/previous_focus_topics/next_steps/on_the_ground/?6689/Securing-a-safe-passage-for-salmon

Comment Author	Sang Lee Chung, Hyo
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1216_1086-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).	No

GP_EM_1109_413

From: OLYMPIC45@aol.com[SMTP:OLYMPIC45@AOL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 12:40:54 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Re Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I DO NOT WANT ANY DAM REMOVAL.. AT KLAMATH OR ANY WHERE ELSE.

CONCERNED CITIZEN
CHRISTINE SARGENT

Comment Author	Sargent, Christine
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 09, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1109_413-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1011_025

October 6, 2011

Bureau of Reclamation
c/o CDM
2295 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 240
Sacramento, CA 935833

Re: **Change of Address for John P. and Jean O. Santori**
Property Owners: (COS Bond, Series A-C Copco Lake Unit 2, Lot 61, APN 4-392-611)

Please change the address in your records for John P. and Jean O. Santori

FROM:
43354 30th St W Apt 110,
Lancaster CA 93536-5309

TO:
John P. and Jean O. Santori
4482 Via Amable
San Diego, CA 92122

Thank you for your assistance in making the address change to assure all correspondence is mailed to the new address.

Nancy J. Santori Cash

Nancy J. Santori Cash
for John P. and Jean O. Santori

John and Jean Santori
4482 Via Amable
San Diego, CA 92122

SAN DIEGO CA 921
07 OCT 11 PM 1 01

RECEIVED
OCT 11 2011
CDM SACRAMENTO

Bureau of Reclamation
c/o CDM
2295 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 240
Sacramento, CA 935833

Comment Author	Santori Cash, Nancy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1011_025-1	Data Base was updated to reflect this change of address.	No

11/09/2011 12:41 510-2354500 SARGENT FAX

GP_LT_1110_473

11/9/11

Comment 1 - Against Dam Removal

Bureau of Reclamation

I do not want Dam Removal at Klamath dam. Save our future prosperity and welfare

Concerned citizen
[illegible]
Richmond, CA 94805

BUREAU OF RECLAMATON
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
NOV 10 '11

CODE	ACTION	SURNAME & DATE

SCANNED

Classification
Project
Control No. 1084513
Folder I.D. 11-9-014X-1
Date Input & Initials 11/10/2011 IN

Comment Author	Sargent, Nadine
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1110_473-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1120_812

From: williamusavage@aol.com[SMTP:WILLIAMUSAVAGE@AOL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 3:10:30 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Draft EIS/EIR: I support Alternative 2 Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: William Savage
Organization: Cal Trout

Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503

Subject: Klamath Draft EIS/EIR: I support Alternative 2

Body: I support Alternative 2 of the Klamath Draft EIS/EIR proposal (full removal of the Iron Gate, Copco1, Copco2, and J.C. Boyle dams).

* These dams are decimating what used to be the west coast's third most productive steelhead and salmon fisheries, and strangling the area's economy
* Alternative 2 will help restore salmon runs (dramatically increasing steelhead populations), and ensure predictable water deliveries to irrigators
* The dams don't make economic sense: if upgraded to modern standards they'll actually operate at a $20 million annual loss
* Even the owner (PacifiCorp) wants these privately owned dams taken out

I support healthy fisheries and a healthy local economy (dam removal brings many jobs to the area) -- and I support Alternative 2.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Savage, William
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded - GP_WI_1111_503. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_WI_1111_503. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_WI_1111_503 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1120_812-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No

GP_WI_1111_550

From: sawaske@gmail.com[SMTP:SAWASKE@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 5:33:14 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Name: spencer sawaske
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dams

Body: I support Alternative 2 of the Klamath Draft EIS/EIR proposal (full removal of the Iron Gate, Copco1, Copco2, and J.C. Boyle dams).

Comment Author	Sawaske, Spencer
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_550-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1025_299

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 25, 2011

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ORLEANS, CALIFORNIA

MR. SAXON: How are you doing? My name is Josh Saxon, J-o-s-h S-a-x-o-n. And I would like to echo the sentiments of the majority of the community here.

I would like to -- I'm a resident of Orleans. I was born here, raised here. And I think that Alternative 2 is definitely the only option on the table that we support. It's going to contribute to the health of the river and the way that it needs to be restored back to the way it was.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

You know, like BeaVi was saying, you know, the stories from the old people, from the old folks, was that at some times during the river runs, on some stretches of the river, you could walk right on the backs of the salmon all the way across. That's how plentiful the runs were here. And, obviously, that's not the case.

And the majority of the time, this river is not healthy. And I have three children. I have a fourth one on the way in March. And I feed my kids fish, but I typically only feed my kids fish from the mouth, because anything that goes up the river is just not as healthy. When it gets in this river, there's just too much going on. There's too much runoff. There's too much

chemicals. There's just way too much going on in the river for the fish to be healthy in it.

And I think that the economic impact could be huge for this area, not just for this area but for the upper river as well. I'm always confused about how the folks upriver, up in Yreka and Montague and those places, are so against dam removal, because it's going to benefit them so much with all the job creation that's up there. Their economy is not any better than ours.

So, I appreciate you guys being here. And I hope that the more people that read the EIS study and understand it will actually -- cooler heads will prevail and that we can get this thing done. Thank you.

MS. JONES: Thank you.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Josh.

Comment Author	Saxon, Joshua
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1025_299-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1122_886

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Date: 11/6/11

Dear Ms. Vasquez:

I support Klamath Dam Removal as described in Alternative 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR on Klamath Facilities Removal because:

[illegible] alternative is the only one that will ensure that the habitat is restored [illegible] be opened enough to give a [illegible] water species and [illegible] species in better ecosystem

Sincerely,

Name (printed clearly)

Signature

SCANNED

Comment Author	Saxon, Joshua
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1122_886-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_131

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter

MS. BELINDA SCALAS: My name is Belinda Scalas, S-c-a-l-a-s.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my

comments on the draft EIS this evening.

Building dams has been foundational to settling

and reclaiming the West. However, not all dams were

created equally nor were there long-term environmental

impacts known upon siting and building them.

Comment 1 - General/Other

The four lower Klamath dams have served our

purpose and produced electricity during their useful life,

but the time has come when they have proved to be more of

a blight to the Klamath River than the benefit of their

presence is worth. This isn't a universal truth about all

dams but for these dams, it is a reality.

In negotiating the Klamath Agreements, parties

from the entire Klamath Basin watershed came together and

learned some real and lasting lessons about what it means

to be a neighbor.

The Bible says, "Love your neighbor as

yourself;" much easier said than done. But in working

with neighbors to find agreement about how to manage our

water resources together, I think we collectively found

that, excuse me -- that when you love your neighbor and

honor them, you love and honor yourself.

The Klamath Agreements are a perfect example

of the results of being a good neighbor. Tribes care

about agricultural water, farmers care about tribal

heritage, and we all care about being stewards and leaving

a healthy ecosystem for our children.

The Klamath River ties our communities

together. It is the main artery through which the pulse

of water courses. We have got some real issues happening

in our main artery: Poor water quality, blockage of

ESA-listed species, and a general lack of coordinated

water management.

The Klamath Agreements address all these issues

and more. The time has come to restore health to the

Klamath River, and when the main artery of this watershed

is healthy, our communities will also be healthy.

Comment 2 - Approves of Dam Removal

I urge Secretary Salazar to make a positive

determination in moving forward with implementation of the

Klamath Agreements, for the health of the Klamath River

and for our communities.

Comment Author	Scalas, Belinda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_131-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1018_131-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1117_741

From: Mark Scharff[SMTP:GRATEFUL1MARK@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 1:19:59 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Dear Ms. Vasquez,

As a lifelong citizen of Oregon, and the Earth I want to thank you for your work on the Klamath River. The theft of Native land, Water Rights and destruction of the Rivers lifeblood that is needed to sustain the wildlife native to this land has to end, not only is it morally right, it is one more step towards restoring then natural balance to an area long abused by ranchers, and farmers. For too many years "resorce extraction" has been the mantra of those who are so myopic that they won't look beyond their own pocket books and political power. May Mother Earth make you strong, and give you direction and wisdom as you continue to help reclaim our lands and help us begin to heal the scars left by those who want to destroy the Natives of our lands.

--
Mark W. Scharff

Comment Author	Scharff, Mark
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_741-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_EM_1120_811

From: bj_109@att.net[SMTP:BJ_109@ATT.NET]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 2:38:50 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Dam Removal - NO!!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

This is insanity! Absolutely NO on removing any of our dams!
You think the against wallstreet demonstrators are strong – just try this and see what happens.

Please reconsider.
Thank you.
Barbara Schell
109 Woodland Dr., Napa, CA 94558

Comment Author	Schell, Barbara
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_811-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1117_742

From: sscher@opendoorhealth.com[SMTP:SSCHER@OPENDOORHEALTH.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 1:29:41 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: klamath dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Sarah Scher
Organization:

Subject: klamath dam removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I am writing to support Alternative 2, full removal of the four dams on the Klamath River in CA and OR. I believe this is the best available solution to restore the river and the salmon population. Thank you.

Comment Author	Scher, Sarah
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1117_742-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1128_945

D 11/21/2011

NOV 25 2011

157 11/28

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Eric Schmidt

Organization:

Title:

Address: P.O. Box 223 Orleans, CA 95556

Email: enschmidt@juno.com

Comments: Dear Mr Secretary of Interior,

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment 2 - Alternatives

Thank goodness the United States Federal Government is finally recognizing the environmental and economic need of removing the four dams and restoring fish habitat on Northern California's Klamath River. I do not know about waiting nine more years to finally tearing down the dams, though. I'll be almost 65 years old and probably too old to get one of the jobs helping to take down the dams. Must we wait that long? I wish there were some sort of executive order to move forward on dam removal. We needed the dams removed, the jobs created and the fish yesterday. Is it a vestige of our racist colonial past, like how it took a hundred years for civil rights to kick in after the end of slavery? To be honest it still feel

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

4) like "cowboys and Indians" up here sometimes.
My father, a veteran and retired engineer who joined the Riverkeepers and wanted the dams removed told me before he died that they are "dragging their feet" because they don't really want to remove the dams or give some fish back to the Native Americans. I hope that isn't true The Klamath River and fish belong to all Americans to enjoy anyway, so we are only hurting ourselves. The good economics for dam removal is clear. The good ecological science for dam removal is clear. The good ethics for dam removal is clear also How future historians will remember our time and our deeds is in your hands now. Be visionary if you can and try to see the unmet challenges and problems. Go for the Glory of restoring the West's great fish runs, honoring promises and improving Native American relations. Correct a National injustice that was done by the ruining of the Klamath river with dams, sediment and algae producing resevoirs. We all need to put our human needs aside for once and think of the fish first. In regards to the draft EIS/EIR there are some problems that need to be addressed. Dam removal without reducing nutrient

Missing Text: Dam Removal without reducing nutirent...

Comment 3 - Water Quality

5) flows from the Upper Klamath will not help the river or fish! The Upper Basin nee rehabilation to make the river's ecology work. An "Everglades like" restoration and rebuiding of the original wetlands for the river's natural filtering program needs to be incorporated. This probably means that ranch and agricultural lands will be needed and will have to be bought up. The Native Americans and fisherman ha sacrificed for many decades, Now it is the farmers, and ranchers who must sacrifice. No, just be bought out maybe by the Nature Conservancy or the United States Govt. Buy up Upper Klamath Basin devalued land and build a National Monument dedicated to the people of the Upper Basin, who sacrificed their land, water and livelihood for restoration of the Klamath River and the salmon.

Comment 4 - ITAs

Also, you can not allow the desenting tribes such as the Hoopa to be cut out of the process for fifty years as in the BRA. That would be a social injustice to say the least. Thank you for your work on this issue. Sincerely, Eric Schmidt

Comment Author	Schmidt, Eric
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1128_945-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MF_1128_945-2	Master Response ALT-3 Elimination of Alternative 13 - Federal Takeover of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project from Detailed Study.	No
GP_MF_1128_945-3	Concern #1: Nutrient pollution will continue in the Klamath Basin and dam removal may help, but it will not be enough. Master Response WQ-16 Upper Klamath Basin Historically Productive but Land Use Exacerbates Problem. Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. In most years (2011 being somewhat of an exception) water quality in Upper Klamath Lake and Keno is seasonably poor between June and October. During these periods, high water temperatures and low dissolved oxygen levels related to algae blooms can negatively impact fish. However, the Draft EIS/EIR provides substantial information to suggest that at other times of the year there is presently suitable habitat in Upper Klamath Lake to support reintroduction of steelhead and salmon. Once the weather cools down in the fall, salmonid species, which have evolved within this seasonal cycle in the Klamath Basin, can use the Upper Klamath Lake. Concern #2: An Everglades-like restoration program is needed to reduce nutrient pollution in the upper basin. The Everglades restoration program uses a variety of pollutant management / reduction techniques. Many of these same techniques are being contemplated for use as part of the Klamath River TMDL implementation program. Several water quality improvement activities have been recently funded through the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) Interim Measures (Interim Measures 10, 11, and 15; see Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.1, p. 3.2-34 to 3.2-35). Projects currently being considered under IM 11 include water quality pilot projects for organic matter removal, sediment sequestration of nutrients, treatment wetlands, and natural wetland restoration, among others, to address nutrient over-enrichment in Upper Klamath Lake and the Klamath River reaches downstream of the lake. As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR, pilot scale projects are still in the data collection or planning stage, so an assessment of water quality impacts from these projects is not yet practical (see p. 3.2-25).	Yes

Comment Author	Schmidt, Eric
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1128_945-4	Master Response TTA-7 Tribal Involvement in Future Discussion of Water Management.	No

GP_WI_1027_247

From: hschmidt17@juno.com[SMTP:HSCHMIDT17@JUNO.COM]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2011 4:33:19 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Settlement/EIS/EIR Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Hermalee Schmidt
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath Settlement/EIS/EIR
Body: I am a home owner on this area. I support removal of all four dams.

Comment Author	Schmidt, Hermalee
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 27, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1027_247-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1217_1081

From: tabula.rasa.ideology@gmail.com[SMTP:TABULA.RASA.IDEOLOGY@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Saturday, December 17, 2011 8:25:15 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Jen Schoener
Organization:

Subject: Klamath River dam removal

Body: Please Support Alternative 2- Full Dam Removal. This alternative provides the greatest benefit to the Klamath River watershed, fisheries, and eliminates future tax payer dollars that would be needed to maintain parts of the aging dam infrastructure.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Schoener, Jen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1217_1081-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_071

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Cameron Scott

Organization: Writer in Residence / Chiloquin High School

Title: ✓

Address:

Email: tucannon river 00@gmail.com
zeros

Comments:

Comment 1 - Approves Dam Removal

#2. Remove the dams.

Thanks.

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Scott, Cameron
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_071-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1118_765

From: longcanyon tds.net[SMTP:LONGCANYON@TDS.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 10:45:38 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Save the Klamath River
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_729

An estimated 22 million cubic yards of toxic sediment will sludge its way down the Klamath River destroying salmon runs, mucking up the environment affecting water clarity and purity! This amount of sediment will sterilize the river for 100 years.

We are against the waste of the taking down of the Damns. This is one more waste of taxpayers money as well as way to harm our food supply of Scott Valley.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

John R. Scott

Comment Author	Scott, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded -GP_EM_1116_729. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_EM_1116_729. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_EM_1116_729 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1118_765-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response HYDP-1 Reservoir Water Rights.	No

GP_WI_1116_713

From: gseegs@hotmail.com[SMTP:GSEEGS@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 1:52:43 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Un-Dam the Klamath Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Galena Seeger
Organization:

Subject: Un-Dam the Klamath Dams

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: To Whom it May Concern:
I am writing to express my support to un-dam the 4 dams on the Klamath River. These dams are endangering the lives of the Salmon which at first glance may seem less important than other factors but at a closer look are a critical link to the ecosystem and the native communities living along the Klamath. In greater context will we forever be remembered as the generation that made choices that allowed these species of fish to die out to extinction? With this letter I say no. Please choose the long view and make the choice to tear down the dams, restore this habitat and allow generations of people to experience this amazing ecosystem. The time is now and I encourage you to make the right choice.

Comment Author	Seeger, Galena
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_713-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_0930_015

From: ljsees@hughes.net[SMTP:LJSEES@HUGHES.NET]
Sent: Friday, September 30, 2011 10:00:40 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Larry & Joan Sees
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Disapproval of Dam Removal

Body: We are very strongly against the removal of the 4 dams along the Klamath River. In a time of energy crisis removing dams that supply power to a minimum of 70,000 homes is insane. No one in their right mind would sign a blank document, but that is what is being asked of the off-project farmers. No one can give any definate answers about anything. Anytime you ask a question the answer is "that hasn't been determined yet".
So "NO", no dam removal until all questions are answered completely.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

Comment Author	Sees, Larry & Joan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	September 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_0930_015-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_0930_015-2	Comment noted. Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_EM_1106_388

From: jeanselbach@comcast.net
To: klamthsd@usbr.gov
Sent: Sunday, November 6, 2011 8:58:08 AM
Subject: SAVE THE DAMS

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

MRS. VASQUEZ
OR
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

WE VERY STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE REMOVAL OF THE KLAMATH RIVER DAMS. WE HOPE YOU WILL LISTEN TO THE CONCERNS OF THOSE CITIZENS WHO WILL BE DIRECTLY EFFECTED AND HARMED IF THE DAMS ARE DESTROYED.
SINCERELY,

WILLIAM AND JEAN SELBACH
ORINDA, CA

Comment Author	Selbach, William & Jean
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 06, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1106_388-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1107_391

From: chipsharpe@sbcglobal.net[SMTP:CHIPSHARPE@SBCGLOBAL.NET]
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 10:17:14 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Remove Klamath dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Charles Sharpe
Organization:
Subject: Remove Klamath dams

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Restoration of river flows requires removal of all Klamath dams. Dam removal should proceed as quickly as is feasible.

Comment Author	Sharpe, Charles
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 07, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1107_391-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_054

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Chris Shaw

Organization: self

Title:

Address: 7221 Harpold Rd., KF 97603

Email: chris.jtshaw@gmail.com

Comments:

The Dams were built for 3 Reasons 1) power generation 2) irrigation 3) flood control. They are being removed because of fish & greed.

Comment 1 - Alternatives

Build fish ladders for the fish.

Leave the dams in place to do the jobs they were meant to do!

Comment 2 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Shaw, Chris
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_054-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MF_1019_054-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) Chris Shaw

Representing Klamath Falls

Notes: 1) irrigation
2) flood control
3) power generation

leave the dams in place! ✓3

*Please read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

GP_MF_1019_094

Comment Author	Shaw, Chris
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_094-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_110

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---
STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. CHRIS SHAW: Chris Shaw, S-h-a-w, and I'll keep this really short, okay.

There were three reasons for building the dams: Power generation, irrigation, and flood control. And I realize that the flood control will only go back a foot or two -- you know, the Mississippi Valley people would really appreciate the flood control -- ; build the area where the fish can get around the dams and keep the dams in place.

Comment 1 - Alternatives

Thank you.

Comment Author	Shaw, Chris
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_110-1	The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes an alternative that would leave the dams in place but add fish passage at each facility (Alterative 4, Fish Passage at Four Dams).	No

GP_EM_1111_546

From: Lindsey Shere[SMTP:LINDSEY@SHERE.ORG]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 5:49:26 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: I Support Alternative 2 - Full Removal of 4 Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Dear Secretary Salazar:

I support alternative 2 within the draft dam removal EIS/EIR – full removal of four Klamath River dams. The draft EIS/EIR correctly shows that alternative 2 is the best option for fisheries restoration, job creation, and the reduction of toxic pollution. Option 2 is supported by a growing body of scientific research and best serves the public interest.

Lindsey Shere

95448

Comment Author	Shere, Lindsey
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1111_546-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1110_477

From: Lauryn Sherman[SMTP:LJSHERM@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2011 10:05:40 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov
Subject: Public Comment Period for the Draft EIS/EIR: I Support the Removal of all Dams in the Klamath Region
Auto forwarded by a Rule

To Mr. Ken Salazar, Secretary of the Interior,
Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez at the Bureau of Reclamation,
Gordon Leppig at the California Department of Fish & Game,
and Whomever This May Concern:

I spent this past summer hiking, rafting, and swimming in the Klamath, Trinity, and Smith rivers of the Klamath region. The area is magical to say the least. It is somewhere that I believe should be protected indefinitely for both its beauty and biological diversity.

The coho and the chinook are amazing components of the ecosystems of the area and there are far too few of them left. It is clear that the removal of the dams would assist these species in coming back in greater numbers, and the urgency of this task couldn't be greater.

Therefore, I support the complete removal of all dams in the Klamath region. I also support the restoration of all historic wetlands and marshes in the upper Klamath basin, including Lower Klamath Lake, Tule Lake and Upper Klamath Lake. I support improving the conditions for salmon on the Scott and Shasta Rivers, and I support upholding the Endangered Species Act as well as policies which institute a sufficient minimum water flow for fish.

The water flowing through these rivers should stay in these rivers. This is how it once was, and how it should be again.

As a concerned citizen, I request that you uphold your duties to "protect America's natural resources and heritage," and support the removal of all dams on the Klamath river and its tributaries.

Sincerely,
Lauryn Sherman

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Sherman, Lauryn
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1110_477-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA). .	No

GP_EM_1104_352

From: busycherie@comcast.net[SMTP:BUSYCHERIE@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 2:08:43 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Please do not tear down the Klamath dam system!!!

Thanks so much,
Richard and Cherie Shetler and family

Comment Author	Shelter, Richard & Cherie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 04, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1104_352-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1111_495

From: Bruce Shoemaker[SMTP:BSHOE@BITSTREAM.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 1:01:36 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Comment on Proposed Dam Removal on Klamath River Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Dear Secretary Salazar:

I am a landowner on a tributary of the Shasta/Klamath River watershed in the vicinity of Black Butte, CA. I support alternative 2 within the draft dam removal EIS/EIR – full removal of four Klamath River dams. The draft EIS/EIR correctly shows that alternative 2 is the best option for fisheries restoration, job creation, and the reduction of toxic pollution. Option 2 is supported by a growing body of scientific research and best serves the public interest.

Despite the rhetoric of some people in our county (Siskiyou) I believe that dam removal will be in the best long-term interest of the vast majority of county residents.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment.

Bruce Shoemaker
800 Black Butte Road
Weed, CA 96094

Bruce Shoemaker

96094

Comment Author	Shoemaker, Bruce
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1111_495-1	Comment Noted. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1207_974

From: shum.mike@yahoo.com[SMTP:SHUM.MIKE@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 3:24:22 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: michael shum
Organization: oregonian

Subject: dams

Body: The bullying of private land owners must stop. Destroying the dams will cause unimaginable damage to the fisheries. Stop this madness.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Shum, Michael
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 07, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1207_974-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response AQU-5 Will Benefit all Salmonids.	No

GP_WI_1111_543

From: msill@juno.com[SMTP:MSILL@JUNO.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 7:13:09 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River restoration Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Marjorie Sill
Organization: many

Subject: Klamath River restoration

Body: I totally support Alternative 2, the removal of the dam on the Klamath River. We need to restore the important steelhead and salmon fishery.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Sill, Marjorie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_543-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1128_1043

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 10:21:34 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Klamath Dam
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> Linda Sills <linjete@gmail.com> 11/28/2011 9:25 AM >>>
Please do Not remove the dam. The stupid and crazy nonsense that the EPA and the other enviro-whackos are perpetrating on the good people of this country, will not be tolerated any more.
You uneducated, Fabian Socialist progressives are destroying this country and her freedoms.
We will fight you every step of the way. We will Not allow you to be tyrants over us.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Sills, Linda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1128_1043-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1128_914

From: Linda Sills[SMTP:LINJETE@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2011 10:23:22 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath Dam
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Please do NOT remove the dam. This Agenda 21 stuff is evil. The encroachment on private property, normal activities and basic freedoms is unacceptable. We the people will fight you every step of the way on this "sustainable development" garbage.
Everything the enviro-whackos are doing is the antithesis of liberty and our American way of life.
I do not expect that you have read The Road To Serfdom by Hayek. But I suggest that you do.
The people of these United States will NOT allow you to be tyrants over us.

Comment Author	Sills, Linda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1128_914-1	Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21.	No

GP_EM_1128_919

From: Mcgraw50@aol.com[SMTP:MCGRAW50@AOL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2011 1:39:16 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov
Subject: Klamath Dams - do not destroy them
Auto forwarded by a Rule

For the sake of our country, please do not destroy the Klamath Dams.

The dams improve our water quality and provide essential power.

Please rethink this issue.

Thanks,

Don Silver

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Silver, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1128_919-1	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities.	No

GP_EM_1128_899

From: denise@freedom-walker.com[SMTP:DENISE@FREEDOM-WALKER.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2011 6:01:30 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath River Dam Removal Project Auto forwarded by a Rule

To Whom it may concern:

Comment 1 - KHSA

Comment 2 - Fish

It is unbelievable to me that 40,000 residents impacted by this "sustainable development" decision were not invited to meetings regarding the removal of their energy source. This sure looks like a forced land/resource grab on the way for the furthering of Agenda 21, let's face it that really is what "sustainable development" is anyway. So why won't you just come out of the shadows and say it out loud? Why is the Coho Salmon (non-native to the area) being placed ahead of the needs of the natural born law-abiding land owner citizens?

Comment 3 - Hydropower

Comment 5 - Sediment Toxicity

How are you going to replace their source of energy? Lemme guess, and in the words of your king "energy costs will naturally skyrocket". What will the farmers in the area do for irrigation? Won't the built up sediments pollute the river and shores once the dams are removed? Do you realize that this decision will hurt many and likely drive them from their homes and properties? Isn't that really the whole point of the decision anyway?

Comment 6 - Out of Scope

What gives you the right to do such a thing? How about refocusing your efforts on "sustainable retention" of the Constitution. How about pulling your noses out of the Klamath River dams and focus on the corrupt liberty & US Constitution usurpers in legislature? How about stopping the misappropriation of tax payer dollars to further unspoken agendas which will damage already economically hurting citizens? How about scaling back collective government rights encroaching policies and refrain from the Dam removal on Klamath River altogether! That, of course, would be the RIGHT thing to do.

Respectfully Annoyed,

Cheryl Denise Simmons
denise@freedom-walker.com

Comment Author	Simon, Daniel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1128_899-1	Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA. Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21.	No
GP_EM_1128_899-2	Master Response AQU – 4 Coho are Native. The comment, as submitted, provides no evidence to support the claim that coho salmon are not native to the Klamath River. Master Response AQU – 5 Will Benefit all Salmonids. Master Response AQU – 6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook. Master Response AQU – 7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success.	No
GP_EM_1128_899-3	Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_EM_1128_899-4	Master Response WSWR-1 Effects on Agricultural Water Supply.	No
GP_EM_1128_899-5	Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants.	No
GP_EM_1128_899-6	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_MC_1020_217

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. DANIEL SIMON: I'm Daniel Simon, D-a-n-i-e-l S-i-m-o-n.

Yeah, I -- I am a professional civil engineer

and I also do environmental consulting.

I want to talk a little bit about arsenic. And

I actually had a rather pleasant conversation with

Chauncey Anderson, who I call a specialist -- um, I'll get

to that.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

There are many options on the table and I am

for anything but dam removal. I'd like to see the dams

stay, if we can.

Comment 2 - Sediment Toxicity

But, um, back in the spring of 2009, um,

Christopher Liles, who was the mayor of Etna at the time,

he communicated in a meeting with the North Coast Regional

Water Control Board that there was an arsenic problem in

the past. And what the problem was, is there was a, um,

tributary or a stream up Copco that was, um, feeding a

small fishery, and when there were heavy rains, the fish

kept dying.

And they finally did a bio assay and they found

out it was arsenic that was basically coming from the

sedimentation, onto, um, onto the fisheries. Um, in

talking to Chauncey Anderson, he communicated how arsenic, um, was sampled in the EIR.

I drew up a little diagram here. What happened was -- I'll just kind of draw this -- there were samples taken along the river course, you can kind of see it, kind of where the old stream -- the Klamath River basin -- the Klamath River, um, bed was. They took several samples, 77, over a number of -- over a number of, um, dam locations, but that could be half a mile per sample.

Um, what was going on, though, is in the past, what Christopher Liles communicated, if you can see this, this fishery had sediment that was -- yeah -- the sediment was from the tributary, and that hasn't really been looked into.

And so what I'm going to ask is if any locals here know of that fishery, the stream that was feeding it, or anybody who worked there, come talk to me afterward because it will be mandated by CEQA to investigate that location for our high arsenic concentrations. Come talk to me, if you know.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Simon, Daniel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_217-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1020_217-2	In mid-November 2011, a number of State and Federal agencies working in the Klamath Basin, including USFWS, USEPA, NOAA, USFS, USGS, USBR, ODEQ, CDFG, and NCRWQCB, were contacted regarding any knowledge of fish kills occurring on Fall Creek and general arsenic issues in the Klamath Basin. None of the staff contacted were able to find any documented information on a fish kill in Fall Creek. The CDFG reviewed all their fish kill files and found no fish kill records for Fall Creek or any location in the Klamath Basin. The NCRWQCB checked the California Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) database, 303(d) List supporting data, and local basin coordinators. No arsenic data were found for Fall Creek or documentation on any fish kills occurring or other arsenic issues. A USGS groundwater hydrologist who has studied and modeled the Klamath Basin groundwater system, was asked about the Fall Creek and whether it is likely to carry high arsenic concentrations. His assertion, based largely on the local geology and hydrology, is that Fall Creek is a “High Cascades” groundwater dominated system (the most westward such basin in the Klamath system, in fact) and therefore is likely to have relatively low levels of arsenic. However, he was unaware of any locally specific data that could be used to verify this assertion. Master Response WQ-1B-G Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants. Arsenic was included in the set of analyzed metals. Arsenic was detected in reservoir sediments at levels that did exceed human health screening levels but not the primary marine or freshwater sediment screening levels (i.e., Pacific Northwest Sediment Evaluation Framework sediment screening levels [“PNW SEF SL1-MS” or “SL1-FWS”], see CDM [2011b]). Arsenic levels may still exceed human health criteria after mixing and dilution for the first 2 years of the Proposed Action, but the lower Klamath River and Estuary are not drinking water sources, so human exposure to the arsenic will be limited. Arsenic was also found in the tissue of laboratory invertebrates and resident fish. Only the levels found in the resident fish tissue exceeded screening levels used to assess the safety of fish for consumption by humans (CDM 2011b). These results indicate arsenic has the potential for minor or limited adverse effects to humans that consume the fish from the existing	No

Comment Author	Simon, Daniel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	reservoirs and will not pose any significant impacts under the Proposed Alternative (see p. 3.2-71 to 3.2-76 and 3.2-118 to 3.2-125). If the reservoirs remain, future monitoring may be proposed to identify the source of the arsenic which may involve sampling surface soils, nearby groundwater, the water quality of Fall Creek and other tributaries during wet and dry events, and sediments near the mouths of tributaries to identify arsenic levels.	

GP_LT_1116_722

Daniel F. Simon, P.E.
Civil & Environmental Engineering Siskiyou County, California

Chauncey Anderson- Water Quality Specialist 11/03/2011
USGS
2130 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland Oregon, 97201 via e-mail: chauncey@usgs.gov

Re: Arsenic Sediment Potential;
Iron Gate & Copco Reservoirs

Thank you for your time at the EIR hearing on October 20th, 2011. I wanted to bring to your attention Arsenic concerns upon aquatic life.

You may remember me as the environmental consultant/ civil engineer discussing Arsenic, and the fish hatchery that was closed due to fish dying from Arsenic impacted sedimentation; the cause of death (by Arsenic) was determined by a bioassay of the fish..

You received well this information by saying, "That is the first I heard of this."

At this time, the information I have received is "legend"; or more "local legend." A few people have discussed this fish die-off with other elderly people. These elderly people have confirmed it, but from a professional position, it is all still legend. I am searching for and awaiting first-hand accounts of this legend.

More specifically, according to "legend", a fish hatchery receiving water from Fall Creek had multiple fish die-offs; this after heavy rains. This hatchery is now non-operational. In summary, Arsenic laden sediment eroded into the Fall Creek and killed fish at the hatchery.

I did find out that the California Fish and Game did operate a fish hatchery supplied by Fall Creek, and it is presently NOT IN OPERATION. There may be several factors in the non-operational status. Some factors may be budget, water quality (other than Arsenic), etc…. or that the fish hatchery was indeed shut-down due to the Arsenic problem. At this time, I can not determine the cause of the "NON-OPERATION" status.

If the above possibility proves true, then there could be substantial quantities of Arsenic impacted sediment behind the dams. These will be released/ eroded when the dams are removed –impacting aquatic life.

Further Information: From the USGS topo map Fall Creek has a reach of ~9 miles, and a drainage area of 12+ square miles (Crude quick estimate.) The City of Yreka gets is main water supply from Fall Creek through an intake structure (24"pipe to Yreka).

412 S. Main St., Suite 2, Yreka, California 96097 530-598-9671

The City looked back to 2002 for Arsenic, and did not find Arsenic (non-detect levels were 2 ug/l – or 2 ppb). However, in discussion with Rob Tailor (sampler/ water quality monitoring City of Yreka), he stated that they only sample ever 9 years. In addition, sampling is most likely performed on a sunny day, and not on a rainy day.

Rob Tailor and Steve Neil (City Engineer, City of Yreka) from their concerns of city water supply commented that it would be a good idea to sample during a rainy day, when the water is cloudy, or with high turbidity. Should a "hit" of Arsenic be detected, this could confirm (somewhat) this information.

At this time, I'm communicating the above "Lightly", as I understand environmental sites could have infinite samples taken, and nothing appears. Hence a focus of sampling efforts needs careful consideration due to cost and time.

Comment 1 - Sediment Toxicity

Again, Main Concern: If there is a history of Arsenic impacted sediment eroding from rainstorms, then ending up behind the dams, there could be substantial impacts upon aquatic life, should the dams be removed, and sediment released with Arsenic.

Recommendations: I do recommend the following:

1. Contact California Fish & Game inquiring if they know of the above fish-die-off "legend"/ closed hatchery;
2. Utilize the USGS data base to determine if surface soil types may contain Arsenic;
3. Identify locations where Arsenic may occur naturally in the groundwater. (Hint, wells drilled on the north side of Copco lake have high Arsenic concentrations);
4. Sample a few tributaries feeding the Klamath River; **this during heavy rain storms**. Of course other constituents of concern should be analyzed as well, like Chromium, Mercury, Copper, turbidity, suspended & dissolved solid(s) concentrations;
5. Sediment samples analyzed for same (#4 recommendation above) near the mouth of Fall Creek, or any other tributary of known/discovered concern;
6. If Arsenic impacted sediment is discovered near the mouth of Fall Creek, determine if this material would end up in the old river channel of the Klamath River; meaning would it work its way down the natural slope to the Klamath River channel? (I suspect not); If it does reach the main channel, has this area had sediment samples taken?
7. If Arsenic impacted sediment is discovered, quantify the quantity of impacted soil by further sampling and re-evaluate the EIR w/r to impacts from a sediment release; &
8. Of course, use appropriate scientific methods and professional levels of care in your evaluations. From your openness at the meeting and "response" of "That is the first I heard of this", it appears you carry these levels of care.

Note: The City of Yreka, should have additional "base-line" data from their intake sampling of Fall Creek. Again, these samples were probably sampled during sunny days (low turbidity), as field crews don't like to work in the rain, and only sampled every 9 years.

Closing: Mr. Anderson, you requested that I contact you "the sooner the better", and at this point all I can do is communicate the limited information I have received. As I find out more, I will be in contact with you. I still believe the above recommendations should be pursued in the protection of aquatic life; whether or not one is for/ against dam removal.

Sincerely,

Daniel F. Simon, P.E.
BS/MS Civil (Environmental) Engineering, Calif. RCE#58237

PS: Nice talking on the phone today, and it appears you are concerned about the potential of Arsenic, and its impacts over the first few years of dam removal.

PPS: **Shear speculation introduced:** There are two arguments as to where Salmon migrated; ie… how far up the Klamath River. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined no further than Iron Gate; hence the dam location. Local Native Americans claim that their forefathers caught Salmon much further upstream than Iron Gate Reservoir. **Speculation Hypothesis: Arsenic impacts may explain these different opinions.** Different years yielded different rainfall intensities. Some years, the rains were low and steady (substantial groundwater feeding of the Klamath), hence the Arsenic may not have impacted water quality, therefore Salmon went along way upstream (past the dams). Other years, frequent intense rains (higher Arsenic from erosion) during spawning season prohibited the Salmon from migrating very far upstream.

Comment Author	Simon, Daniel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1116_722-1	In mid-November 2011, a number of State and Federal agencies working in the Klamath Basin, including USFWS, USEPA, NOAA, USFS, USGS, USBR, ODEQ, CDFG, and NCRWQCB, were contacted regarding any knowledge of fish kills occurring on Fall Creek and general arsenic issues in the Klamath Basin. CDFG records indicate that in September 2003, there was an accidental shut-off of water in Fall Creek and most of the fish in the Fall Creek rearing facility died. That was the last year that the Fall Creek facility was operated; it was subsequently closed for funding reasons. CDFG records also indicate that in 2010 there was a chlorine spill at the water supply area for the Yreka Municipal Drinking Water facility that resulted in a fish kill in Fall Creek (Radford 2011). The NCRWQCB checked the California Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) database, 303(d) list supporting data, and local basin coordinators. No arsenic data were found for Fall Creek or documentation on any fish kills occurring or other arsenic issues. Additionally, Fall Creek is a “High Cascades” groundwater-dominated system and is therefore likely to have relatively low background levels of arsenic (Anderson 2012). The City of Yreka routinely tests for arsenic in its drinking water quality. The 2010 Annual Drinking Water Quality Report indicates that arsenic was not detected. Master Response WQ-1B-G Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants. Arsenic was included in the set of analyzed metals. Arsenic was detected in reservoir sediments at levels that did exceed human health screening levels but not the primary marine or freshwater sediment screening levels (i.e., Pacific Northwest Sediment Evaluation Framework sediment screening levels [“PNW SEF SL1-MS” or “SL1-FWS”], see CDM [2011b]). Arsenic levels may still exceed human health criteria after mixing and dilution for the first 2 years of the Proposed Action, but the lower Klamath River and Estuary are not drinking water sources, so human exposure to the arsenic will be limited. Arsenic was also found in the tissue of laboratory invertebrates and resident fish. Only the levels found in the resident fish tissue exceeded screening levels used to assess the safety of fish for consumption by humans (CDM 2011b). These results indicate arsenic has the potential for minor or limited adverse effects to humans that consume the fish from the existing reservoirs and will not pose any significant impacts under the	No

Comment Author	Simon, Daniel
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Proposed Alternative (see p. 3.2-71 to 3.2-76 and 3.2-118 to 3.2-125). If the reservoirs remain, future monitoring may be proposed to identify the source of the arsenic, which may involve sampling surface soils, nearby groundwater, the water quality of Fall Creek and other tributaries during wet and dry events, and sediments near the mouths of tributaries to identify arsenic levels. If there is an affirmative Secretarial Determination, there is the potential for additional studies. Sampling for arsenic in sediment or groundwater near Fall Creek as suggested by the comment author could be undertaken if there is sufficient evidence to suggest that it is warranted.	

GP_EM_1105_387

From: Ruth Simpson[SMTP:SUPERGIRL@FINESTPLANET.COM]
Sent: Saturday, November 05, 2011 11:56:16 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: save the dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Ms. Vasquez, Siskiyou County has voted to save the dams. Why is there still a movement to remove the dams? We are the People, and we have voted to retain the dams. Thank you for listening. I am a long-time resident of Siskiyou County, California.
Ruth Simpson

Comment Author	Simpson, Ruth
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 05, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1105_387-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1116_710

From: suzanne.simpson.litzky@gmail.com[SMTP:SUZANNE.SIMPSON.LITZKY@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 2:23:44 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River Dam Removel Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Suzanne Simpson
Organization:

Subject: Klamath River Dam Removel

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: It is imperative for the health of the Klamath River and the fish that migrated up that river for centuries that the dams be removed asap. Time is of the essence. We must stop the extinction of our fish

Comment Author	Simpson, Suzanne
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_710-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1220_1231

Ray\politic8.wpd

December 15, 2011

RECEIVED
2011 DEC 20 PM 3:09
OFFICE OF THE
EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

507727

Secretary Ken Salazar
Department of the Interior
1849 C Street, N.W.
Washington DC 20240

Good Morning Secretary,

RE: Klammath economic Restoration Act
Klammath River Dam Removal

Reported is your support for the $1.1 Billion dollar cost and removal of the Klammath River dams. In view of the following, please don't allow this to happen?

Comment 1 - Hydropower

1. Overburdened home owner utility rate payers and tax payers are or will be paying three times for electricity; First, the original cost of building the dams by COPCO; second for the cost of their removal; and third for the cost of replacing the generating capacity that is abandoned. My Pacific Power bill currently shows 6.3 mills per KWH charge for Boyle, Copco and Iron Gate dam removal. SHAME! I remember in the late 1940's when the entire electrical bill was 8 mills. What happens to the money collected if the dams are not removed?

2. If the hydro electricity from dam removal is replaced by the alternative energy sources of wind or solar, the additional cost is dramatic. I am told that the hydro generating cost at Toketee, Klammath River and Bonneville is between 2 and 3 cents per KWH. Compare this to the 1,000% increase to 20 cents per KWH for wind or solar electrical generation. OUCH!

3. Dam removal will eliminate the electricity generated and probably cause that deficit to be replaced by oil imported from unfriendly overseas countries. The hundreds of billions of dollars paid for this oil (money that should stay at home) would be increased and increase the United States trade deficit.

4. Carbon from Coal or Oil generated electricity, if used to replace the hydro power, will further degrade the environment, which all are committed not to do.

5. If minimum stream flow is a consideration, will dam removal moderate that? Dams don't increase or diminish the flow of water in a river, they just control the timing of it. Would not the answer be to build more winter rain storage which could be used to decrease runoff in the winter and increase it during the dryer periods? Would this not make more water available for irrigation and fish runs?

Comment 2 - Fish

Comment 3 - Fish

Comment 4 - Alternatives

6. If the fishery is a consideration, grocery stores have an ample supply of salmon on the shelves today.

7. The number of fish killed because of low stream flow a few summers ago was nothing compared to the 1,000,000 eggs produced by each spawning salmon. Build another "Rock Creek" hatchery on the Klammath.

Comment 5 - Economics

8. The reported 4,600 jobs created by removal is incidental compared to the costs indicated in items number 1 through 3 above.

Comment 6 - Hydropower

9. Pacific Power's 20 year long range plan proposes the construction of several more coal fired generating plants, a cost to be spread out to the rate payers. Is part of this to replace that produced by the dams?

Klammath Basin farmers do need water for irrigation, and electricity is demanded for home owners and businesses throughout Oregon and California. Considering all the above it appears that too much emphasis has been given to the fishery and not enough to the Rate Payers, the Tax Payers and to the National Debt. Please don't leave any of these out of the equation.

Sincerely,

Ray O. Sims
471 Rachel Lynn Way
Roseburg, OR 97471

rsims@rosenet.net
541-673-8531

Dr. Don E. Bailey, DMV
510 NW Jones Road
Roseburg, OR 97471

Comment Author	Sims, Ray
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1220_1231-1	1. Comment noted. 2. As noted in Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increase, rate increases will be used to fund a portion of the Proposed Action, if approved, or the cost of relicensing, if it is not approved. Additional detail on the use of these funds with or without an Affirmative Determination is presented in Oregon PUC Order #10-364. 3. Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increase. 4. Comment noted. 5. Master Responses GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_LT_1220_1231-2	Master Response AQU – 11 NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management.	No
GP_LT_1220_1231-3	Different species of salmon, including coho are raised by commercial aquaculture businesses for the specific purpose of meeting the demand for fresh, frozen and canned salmon. Commercial fisheries also supply a source for fresh, frozen and canned salmon to consumers. In California all coho salmon stocks are listed as Threatened or Endangered under State and Federal Endangered Species Acts. However, not all stocks of coho salmon, or other salmon species, are listed as such. There are several populations of coho salmon in other places such as coastal Alaska, as well as other salmon species whose populations are considered to be stable and capable of being harvested as a food source. Removal of the Klamath River Dams as proposed in Alternatives 2 (the Proposed Action) and 3 is intended to benefit all salmonid species. Section 3.3.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR addresses the likely impacts of each alternative on aquatic habitat and various fish species.	No
GP_LT_1220_1231-4	Master Response ALT-9 Hatcheries.	No
GP_LT_1220_1231-5	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_LT_1220_1231-6	As noted in Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power, new sources of power, demand side management, and power purchases will be needed to meet the increasing demand in	No

Comment Author	Sims, Ray
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	PacifiCorp's service area in the near future, and is unrelated to the Proposed Action. However, as noted in Master Response GHG-1 Green Power, the loss in renewable power production is expected to be offset by California requirements on power retailers that 33% of their power portfolio be provided from renewable power sources by 2020.	

GP_WI_1219_1099

From: lynne_siodmak@patagonia.com[SMTP:LYNNE_SIODMAK@PATAGONIA.COM]
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2011 3:43:18 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Lynne Siodmak
Organization: Patagonia

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I support the removal of the Klamath Dam.

Comment Author	Siodmak, Lynne
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1219_1099-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1107_390

From: hsizemore@ncoinc.org[SMTP:HSIZEMORE@NCOINC.ORG]
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 10:09:59 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River Dam
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Helen Sizemore
Organization: North Coast Opportunities

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath River Dam
Body: Restore the watershed - remove the Klamath River Dam.

Comment Author	Sizemore, Helen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 07, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1107_390-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1107_384

From: Craig Sjoberg[SMTP:CSJOBERG@SBCGLOBAL.NET]
Sent: Sunday, November 06, 2011 10:03:32 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: DO NOT DESTROY OUR RANCH AND FARM DAMS - PLEASE

The dams you propose to destroy / "remove" are A VITAL PART OF THIS MORE ARID LANDS PRODUCTIVITY.... AND THE LIVELIHOOD OF THIS COMMUNITIES MORE THAN HARD WORKING RANCHERS / FARMERS...

In the LAST SERIOUS RECESSION aka STAGFLATION OF THE LATE 70's I witnessed the audacity of the "Spotted Owl Worship" that truly SHUT DOWN FOR THE LAST 40 YEARS THE MAJORITY OF THE LUMBER INDUSTRY IN THE ENTIRE NORTHWEST. Your actions in tearing down dams and controlling these and any other resources by fiat or emotional politics have a VERIFIABLE HISTORY OF TERRIBLE CONSEQUENCES TO THE AREA'S INDUSTRIES AND ENTIRE ECONOMIES OF REGIONS OF A STATE.

Comment 1 - Economics

I PERSONALLY WITNESSED THE IRREPARABLE ECONOMIC AND EMOTIONAL DAMAGE TO THREE GENERATIONS OF TIMBER HARVESTING FAMILIES IN NORTHEAST CALIFORNIA. THE OVERFLOW OF THAT DID ALSO DESTROY MY SMALL FAMILY DENTAL BUSINESS TOO !!

HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN A 50 % UNEMPLOYED SMALL TOWN??

PLEASE DO NOT TAKE AWAY THIS MOST NEEDED NATURAL RESOURCE (WATER USES OF ALL KINDS) FROM ANY PORTION OF ANY STATE'S LAKES, STREAMS AND RESERVOIRS.

Comment 2 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

THANK YOU VERY MUCH,

DR. CRAIG C SJOBERG, BS DDS

c/o 663 Orofino Ct. Pleasanton, CA 94566 (and Nampa Idaho)

Comment Author	Sjoberg, Craig
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 07, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1107_384-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_EM_1107_384-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_EM_1119_1152

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 9:33:10 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: dam saving
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

>>> Scott Skinner <scottskinner@me.com> 11/19/2011 5:46 PM >>>

Any Look at the history of how the settlers found the land will tell you that without the dams there was no Klamath River. It ran every winter and dried up. Do not let any one lie to you and do not destroy the Environment that has been given us.

Our fathers sweat and blood has increased the water table by those dams. By destroying the dams you destroy the water tables.

Comment 2 - Groundwater

Comment Author	Skinner, Scott
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1119_1152-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
	Master Response GEN-29 River Drying Up.	
GP_EM_1119_1152-2	Master Response GRO-1: Groundwater Use.	No

GP_EM_1116_704

From: Dr Greg Skiptis[SMTP:G1STORK@PACBELL.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 5:40:54 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Please do not destroy our Klamath water basin by removing these dams. The removal will not be helpful and will waste taxpayor dollars, DO not remove the dams.
Gregory Skipitis M.D.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Skiptis, Greg
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_704-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1019_048

From: asmith@klamathnews.net[SMTP:ASMITH@KLAMATHNEWS.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2011 6:25:08 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: No: Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: A. Smith
Organization:

Comment 1 - NEPA

Subject: No: Dam Removal

Body: EIR/EIS has far too many opinions and not enough science. While there is a lot of science gathering data, the problem lies in that there there are opinions of what that data means.

That is called a hypothesis. Unless you can repeat the results over and over with certainty, it's a hypothesis, not science.

We don't want experimentation on the cleanest form of power for the Basin for maybe a chance of fish runs returning to "mythical normal".

Models don't count. We have all sorts of sophisticated models for weather forecasting, hurricane forecasting, etc... none of them are accurate to be called science. They are best guesses.

We don't want best guesses from people who, if wrong, will not face any consequence other than "oops". Let's say if this does go through and we know for certain we have no power and the fish don't return to the guesses estimated, that then the people who made the guesses pay for new dams to be built.

Accountability. There is none, none, none in this entire approach. None.

Comment Author	Smith, A.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1019_048-1	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No

GP_WI_1202_960

From:
humboldtarearestorationteams@gmail.com[SMTP:HUMBOLDTAREARESTORATIONTEAMS@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, December 02, 2011 9:57:29 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: dam free klamath
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: das smith
Organization: HART

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: dam free klamath
Body: one day the river will flow free to the sea. remove the dams one rock at a time.

Comment Author	Smith, Das
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 02, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1202_960-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1110_485

From: ragga@frontiernet.net[SMTP:RAGGA@FRONTIERNET.NET]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2011 7:49:02 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: draft EIS/EIR Klamath River Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Donald Smith
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: draft EIS/EIR Klamath River

Body: I am writing to support the quick removal of all damns on the Klamath River and its tributaries.

This urgently needed to restore wild fish populations, improve water quality and renew the river to its former glory, as well as to the Scott and Shasta Rivers.

Actions are needed to restore wetlands and marshes, increase water flows, especially at the Iron Gate damn and the Trinity River.

As someone who lives in close proximity to the area, this has great importance to me, my family and many friends who find the area to have vast importance for purposes of recreation.

Beyond this, the area is in crucial need of restoration to bring back wild populations of salmon, so important to so many of us who live in the Pacific Northwest.

Comment Author	Smith, Donald
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1110_485-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1114_635

From: edwebnetjds@yahoo.com[SMTP:EDWEBNETJDS@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2011 11:59:51 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: UnDam the Klamath
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: James Smith
Organization: The Old Growth Organization

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: UnDam the Klamath

Body: I join with thousands of other concerned citizens and environmental activists, who would like our government to undam the Klamath River. We believe that nature has a perfect plan, like Gods Plan, and this plan includes the natural shape of our rivers and watersheds. Thus, I do not believe that the natural system can be improved upon, and instead, it should be preserved. Therefore, dams are not viewed as improvements, instead, they are seen as a mistake that can threaten the natural migration patterns of wildlife and cause endangered species.

Comment Author	Smith, James
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1114_635-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1120_803

From: Josette Smith[SMTP:KLAMATHCHIC@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 9:56:43 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: I Support Alternative 2 - Full Removal of 4 Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Dear Secretary Salazar:

I support alternative 2 within the draft dam removal EIS/EIR – full removal of four Klamath River dams. The draft EIS/EIR correctly shows that alternative 2 is the best option for fisheries restoration, job creation, and the reduction of toxic pollution. Option 2 is supported by a growing body of scientific research and best serves the public interest.

Josette Smith

76544

Comment Author	Smith, Josette
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_803-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1130_948

From: latimersmith@hotmail.com[SMTP:LATIMERSMITH@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2011 11:44:35 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:
Subject: Dam Removal
Body: Please remove all dams along the Klamath River.

Latimer Smith

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Smith, Latimer
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1130_948-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_068

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Maddie Smith

Organization:

Title:

Address: 6736 Hwy 39 - Klamath Falls, OR

Email:

Comments:

Comment 1 - Disapproval of Dam Removal

I am against the removal of the dams. It makes no sense to remove the source of clean hydroelectric power. I think of the KHSA and the KBRA as a giant redistribution of water and of wealth. I believe it's wrong, and it's especially wrong for the Klamath Basin. I believe this will adversely affect our property values, our land and water rights and our way of life.

Comment 2 -Hydropower

Comment 3 - Water Rights/Supply

I think we should keep the dams, and you can keep the change.

Comment 4 - Real Estate

thank you

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Smith, Maudie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_068-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MF_1019_068-2	Comment noted.	No
	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	
GP_MF_1019_068-3	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MF_1019_068-4	Master Response RE-1E Real Estate Evaluation Report.	No
	Master Response RE-2 Changes in Property Values	

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) Maudie Smith

Representing

Notes: I'm against the removal of the dams, the KBRA & the ESA

*Please read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

GP_MF_1019_096

Comment Author	Smith, Maudie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_096-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_172

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. MAUDIE SMITH: My name is Maudie Smith,

S-m-i-t-h. My husband and I are Klamath Project

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

irrigators. I'm very much against the removal of the dams

Comment 2 - KBRA

and the KBRA. I keep hearing the KBRA gives jobs, but it

is a giant redistribution of land and water and will.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Smith, Maudie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_172-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1018_172-2	The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the KHSA and KBRA.	No

12/01/2011 12:52 +000000000 RPSMITH PAGE 01

GP_LT_1202_970

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION OFFICIAL FILE COPY RECEIVED 2011

CODE	ACTION	SURNAME & DATE
150		12/2

Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

RE: Klamath River Basin Dam Removals

To Whom It May Concern:

Comment 1a - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I have visited the area in Siskiyou County, primarily the Irongate Dam and Fish Hatchery and my husband has been visiting the areas affected for over 30 years. I'm very concerned to hear that the government is hoping to remove four perfectly working hydro-electric dams that are producing clean energy. The devastation to that area may be immeasurable to the residents and land. I've seen the pictures of the aftermath of Condit Dam in Washington state removed. NO fish will use that river. It is one big mud hole.

Comment 2 - Fish

In my research I've found that the Coho Salmon are NOT indigenous to the area. They were planted. I've also found that the millions of healthy salmon produced by Irongate Fish Hatchery are NOT counted in the yearly count of Salmon on the river. This sounds like cooking the books in my estimation on par with Enron.

Comment 3 - Water Quality

Historically facts do not coincide with what the "paid-for" science sent to government agencies by special interest groups. The Dams have not caused water degradation. Facts:

In August 1855 *at a campsite near the confluence of the Klamath River and KlamathLake, Lt. Henry L. Abbott, Corps of Topographical Engineers made an entry into his expedition journal, "the water taken from the lake had a dark color and disagreeable taste, occasioned apparently by decayed tule."*

On August 16, 1855*, Lt. Abbott wrote, "the taste of the water was so disagreeable that several vain attempts were made to discover a spring in the vicinity."*

Comment 4 - Sediment Toxicity

Another issue I've heard no one address is the possible toxicity released from the sediments in the silt that will be washed down stream. In an article written by Christen Peattie, HHP, concerning the health affects due to removing two dams on the Rogue River in Oregon, we read horrifying results in this excerpt:

"As far as the health of the river is concerned, the Grants Pass Water District has reported high levels of sediment in the spring of 2010; enough to clog their pumps and affect water flow. ***According to the agency's publicly published lab results, relatively high levels of Chromium - 6 were detected at this time also****. Something to consider in all of this, is the fact that since 1986 the City of Grants Pass tests the river water quality every year, and they claim it is always within safe FDA ranges for heavy metals. This to me, as a health advocate, is very concerning.*

Classification
Project 12
Folder ID
Date input & Initials 12-2-2011

Comment 4 cont.

According to several independent local environmental sources, black goo showed up on the beaches of the Rogue River in the summer of 2010; ***this sediment was rich in many heavy metals, including chromium - 6.***

The GP Water District has stated that the metals will eventually stabilize and work their way to the bottom sediment of the river bed, and are of no major concern for public safety. But, it is a fact also that chromium - 6 has been linked to many kinds of cancer and should be closely monitored by environmental experts.

As a cancer survivor, I feel like I should do what I can to protect people from unnecessary harm from any water supply or local area resources. Unfortunately our country's low standard of environmental protection leaves many gaps in the current legal structure, and ***many community utilities are not required to report certain trace elements or testing numbers that fall out of a stated range.***

In 2008 a local environmental activist had checked with the Three Rivers hospital, according to Curtis Hayden of The Sneak Preview, and found 17.2% of cancer cases were of the intero-gastero-intestinal type (one of the many linked to this contaminant). He checked again two years after all the dams were taken out, and the amount of cases increased to 42.6%. He thinks that there is a sound connection here; I agree and aim to look into this further myself. I plan to follow this story as I find more leads, and read about local environmental activists that are as passionate as I am about our citizen's health."

http://www.examiner.com/alternative-medicine-in-medford/rogue-river-heavy-metals-are-being-churned-up-from-dam-removals July 17, 2011

Can we all say Erin Brocovich revisited?

Comment 5 - Cultural Resources

Then there is the matter that equal protection under the law seems to be violated. Shasta Tribal people on the Klamath River Basin and 77,000 residents of Siskiyou County, CA have not been allowed in the secret meetings concerning ANY agreement. This is still the United States of America isn't it?

It's time to keep the dams, the good clean energy they produce, the Irongate Fish Hatchery producing millions of health Salmon, protecting private property rights, safety during floods and water during drought to the good citizens of the Klamath River Basin. Setting up land grabs and making millionaires even richer is not the job of any government entity or politician. We know the names and the connections.

Comment 1b - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I've looked at H.R. 3398 authored by Congressman Mike Thompson. He's asking for $536 million to fund the project. WE'RE BROKE. He states $555 million will come from private funds. My guess, funds from environmental groups who have received MY taxpayer funds through grants. As a taxpayer I say NO and NO to both.

Comment 6 - Costs

Phyllis Smith
Sonoma County, California

Comment Author	Smith, Phyllis
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 02, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1202_970-1	The Iron Gate fish hatchery is not proposed for removal under the dam removal alternatives. The dams provide minimal flood control and are not used for drought water storage. EIS/EIR Section 3.6, Flood Hydrology, describes flood hydrology effects. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response HYPD-1 Flood Protection. There has been extensive chemical testing of the sediment that would be released if the Four Facilities were to be removed. Two separate studies have collected over 80 drill cores from reservoir sediments in two separate studies (Draft EIS/EIR p. 3.2-121 to 3.2-125 summarizes some of the major results of the chemical testing performed for the study Section C.7 contains a detailed contaminant assessment). Camp Dresser and McKee (CDM) published a report titled "Screening-Level Evaluation of Contaminants in Sediments from Three Reservoirs and the Estuary of the Klamath River, 2009-2011" regarding the potential for adverse ecological or human health effects from chemical contamination in Klamath Reservoir sediments (CDM 2011b). It is available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies. The report concluded that the Klamath Reservoir sediments can be considered relatively clean, with no chemicals present at levels that would preclude their release into downstream or marine environments. Future management of the Iron Gate Hatchery is considered a part of the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA). Under the No Action/No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) and the Proposed Action (Alternative 2) or Alternative 3, future management of the Iron Gate Hatchery would be re-evaluated. Under the No Action/No Project Alternative, PacifiCorp would continue to fund the development and implementation of a Hatchery and Genetics Management Plan for IGH Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast (SONC) coho salmon. PacifiCorp has also established a fund to study fish disease relationships downstream of Iron Gate Dam. PacifiCorp would consult with the Klamath River Fish Health Workgroup regarding selection, prioritization, and implementation of such studies under the Proposed Action. Iron Gate Hatchery would play a role in restoration of salmonid fisheries if dams are removed. The initial use of the hatchery facility at Iron Gate Dam or on Fall Creek would provide	No

Comment Author	Smith, Phyllis
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 02, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	conservation of native salmon stocks during the impact period of dam removal. The development of guidelines for the use of the conservation hatchery at Iron Gate Dam or on Fall Creek outlined in the Phase I Fisheries Reintroduction and Management Plan would be to support the establishment of naturally producing populations in the Klamath Basin following implementation of the KHSA (Draft EIS/EIR 3.3-140). In this scenario, PacifiCorp would evaluate hatchery production options that do not rely on the current IGH water supply. The study will assess groundwater and surface water supply options, water reuse technologies or operational changes that could support hatchery production in the absence of Iron Gate Dam. Based on the study results, PacifiCorp would propose a post-Iron Gate Dam Mitigation Hatchery Plan to provide continued hatchery production for eight years after the removal of Iron Gate Dam. After removal of Iron Gate Dam and for a period of eight years, PacifiCorp would fund 100 percent of hatchery operations and maintenance costs necessary to fulfill annual mitigation objectives developed by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) in consultation with the NOAA Fisheries Service (Draft EIS/EIR Section 2.4.3.1).	
GP_LT_1202_970-2	Master Response AQU – 3 Coho Native Status not Critical to NEPA or CEQA. Master Response AQU – 4 Coho are Native. The comment, as submitted, provides no evidence to support the claim that coho salmon are not native to the Klamath River. Fish Counting Although this portion of the comment also does not directly address the content and analysis of the Draft EIS/EIR, a brief explanation of fish counting activities is provided below as a courtesy. Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) was completed in 1966 by Pacific Power as mitigation for the construction of Iron Gate Dam (IGD). The dam blocked upstream access for anadromous fish. A US Supreme Court decision mandated hatchery production goals for Chinook and coho salmon as well as steelhead. These production goals require IGH annually release 4.9 million smolt and 1.08 million yearling Chinook salmon, 75,000 yearling coho salmon and 200,000 yearling steelhead. Although Pacific Power pays 100% of the hatchery's operations, it is operated by the California Department of Fish and Game. To ensure compliance with current production requirements, all	No

Comment Author	Smith, Phyllis
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 02, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	fish released from IGH are counted. Annual hatchery reports are available from the Department of Fish and Game which document each year's releases as well as adult returns. Additionally, all coho salmon and steelhead are marked prior to release. Due to the larger number of Chinook salmon produced and released; only a fraction (25%) is marked. As each fish returns to the hatchery, they are examined and records of hatchery produced and naturally produced fish by species, is collected. In addition to documenting achievement of hatchery production goals, marking hatchery fish is very important for other reasons. First, management of Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Klamath Basin is based on natural production, not hatchery production. As a federally and State-listed threatened species, coho salmon recovery is also based on natural production. Being able to distinguish between the hatchery and natural production is crucial. Secondly, only hatchery produced steelhead (adipose fin clipped) are legally allowed to be harvested by sport anglers in order to allow unmarked, naturally produced fish to continue to spawn. Finally, the number of adult Chinook and coho salmon returning to spawn in areas outside the hatchery (e.g., Shasta River, Scott River, Bogus Creek, etc), is also determined. This information is combined with counting information from the hatchery and used to monitor the strength of fish populations, for fishery management purposes, and for coho salmon recovery. The comment author is incorrect regarding the statement "….millions of healthy salmon produced by Iron Gate Fish Hatchery are not counted in the yearly count of salmon on the river." Salmon and steelhead returning to Iron Gate Hatchery are counted annually when the adults return and when the juveniles are released.	
GP_LT_1202_970-3	Master Response WQ-16. Upper Klamath Basin Historically Productive but Land Use Exacerbates Problem. Master Response WQ-4B Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. Along with KBRA and TMDL implementation, dam removal will improve water quality in the Klamath River and support numerous designated beneficial uses.	No
GP_LT_1202_970-4	Master Response WQ-1B-G Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants.	No

Comment Author	Smith, Phyllis
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 02, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Master Response WQ-2 Chromium VI / Heavy Metals in Sediments Deposited Behind the Dams. Master Response WQ-11 Comparisons With Rogue River and Downstream Sediment Effects.	
GP_LT_1202_970-5	The Klamath agreements are examples of negotiations designed to resolve longstanding legal battles over the use of water resources in the Klamath Basin. There are provisions in law that allow parties to negotiate privately to resolve litigation and to keep the contents of discussions confidential. This is what occurred in the negotiations over PacifiCorp's Klamath Hydroelectric Project, as well as the related Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA). PacifiCorp, tribes, environmental, fishing and agriculture interests used these meetings to negotiate agreements that avoid litigation. The Federal Government often times has a vested interest in resolving litigation as well. Your comment will be considered as part of the Secretarial Determination relative to the four dams on the Klamath River.	No
GP_LT_1202_970-6	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_EM_1116_1128

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 8:58:58 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Klamath river dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> "Dr. Bob Smith" <chirobob@citlink.net> 11/16/2011 1:38 PM >>>
Gentlemen:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Please stop the federal takeover and destruction of the four dams on the Klamath river in Northern California.
We need these dams for a host of green issues, and their destruction will sterilize the river for at least five generations.

Comment 2 - Fish

Robert L. Smith, DC (ret)
Shingletown, CA

Comment Author	Smith, Robert
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_1128-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1116_1128-2	Master Response AQU – 1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response WQ-1 B-G Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants. Master Response WQ-2 Chromium VI / Heavy Metals in Sediments Deposited Behind the Dams. Master Response AQU – 2 Sediment Dredging. Master Response AQU – 20 Bedload Sediment and Fish Habitat. Master Response AQU – 5 Will Benefit all Salmonids. Master Response AQU – 6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook. Master Response AQU – 7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power.	No

GP_EM_1212_1202

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 8:58:58 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Klamath river dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> "Dr. Bob Smith" <chirobob@citlink.net> 11/16/2011 1:38 PM >>>
Gentlemen:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Please stop the federal takeover and destruction of the four dams on the Klamath river in Northern California.
We need these dams for a host of green issues, and their destruction will sterilize the river for at least five generations.

Robert L. Smith, DC (ret)
Shingletown, CA

Comment Author	Smith, Robert
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1212_1202-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response AQU-5 Will Benefit all Salmonids. Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants.	No

GP_EM_1021_098

From: scouter444@charter.net[SMTP:SCOUTER444@CHARTER.NET]
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2011 12:01:54 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: retain dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment 2 - Hydropower

I feel the dams on the Klamath River should stay. I cannot see removing them at Pacific Power rate payer's cost and then expecting those ratepayers to fund new power development that will not be so green as the hydro. I am also concerned that the sediment flow after the removal will cause problems.

Comment 3 - Sediment Toxicity

.....Suzanne Smith, Klamath Falls

Comment Author	Smith, Suzanne
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1021_098-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1021_098-2	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_EM_1021_098-3	Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants. Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects on Fish. Master Response AQU-20 Bedload Sediment and Fish Habitat.	No

GP_EM_1115_680

From: Julie Smithson[SMTP:PROPERTYRIGHTS@EARTHLINK.NET]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2011 2:33:07 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; ksdcomments@dfg.ca.gov
Subject: My Official Public Comments on what is misnamed "Klamath Restoration Draft EIS/EIR"
Auto forwarded by a Rule

My Official Public Comments on what is misnamed "Klamath Restoration Draft EIS/EIR"

November 15, 2011

Julie Kay Smithson, property rights and natural resources researcher, 213 Thorn Locust Lane, London, Ohio 43140. propertyrights@earthlink.net

http://propertyrightsresearch.blogspot.com/2011/11/my-official-public-comments-on-what-is.html

It is said here: http://klamathrestoration.gov/home that "This is the official website of the Department of the Interior, and other federal and state agencies that are involved in carrying out obligations set forth in the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement, including the Secretarial Determination on Klamath River dams. Use this website to stay up to date on issues surrounding the Secretarial Determination and the environmental analysis that will be conducted pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)."

Instructions for submitting "feedback" (one can only believe that "feedback" is synonymous with "comments") are located here: http://klamathrestoration.gov/Draft-EIS-EIR/feedback

Comment 1 - KHSA

Any schemes to remove any of the four dams on the Klamath River -- in Oregon and/or California -- are just that: schemes. If there were any validity to claims touted by those involved in CLOSED DOOR 'negotiations' regarding the Klamath Basin and its four dams, those claims were rendered null and void by the few years of secretive and selective clique of "interested parties" involved. The very fact that -- in order to "have a seat at the table" and be included in these highly suspect "negotiations" -- one had to agree "in principle" to the scheme, makes it more rotten than Denmark! While those living and working in the Klamath Basin may, by virtue of their proximity to the "forest," not be able to see it for the "trees," I am in Ohio and can clearly see the intent of these schemes, and the power behind them, pushing the Trojan horse at the gates of economic independence as though the power brokers were merely arriving for an afternoon tea!

Nothing that seeks to destroy the entire economy and culture of the Klamath Basin for the past hundred years, can be called an "agreement" or "agreements." Both the "Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement" (208 pages) and the "Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement" (378

pages) are nothing more than stalking-horses: decoys. **Neither settles anything other than which fox gets to dine in the hen house first!** Even the number of people originally adamantly against any such things as would steal their ability to do one or more of the following: own and utilize private property as they have done so in the past; have a home, job and future in the Klamath Basin that is of their own accord; raise their families and contribute to a vibrant place in the Pacific Northwest through the fruits of their endeavors; rest and die in peace, knowing that their families, friends and co-workers will have a place, too, in their beloved Klamath Basin; grow and harvest food and fiber in the Klamath Basin, whether it be the plethora of food crops, fish, timber, minerals, livestock, or hunting/fishing opportunities that abound -- have been ground into the dust of the Basin by the forces aligned against their very existence.

Rocket science is not needed to know that the people of the Klamath Basin -- living and working in this area of northern California and southern Oregon -- are good people with multigenerational experience and expertise. No one coming from distant Washington, D.C., Portland, Oregon, or Sacramento, California, governmental locations, has any right to erase promises made to good people, war veterans and their families. No one anywhere has the right to sway people by the mirage of promises made, knowing that the intent is to rid the Basin of its very lifeblood. NO ONE. The Klamath Basin is a wonderful place to live, work, farm, ranch, hunt, fish, etc. -- not in spite of its inhabitants and private property owners, but BECAUSE OF THEM!

I look askance at people who have been downtrodden by this sham, which purports to somehow be a good thing for anyone or anything in the Klamath Basin. From the farmers and their families to the livestock, animals, wildlife and waterfowl of the Klamath Basin, these "agreements" bode ill for the entire Klamath Basin. An ill wind blows upon the Klamath Basin, and the thought that one "secretary" of a federal agency -- who obediently does the bidding of his bosses and lets people think of him as a "rancher" -- plans to make a "secretarial determination" about the four dams that have been part of the underpinning of the Klamath Basin's economic independence and freedom for almost a hundred years, makes my stomach turn. Ken Salazar is not an expert on the Klamath Basin, its dams, people, water, flora, fauna, and economy!

My gut feeling -- which stood me in good stead for the twenty-seven years during which I drove semi-trucks safely on America's highways -- is that these schemes are the death knell of the Klamath Basin as those that love this special, blessed place now know it.

Rather than allow themselves to be litigated into extinction or cowed by such a wooden decoy with a bellyful of armed forces, I pray for those in the cross hairs of these "agreements" to realize what is happening in time to stop it. How? Stop it the same way you would stop any trespasser trying to steamroller what rightfully belongs to you.

Would you allow someone to steal your home? Children? Car? Bank account? Family history? Future? How is this scheme any different? It is all of these things, and more.

I may not live or work in the Klamath Basin, but its potatoes, horseradish, and other crops contribute to my health and well-being. Its people are my friends. Its history is part of my country's history. I depend on its economic and cultural health as I depend on my nearby neighbors' efforts to grow, harvest and market what may look to some like items on store shelves, but that, to me, look like freedom and heritage! Stop the destruction of the Klamath Basin via the very real reason that Ken Salazar and his “interested parties” have no right to steal your -- or my -- future! Tell him so! You would not venture into the part of Colorado owned by him and his kith and kin and tell them that you were going to make a “determination” that would put them immediately out of reach of the property rights, past, present and future that they'd built!

Comment 2 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

1,070 words.

http://propertyrightsresearch.blogspot.com/2011/11/my-official-public-comments-on-what-is.html

Comment Author	Smithson, Julie Kay
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 15, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1115_680-1	Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations in Private.	No
GP_EM_1115_680-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1117_746

From: Joseph Snook[SMTP:JOE@USOBSERVER.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 2:29:51 PM
To: KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov; BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Important: Please veriry
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Gordon & Bureau of Reclamation,

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I support the movement to STOP the dam removals in the Klamath River Basin.

-
The people is those communities overwhelmingly disagree with the removal - Elected Sheriffs included.

-
Southern Oregonians have seen the effect of dam removals with the recent removal of "Savage Rapids" and "Gold Rey" dams.

-
There are many negative effects, and costs associated with the removal of these dams. Chromium 6 is just one issue - which is reportedly in the City of Grants Pass' drinking water.

More important - the people who pay your wages, want action from you regarding this matter. The people have spoken loud and clear and their employees (you), to represent them. Please see this video (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e4RuWK2Ww-4) so that you can inform yourself on what is going on.

Regards,

Joseph Snook
Investigative Reporter
US~Observer
541-226-8235

Comment Author	Snook, Joseph
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_746-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_538

From: alsolis55@yahoo.com[SMTP:ALSOLIS55@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 4:15:03 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: (Full Dam Removal) of the Klamath's Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Alberto Solis
Organization:

Subject: (Full Dam Removal) of the Klamath's

Body: These dams are decimating what used to be the west coast's third most productive steelhead and salmon fisheries, and strangling the area's economy

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Solis, Alberto
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_538-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1020_207

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MS. GLENDA SOUTHARD: G-l-e-n-d-a, S-o-u-t-h-a-r-d.

Like the gentleman who spoke so eloquently

earlier about living here or his tribe for a thousand

Comment 1 - GHG/Climate Change

years, I, too, would like clean air, clean water, abundant

healthy fish and happiness for all of us. And if I

thought taking out the dams would accomplish that, I would

have picked 2 or 3, but I picked Alternative No. 1.

And Mr. Lynch, I'm sorry that you don't find

that viable, because I chose that alternative from your

own report released by the Interior Department in April of

this year.

I will read some of it. The Interior Department

released a report that addresses the expected impact of

climate change on eight major river basins, one of those

was the Klamath. In part it said that all eight basins

would see an increase in temperature of about five to

seven degrees by the end of the century. That means a

warmer Klamath River. Sure don't like that, fish don't

like that.

Aside from that it said that reduction in spring

and summer runoffs could lead to a drop in water supply.

Whoops, less water.

And due to earlier snow melt, and relatively

higher winter rain from warmer conditions, all but the

Colorado Basin could become vulnerable to floods, floods.

The Interior Department is putting this whole

area at risk. You're destroying more than the river

basin, your jeopardizing the economy and well-being of

this county.

Comment 2 - Economics

Siskiyou County is losing thousands of dollars

in taxes already, and it will be worse when the dams come

out, if they do.

Comment 3 - Hydropower

Consumers are losing affordable green and safe

Comment 4 - Water Rights/Supply

power. Ranchers and farmers are losing water rights.

Comment 5 - Recreation

Sportsmen are losing fishing rights. Businessmen and

Comment 6 - Economics

women are losing businesses along the river and we are all

Comment 7 - Hydrology

left vulnerable to drought, forest fires and flooding; and

Comment 8 - Water Quality

this based on the lie that the dams are the cause of blue

green algae and water pollution.

Comment 9 - Fish

Without the dams to temper the temperature of

the water, filter contaminants and store water during

drought, you're also putting the fish that you're

purporting to save at risk.

But you know all this, so what's the purpose and

value? What will be gained by all this expenditure of

money and time and effort if you destroy the very thing

you're purporting to save?

Comment Author	Southard, Glenda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_207-1	As discussed on p. 3.10-22 of the Draft EIS/EIR, improvement in the river thermal regime by the Proposed Action and alternatives would likely moderate the anticipated stream temperate increases resulting from climate change. See EIS/EIR Section 3.3, Aquatic Resources, for a more detailed explanation of stream temperatures. Additionally, as described on p. 3.10-21 of the Draft EIS/EIR, removing the Four Facilities would provide a migration corridor for fish to move further upstream to find cooler water. Relief from increased temperatures on the river could then be provided. Moreover, the comment's concern of an increased flood risk is unwarranted. The dams provide only incidental flood protection as discussed on p. 3.6-30 of the Draft EIS/EIR.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-2	Section 3.15 discusses potential effects on tax revenues, including property taxes and sales taxes. Section 3.15, p. 64 of the Draft EIS/EIR identifies effects as a result of decreased property tax revenues to Siskiyou County from potential decreased property values around reservoirs. P. 65 discusses effects of PacifiCorp not paying property taxes to Siskiyou County after the dams are removed and potential increases in sales tax revenues as a result of the influx of construction workers during dam removal. Klamath and Siskiyou counties receive tax revenues from multiples sources, and it is unknown how the county would change services to citizens as a result of changes in tax revenues related to the Proposed Action and alternatives.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-3	Comment noted.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-4	Master Response WSWR-7 Effects to Water Rights/Water Supply from Dam Removal as Described in KHSA.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-5	Master Response REC-8 Flat Water Fishing.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-6	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-7	Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection. Master Response WSWR-4 Summary of Effects to Water Rights/Water Supply for Alternatives 2 and Alternative 3 for Municipal, Agricultural, and Tribal Use. *Fire fighting* The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes impacts to water availability for fire fighting in Section 3.18, Public Health and Safety. The impact analysis recognizes that Copco 1 Reservoir is used as a source of	No

Comment Author	Southard, Glenda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	water for fighting fires; however, the Klamath River can also be used as a water source. The impact to availability of water for firefighting is therefore less than significant.	
GP_MC_1020_207-8	As described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.1 Overview of Water Quality Processes in the Klamath Basin (pgs 3.2-19 to 3.2-21), the presence and operation of the Four Facilities affect many aspects of water quality in the Klamath River, including slower transport of water downstream, interception and retention of sediment, organic matter, nutrients, and other constituents that would otherwise be transported downstream, and alteration of seasonal water temperatures when compared to free-flowing stream reaches. Blooms of toxic algae (phytoplankton) in the Project reservoirs are discussed in multiple places in the Draft EIS/EIR, including, but not limited to, the following sections: 3.2.3.7 Chlorophyll-a and Algal Toxins (Existing Conditions) p. 3.2-29 to 3.2-30; 3.2.4.3.1.6 Chlorophyll-a and Algal Toxins (Effects Determinations No Action/No Project Alternative) p. 3.2-68 to 3.2-71; 3.2.4.3.2.6 Chlorophyll-a and Algal Toxins (Proposed Action) p. 3.2-117 to 3.2-118; 3.2.4.3.3 Alternative 3: Partial Facilities Removal of Four Dams, p. 3.2-132 to 3.2-135; 3.2.4.3.4 Alternative 4: Fish Passage at Four Dams, p. 3.2-135 to 3.2-136; 3.2.4.3.5.6 Chlorophyll-a and Algal Toxins (Alternative 5: Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate) p. 3.2-145; 3.4 Algae, p. 3.4-1 to 3.4-32; and, Appendix C, Section C.6 Algal Toxins and Chlorophyll-a, p. C-52 to C-63.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-9	Master Response WQ-15 Klamath Dams Do Not Supply Cool Summertime Water to Downstream River Reaches. In addition, the sole water supply for Iron Gate Hatchery withdraws cold water from the deeper water of Iron Gate Reservoir, and depleting or exhausting this cold water pool during the summer would likely seriously impair hatchery operations during any year that such hypolimnetic releases occur (FERC 2007, p3-147). Alternative 1 does not include modification of outlets to use hypolimnetic water. Water Quality: As described in this section and summarized in Table 3.2-14 (p. 3.2-147 to 3.2-158) of the Draft EIS/EIR, dam removal would improve water quality in the Hydroelectric Reach and the Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam by decreasing late summer/early fall water temperatures, increasing seasonal dissolved oxygen concentrations, decreasing seasonal pH levels, and decreasing or eliminating high seasonal chlorophyll-a and algal toxin concentrations. In addition to the immediate water quality improvements that will be realized due to dam removal, water quality trends throughout the Klamath Basin	No

Comment Author	Southard, Glenda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	are expected to improve over the next fifty years in response to TMDL implementation measures and resource management actions included as part of the KBRA. As described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2.10 KBRA (p. 3.3-125 to 3.2-132), resource management actions implemented under KBRA would accelerate long-term improvements in water quality, including those anticipated under the TMDLs. Additional detail on the interaction of the TMDLs and the Alternatives is provided by the Water Quality SubTeam (2011) (also referred to as the Water Quality SubGroup), as cited in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.5, p. 3.3-241. This document, entitled "Assessment of Long Term Water Quality Changes for the Klamath Basin Resulting from KHSA, KBRA, and TMDL and NPS Reduction Programs" can be found at http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies. Water Storage: As described in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR, flows through the Hydroelectric Reach from Keno Dam downstream to Iron Gate Dam are related to Upper Klamath Lake elevations, flows diverted to and returned from Reclamation's Klamath Project, relatively small storage capacities of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project developments, and the releases out of Iron Gate Dam. Upper Klamath Lake holds 83 percent of the total storage capacity of the reservoirs on the Klamath River (FERC 2007) and approximately 98 percent of active storage. Link Dam controls Upper Klamath Lake and would remain under all alternatives. Associated reservoirs for J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams contain 14 percent of the total storage capacity and only 2 percent of the active storage on the river. The purpose for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project facilities is power generation, and although the operation of these facilities can alter flow patterns (power peaking) with in this reach, the operation of these facilities does not create additional storage of water that could be used to supplement flows in the river downstream. The total amount of active storage available within the four hydroelectric reservoirs is only 11,749 acre-feet and release of this pool would eliminate the ability of these projects to generate hydropower. The presence of the reservoirs actually reduces the annual volume of water that would otherwise flow downstream because of evaporative losses related to the large surface area created by the impoundments. Removal of the hydroelectric project reservoirs will result in a slight increase in flow as the evaporative losses would be reduced. Evaporation from the surface of the reservoirs is currently about 11,000 acre-feet/year and after dam removal the evapotranspiration in the	

Comment Author	Southard, Glenda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	same reaches is expected to be approximately 4,800 acre-feet/year, resulting in a gain in flow to the Klamath River of approximately 6,200 acre-feet/year (Reclamation 2012d). As described in Section 3.3.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Proposed Action, which includes implementation of the KBRA, would result in flows more favorable to all life stages of salmonids, and would provide suitable habitat for resident riverine species, anadromous fish and lamprey in hydroelectric reach from the upstream end of J. C. Boyle Reservoir to Iron Gate Dam. In the lower Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam, over the long term, the Proposed Action would alter the hydrograph so that the duration, timing, and magnitude of flows would be more similar to the unregulated conditions under which the native fish community evolved (Hetrick et al. 2009). The Proposed Action would have a beneficial effect on Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for Chinook and coho salmon in the long term. The fact that Chinook and coho salmon historically occupied the hydroelectric reach and the lower Klamath is also evidence that restoring flows to mimic historic patterns will be sufficient for maintenance and recovery of fish populations. Master Response AQU-31 Thermal Lag and Diel Temperatures. Neither the comment that the (hydroelectric) dams improve water temperature, filter contaminants, and provide flow allowing fish to migrate under otherwise low flow conditions, nor the assertion that removal of the dams will create conditions that put fish at risk are supported by the evidence and are not factually correct.	

GP_EM_1026_248

From: Jennifer Sowerwine[SMTP:JSOWERWI@BERKELEY.EDU]
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 1:56:35 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: In favor of full removal of Klamath Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

I am a California constituent, friend and colleague of both tribal and agricultural parties. My Uncle was a Salmon fisherman off the North Coast. I understand the great need to balance all parties interests and concerns. I have seen directly the impact the dams have had on the quality of the river, the drastic decline in available food for the Karuk and other Native Americans living on the river. The water's toxicity have impacted culturally beneficial uses of the water. I urge you to adopt Alternative 2: full removal of all four dams.

Comment 1 - Approval of Dam Removal

Thank you for your time,

Jennifer Sowerwine
960 Euclid Ave.
Berkeley, Ca.
94708

Comment Author	Southard, Glenda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_207-1	As discussed on p. 3.10-22 of the Draft EIS/EIR, improvement in the river thermal regime by the Proposed Action and alternatives would likely moderate the anticipated stream temperate increases resulting from climate change. See EIS/EIR Section 3.3, Aquatic Resources, for a more detailed explanation of stream temperatures. Additionally, as described on p. 3.10-21 of the Draft EIS/EIR, removing the Four Facilities would provide a migration corridor for fish to move further upstream to find cooler water. Relief from increased temperatures on the river could then be provided. Moreover, the comment's concern of an increased flood risk is unwarranted. The dams provide only incidental flood protection as discussed on p. 3.6-30 of the Draft EIS/EIR.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-2	Section 3.15 discusses potential effects on tax revenues, including property taxes and sales taxes. Section 3.15, p. 64 of the Draft EIS/EIR identifies effects as a result of decreased property tax revenues to Siskiyou County from potential decreased property values around reservoirs. P. 65 discusses effects of PacifiCorp not paying property taxes to Siskiyou County after the dams are removed and potential increases in sales tax revenues as a result of the influx of construction workers during dam removal. Klamath and Siskiyou counties receive tax revenues from multiples sources, and it is unknown how the county would change services to citizens as a result of changes in tax revenues related to the Proposed Action and alternatives.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-3	Comment noted.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-4	Master Response WSWR-7 Effects to Water Rights/Water Supply from Dam Removal as Described in KHSA.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-5	Master Response REC-8 Flat Water Fishing.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-6	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-7	Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection. Master Response WSWR-4 Summary of Effects to Water Rights/Water Supply for Alternatives 2 and Alternative 3 for Municipal, Agricultural, and Tribal Use. *Fire fighting* The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes impacts to water availability for fire fighting in Section 3.18, Public Health and Safety. The impact analysis recognizes that Copco 1 Reservoir is used as a source of	No

Comment Author	Southard, Glenda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	water for fighting fires; however, the Klamath River can also be used as a water source. The impact to availability of water for firefighting is therefore less than significant.	
GP_MC_1020_207-8	As described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.1 Overview of Water Quality Processes in the Klamath Basin (pgs 3.2-19 to 3.2-21), the presence and operation of the Four Facilities affect many aspects of water quality in the Klamath River, including slower transport of water downstream, interception and retention of sediment, organic matter, nutrients, and other constituents that would otherwise be transported downstream, and alteration of seasonal water temperatures when compared to free-flowing stream reaches. Blooms of toxic algae (phytoplankton) in the Project reservoirs are discussed in multiple places in the Draft EIS/EIR, including, but not limited to, the following sections: 3.2.3.7 Chlorophyll-a and Algal Toxins (Existing Conditions) p. 3.2-29 to 3.2-30; 3.2.4.3.1.6 Chlorophyll-a and Algal Toxins (Effects Determinations No Action/No Project Alternative) p. 3.2-68 to 3.2-71; 3.2.4.3.2.6 Chlorophyll-a and Algal Toxins (Proposed Action) p. 3.2-117 to 3.2-118; 3.2.4.3.3 Alternative 3: Partial Facilities Removal of Four Dams, p. 3.2-132 to 3.2-135; 3.2.4.3.4 Alternative 4: Fish Passage at Four Dams, p. 3.2-135 to 3.2-136; 3.2.4.3.5.6 Chlorophyll-a and Algal Toxins (Alternative 5: Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate) p. 3.2-145; 3.4 Algae, p. 3.4-1 to 3.4-32; and, Appendix C, Section C.6 Algal Toxins and Chlorophyll-a, p. C-52 to C-63.	No
GP_MC_1020_207-9	Master Response WQ-15 Klamath Dams Do Not Supply Cool Summertime Water to Downstream River Reaches. In addition, the sole water supply for Iron Gate Hatchery withdraws cold water from the deeper water of Iron Gate Reservoir, and depleting or exhausting this cold water pool during the summer would likely seriously impair hatchery operations during any year that such hypolimnetic releases occur (FERC 2007, p3-147). Alternative 1 does not include modification of outlets to use hypolimnetic water. Water Quality: As described in this section and summarized in Table 3.2-14 (p. 3.2-147 to 3.2-158) of the Draft EIS/EIR, dam removal would improve water quality in the Hydroelectric Reach and the Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam by decreasing late summer/early fall water temperatures, increasing seasonal dissolved oxygen concentrations, decreasing seasonal pH levels, and decreasing or eliminating high seasonal chlorophyll-a and algal toxin concentrations. In addition to the immediate water quality improvements that will be realized due to dam removal, water quality trends throughout the Klamath Basin	No

Comment Author	Southard, Glenda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	are expected to improve over the next fifty years in response to TMDL implementation measures and resource management actions included as part of the KBRA. As described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2.10 KBRA (p. 3.3-125 to 3.2-132), resource management actions implemented under KBRA would accelerate long-term improvements in water quality, including those anticipated under the TMDLs. Additional detail on the interaction of the TMDLs and the Alternatives is provided by the Water Quality SubTeam (2011) (also referred to as the Water Quality SubGroup), as cited in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.5, p. 3.3-241. This document, entitled "Assessment of Long Term Water Quality Changes for the Klamath Basin Resulting from KHSA, KBRA, and TMDL and NPS Reduction Programs" can be found at http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies. Water Storage: As described in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR, flows through the Hydroelectric Reach from Keno Dam downstream to Iron Gate Dam are related to Upper Klamath Lake elevations, flows diverted to and returned from Reclamation's Klamath Project, relatively small storage capacities of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project developments, and the releases out of Iron Gate Dam. Upper Klamath Lake holds 83 percent of the total storage capacity of the reservoirs on the Klamath River (FERC 2007) and approximately 98 percent of active storage. Link Dam controls Upper Klamath Lake and would remain under all alternatives. Associated reservoirs for J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams contain 14 percent of the total storage capacity and only 2 percent of the active storage on the river. The purpose for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project facilities is power generation, and although the operation of these facilities can alter flow patterns (power peaking) with in this reach, the operation of these facilities does not create additional storage of water that could be used to supplement flows in the river downstream. The total amount of active storage available within the four hydroelectric reservoirs is only 11,749 acre-feet and release of this pool would eliminate the ability of these projects to generate hydropower. The presence of the reservoirs actually reduces the annual volume of water that would otherwise flow downstream because of evaporative losses related to the large surface area created by the impoundments. Removal of the hydroelectric project reservoirs will result in a slight increase in flow as the evaporative losses would be reduced. Evaporation from the surface of the reservoirs is currently about 11,000 acre-feet/year and after dam removal the evapotranspiration in the	

Comment Author	Southard, Glenda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	same reaches is expected to be approximately 4,800 acre-feet/year, resulting in a gain in flow to the Klamath River of approximately 6,200 acre-feet/year (Reclamation 2012d). As described in Section 3.3.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Proposed Action, which includes implementation of the KBRA, would result in flows more favorable to all life stages of salmonids, and would provide suitable habitat for resident riverine species, anadromous fish and lamprey in hydroelectric reach from the upstream end of J. C. Boyle Reservoir to Iron Gate Dam. In the lower Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam, over the long term, the Proposed Action would alter the hydrograph so that the duration, timing, and magnitude of flows would be more similar to the unregulated conditions under which the native fish community evolved (Hetrick et al. 2009). The Proposed Action would have a beneficial effect on Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for Chinook and coho salmon in the long term. The fact that Chinook and coho salmon historically occupied the hydroelectric reach and the lower Klamath is also evidence that restoring flows to mimic historic patterns will be sufficient for maintenance and recovery of fish populations. Master Response AQU-31 Thermal Lag and Diel Temperatures. Neither the comment that the (hydroelectric) dams improve water temperature, filter contaminants, and provide flow allowing fish to migrate under otherwise low flow conditions, nor the assertion that removal of the dams will create conditions that put fish at risk are supported by the evidence and are not factually correct.	

Comment Author	Sowerwine, Jennifer
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 26, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1026_248-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. The EIS/EIR recognizes that the tribes of the Klamath Basin depend on the river and the salmon for their livelihood, and that the spiritual beliefs and traditional practices are inseparable from the river and surrounding homeland environments. Although the language groups and traditional practices sometimes vary among the tribes, all of them derived their cultures, commerce, and subsistence primarily from the river and its aquatic and terrestrial resources. We thank you for input for the Secretarial Determination. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment and others when making his determination.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) Glen Spain

Representing commercial fisherman

Notes: Supports Dam Removal Alternative 2 or 3

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

e read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

18

GP_MP_1019_088

Comment Author	Spain, Glen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_088-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1020_187

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. GLEN SPAIN: My name is Glen Spain,

G-l-e-n, one N, Spain, Like the country, S-p-a-i-n.

I'm the Northwest Regional Director of the

Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations,

PCFFA. We represent coastal fishing families who make

their living largely from the harvest of salmon.

I'm not going to address the salmon benefits

and other things, other speakers will do that. But I want

to address the economic facts about dams and dam removal,

itself. Much of these facts have been lost in the debate.

There's been a lot of obfuscation, but there's some very

key facts that people need to know and need to understand.

As one person once said, everyone is entitled to their

opinion but not to their own facts.

One fact is this: And that is that there are only

two options that PacifiCorp, which is a private property

owner -- these are private properties -- must make:

Either the dams will be relicensed or they will be

decommissioned and removed. There are only these two

options, no other option is legal.

The choices before PacifiCorp are to relicense the

Comment 1 - Costs

dams at roughly 500 million dollars in cost, cost that
their ratepayers must pay -- and by the way, many of our
commercial fishermen are also ratepayers for Pacific Power
-- or they can remove the dams under the Klamath
Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement for 200 million.
And if they are removed -- another fact is: If
they are removed -- excuse me, if they are relicensed,
they will not be as productive of power as they are today.
You will be paying a great deal of money for very little
power, and they will run, according to FERC's own staff
estimates, at a twenty-million-dollar-a-year loss, or,
say, a license of 40 years, which is typical, 40 to 50
years, that means an additional 800 million that will have
to be paid by ratepayers in order to even break even on
these nonproductive, aging dams.
You add those together and these dams will cost
ratepayers 1.3 billion dollars over a 40-year license
term.
There is very little power there. Right now, they
produce a total of about 78 megawatts of power, total.
That's the average over the last 50 years. By comparison,
a single, modern power plant generates roughly 1,000
megawatts or more. If they are relicensed, they will
produce 20 megawatts less, down to 58 megawatts, at a huge

cost.

Um, so altogether, PacifiCorp has determined that

it is in the best interests of their ratepayers, which

they have to serve, for the dams to be replaced and that

power be found elsewhere.

The Public Utility Commissions in both states have

agreed that dam removal is, by far, by a factor of 6.5

times, far cheaper than replacement of -- or the

relicensing of the FERC under the current conditions.

In other words, they are losing money and they will

continue to lose money until they are replaced.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

As to replacement power, there is always a lot of

concern about that -- this is carbon-free power. We are

concerned about that, too, but PacifiCorp is obligated,

under law, as part of the purchase agreement by their

current owners, in 2006, to bring on line 1400 megawatts

of green, noncarbon renewable power, and to do so by 2015.

Comment Author	Spain, Glen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_187-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1020_187-2	Comment noted.	No

GP_WI_1112_574

From: rcspott@yahoo.com[SMTP:RCSPOTT@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2011 10:01:06 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Alternate 2
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Richard & Cindy Spott
Organization:

Subject: Alternate 2

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I'm in favor.

Comment Author	Spott, Richard & Cindy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1112_574-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_562

From: sproull.janice@gmail.com[SMTP:SPROULL.JANICE@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 7:17:28 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River Restoration Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Janice Sproull
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath River Restoration

Body: Please accept these comments in favor of advancing the dam-free restoration of the Klamath River now. Current restoration (instead of delay until 2020) would wisely use our money system not to increase profits for the few but instead to promote the health of the natural world's water, wetlands and marshes for the many.

Ursula Le Guin, Nobel laureate, in 1985 wrote a novel (Always Coming Home) chronicling the damage to future lives in what is today northern California because human feats of hubris had disregarded the living natural system as a whole. We have the opportunity now, through dam-free restoration, to keep Ursula Le Guin's novel in the realm of fiction instead of prophecy.

To further the goal of wholistic survival of species (including humans and our natural connections), I support the immediate removal of all dams on the Klamath River and its tributaries. Additionally, I support the restoration of all historic wetlands and marshes in the upper Klamath basin, including Lower Klamath Lake, Tule Lake and Upper Klamath Lake.

Comment 2 - Out of Scope

The Secretary of Interior has the power and accordingly should ensure that more water from the Trinity River stay within the watershed so that increased water flows in the dry season for salmon migration in the Lower Klamath River. In addition, because the vitality and continuing existence of significant fish species speak to the overall interconnected health of life on earth, I ask that the restoration activities improve conditions for salmon on the Scott and Shasta Rivers.

Comment 3 - Fish

The National Marine Fisheries Service has required a minimum flow at Iron Gate pursuant to biological opinions to comply with the Endangered Species Act, and therefore the Secretary should include a minimum flow for fish. Trusted experts recommend that an absolute minimum flow of 1,300 cubic feet per second at the Iron Gate gauge be established for the dry season.

The citizenry has no concern more important than preservation and --- where natural damage has occurred by human head, hand and technology --- restoration of our rivers and other life-essential natural resources. We can all survive without our bank balances, gold or paper money. Nobody (fish, fowl or human) stays alive without water.

Sincerely,
Janice Sproull

Comment Author	Sproull, Janice
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_562-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_1111_562-2	Master Response GEN-27 Interplay between Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) and KBRA.	No
GP_WI_1111_562-3	Master Response AQU-11A-B NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management. The BO does not require a minimum flow of 1,300 cfs downstream of Iron Gate Dam during all months and hydrological conditions. Master Response AQU-11C-J NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management.	No

GP_MC_1025_293

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 25, 2011

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ORLEANS, CALIFORNIA

Comment 1 - Approves of Dams

MS. STAATS: My name is Jenny Staats, J-e-n-n-y S-t-a-a-t-s. I'm a resident of Orleans, and I support Option 2, the full removal of the Klamath Dams. And thank you for taking our comments today.

I'm part of the local Food Justice movement that's promoting healthy affordable, accessible, secure, and appropriate food for all. We promote both traditional and local food sources. Restoring the fishery would be one step in restoring the balance to this ecosystem and moving towards the goal of better nourishing and strengthening our community.

I want to recognize that I'm a settler on stolen Native land and that, although I did not steal the land or take part in the massacres of Native people in this area, my living here is direct proof that I and other non-Native residents are benefiting from those events and from the ongoing effects of colonization and attempted genocide, as seen in policy that empowers certain destructive agency management practices and other extractive private industry. We benefit from the historical displacement of people and see an unequal balance in land ownership, as well as limited access to

appropriate food and healthcare and other basic necessities.

As settlers and non-Native people in this community, I believe it's our responsibility to proactively challenge and dismantle colonialist and white supremacist thought and behavior in the communities we identify ourselves to be a part of. While we all have good intentions in the work we do, I want to challenge myself and other non-Native residents to constantly question the cultural appropriateness of our actions, as we strive to align ourselves as allies with the original inhabitants of this area, if they will have us as allies and partners.

Comment 2 - NEPA

After attending and video-documenting the Yreka hearings, I encourage the Department of the Interior to dismiss the testimony of those individuals whose comments were wrought with hateful white supremacist sentiment and patronization towards the downriver communities, and specifically Native peoples. Those who spoke at the Yreka hearing, with a clear air of entitlement to their way of life, especially when touting having lived in the area for four generations, are living in denial or at least not recognizing that it was some of their predecessors who are responsible for the massive loss of life and culture in this area.

A daughter of a rancher in the Valley

condescendingly demanded to know where tribal people would get their food when farmers were out of business. One Copco resident said, "The lake is the centerpiece of our pleasurable existence," and added that it was the ones who wanted dam removal who are selfish. Numerous people refer to downriver communities as special interest groups and ask, "What about," quote, "the people," as if they were the only people. Another man said that what was needed was a sustainable economy, not a sustainable environment, as if the two were not connected.

Another Copco resident was quoted in the October 4th Siskiyou Daily, saying, quote, "They tell us the Indians have to get in the water every day because of their religion, but we're still waiting to see a single dead Indian." This was in regards to toxic algae. These sentiments are racist and ignorant.

Those who are benefiting from exploitive resource extractive industry are not the ones with the solutions to problems that their industries created. When Upper Basin residents demand that you, quote, "take the rights of the people, not just the fish, into account," remember that down here our lives are completely intertwined with the fish, and, therefore, the rights of the fish are the rights of the people.

Thank you. MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Jenny.

Comment Author	Staats, Jenny
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1025_293-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1025_293-2	Master Response N/CP-20 Response to Public Comment.	No

GP_EM_1128_915

From: Wayne C. Stahl[SMTP:WSTAHL@NEMONT.NET]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2011 11:24:10 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Auto forwarded by a Rule

PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY THE HISTORICAL DAMS OR ANY OTHER DAMS ANYWHERE IN THE U.S.

Montana State Representative

Wayne C. Stahl

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Stahl, Wayne
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1128_915-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_169

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MR. MARSHALL STAUNTON: I'll sorry, I'm a little dirty. I came out of the onion fields, I've got 13 loads -- be careful on the highways heading south to Gilroy, California, we've got a lot of trucks on the road out of the valley.

I served aS co-chair of the --

THE FACILITATOR: Let me just clarify your name for the court reporters.

MR. MARSHALL STAUNTON: Marshall Staunton, S-t-a-u-n-t-o-n.

Comment 1 - KBRA

Okay, so I served as co-chair of the Upper Klamath Basin Working Group, the Hatfield Group, and I support the KBRA as the best possible solution. The KBRA honors tribal treaty rights, it honors reclamation farms and ranches, plus upper Klamath River Basin water users, as well.

Comment 2 - Water Supply/Rights

Refuges, which haven't been mentioned a lot, world-class refuges gain us sustainable and dependable water supply.

Comment 3 - Recreation

And sport fishermen at the ocean level, on up the river, gain the strongest strategy of fishery recovery, and PacifiCorp ratepayers receive the benefits

at the lowest cost ratepayer option.

And I farm with my brothers Sid and Ed, and I

farm with Nephew Mark and my dad John; we grow 6,000 acres

of onion, sweet potatoes, pepper, and alfalfa; we've

endured two water shutoffs in the last ten years, and when

the water shutoff occurs in the Klamath Reclamation

Project, all those onions and potato fields are left

harvested in mid- to late October, and we don't have time

to establish ground cover on them. So when the water is

cut the following spring, we have essentially bare fields

at critical dust-bowl conditions, which are very nasty to

all the residents of our valley and then the valleys away

from our valley.

So the current situation is unacceptable; we

need the KBRA.

Comment 4 - Recreation

I am also an avid fly fisherman, and any chance

I get, and I enjoy world-class trout fisheries right down

below Keno Dam, the stretch that has relatively unimpeded

flow or nonregulated flow. And below Boyle, there's a

spike in flow right now, and I look forward to the day

when I'll enjoy the trout, steelhead, and salmon fisheries

all the way to the ocean. I think it will be quite

impressive and will happen very quickly.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Staunton, Marshall
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_169-1	The agreements are intended to provide the diverse stakeholders with locally developed solutions to restore fisheries and support local economies.	No
GP_MC_1018_169-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1018_169-3	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MC_1018_169-4	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_WI_1121_863

From: gshogcreekrch@aol.com[SMTP:GSHOGCREEKRCH@AOL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 8:28:21 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Save the salmon/Save the dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: George Steen
Organization:

Subject: Save the salmon/Save the dams

Body:
Save the Salmon-Save the Dams

Comment 1 - Alternatives

There is a way to save the salmon and save the dams at the same time. The fall salmon run has just ended at the Iron Gate dam. The eggs are fertilized and placed in trays at the Hatchery. The cycle of life begins for the new fry. The young hatchlings will find themselves placed in raceways and fed several times a day. They will be pampered for several months. Then, as the water temperature in the Klamath begins to rise in early June, they will be flushed into the river. Suddenly, there is no more daily feeding and their environment drastically changes. Predators are everywhere, otters scoop up the fingerlings and fill their bellies. Larger fish make meals of them and birds of all kinds feast on the unsuspecting babies. For the ones who are fortunate to survive the river they must endure sea lions, sharks and killer whales not to mention man.

The cycle of life for these young salmon is a tough one. We can improve their chance of survival. First, the fish need to be released early in the spring. This will give them cooler water which increases their appetite and there are less parasites. Second, feed the fish. There are floating feeders, like the ones they use in the fish farms. These can float downstream as groups of fish are released in small groups of, let's say, 100,000. This may sound like a large number, but present practice is to release 2,000,000 at a time and let them fend for themselves. If the fish are fed with the floating feeders in the raceway prior to release they will be used to it, kind of a surrogate mother. These feeders could lead the fish clear to the ocean. Third, the fish need to be protected. They could be guided downstream in floating pens with covers. This will create many jobs. Individuals will be needed care for the feeders and the pens. In other words, the fish will be pampered all the way to the ocean.

The cycle of life continues in the ocean. Only this time there will be an abundance of fish and they will reach the ocean larger from being fed all the way down the river. In the following three to four years the fishing industry and the sport fishermen will have as many fish as there were 70 years ago. The returning salmon will fill the Native Americans nets and increase the tourist trade all along the Klamath. Jobs will be created and Siskiyou County will prosper.

Here is where the importance of the dams comes to play. When the spawners are ready to enter the river it is important for them to have plenty of water. If the dams are removed the river will flow heavy in the winter and the spring when

there are rains. When the blistering hot summer comes the water levels will fall and the river temperature will rise. As summer turns to fall the water levels will continue to drop unless there are rains which would cause considerable muddy conditions in the shallow river. Without the rains the river is a series of pools waiting to be connected. At present the river flow is controlled by releasing water from the dam. This ensures a constant flow for the spawners. If the dams are removed, the spawners are capable of traveling further upstream. However, this is no more than a death sentence for the spawners and their young. How many salmon can survive in the Klamath? At present, estimated 30,000. The rest die of starvation, disease and predators.

It is time to pamper this great resource. This has been brought to the attention of politicians, California Department of Fish and Game, Native American tribesmen and many individuals throughout Siskiyou County. It is time to work together for the good of all. We can save the salmon and the dams.

George Steen
Montague,CA

Comment Author	Steen, George
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1121_863-1	Master Response ALT-9 Hatcheries. Master Response ALT -9 describes why increased or improved hatchery operations were not considered for detailed analysis in the EIS/EIR. The commenter indicates that dam removal would decrease flows on the river, but as described in Section 3.6 of the EIS/EIR, Alternatives 2 and 3 would result in very small changes to flows in the rivers.	No

GP_EM_1114_640

From: Jim Steitz[SMTP:JIMSTEITZ@MAC.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2011 8:07:35 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Restore Klamath River, Remove the Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear Secretary Salazar:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I write to urge you to completely remove the four dams currently being considered for removal in the EIS. These dams continue to menace the health of the river and impede any opportunity for salmon restoration. These rivers continue to suffer from toxic algae blooms and exclusion of salmon from otherwise potential spawning habitat, due to these dams.

The draft EIS/EIR makes clear that complete removal, as contemplated in Alternative 2, provides the greatest net return to the affected ecosystem and human communities, as the value of the potential salmon runs is far greater than any loss of water storage for the low-value agriculture that is practiced in the Klamath watershed. The economic gain alone from increased fishing and recreation associated with a free-flowing river is compelling reason to remove these nuisance dams.

Please take this opportunity to rectify part of our past transgressions against the Klamath River, and bring back part of the Pacific Northwest's natural heritage. Thank you for your attention to this urgent issue.

Sincerely,

Jim Steitz

Jim Steitz

97520

Comment Author	Steitz, Jim
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1114_640-1	Comment Noted. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1220_1108

From: stephanej85@gmail.com[SMTP:STEPHANEJ85@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2011 8:49:33 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: edward stephan
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Body: Take the dam down! Free the river. Please.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Stephen, Edward
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1220_1108-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1118_788

From: sksteward@charter.net[SMTP:SKSTEWARD@CHARTER.NET]
Sent: Saturday, November 19, 2011 7:40:31 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: klamath river dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Stephen and Karen Steward
Organization:

Subject: klamath river dams

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Body: I don't even come close to seeing the "greater good" in the removal of these dams. What could possibly be the motivation behind this scheme. Maybe we ought to follow the "money motive." It can't possibly be the salmon or anything/anybody connected to the salmon.

Comment Author	Steward, Stephen & Karen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1118_788-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1120_808

From: David Stewart[SMTP:DMS@SBCGLOBAL.NET]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 12:08:45 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Why are you going to destroy green energy?
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Hydropower

Dams are the best, cleanest source of green energy in our industrial reality. Why do you want to destroy this excellent source of green energy just when the all the auto companies are releasing electric cars? This makes absolutely no sense at all.

Best Regards,
David M Stewart
"Look at the law, and see if it does for one man at the expense of another what it would be a crime for the one to do to the other himself." (Claude Frédéric *Bastiat* (30 June 1801 – 24 December 1850) was a French classical liberal theorist)

Comment Author	Stewart, David
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_808-1	Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-3: Replacement Power.	No

GP_WI_1110_494

From: foodtopia@humboldt.net[SMTP:FOODTOPIA@HUMBOLDT.NET]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2011 11:44:07 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: John Stewart
Organization: Foodtopia

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Remove the Klamath dams please.

Comment Author	Stewart, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GPWI_1110_494-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1105_398

11-05-2011
701 N. 9th St.
Montague, CA 96064-9255

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Mrs. Vasquez,

I am appalled that our own government has not taken our lives, liberties and properties, our economy, society and culture into consideration. Siskiyou County voted 79.4% to Keep the Dams. Even many Karuk Indians voted to Keep the Dams. 250 of them signed a petition to Keep the Dams.

Craig Tucker would not let **anyone** into the KBRA meetings if they wanted to Keep the Dams. In 1973 The Endangered Species Act was passed by our Congress. Craig Tucker and Felice Pace are NGOs -Non-governmental organizers are using the ESA to usurp our rights. They and our government/DOI have not given we the people any consideration because the Environmentalists, also called Stakeholders, are using the ESA to make 55% of America and the world into a Wilderness. There is the California CoastKeeper Alliance or –CCKA involved. See an important site: http://www.cacoastkeeper.org/programs/people-and-government/rights-of-nature
The Wildlands Project was begun in 1968 by Dave Foreman, Reed Noss and Michael Soule`. Forman wants the last 100 miles of the Colorado River to be turned into Pre-Columbian times, which will also destroy the Hoover dam! Dave Foreman wants the earth and her people, "to live like they did in the pre-Columbian days,"

In 1992 the Wildlands Project, Agenda 21 and the Biodiversity Treaty was passed by the United Nations. They wanted to make everything sustainable. President Clinton, in 1993 created, by Executive Order, the "Presidents Council on Sustainable Development" which had the DOI teach all about Sustainable Development and use it in their business dealings. The Biodiversity Treaty listed all the things that are Unsustainable. The NGOs use Agenda 21 to help create Sustainable Development, which in turn creates the Wildlands Project. All this can be found in a book he wrote, on the Internet and in UN Treaties. They now have the "Rights of Mother Earth," and her "10 commandments," which we are supposed to follow, see: http://pweee.wordpress.com/programa/ http://www.newexpression.com/drumming/10-commandments.html

Comment 2 - Out of Scope

All this information helps to understand why they want **dam removal**, when they should be creating more hatcheries! They should also use Jerry's and Harry's engineered-planned tunnel as a fish bypass which would solve the whole problem! But No, they want to make this a Wilderness!

Comment 3 - FERC

These NGOs consider "Fauna, Flora, wetlands, streams, rivers as PERSONS with RIGHTS." Mount Shasta, California, put this in their Ordinance of 2010. It did not get on the ballot. Now you may think I am crazy, but I have been studying this for over 18 years and I see what they are doing to dams, salmon and our rights. Look up the information on Water in Chapter 18 and Indigenous people, in Chapter 26 in Agenda 21. I have a map by the "Friends of the River," who are also members of American Rivers, showing all of the larger dams in northern California they want removed; even though the silt is very poisonous to the fish as well as to humans. But then they want 90% of humans removed, and you can see many articles of this, just look up "Depopulation." It is also mentioned in the 10 Commandments of Mother Earth.

Comment 4 - Out of Scope

Comment 1b - Disapproves of Dam Removal

There are articles that show how "dams out," will destroy riparian areas, drastically lower the flow of water exposing the bottom of the river which will make the Klamath warmer, shallower and will cause more salmon deaths because of bacteria; cause flooding in high water, greatly reduce real-estate value as well as reduce taxes and recreation. Why is it a person can buy Coho and all kinds of Salmon in the grocery stores everywhere, if it is so endangered?!

Comment 5 - Fish

And the California Water Boards think they are going to make a "Stinking" river, the Klamath, clean? The river was formed in a volcanic area. There are 3 large areas of mercury along the banks and phosphorus, as well as several warm springs that are flowing into the Klamath River near the 7 miles of rapids west of Keno Dam. The Klamath RiverKeepers also want Keno and Link River Dams out, as well as Dwinell Dam that supplies Montague, CA, removed. Felice Pace is the one who wants that to happen. Fall Creek, which supplies Yreka's water, may also be harmed! The Klamath RiverKeepers are also members of American Rivers, which wants to remove all dams in the United States. The Pacific Ocean is becoming warmer so the salmon are moving north to Alaska. NASA says we are going to have 20-30 years of cooler weather, so the salmon may return!
http://www/godlikeproductions.com/forum1/message485458/pg1#7480616

Comment 6 - Fish

Much of this has led up to the deceptive ritual of dam removal. Some of the Unsustainable things are Dams, logging, mining, roads in the forest, Industry, technology, skiing, fishing, hunting, water for the farmers and ranchers and much more! See FreedomAdvocates.org "Unsustainable" for a list of Unsustainable things from the Biodiversity Treaty.

Comment 7- ITAs

The Karuk are in better shape now than in the 17-1800's. The only designated spot to catch their fish is at Isi Pishi Falls and that is what they are doing. So why must the dams be removed when their aboriginal territorial land was Bluff Creek to Clear Creek along the Klamath River, below Happy Camp. They are claiming part of the Shasta Tribes Aboriginal Land and they fraudulently usurped the November4, 1851 Native American Shasta Peoples Treaty R in 1979 to get their Federal Recognition status from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and that was an illegal representation.

When salmon get 190 miles up stream near the Iron Gate dam, their flesh is so deteriorated the salmon are not good to eat. Many Native American people are prone to diabetes and the removal of the dams will not help that situation or their food supply, for they now receive multi millions of tax payer's dollars for sustenance and they go grocery shopping like all the American People do! Mainly what they ate long ago was salmon, other fish, deer and acorn soup along with some wild berries and vegetables. There have been NO reports of Algae poisoning at all along the Klamath River. The Karuk Tribal spokesman, Craig Tucker gave that as another excuse for dam removal.

Comment 8 - Algae

Dams ARE GREEN ENERGY and we WANT THEM LEFT IN. What I have written is a history. Dams are important, in fact they have made the water cleaner and that has been proven scientifically. THIS WHOLE THING IS A **COLLABERATION** for the Wildlands Project Wilderness! WE WANT TO KEEP OUR DAMS! If you really stand for the truth and love our USA, I have given you a plethora of information on **why the four Klamath River dams** should **NOT** be destroyed. Thank you,
Most Sincerely, Nita Still

Comment 1c - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Still, Nita
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 05, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1105_398-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-29 River Drying Up. Master Response AQU-31 Thermal Lag and Diel Temperatures. Master Response WQ-6 Periphyton Growth and Fish Disease. Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection. Master Response RE-2 Changes in Property Values. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response WQ-4A and B Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No
GP_LT_1105_398-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21.	No
GP_LT_1105_398-3	The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes two alternatives in detail that include fishways (Alternatives 4 and 5). Engineered bypasses, as identified in this comment, are part of Alternatives 10 and 11 in Sections 4.2.10 and 4.2.11 of Appendix A and in Section 2.3, Table 2-2 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternatives 10 and 11 did not meet any elements of the purpose and need or project objectives; therefore, they were not carried forward for further analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) conducted a preliminary analysis of the Hart Bypass (also known as the Bogus Creek Bypass) proposal, and concluded it would not provide an effective alternative for passage of adult salmon and steelhead populations (CDFG 2009). Alternatives 10 and 11 also had independent reviews that concluded that the bypass systems do not comport with known salmonid migratory behavior and do not include provisions for outmigrating juvenile salmonids (Mefford 2011 and White 2011). Mr. Mefford states that the tunnel alternative provides no ecological benefit for the river, and, to a degree, further degrades the ecology of the Klamath River within this reach by diverting water. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) (2011) reviewed all Engineered Bypass proposals submitted. They	No

Comment Author	Still, Nita
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 05, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	concluded that the proposed conceptual by-pass alternatives all contain elements related to fish passage that are beyond the realm of known, successful application and that the proposals are not acceptable alternatives to dam removal, from fish passage perspectives. Alternatives 10 and 11 would not provide a simple alternative for passage of salmon and steelhead populations past the lower four dams in the Klamath River. Hatchery operations are only one of the factors impacting fisheries in the Klamath Basin. The Klamath dams are affecting salmonid fisheries by blocking at least 420 miles of potential river habitat, by affecting downstream water quality (specifically, dissolved oxygen, water temperature, and algal toxins), and altering flows in sections of the mainstem of the river (Hamilton et. al. 2011, EIS/EIR Chapter 1). Altering hatchery management will not resolve any of these other issues because Iron Gate Hatchery is below the dams.	
GP_LT_1105_398-4	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Agenda 21 is an action plan of the United Nations seeking to promote sustainable development. It was an outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992. Agenda 21 can be found on the internet at http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/. Neither the United Nations nor any of its programs or committees provided guidance, consultation, input, or review of the KHSA, the KBRA, or this EIS/EIR. There has been extensive chemical testing of the sediment that would be released if the Four Facilities were to be removed. Two separate studies have collected over 80 drill cores from reservoir sediments in two separate studies (Draft EIS/EIR p. 3.2-121 to 3.2-125 summarizes some of the major results of the chemical testing performed for the study Section C.7 contains a detailed contaminant assessment). Camp Dresser and McKee (CDM) published a report titled “Screening-Level Evaluation of Contaminants in Sediments from Three Reservoirs and the Estuary of the Klamath River, 2009-2011” regarding the potential for adverse ecological or human health effects from chemical contamination in Klamath Reservoir sediments (CDM 2011b). It is available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.	No

Comment Author	Still, Nita
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 05, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	The report concluded that the Klamath Reservoir sediments can be considered relatively clean, with no chemicals present at levels that would preclude their release into downstream or marine environments.	
GP_LT_1105_398-5	Not all stocks of coho salmon, or other salmon species, are endangered. There are several populations of coho salmon in other places such as coastal Alaska, as well as other salmon species which are considered to be stable populations, capable of being harvested as sources of food. Salmon, including coho are also raised by commercial aquaculture businesses for the specific purpose of meeting the demand for fresh, frozen and canned salmon. Commercial fisheries also supply a source for fresh, frozen and canned salmon. We acknowledge your comment on the EIS/EIR. No further response to this comment is required by NEPA or CEQA. Your comment will be considered as part of the Secretarial Determination relative to the four dams on the Klamath River.	No
GP_LT_1105_398-6	Master Response AQU-13 Ocean Conditions. The Proposed Action [Alternatives 2 and 3] offers greater potential than the Current Conditions for Chinook salmon to tolerate climate change and changes in marine survival (Goodman et al. 2011; p. 19).	No
GP_LT_1105_398-7	In response to the comment that the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) illegally recognized the Karuk Tribe, the following has been added to Section 3.12.3.3. The Karuk began efforts in 1978 to receive Federal recognition. In November 1978, the BIA staff conducted a field trip to Northern California. The BIA determined that the aboriginal subentities of the tribe consisted of three communities located in Happy Camp, Orleans, and Siskiyou (Yreka). See 13 IBIA 76, 78; 1985 WL 69127 (I.B.I.A.). The Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, in a memorandum entitled “Revitalization of the Government-to-Government Relationship Between the Karuk (sic) Tribe of California and the Federal Government,” notified the local offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs on January 15, 1979, that: Based on the findings collected . . ., the continued existence of the Karuk's as a federally recognized tribe of Indians has been substantiated. In light of this finding, I am directing that the government-to-government relationship, with attendant Bureau services within available resources, be re-established.”	Yes

Comment Author	Still, Nita
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 05, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1105_398-8	Master Response ALG-1 Cyanobacteria and Algal Toxins.	No

GP_WI_1128_918

From: gadumma@msn.com[SMTP:GADUMMA@MSN.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2011 1:29:26 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: draft eis
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: john stokes
Organization: no affiliation

Subject: draft eis

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I agree that removal of the dams will benefit the salmon and the economy. The fisheries will continue to decline so long as the dams exist.Let's get it done, as soon as possible.

Comment Author	Stokes, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1128_918-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_O926_008

From: mary@4fast.net[SMTP:MARY@4FAST.NET]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2011 9:52:17 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Mary E. Stone
Organization:

Subject: dam removal

Body: I haven't read the impact statement or report, but on the basis of the story in Siskiyou Daily News (09/26/11), I assume the recommendation is for dam removal. I wish to express my support for that recommendation, for the same reasons cited by the Karuk Tribe, Klamath Riverkeeper, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, Klamath basin farmers, Salmon River Restoration Council, Cal Trout, and for the common good implied.

I once lived beside a state highway in Oregon. We knew when we bought the place that the highway would one day be widened. After 18 years, the state bought our house & 13 acres, and went to work on the road. We moved. Life goes on. The roadwork on that highway was an improvement and remains beneficial to that region to this day, 24 years later.

Accommodating progress is a valuable skill. For these dams, on this river, the time has come for change. I believe removal of these damns, though it must be done carefully, will benefit this region in general. There is such a thing as common good, and dam removal is a step in that direction.

Comment 1 - Approval of Dam Removal

Thank you,

Mary E. Stone

Comment Author	Stone, Mary
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	September 26, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_0926_008-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1027_313

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 27, 2011
PUBLIC TESTIMONY
KLAMATH, CALIFORNIA

MR. STRANGE: Hello. My name is Joshua Strange. And there's a lot of excitement in the air. We got three big dams being removed, as we speak, and four more to go.

So, I'm here to represent myself. I am a biologist. And I do support the proposed alternative, removing all four dams.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I would like to make a few comments in terms of the analysis. I do think that one thing that has not been properly appreciated is the risk with the status quo, in terms of no action. I think it's really been underestimated, the serious prognosis for salmon and other anadromous fish in this river, if the dams stay in. There are disease problems that cannot be fixed with the dams and reservoirs in place.

We also have a storm coming, and it's called global warming. And that is something that also cannot be stopped, but we can get our house in order and get ready for that storm. And that means getting these dams out so the fish can access the cold water in the Upper Basin.

I also just want to say that I really love this river. And I have traveled from Keno Dam all the way

down to the mouth, personally. I've floated it. I've seen it. I have swam in it. I swam in this river when the fish kill was happening, in 2002, probably one of the few people that did that. And it just really means a lot to see this process moving forward, to see these dams coming close to coming out.

I would also just like to speak to the people here and let them know that there has never been a dam removed in this country due to violations of the Clean Water Act. There has never been a dam removed in this country at the orders of FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Dams of this nature have only been removed through Settlement Agreements. And this is the Settlement that we have before us that will do that.

So, with that, I would just like to say blessings to the salmon. They don't have a voice, but I think we all know what they want. So, take the dams out. Thank you.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

Comment Author	Strange, Joshua
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 27, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1027_313-1	Master Responses GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response AQU-27 Disease. Master Response AQU-24 Chinook Climate Change and Marine Survival. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No

GP_WI_1111_518

From: garrett.strickland@gmail.com[SMTP:GARRETT.STRICKLAND@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 3:16:17 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: take em down
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: GARRETT STRICKLAND
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: take em down

Body: I support removal of the dams on the klamath

Comment Author	Strickland, Garrett
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_518-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1120_826

From: GSudderth@aol.com[SMTP:GSUDDERTH@AOL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 8:55:02 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Klamath River Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Bureau of Reclamation

2800 Cottage Way

Sacramento, Ca.95825

Re: DEIR and DEIS

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

It is sad to see that the government is willing to destroy the lives of so many people along the Klamath River because of some flawed research. These people deserve better.

The FOUR DAMS in question provide a variety of benefits and should NOT BE DESTROYED.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

The dams provide green energy to thousands of homes. How will this be replaced and at what cost?

Comment 3 - Hydrology

Who will be responsible for preventing down stream floods when the dams are gone?

Comment 4 - Sediment Transport

How will the sediment behind the dams be removed and at what cost? The flushing of toxins in the sediment will probably take years and will have a bigger negative affect on the Coho than leaving the dams in tact. It is my understanding that the Klamath is a toxic river and the dams help filter out a lot of the toxins and thus improve the river for Coho spawning.

Comment 5 - Fish

How will you replace the Iron Gate fish hatchery that produces millions of fish (including Coho) that will be lost to the area?

Comment 6 - KHSA

Why were the local residence excluded from the process since these are the people that will be impacted the most, especially since the Coho is not indigenous to the area? Was it because they know that the report was flawed?

California is already bankrupt. The cost to remove these dams will be in the billions. How can the state afford this? Who will pay? Do we increase the unfunded debt to the public employees?

Comment 7 - Costs

I hope you have a little sympathy for the thousands of people that you will be disrupting if the dams are destroyed.

Sincerely,

Gerald Sudderth

Comment Author	Sudderth, Gerald
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_826-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information. Master Response HYDP-1 Reservoir Water Rights.	No
GP_EM_1120_826-2	Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	No
GP_EM_1120_826-3	Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection.	No
GP_EM_1120_826-4	Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants. Master Response AQU-1C Sediment Amounts and Effects on Fish.	No
GP_EM_1120_826-5	Master Response AQU-18 Fate of Iron Gate Hatchery under Alternatives.	No
GP_EM_1120_826-6	Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA. Master Response AQU-4 Coho are Native.	No
GP_EM_1120_826-7	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No

GP_WI_1220_1107

From: danvil@live.com[SMTP:DANVIL@LIVE.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2011 9:36:43 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Dan Sullivan
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Dam removal

Body: We support Alternative 2- Full Dam removal to restore the watershed to its natural state together with its fishery and relieve all the attendant costs to taxpayers due to untold maintenance issues with the aging structure.

Comment Author	Sullivan, Dan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1220_1107-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1104_359

Mary Sullivan Murphy

7110 HIGHWAY 66
ASHLAND, OREGON 97520

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
NOV 14 2011
CODE | ACTION | SURNAME & DATE
150 | Copy to Mg. | 11/14

Nov. 1, 2011

Dear Ms. Vasquez and Mr. Leppig,

Comment 1 - Hydropower

I strongly object to the Klamath Dam Removal project. These dams not only provide H_2O in the Klamath Basin to farmers but they provide many Killowat hours of energy cheaply & clearly with water.

If there is any way to stop this I would like to see this done. In the name of spawning fish & fisherman who like to catch them, the average person gets higher energy costs. Now I know there are some that think our abundant cheap energy is wrong but I do not want these eco-nuts speaking for me. Do not remove these dams which provide abundant cheap energy.

M. S. Murphy

SCANNED

Classification
Project
Control No. 11u8364
Folder I.D.
Date Input & Initials

Comment Author	Sullivan Murphy, Mary
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 04, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1104_359-1	Master Response HYDP-1 Reservoir Water Rights. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No

GP_WI_1111_564

From: l.sultz@bresnan.net[SMTP:L.SULTZ@BRESNAN.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 7:48:21 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Support Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: LaVerne Sultz
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Support Dam Removal

Body: Put me down as solidly in support of Alternative 2 to remove the Klamath Dams. Those dams no longer make ecological or economic sense and need to go. We have a chance to restore a natural legacy for future generations by dam removal and at the same time support irrigators.

Comment Author	Sultz, LaVerne
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_564-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1214_1036

From: sarasun18@humboldtmail.com[SMTP:SARASUN18@HUMBOLDTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2011 6:25:00 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dams Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Sara Sunstein
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dams Removal

Comment 1 - Fish

Body: I urgently request that you get on it for the dams to be removed immediately. The fish in the Klamath River really can't wait another 8 years for the dams to be removed. The dams are creating toxic levels of algae and other bacteria, as well as preventing natural flow of the river and migration upstream for fish. Bureaucracies and power company may want to wait 8 years, but the ecosystem doesn't operate on a fiscal year, nor by financial profit and loss.

Removal of the dams needs to include restoration of all the historic wetlands in the Upper Klamath Basin as well as improve the conditions for salmon on the Scott and Shasta Rivers.

There also has to be guaranteed minimum flow of 1300 cu. ft. at the Iron Gate gauge, to comply with Endangered Species Act. Along similar lines, more water from the Trinity River has to be guaranteed to remain in the water shed to support salmon migration in the Lower Klamath.

Do the right thing. Support endangered species and the entire river ecology today!

Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480

Comment Author	Sunstein, Sara
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 14, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded - GP_WI_1110_480. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_WI_1110_480. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_WI_1110_480 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1214_1036-1	Master Response AQU – 11 NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management. The BO does not require a minimum flow of 1,300 cfs downstream of Iron Gate Dam during all months and hydrological conditions.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1024_253

OFFICIAL FILE COPY RECEIVED

	ACTION	SURNAME & DATE

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: FORREST SUTHERLAND

Organization: TAX PAYER

Title: HOME OWNER

Address: 1516 PATTERSON ST. KLAMATH FALLS, OR. 97603

Email:

Comments: Comment 1 - KHSA

I AM AGAINST THE DAM REMOVAL BECAUSE IT WAS CONCOCTED BEHIND CLOSED DOORS, WITH LESS THAN HONEST SCIENTIFIC FACT. IT WAS DRUMMED UP WITHOUT PUBLIC INPUT. YOU EXPECT EVERYONE TO AGREE THAT REMOVING THE DAMS IS BEST FOR EVERYONE. GIVING BACK THE NINETY THOUSAND PLUS ACRES OF THE MAZAMA TREE FARM TO THE KLAMATH TRIBE AT TAXPAYERS EXPENSE IS UNEXCEPTABLE. THE TAXPAYERS HAVE ALREADY PAID FOR THIS LAND TWICE. Comment 3 - Hydropower Comment 2 - KBRA

BY REMOVING THE DAMS ELECTRIC RATE WILL EXCELLERATE, THE PEOPLE ON FIXED INCOMES WILL NOT BE ABLE TO AFFORD THEM, MUCH LESS THE FARMERS. PROPERTY VALUES IN THE KLAMATH BASIN AND KLAMATH DRAINAGE AREAS WILL DECREASE, BRINGING LOSS OF TAX REVENUE TO KLAMATH COUNTY AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. THIS IS SO FLAWED IT SHOULD BE S-CANNED. IN MANY PARTS OF IT, IT COULD POSSIBLY BE ILLEAGLE. Comment 4 - Real Estate

FISH LADDERS SHOULD BE INSTALL AND TRIED LONG BEFORE REMOVING THE DAMS

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Date input

Comment Author	Sutherland, Forrest
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 24, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1024_253-1	Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA. Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement. Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information.	No
GP_MF_1024_253-2	Among the various provisions under full implementation of the KBRA, tribes that are parties to the agreement would agree to not exercise their senior water rights within the basin and to relinquish claims for natural resources damages (KBRA Section 15) in exchange for increases in fisheries (dam removal and fisheries habitat restoration programs) and assistance with acquisition of Mazama forest.	No
GP_MF_1024_253-3	Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_MF_1024_253-4	Please see Section 3.15, Socioeconomics for an analysis of the impacts to real estate values.	No

GP_EM_1120_821

From: Roberta Swank[SMTP:ROBERTANASHVILLE@INBOX.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 9:40:46 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Leave the Dams and Strengthen Them
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I have recently been made aware that several dams are scheduled for removal.

Why do we continue to dismantle this important part of our infrastructure? We will never be able to rebuild them given the extremist view of environmentalism in this country.

Why are fish more important than people/farmers/citizens.

Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800

How will taking out dams improve water quality?

Klamath is naturally warm and polluted up stream

* Area of headwaters is volcanic and rich in minerals, including basalt, magnesium and phosphorus

* System of four dams filters out the minerals and allows the water to cool

How will the green, affordable energy currently provided by the four, hydroelectric dams be replaced?

* Existing four dams provide hydroelectric power

* Hydroelectric power is both green and economical

* Current system provides enough electricity to power 70,000 homes

How were "stakeholders" determined?

* 40,000 Siskiyou County residents and their local, elected representatives were not included in the Klamath River Dam removal meetings

* Four tribes exist in the Klamath Basin - the Shasta, Karuk, Yurok, and Hupa; the Shasta have been left out of all agreements and their sacred burial grounds will be destroyed when the dams are breached

A major impetus for dam removal is concern over the Coho salmon, a non-native species to the Klamath River; why?

* Coho salmon are not native to the Klamath and were planted in the river in the late 1800's

* Coho are not natural to the Klamath and yet millions of fish produced at the Iron Gate fish hatchery are not included in the river population because they are not considered natural

* Coho typically spawn within 30 miles of the ocean; first dam on the Klamath is 187 miles upstream

Duplicate cont.

Roberta Swank

Comment Author	Swank, Roberta
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded - GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_EM_1118_800 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_821-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1103_369

From: starhart11@msn.com[SMTP:STARHART11@MSN.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 12:02:45 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Support the Klamath Eco System Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Barbara Swanson
Organization: Simplexity Health

Comment 1 - KBRA

Subject: Support the Klamath Eco System

Body: This note is in support of maintaining the natural health of Klamath Lake and the Klamath Basin. Not only is this ecosystem important to millions of birds and animals, it is a unique source of wild edible microalgae. This algae supports the health of tens of thousands of consumers; as a harvestor and manufacturer, Simplexity supports the financial health of several thousand people, world-wide. Please protect the lake and all it stands for.

Comment Author	Swanson, Barbara
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 03, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1103_369-1	The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the KHSA and KBRA. Simplexity Health (www.simplexityhealth.com/, accessed 5/2/2012) is a Klamath Falls-based business that advertises Upper Klamath Lake as the source of the algae species *Aphanizemenon flos-aquae (Aph. Flos-aquae)* used in its nutritional supplement. Lake-like conditions conducive to growth of *Aph. Flos-aquae* in Upper Klamath Lake would not be changed under any of the five Alternatives analyzed in the EIS/EIR. The presence of *Aph. Flos-aquae* at population levels which would permit collection in Upper Klamath Lake would persist under all alternatives. Commercial enterprises that collect algae may have a role in improving water quality in Klamath Basin lakes. For example Simplexity was included by PacifiCorp in their “Plan for Water Quality Management Actions for Copco and Iron Gate Reservoirs” (PacifiCorp 2009).	No

12/31/2011 02:18 Scott Valley PT (FAX)530 468 5445 P.002/003

GP_LT_1230_1227

Dec 29, 2011

Dear Sirs,

Comment 1 - Disapproves Dam Removal

We citizens of Siskiyou County are well aware of the poor "science" and poor reasoning used to justify the removal of dams on the Klamath River. Plainly the destruction of this clean energy source, which has established an ecosystem of its own over many decades, is being proposed for an agenda which clear-thinking citizens could not support, if it were made plain + obvious. We strongly oppose the removal of dams on the Klamath.

Lauren Sweezy
Paul Sweezy SR
Paul Sweezy JR

Comment Author	Sweizy, Lauren, Paul Sr., & Paul Jr.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1230_1227-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No

GP_WI_1116_688

From: Olswinney@sbcglobal.net[SMTP:OLSWINNEY@SBCGLOBAL.NET]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2011 10:38:02 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: KLAMATH RIVER DAMS Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: O'ROURK & LINDA SWINNEY
Organization: NORTH COAST ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER

Subject: KLAMATH RIVER DAMS

Body: PLEASE REMOVE ALL THE DAMS ON THE KLAMATH RIVER THANK YOU O'ROURK & LINDA SWINNEY

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Swinney, O'Rourk & Linda
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_688-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1109_418

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OCT 31 2011
RECEIVED
NOV 08 2011
152

Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Dear Mrs. Vasquez,

Comment 1a - Hydropower

I am outraged that I have to take the time to write this letter. The fact that our Federal Government is pushing to remove four clean energy resources is ironic given the fact that this administration was going to be the "green jobs" leader.

The environmental regulations that are killing California jobs and businesses are now plotting to destroy perfectly good energy resources. The recklessness of these actions will show over time that you helped to destroy more lives, communities, and families by removing the Klamath River dams. The cost of removing these dams is approximately $290 million dollars with no plan to generate a replacement power source.

Your inability to listen to the citizens of California is why many citizens are coming to the realization that our government is more committed to serving environmental activists than local and state citizens. **-An average of 80% of Citizens VOTED NO on Dam Removal in Siskiyou County, California and Klamath County, Oregon.**

Comment 1b - Hydropower

Before blowing up dams why doesn't the government show the citizens what clean energy resource will be built to replace the power the dams generate. Show us the cost savings, and build the new energy plant before **spending a quarter of a billion dollars destroying a perfectly good hydro-electric energy resource.** -Hydro-electric energy is 10 times cheaper than wind energy, and 20 times cheaper than solar.

California energy costs are rising, businesses are leaving CA and many citizens are unemployed. Your inhumane decisions will not improve the lives of the citizens of California, but make it much harder for the people to pursue happiness (prosper). Based on the actions of the Federal Government I must assume fish and wildlife are more important than your fellow citizens.

Comment 2 - Costs

The cost of dam removal will be extremely expensive. Since rate payers will be paying for this cost, this will cause a large cost increase on electricity to rate payers, including homeowners and elderly. I am very concerned about how the rate payers and tax payers are going to afford this increase in electricity costs. The actual cost of dam removal is largely believed to be in excess of $3 billion and we will be the ones to pay the price.

Comment 3 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I urge you to not destroy the Klamath River Dams.

Sincerely,

R. J. Sylvester
3679 Rosebrook Ct.
Concord, Ca. 94518

SCANNED
Classification DRD-13 00
Project 12
Control No.
Folder I.D. 1153134
Date Input & Initials 11/9/2011 AP

Comment Author	Sylvesto, R.J.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 09, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1109_418-1	Master Response GHG-1 Green Power.	No
	Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	
	Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	
GP_LT_1109_418-2	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate	No
	Master Response COST-3 Cost of Power Surcharge.	
GP_LT_1109_418-3	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1020_186

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. FRANK TALLERICO: My name is Frank Tallerico, F-r-a-n-k T-a-l-l-e-r-i-c-o.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

First of all, I'd like to say that I represent almost 80 percent of the voters in Siskiyou County, including that area of Tulelake which is in the upper basin, and had those three precincts in Tulelake been included in the Klamath County election on dam removal, you would have had a resounding "no" on dam removal in this upper basin and in this mid-river part of the Klamath River.

Comment 2 - Out of Scope

Now, I find it almost appalling that nowhere in the entire presentation this evening, that there is no mention of the Klamath Basin Compact of 1957, where both states, both governors, the Congress of the United States, and then-President Eisenhower, signed that compact, and there's no law out there that supersedes that, not that we could find.

Comment 3 - KHSA

I think it's appalling that the information put out today is, as the secretary said in San Francisco at the Commonwealth Club, we have a predetermined outcome and we are going to work toward that outcome.

With that in mind, you have deceived and you

have not been forthwith with the real estate holders of

the area, and that's the people.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Tallerico, Frank
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_186-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1020_186-2	The Proposed Action analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR does not change the Klamath Basin Compact. To ensure the Compact was given full consideration the Klamath Basin Compact Commission is a Cooperating Agency on the EIS/EIR (see Draft EIS/EIR Table 1-2). Also, Section 3.8, Water Supply Water Rights, of the EIS/EIR considers how the Klamath Basin Compact relates to the Proposed Action and water supply and water rights, Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.8.2.3 discusses the Compact as it relates to interstate water allocation, and Section 3.14, Land Use, considers the Compact as it relates to land use, agricultural, and forest resources.	No
GP_MC_1020_186-3	Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No

GP_EM_1104_353

From: Debra Tash[SMTP:TIMARETE@EARTHLINK.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 1:58:41 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Do not remove the dam
Auto forwarded by a Rule Ms. Vasquez:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I am hereby writing to oppose your office's proposal to remove the Klamath River Dam. You will destroy thousand of acres of farmland and people's livehoods.

No Dam Removal! Absolutely not.

Sincerely,
Debra Tash
--
Debra Tash, Vice President, GT Water Products, Inc.
http://www.gtwaterproducts.com/

Debra Tash, Author
http://www.debratash.com

http://peopleprotectingfreedom.ning.com/

Comment Author	Tash, Debra
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 04, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1104_353-1	Master Responses GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Other Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response HYDP-1 Reservoir Water Rights. EIS/EIR Section 3.15, Socioeconomics evaluates economic effects to agriculture of the Proposed Action. These effects are described in more detail in Irrigated Agriculture Economic Technical Report For the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon which can be found on www.klamathrestoration.gov. Agriculture would continue to be an important part of the region's economy with dam removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_830

From: Debra Tash[SMTP:TIMARETE@EARTHLINK.NET]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 12:05:46 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd

Subject: Save the Dam!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Do NOT remove the dam on the Klamath River. There is no reason to do other than to destroy agricultural and people's private property.

Debra Tash
Somis California

Comment Author	Tash, Debra
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_830-1	Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response HYDP-1 Reservoir Water Rights. EIS/EIR Section 3.15, Socioeconomics, evaluates economic effects to agriculture of the Proposed Action. Agriculture would continue to be an important part of the region's economy with dam removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_528

From: bentayfly@aol.com[SMTP:BENTAYFLY@AOL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 2:37:43 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dams Draft EIS/EIR Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Ben Taylor
Organization: NCCFFF

Subject: Klamath Dams Draft EIS/EIR

Body: Since the main purpose of removing the dams on the KLamath is to restore the runs of salmon and steelhead to former levels, I would suggest that we also address the gill-netting of fish in that river. Currently the several Tribes living along the Klamath may gill-net 50% of returning anadromous fish, and commercial fishermen may net another 25%. I would hope that we will address this issue soon so that after all our hard work, the returning fish will not swim head-long into a gill-net.
Thank you, Ben Taylor

Comment 1 - Out of Scope

Comment Author	Taylor, Ben
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_528-1	The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) manages the salmon fishery on the basis of 'weak stock management', whereby regulations are designed to protect weaker stocks, even if that means foregoing some harvest of the healthier stocks that comingle with the weaker ones in the ocean harvest. In years where a stock fails to meet its conservation goal for three consecutive years, PFMC the declares a conservation concern, and the commercial fishery is closed or otherwise highly constrained, even in areas far removed from the stock's river of origin. The PFMC would continue to manage the fishery in the future to protect salmon stocks.	No

GP_WI_1110_417

From: rossntaylor@sbcglobal.net[SMTP:ROSSNTAYLOR@SBCGLOBAL.NET]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2011 2:57:23 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Draft EIS/EIR
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Ross N. Taylor
Organization: Ross Taylor and Associates

Subject: Draft EIS/EIR

Body: As a fisheries biologist whose career started on the Klamath River in 1986, I am in support of alternative #2 - full removal of the four lowermost dams on the Klamath River - Iron Gate, JC Boyle and Copco 1 and 2.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Taylor, Ross
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1110_417-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1222_1165

From: tejedarichard@yahoo.com[SMTP:TEJEDARICHARD@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2011 4:50:05 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Sustainablity or common sense Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Richard Tejeda
Organization:

Subject: Sustainablity or common sense

Body: The Klamath has been home to Native Americans for 1,000 of years. We have taken possession of land and not been responsible. We dam rivers which we all know creates unsafe sediments deposition, higher water temperatures that cause algae blooms, fragmentation of habitat, deprivation of free nutrient flow, blocked crucial spawning resources i.e. noiyo rock, changed rain patterns and much, much more. It's up to you us to lead the country by example to reopen the biggest salmon producer next to Alaska. We owe it to the Native Peoples, to ourselves and to our children and grandchildren. We have to learn to coexist and find new ways to support our continuously growing population. We must change the way we think or go extinct. This dam is the most important removal in California in the past 100 years I'm sure. I'm also sure that we don't know the true effects that a dam can have until we remove it and collect biological data. It certainly can only get greater. We should remove the dam because of the environmental impact it’s having on the fish, amphibians, birds, mammals, macroinvertabrates. These are things that no amount of mitigation can bring back once they’re gone and the state or country surely doesn’t have the money to fix the environment once we have demolished the ecosystem with poor decisions. The dam has never made sense and no dam ever will. Dams kill the biodiversity of the area by limiting keystone species' i.e. salmon, steelhead, lamprey etc.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Tejeda, Richard
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1222_1165-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21. The EIS/EIR recognizes that the tribes of the Klamath Basin depend on the river and the salmon for their livelihood, and that the spiritual beliefs and traditional practices are inseparable from the river and surrounding homeland environments. Although the language groups and traditional practices sometimes vary among the tribes, all of them derived their cultures, commerce, and subsistence primarily from the river and its aquatic and terrestrial resources. We thank you for input for the Secretarial Determination. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment and others when making his determination.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_072

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

10/19/01
Chiloquin

Name: Victoria Tenbrink

Organization:

Title:

Address:

Email:

Comments: After hearing Becky Hyde's comment I would like to add a post script to mine. The reason I came to Chiloquin to listen and comment, even though I live in Klamath Falls, is because there is a small group of people in Klamath Falls who are rude and even intimidating at public meetings. I sincerely hope this behavior is not taken as the majority or the methods of the citizens of Klamath County. Thanks.

Comment 1 - Out of Scope

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Tenbrink, Victoria
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_072-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part Record.	No

GP_MC_1019_174

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM

---o0o---

CHILOQUIN, OREGON

OCTOBER 19, 2011

---o0o---

I'm Victoria Tenbrink.

Thanks for this opportunity, I appreciate it.

Um --

THE FACILITATOR: Could you spell your last name?

MS. TENBRINK: The number ten, T-e-n, and like you are on the brink of disaster, b-r-i-n-k, all one word.

When the dam removal issue first came to my attention, I thought it was a rock-and-hard-place, because I understand that we need renewable energy, we are facing anthropogenic climate instability, and renewable energy is pretty important. But we are also looking for survival and habitat restoration for at least four species of anadromous fish plus attendant benefits for invertebrate reptiles and amphibians, birds, other fishes and mammals including and maybe especially us.

So both problems are human engendered, and my dilemma was: Is it possible to have our cake and eat it, too?

So I was instructed by a wise professional standing at a table out there to say that I looked at every page of the document, so I turned to the side, looked at the bottom, and said, "I've looked at every page

of that document.

So in reality, my comments are based on the materials that you have provided recently, and so I understand that I may not have all the information available but, however, I would like to comment on how those materials do affect the public perception of things, in particular.

Overall, I think it's a really good, thorough job, and I appreciate it.

Comment 1 - Alternatives

I was looking at Alternative 1, and I was concerned that out there and in here, it states that we'll just go on as a year-to-year, um, agreement.

I understand the FERC relicensing is now, what, eleven years behind, so at some point, that is going to have to happen. And so the no-alternative alternative does have a big consequence that I think is maybe not being put out there as full, um, weight.

Comment 2 - Alternatives

And also in the bullet points, um, there is fish, you know, ladders you don't have to build, but those -- that infrastructure is going on a hundred years old and less, and so there's obviously -- I mean, I have an old house, I have concrete, I have masonry, I'm constantly repairing it, so I see that the cost of keeping those dams up is going to be accelerating over time, it already has been, and I think that is another clear thing that needs to come out from Alternative 1.

Comment 3 - Global Climate Change/GHGs

As far as greenhouse gas impacts, there's a basic assumption that the power has to be replaced. And

over 20 years ago, a guy named Amory Lovins, of the Rocky Mountain Institute, helped develop and popularize a concept called Megawatts, and that means if you use efficiency in conservation, you'll know how to generate power. So if you look up, you see the compact florescent bulbs in recessed wells. We are rapidly developing technology that could make that power replacement neutral or even positive if we got a plan for it.

So as the world population tops a billion this month, resource conflicts, those rocks and hard places, are going to be increasing.

I want to thank the department for their exhaustive study.

Comment 4 - Alternatives

I think Alternative 1, when clearly explained, seems to be the least desirable, and I prefer Alternative 2; 3, 4, and 5 look messy and expensive.

Comment 5 - Approves Dam Removal

The first dam began a hundred years ago and the power generated was in excess of the needs. The impact on the largest, I've heard, third-largest salmon systems on the Pacific coast was devastating.

Removal of the dams, restoration of habitat will help right a wrong that was arguably unknowingly committed many years ago, and I say arguably, not unarguably. You can argue that it was unknown. By some it was, by others it was not.

Comment 6 - Hydropower

I think we can take care of the power loss and the greenhouse gas emissions easily through a program of energy efficiency and also open up the way for continuing

with hard work that people have done with the KBRA.

So I thank you for your attention.

Comment Author	Tenbrink, Victoria
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1019_174-1	Under the Alternative 1 as described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 2.4.2, PacifiCorp would need to obtain a long-term operating license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to replace the existing annual license. PacifiCorp would resume relicensing proceedings with FERC to obtain the required long-term operating license. Until that unknown time, PacifiCorp would continue to operate under an annual license. The No Action/No Project Alternative, as described, is the most reasonable assumption of future conditions. Among the action alternatives, Alternative 4: Passage at Four Dams, as described in FINAL EIS 2.4.5, describes a scenario where KHSA terminates and the requirements for fish passage as set forward by the prior FERC relicensing proceedings are implemented.	No
GP_MC_1019_174-2	Master Response ALT-8 Inclusion of Alternatives Solely Based on Cost.	No
GP_MC_1019_174-3	Master Response GHG-4: GHG Emissions Estimate.	No
GP_MC_1019_174-4	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1019_174-5	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1019_174-6	Comment noted.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_264

Page 1

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Victoria Tenbrink

Organization: General Public

Title:

Address: 1412 Crescent Ave, Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Email: vtenbrink@cldt.com

Comments:

When the dam removal issue 1st came to my attention I saw it as a rock & a hard place losing Renewable energy that would counter anthropogenic climate instability

Comment 1 - Hydropower

vs.

Survival & habitat restoration for at least 4 species of anadromous fish plus attendant benefits for invertebrates reptiles and amphibians, birds other fishes, & mammals, (including us) & maybe especially

Both problems are human engendered, and my dilemma was, is it possible to ~~can we~~ have our cake & eat it too?

I was instructed by a wise professional standing at a table to say that I had looked at every page of the draft EIS/EIR document. So I bent down & took a good look at the bottom edge & can now say that I have looked at every page.

In results, my comments are based on the information provided

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

here tonight.

regarding alt 1,

Comment 2 - FERC

- FERC year to ~~[illegible]~~ year. I think it's important to make clear that, similar to alts 4 & 5, at some point a ~~long-term license~~ the FERC re-licensing would again be engaged.

Comment 3 - Alternatives

- Also, in the bulleted pros of impacts of the alternatives, accelerating cost of maintaining aging infrastructure was not addressed for the public.

Comment 4 - GHGs/Climate Change

Greenhouse gas impacts

A basic assumption is that the power from removal alternatives would have to be positively replaced. Over 20 years ago Amory Lovins, of the Rocky Mtn Institute helped develop & popularize Negawatts. Every megawatt saved through efficiency does not have to be generated. This is a scenario I did not see discussed in the context of greenhouse gas impacts of dam removal.

As world population tops 7 billion this month resource conflicts, rocks & hard places will

Comment 5 - Approves of Dam Removal

Thanks to the Dept of Interior for the exhaustive study, alt 3 seems the least desirable, alt 2 the best.

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Please place first class postage here

Comment Author	Tenbrink, Victoria
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_264-1	Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power. Section 3.10, Greenhouse Gases, of the Draft EIS/EIR analyzes the increased greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that could occur from removing a source of renewable power production from the Four Facilities.	No
GP_MF_1019_264-2	Information describing the Klamath Hydroelectric Project and the FERC re-licensing process is provided in the Section 1.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Your comment will be considered as part of the Secretarial Determination relative to the four dams on the Klamath River.	No
GP_MF_1019_264-3	These costs, to the extent they were addressed, are discussed in Section 3.15 in the context of estimated changes to operation and maintenance costs relative to the no action alternative and effects to the regional economy. The economic analysis conducted in support of the Secretarial Determination process also includes the regional economic impacts of operation and maintenance of the dams over the period of analysis. This analysis can be found in the Economics and Tribal Summary Technical Report on KlamathRestoration.gov.	No
GP_MF_1019_264-4	Master Response GHG-4 GHG Emissions Estimate.	No
GP_MF_1019_264-5	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1020_220

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MS. ERICA TERENCE: My name is Erica Terence,

E-r-i-c-a, T-e-r-e-n-c-e. And I live in Siskiyou County,

and I work for the nonprofit organization Klamath River

Keepers. I will submit more detailed written comments

later.

For now I wanted to keep it pretty short and say

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

I really want to recognize and appreciate all the time and

effort and resources that have gone into this whole

process from tribal communities, commercial fishing

communities, Upper Basin farming communities and

irrigators.

To all those people, thank you for keeping an

open mind. When we first got in the same room we couldn't

talk about fish and farms in the same sentence. We want

farms and we want fish. We're not giving up on the last

part, we have to have fish, too. That is vital to people

like me who live downstream.

But, again, keeping an open mind has been really

important to this process to getting us to where we are

right now, which is talking about KBRA, KHSA, looking at

the whole Basin, not just we tend to carve things up

artificially in counties. Water flows through all our communities, fish swim through all our communities. We want everybody to have fish. We want everybody to have clean water.

I appreciate that you in the document have really tried to summarize some of those benefits, the jobs that will be created, the fish that will be created. I encourage you to keep that basin-wide view and to look at the facts.

Thank you very much. Bye.

Comment Author	Terrence, Erica
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_220-1	Comment Noted. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1026_324

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 26, 2011
PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA

MS. TERENCE: Hello. My name is Erica Terence, E-r-i-c-a T-e-r-e-n-c-e, and I work for Klamath Riverkeeper. I'm also a Siskiyou County resident, just barely, almost a Humboldt County resident. I'm a few miles away. And I grew up on the river and certainly have a stake in the outcome here today and for years to come.

Comment 1 - Economics

I was at the Yreka meeting, as you know, and last night's Orleans meeting and have had a chance to kick around in my brain some of the things -- issues at stake here and the things that people had to say at those meetings and the things you have in your document. And I would like to ask that you all consider the value of a restoration economy in this Basin versus an economy that extracts resources, uses them up, degrades them, spits them out the other side and we have to restore them and figure out how to find the money to do that. It's very costly, and I would argue that the value is significantly less.

I think it's difficult to deny, if you take a close look at the literature, that restoration economy has a lot more value, and it's going to be protecting the integrity of those resources. You'll be able to go on

and use those resources in future generations. That's a lot more sustainable. That has a lot more value. Please take a look at that in your document when you are looking at the economic impacts. And I think we can debate for a long time about how adverse those might be. And, certainly, you heard from residents of Central Siskiyou County who feel that there are adverse impacts to their economy, but please weigh that against what it means to have a restoration economy in this Basin.

And I would also add, on that topic, that this meeting tonight is located in a place where local citizens and public officials, very much to their credit, have figured out how to do a restoration economy, how to build that up. And, you know, so it might be worth taking a look, also, at how that's done and how people have done it right, like the folks around here.

I would also like to note, when I was watching the presentation tonight, the significance of dams as historic sites, or "culturally historic sites" was the way I believe you said it, to me and, I think, to many people I work with, dams -- these dams are outdated. And their value, as cultural sites, that's a thing of the past.

And I think other speakers here tonight have touched on it, Mr. Martien, Mr. Greacen. This is an era of dams coming out. And what will truly be historic and has the most historic value today is four dams out of the

Comment 2 - Approves of Dam Removal

Klamath River. That's Alternative 2. Please adopt it.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Terence, Erica
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 26, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1026_324-1	The Draft EIS/EIR focuses on specific No Action and Action alternatives. A broader discussion of the value of restoration versus extraction is beyond the scope of this document.	No
GP_MC_1026_324-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1025_294

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL
DRAFT EIS/EIR HEARING
OCTOBER 25, 2011

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
ORLEANS, CALIFORNIA

MS. TERENCE: Susan Terence, S-u-s-a-n T-e-r-e-n-c-e.

I think, as Mavis' remarks may have indicated, we share a lot of similarities with Third World nations around here. There's been many years of efforts at short-term gain at the expense of the long-term bounty of this river.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

This river, historically, the Karuk people, the Tribes of Northern California were some of the most prosperous in the nation. Salmon were critical to this prosperity. I would suggest that salmon are critical to the future prosperity of all of the people of the river.

I would urge you to support Alternative 2, and I thank you for the community to speak.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Susan.

Comment Author	Terrence, Susan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1025_294-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. The EIS/EIR recognizes that the tribes of the Klamath Basin depend on the river and the salmon for their livelihood, and that the spiritual beliefs and traditional practices are inseparable from the river and surrounding homeland environments. Although the language groups and traditional practices sometimes vary among the tribes, all of them derived their cultures, commerce, and subsistence primarily from the river and its aquatic and terrestrial resources. We thank you for input for the Secretarial Determination. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment and others when making his determination.	No

GP_EM_1116_693

From: Sue Terence[SMTP:SALMONRIVERSILK@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 8:48:07 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath DEIS comments
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Approval of Dam Removal

Dear Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez;

I am writing to express my support for alternative 2, removal of the four dams and restoration of the Klamath River.

The Native American tribes, who managed to maintain robust salmon runs for 8000 or so years before they were decimated, were some of the most prosperous tribes in North America.This wealth was created largely by the bountiful salmon runs that provided both sustenance and the basis for trading.

In the mere 150 years since the arrival of the Caucasians, various short-sighted extractive practices have transformed the landscape from one of great plenty to one of unsustainability. Extensive gold mining and logging silted in many of the creeks. The dams, built to extract electricity, ensured that the pulses of water from winter storms were not strong enough to wash that silt out to the ocean. Furthermore, the dams, in which water spills over the top, created water temperatures downstream that engender disease in salmon and mortality for many juveniles.

These extractive practices were put into place without a clear understanding of the devastating results. Today, however, we are beginning to comprehend the extent of the damage we have caused. We understand that another 50-year license to operate the dams would doom one of the greatest salmon runs on the earth. Forever. It would also leave the people of this region impoverished for the long run.

It is time to try to reverse this process before it is too late. For the fish, for the fishermen, for the native people who depend on the fish, for all the people who are trying to make a living in this region, for our children and grandchildren, I ask that you remove the dams and restore the river.

Adopt alternative 2. Now, before it is too late.

Sincerely, Susan Terence

6304 Butler Mountain Rd. Somes Bar, CA 95568

Comment Author	Terence, Susan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_693-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. The EIS/EIR recognizes that the tribes of the Klamath Basin depend on the river and the salmon for their livelihood, and that the spiritual beliefs and traditional practices are inseparable from the river and surrounding homeland environments. Although the language groups and traditional practices sometimes vary among the tribes, all of them derived their cultures, commerce, and subsistence primarily from the river and its aquatic and terrestrial resources. We thank you for input for the Secretarial Determination. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment and others when making his determination.	No

GP_EM_1116_1121

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 8:53:55 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Klamath DEIS comments
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> Sue Terence <salmonriversilk@gmail.com> 11/16/2011 7:51 AM >>>

Dear Gordon Leppig:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

>> I am writing to express my support for alternative 2, removal of the four dams and restoration of the Klamath River.
>>
>> The Native American tribes, who managed to maintain robust salmon runs for 8000 or so years before they were decimated, were some of the most prosperous tribes in North America.This wealth was created largely by the bountiful salmon runs that provided both sustenance and the basis for trading.
>>
>> In the mere 150 years since the arrival of the Caucasians, various short-sighted extractive practices have transformed the landscape from one of great plenty to one of unsustainability. Extensive gold mining and logging silted in many of the creeks. The dams, built to extract electricity, ensured that the pulses of water from winter storms were not strong enough to wash that silt out to the ocean. Furthermore, the dams, in which water spills over the top, created water temperatures downstream that engender disease in salmon and mortality for many juveniles.
>>
>> These extractive practices were put into place without a clear understanding of the devastating results. Today, however, we are beginning to comprehend the extent of the damage we have caused. We understand that another 50-year license to operate the dams would doom one of the greatest salmon runs on the earth. Forever. It would also leave the people of this region impoverished for the long run.
>>
>> It is time to try to reverse this process before it is too late. For the fish, for the fishermen, for the native people who depend on the fish, for all the people who are trying to make a living in this region, for our children and grandchildren, I ask that you remove the dams and restore the river.
>>
>> Adopt alternative 2. Now, before it is too late.
>>
>> Sincerely,
>>
>> Susan Terence
>>
>> 6304 Butler Mountain Rd.
>
> Somes Bar, CA 95568

Comment Author	Terence, Susan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_1121-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1118_790

From: terry[SMTP:BETTIS@CHARTER.NET]
Sent: Saturday, November 19, 2011 10:46:53 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: KLAMATH RIVER DAMS
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

KEEP THE KLAMATH RIVER DAMS . YOU PEOPLE HAVE SCREWED UP EVERYTHING ELSE IN THIS COUNTRY ,KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF THE 4 KLAMATH RIVER DAMS . LEAVE THEM ALONE ITS THAT SIMPLE.

Comment Author	Terry
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1118_790-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1018_037

From: krtthms@cs.com[SMTP:KRTTHMS@CS.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2011 1:58:14 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: KBRA and Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Kurt Thomas
Organization: K.C. Thomas Cattle Co.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: KBRA and Dam Removal

Body: I believe that it is essential to remove the four dams as contemplated in the KBRA. It will bring harmony to our basin and restore the natural balence that is critical to the Klamath River. The power generating losses will be minimal, the ecosystem and economic gains will be significant.

Comment Author	Thomas, Kurt
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1018_037-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_559

From: P.THOMAS@SBCGLOBAL.NET[SMTP:P.THOMAS@SBCGLOBAL.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 4:55:44 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: KLAMATH DAMS
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: PETE THOMAS
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: KLAMATH DAMS

Body: TEAR DOWN THE DAMS THAT PREVENT SALMON FROM GOING UPSTREAM TO SPAWN

Comment Author	Thomas, Pete
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_559-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1205_967

From: kitacoastron@charter.net[SMTP:KITACOASTRON@CHARTER.NET]
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2011 9:38:59 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Ronald Thompson
Organization: self& various

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath Dams

Body: Greetings, This is another case of hedonism vs. altruism related to an environmental issue. Go with altruism, restore those fish runs, restore the great bird habitats that used to be in the upper Klamath Basin, restore the great forests. If our country is to survive a thousand years (human kind too) than we had better take care of what we received. Along the way, future generations will be enjoying what glories the Klamath watershed has to offer.

Comment Author	Thompson, Ronald
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 05, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1205_967-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_525

From: gregthorndike@hotmail.com[SMTP:GREGTHORNDIKE@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 2:58:08 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Full Dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Greg Thorndike
Organization:

Subject: Full Dam removal

Body: Remove the dam bring back the steel head population

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Thorndike, Greg
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_525-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1116_702

From: Clean Air ~ Pure Water[SMTP:AIR-WATER@CHARTER.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 5:57:49 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Should the Klamath Dams be removed? No.
Importance: High
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Klamath River Thoughts

Copco Lake : 2008
Published: November 15, 2011, 3:39 pm
Lead Author: Lenny Thyme

Comment 1 - Alternatives

There has been a lot of recent news about the water situation in Northern California. The item that has piqued my specific interest is the algae problems at Copco Lake and the proposed solution to remove of the dam that creates the lake. Our modern science seems to believe that attacking the issue, by poisoning the lake and deconstructing the dam is the solution to the problems, but I disagree and see an opportunity here.

In the case of the algae at Copco Lake, using chemicals to change the composition of the lake seems to beg the problem. At a time when we are searching for reasonable alternatives to fossil fuels, this lake would appear to be an opportunity to investigate using algae as the basis of a bio-fuel industry that uses material that is not in the currently in the cycle. By setting up an aquatic weeds to fuel investigation at Copco, California would take the lead in pursuing economic value out of a semi-worthless material. Algae blooms rapidly and has rapid growth under the proper conditions when nutrients are available. I believe this is the proper basis for a growth industry. Other terrestrial weeds such as scotch broom and gorse could also contribute to the waste to energy agenda – providing biological alternatives to fossil fuels that do not come from the food supply.

Comment 2 - Sediment Toxicity

As to dam removal – this simple idea is somewhat naïve in a practical sense. This particular dam holds back silt layers that have been accumulated since the time of construction. It is my understanding that copper compounds have been added to Copco Lake for the past ten years to poison the algae. As copper is an aquatic toxin, the release of copper sediments would have a chilling effect – it would poison the downstream aquatic community. If there is a plan to recover this material and reformulate it as a soil additive, an organic fertilizer to enhance topsoil, then dam removal might be workable, because copper sequestered into soils is not toxic to terrestrial life.

Comment 3 - Fish

Another complication of dam removal is that the flow of this material will bury redds and saturate refugia sites – doing irreparable damage to the fish species that people are trying to encourage. It would bury the interstices between rocks and streambeds that macro-invertebrates use as their homes – removing a primary food source of the fish. Rather than removing dams, designing better forms of fish passage, by breeching the dams with sacred geometry flow form fish ladder could provide migration access in a much more fish friendly manner.

Streams also can produce a lot of algae when water temperature elevate and flows become stagnant. A rivers-for-energy initiative that develops the algae as an organic fertilizer would be a strong investment in the future from a point of view of earth stewardship. By looking at the world through a combination of science and spirit should allow us to develop scalar and sacred geometry techniques that complement existing biological process, rather than attacking it. We are ready to develop demonstration model systems to prove the effectiveness of this harmonic natural community philosophy.

Dr. Lenny Thyme, PhD
Natural Resource Scientist

Comment Author	Thyme, Lenny
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_702-1	Appendix A of the Draft EIS/EIR includes a wide range of alternatives representing diverse viewpoints and needs based on internal and public scoping. The alternatives that moved forward for more detailed analysis in this EIS/EIR are those that best meet the NEPA purpose and need and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, are feasible, and represent a range of reasonable alternatives (see Appendix A for more information). The NEPA purpose and need and CEQA objectives are broader than addressing algae concerns in Copco Lake (see Section 1.4.2 on p. 1-29 of the Draft EIS/EIR). Converting algae to fuel would not be able to accomplish the purpose and need/objectives. These alternatives would not restore a free-flowing river, achieve full volitional fish passage, establish reliable water and power supplies, contribute to public welfare and sustainability of communities, or be consistent with the goals and objectives of the KHSA and KBRA.	No
GP_EM_1116_702-2	Master Response WQ-1 A and D Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants. Additionally, PacifiCorp confirmed that they have never applied any algaecide to Copco 1 Reservoir (L. Prendergast, PacifiCorp, written communication, January 19, 2012). They did conduct laboratory bench tests on algaecide applications using water from Copco 1 Reservoir. Results of this study are available for download at the following link: http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Hydro/Hydro_Licensing/Klamath_River/2008AlgaecidePilotStudy.pdf The KHSA Implementation Report June 2011, pg 21, indicates that algaecide testing is one of the proposed Interim Measure 11 improvements. http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Hydro/Hydro_Licensing/Klamath_River/2011_KHSA_Implementation_Report_June_2011.pdf Further, copper was analyzed in all of the Secretarial Determination sediment investigations. The copper levels found in sediment, fish tissues, and studies for elutriate and bioaccumulation, from J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, and Iron Gate reservoirs were below values that would indicate an unacceptable level of concern for effects on human health or aquatic biota either in the reservoirs under current conditions (including Copco 1) or in downstream reaches of the Klamath River under the Proposed Action (p. 3.2-71 to 3.2.76 for Alternative 1, p. 3.2-118 to 3.2.125 for Alternative 2, p. 3.2-132 to 3.2.134 for Alternative 3, p. 3.2-135 to 3.2.136 for Alternative 4, and p. 3.2-146 to 3.2.147 for Alternative 5). Based on the results of these evaluations, copper recovery from the sediments would not be necessary.	No

Comment Author	Thyme, Lenny
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_702-3	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-20 Bedload Sediment and Fish Habitat. The Proposed Action would have significant short-term effects for macroinvertebrates; based on substantial reduction in the abundance of a year class. Effects in the long term would be beneficial based on increased habitat availability and improved habitat quality (EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3). While a large proportion of macroinvertebrate populations in the Hydroelectric Reach and in the mainstem Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam would be affected in the short term by the Proposed Action, their populations would be expected to recover quickly because of the many sources for recolonization and their rapid dispersion through drift or aerial movement of adults. Dam removal would increase connectivity between Upper Klamath Basin and the Hydroelectric Reach and would create additional riverine habitat within the Hydroelectric Reach.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Speaker Card

Please fill out this card and hand it to someone with a name tag if you would like to make a verbal comment of up to three minutes. Your verbal comments will be recorded by a court reporter. All recorded verbal comments, along with written comments, received by November 21, 2011, will become part of the official record. Verbal and written comments are weighted equally. To submit written comments, see reverse side of this card.

Name (please print) Stephanie Tidwell

Representing

Notes: The age of dams has passed. To save our salmon & clean water, we must remove the Klamath dams.

*Please read the speaker guidelines on the back side of this card

31

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

GP_MF_1019_106

Comment Author	Tidwell, Stephanie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_106-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_344

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

Stephanie Tidwell

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name:

Organization:

Title:

Address:

Email:

Comments: We could argue the values of dams for the rest of our lives, & we'd probably still find plenty of room to disagree. Fortunately, the point of this process is to decide what to do w/ a series of outdated dams that are in clear violation of multiple enviro laws. The Klamath dams are ruining water quality, threatening ~~fish populations~~ public health, and frankly destroying ~~one of~~ what was once one of the West's most important salmon runs. They have to go. Retrofitting them to bring them in compliance w/ the CWA & the ESA is impractical. They're old, they're crumbling, they need to come down. While I personally don't think the KBRA that the preferred alternative tries to goes far enough to protect & restore the Klamath's fish & waters (or protect the Klamath refuges), I've often heard it said that a good negotiation is one where no one goes away happy but everyone can

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment 1 cont.

live w/ it. That appears to be the case here.

Removing the Klamath dams & restoring the Klamath will also provide desperately needed regional jobs, and the KBRA does a good job (perhaps too good of a job) of ~~providing~~ meeting agricultural needs.

It's time for us to stop arguing about what simply must happen so that we can get the jobs done

Please place first class postage here

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Comment Author	Tidwell, Stephanie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_344-1	Comment Noted. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1228_1185

From: Hallton247@gmail.com[SMTP:HALLTON247@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2011 11:22:34 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Remove the dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Keith Tom
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Remove the dams

Body: Restore the Klamath River Basin and remove the dams for the good of the salmon.

Comment Author	Tom, Keith
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1228_1185-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_109

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---
STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. VIRGINIA TOPHAM: My name is Virginia

Topham, T-o-p-h-a-m.

Comment 1 - NEPA

I have read the executive summary. How come

it is written using such ambiguous language? How is the

word, "could," which is continually overused, to be

interpreted? As far as I'm concerned, it's a political

ploy with the fieldwork keyed to fit the politics. I see

nothing but junk science.

Comment 2 - NEPA

We are extremely disappointed we have only a

short time frame to review the entire document, which is

large and cumbersome.

Comment 3 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I am for Alternative 1, no action, no project.

I'll probably submit a written statement, too.

Comment Author	Tophma, Virginia
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_109-1	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
	Master Response N/CP-5 Use of "Would" and "Could."	
GP_MC_1018_109-2	Master Response N/CP-12 Public Comment.	No
GP_MC_1018_109-3	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_112

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter

MS. VIRGINIA TOPHAM: Thank you for this opportunity.

My name is Virginia Topham, T-o-p-h-a-m. My family owns and operates the Flying T Ranch in the Sprague River Valley.

Comment 1 - NEPA

I have read the executive summary. How come it is written using such ambiguous language? How is the word "could", which is continually overused to be interpreted?

Comment 2 - KHSA

As far as I can see this is all a political ploy with the fieldwork keyed to fit the desired outcome of complete dam removal. It see nothing but junk science.

Comment 3 - NEPA

We are extremely disappointed that we have only a short timeframe to review the entire document which is large and cumbersome.

Comment 4 - Economics

The document fails to mention the job losses and loss of livelihood to off project users, loss of habitat to wildlife, devaluation of real estate and loss of tax base to Klamath County. The real impact on humans has been swept under the rug.

Comment 5 - Terrestrial Wildlife

Comment 6 - Real Estate

Comment 7 - Economics

Comment 8 - Hydropower

This is not the time to remove hydroelectric

power. I'm for Alternative 1, no action, no project.

Comment 9 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Thank you.

Comment Author	Topham, Virginia
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_112-1	Master Response N/CP-5 Use of "Would" and "Could."	No
GP_MC_1018_112-2	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose of Dam Removal.	
GP_MC_1018_112-3	Master Response N/CP-12 Public Comment.	No
GP_MC_1018_112-4	Economic impacts on off project water users are discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR on p. 3.15-71-75. The analysis used the best information available at the time of the study. It's recognized that for purposes of CEQA, relevant parts of the KBRA analysis are programmatic, as described in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. This decision was made because many of its component elements have not been specified to a degree where the associated impacts would be reasonably foreseeable for purposes of this environmental analysis. The parties recognize that future project-specific analysis may be required for various components of the KBRA as they become more clearly defined and if an affirmative public approval is identified. A program-level document is appropriate when a project consists of a series of smaller projects or phases that may be implemented separately. Under the programmatic EIR approach, future projects or phases may require additional, project-specific environmental analysis.	No
GP_MC_1018_112-5	Master Response TERR-2 Reservoir Habitat.	No
GP_MC_1018_112-6	Master Response RE-1E Real Estate Evaluation Report.	No
	Master Response RE-2 Changes in Property Values.	
GP_MC_1018_112-7	Draft EIS/EIR p. 3.15-64 discusses the effects of reduced PacifiCorp property tax payments to Klamath County under the Proposed Action. Oregon law (State Wildlife Fund Section 496.340) requires the State to pay the current assessed value on transferred lands. The State Department of Revenue can review and revise assessed values if it is determined substantially incorrect. If Klamath County receives in-lieu payments of equal value to PacifiCorp property tax payment, there would be no net effect to county revenues under the Proposed Action relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative. As discussed on Draft EIS/EIR p. 3.15-20 and in the Dam Removal Real Estate Evaluation Report (BRI 2011), there are no private properties with views of J.C. Boyle Reservoir; therefore, private property land values at J.C. Boyle Reservoir would not be affected by the	No

Comment Author	Topham, Virginia
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Proposed Action and alternatives. Thus, there would be no changes to property tax revenues to Klamath County from changing property values.	
GP_MC_1018_112-8	Comment noted.	No
	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	
GP_MC_1018_112-9	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1020_285

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Sarah Torres

Organization:

Title:

Address: p.o. box 5964 Eka CA 95502

Email:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comments: I support alternative 2. Save our future!

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Tores, Sara
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1020_285-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1117_757

From: ttoretta@bak.rr.com[SMTP:TTORETTA@BAK.RR.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 8:42:15 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River Alternative 2 Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: tom toretta
Organization:

Subject: Klamath River Alternative 2

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I am in support of Alternative 2 for removal of the Klamath River dams.

Comment Author	Toretta, Tom
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1117_757-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1121_833

From: Leslie[SMTP:PACTG@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 11:53:26 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Dam Removals
Auto forwarded by a Rule

To the Bureau of Reclamation:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I am writing to request that the dams that are scheduled for removal on the Klamath river, 3 in California and one in Oregon **NOT** be removed. I present the following facts.

Thank you for your time
Leslie Tozzini

Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800

WATER QUALITY

Challenge:

How will taking out dams improve water quality?

Klamath is naturally warm and polluted up stream

* Area of headwaters is volcanic and rich in minerals, including basalt, magnesium and phosphorus

* System of four dams filters out the minerals and allows the water to cool

POLLUTING SEDIMENTS from BREACH

Challenge:

How will the release of toxic sediment into the river ecosystem, caused by the breaching of the dams, be mitigated?

* Years of built up, toxic sediment will be released

* Toxic sediment will pollute water, banks, riparian plant life, fish and underground acquifers

* Toxicity of river and acquifers may last 100 years or more

GREEN and AFFORDABLE ENERGY

Challenge:

How will the green, affordable energy currently provided by the four, hydroelectric dams be replaced?

Duplicate cont.

* Existing four dams provide hydroelectric power

* Hydroelectric power is both green and economical

* Current system provides enough electricity to power 70,000 homes

STAKEHOLDERS

Challenge:

How were "stakeholders" determined?

* 40,000 Siskiyou County residents and their local, elected representatives were not included in the Klamath River Dam removal meetings

* Four tribes exist in the Klamath Basin - the Shasta, Karuk, Yurok, and Hupa; the Shasta have been left out of all agreements and their sacred burial grounds will be destroyed when the dams are breached

PROTECTING NON-NATIVE FISH

Challenge:

A major impetus for dam removal is concern over the Coho salmon, a non-native species to the Klamath River; why?

* Coho salmon are not native to the Klamath and were planted in the river in the late 1800's

* Coho are not natural to the Klamath and yet millions of fish produced at the Iron Gate fish hatchery are not included in the river population because they are not considered natural

* Coho typically spawn within 30 miles of the ocean; first dam on the Klamath is 187 miles upstream

Comment Author	Tozzini, Leslie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded - GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_EM_1118_800 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_833-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1104_357

From: Leslie[SMTP:PACTG@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 1:10:32 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Klamath river dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Ms. Vasquez,

We are writing to you to urge your department to cancel any plans to destroy the dams on the Klamath river in California and Oregon. You will be destroying the entire communities of ranchers and farmers that have no other source of irrigation, to restore a fish population (coho salmon) that was never native to this river. The current operating fish hatchery on the Klamath releases 6,000,000,000 salmon and steelhead fingerlings a year and that facility will also be destroyed with the destruction of the dams. The government has not presented any plans to replace the hydroelectric power that is created by these dams or plans to replace the hatchery of salmon and steelhead. Siskiyou county has published alternate plans to removing the dams that have not been taken into account by the Dept. of the Interior. Please look at all alternatives and SAVE the DAMS!

Sincerely
Doug & Leslie Tozzini
concerned citizens

Comment Author	Tozzini, Leslie & Doug
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 04, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1104_357-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response AQU-4 Coho are Native. Master Response HYDP-1 Reservoir Water Rights. Master Response HYDP-2 Power Production at the Four Facilities. The comment author is not correct in saying Iron Gate Hatchery releases six billion salmon and steelhead. Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) was built solely to mitigate for the loss of 16 miles of spawning and rearing habitat between Copco 2 Dam and Iron Gate Dam (IGD) resulting from the construction of IGD. IGH was completed in 1966. A US Supreme Court decision established hatchery production goals for Chinook and Coho salmon as well as steelhead. These production goals require IGH to annually release 4.9 million smolt and 1.08 million yearling Chinook salmon, 75,000 yearling Coho salmon and 200,000 yearling steelhead trout. Although PacifiCorp (PC) currently provides 100 percent of the funding for hatchery's operations, it is operated by the California Department of Fish and Game. In contrast, the restoration of fish passage for anadromous fish to historical habitat under Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 would provide for additional fish production from at least 420 miles (675.92 km) of currently inaccessible habitat. Future management of the IGH is considered a part of the KHSA. Under the No Action / No Project Alternative (Alternative 1), IGH will continue to operate at current levels of production to meet mitigation requirements and PC will continue to fund 100% of operational costs. Under Alternatives 2 and 3 (dam removal alternatives), removal of IGD would require the elimination of the water supply pipe from the penstock intake structure to the fish hatchery and the fish handling facilities at the base of the dam, but IGH would remain in place. Within six months of a Negative Determination by the Secretary of the Interior, PC would propose a post IGD Mitigation Hatchery Plan that would ensure hatchery mitigation goals are met for eight years following dam removal (Interim Measure [IM] 19 of the KHSA). Under IM 20 of the KHSA, PC would also be required to provide funding to IGH or "other hatcheries necessary" to meet current mitigation requirements for eight years after dam removal. Hatchery goals would focus on Chinook salmon production, with consideration for steelhead trout	No

Comment Author	Tozzini, Leslie & Doug
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 04, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	and Coho salmon, and may be adjusted downward from current mitigation requirements by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA Fisheries), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in consultation with other Klamath River fish managers, in response to monitoring trends. After eight years, continued hatchery operations would depend largely on: 1) realized and projected benefits of restored access to additional habitat above the current location of IGD; 2) the success of habitat restoration efforts through the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA); and, 3) the reintroduction program identified in the KBRA. Due to this uncertainty, CDFG, in consultation with NOAA Fisheries, USFWS, and other Klamath River fish managers would evaluate the need to continue hatchery operations to support the upper basin salmon reintroduction program or convert the purpose to conservation and/or production. Funding for continued hatchery operations would need to be identified. Under Alternative 4 (fish passage at 4 dams), PC would continue to fund hatchery operations necessary to meet mitigation requirements. Under Alternative 5 (IGD and Copco 1 dam removal and fish passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2), PC would continue to fund operating IGH to meet current mitigation requirements until IGD is removed, after which time the disposition of the hatchery would be determined.	

GP_EM_1116_703

From: jtrabucco[SMTP:JTRABUCCO@SISQTEL.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 5:52:50 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Keep the dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I would like to urge you very strongly to keep our Dams. The people have spoken by ballot and at public forums stating that removing the Dams is a huge, costly mistake. Along with all the fraudulent so called studies. You will kill everything that you are suppose to be saving. Fish, birds, animals, small businesses, home values and peoples personal lives. We will not have a sustained water supply and flooding would wipe out some of our small towns. We have clean energy NOW! why spend millions of dollars to “Fix” something that isnt broke that benefits everyone, man and beast.

Joan and Dan Trabucco, resident Scott Bar California

Comment Author	Trabucco, Joan & Dan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_703-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN 3 Best Available Information. Master Response HYDG 1 Flood Protection. Master Response GHG 1 Green Power.	No

GP_MC_1020_193

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. JACK TROUT: Good evening, my name is Jack

Trout, J-a-c-k, T-r-o-u-t.

Comment 1 - Algae

I've been a guide on the Klamath River for

18 years. I spend the majority of my May, June on the

Klamath; and then I return to the river in October; and

guide there through the fall months.

I have left the river now in the summer months

because the river has become extremely unhealthy. The

river, when the river gets really, really hot in the

summer months I call it a stew. It just, it blooms these

huge algae, blue green algae, blooms in the river.

I can't even fish people on the river. The

blooms have got so bad the river smells. A lot of you

folks see the river when it's fishing good, sure, spring

and fall after we've had some rain and precipitation. But

this river is suffering from June, July and September.

Comment 2 - Fish

The river is not healthy; and this is what has caused the

salmon kill that we had in the year 2002.

The river has still not recovered since that

kill. And I might add that because the river is so -- the

gravel, the gravel doesn't move, people. The salmon, it

is like trying to make love on Interstate 5, you just

can't do it, okay.

I have to add if I got stuck in Oroville,

Redding or Hornbrook, California and was denied springs

and colder water I would be depressed and declining, too.

Okay, so we need to find some alternative to get

these salmon back in the river because they were there,

they were there all along.

I would like to know the guy that is still alive

from 1905 that is saying that the river dried up

completely. There was no one alive then or right now,

they are not alive.

The other thing that I might mention is, hold on

here, let's take the two drainages. Let's take the

Trinity River, and let's take the Klamath River, and let's

compare them.

Look at the gorges, how you're climbing,

climbing, climbing. You get to Ishy Pishy Falls, you get

clear past the gorge; then you continue on, you're still

climbing. And you finally reach that place, just perfect

for spawning, right? That place on the Trinity is Big

Barn and Junction City.

That's where it starts. You have got 40 miles

of the best love-making gravel until you get to Lewiston

Dam.

When you finally get to the top to where it is

perfect to make love and spawn as a salmon, you got five

miles and then you got Iron Gate Dam. And that is exactly

why our salmon are declining in numbers. It's because of

Iron Gate Dam --

Comment Author	Trout, Jack
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_193-1	As described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.2.3 (p. 3.2-13 to 3.2-14), water quality in the Klamath River is impaired for several water quality parameters and does not fully support designated beneficial uses during summer months. Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements.	No
GP_MC_1020_193-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of the Record. The EIS/EIR notes that fish problems in the Klamath Basin are caused by many factors and likely will not be solved by just removing dams. As a result, the Proposed Action includes the KHSA and KBRA. In broad terms, the KHSA speaks to removal of hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River; the KBRA speaks to the settlement of long-running disputes concerning the use of Klamath Basin water for irrigation, fish and wildlife. Combined, both agreements seek to advance the restoration of salmonids in the Klamath Basin. The central issue in both agreements is removal of the 4 Klamath River hydroelectric dams. The EIS/EIR describes and analyzes 4 Action Alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative (Alternative 1). Alternatives 2 and 3 implement the KBRA and KSHA, including complete or partial dam removal. Alternatives 1, 4 and 5 do not implement the KBRA and KHSA and do not remove the dams. The Secretary may select the No Action/No Project Alternative one of the action alternatives or a combination of alternatives. Effects on fish of dam removal (Alternatives 2 and 3) and not removing dams (Alternatives 1, 4 and 5) are addressed in Section 3.3.4.3 Effects Determinations, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Master Response AQU – 19 Chinook Expert Panel Proposed Action Better Than No Action. Master Response AQU – 16 Benefits to Coho. Master Response AQU – 21 NRC Dam Removal Help Coho. Master Response AQU – 25 Habitat Upstream of Iron Gate. River channel habitat within the reservoir reaches would be low gradient habitat of critical importance for spawning and rearing for salmon, steelhead, redband trout, and Pacific lamprey. The upstream half of the J.C. Boyle Reservoir is shallow and considered low gradient (FERC 2007, p 3-185). FERC also considered the Copco No. 2 bypassed reach and reaches	No

Comment Author	Trout, Jack
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	inundated by Iron Gate and Copco reservoirs to be low gradient. For these reaches, they estimated that the density of Chinook salmon spawners per mile for mainstem habitat was twice that of high gradient habitat (FERC 2007; p 3-315). These river channels would likely excavate to their pre-dam elevations within a Klamath few months, and revert to and maintain a pool-riffle morphology due to restoration of riverine processes, creating holding and rearing habitat for anadromous salmonids. Master Response AQU – 31 Thermal Lag and Diel Temperatures.	

GP_LT_1110_474

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

152 Copy 11/9 mj

November 7, 2011

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Dear Ms. Vasquez:

I am AGAINST Klamath dam removal.

Comment 2 - Water Rights/Supply

Dam removal does not produce any additional water. It only takes water away from irrigated agriculture and gives it to fish. PEOPLE are more important than fish; not to mention people's livelihoods.

Comment 3 - NEPA

This entire process, supported and funded by the Dept. of Interior, mirrors the corrupt, biased and illegal process used in the San Joaquin Valley, shutting down hundreds of thousands of acres of the most productive farm land in the United States. The exact tactics used there are again being used here in the Klamath River Basin. Flagrantly biased, non-peer reviewed, so called "best available science," paid for by stakeholders in the dam removal and KBRA effort is being used by Secretary Salazar to justify moving ahead on dam removal. Again, this process is being repeated here in the Klamath River Basin.

Using known biased, faulty so-called "best available science" such as the Stillwater Report and the economic study compiled by David Gallo, is at least highly inappropriate and at worst, illegal. The Stillwater Report was funded by American Rivers. David Gallo's study was paid for by Cal Trout and Prosper. These groups and or their Directors are signatories to both the KHSA and KBRA. Nothing like being TRANSPARENT!

Using River Design as the lead in modeling and consulting aspects in the so-called "science" seems to follow the government direction of using those with a proven track record of failure in their field. River Design provided modeling and consulting in both recent dam removal projects on the Rogue River. Both projects have a lot of OOPS resulting from dam removal. The Rogue River is a very clean river system compared to the Klamath River. Any type of OOPS in the Klamath Dam Removal will result in an environmental disaster of epic proportions.

Comment 4 - Water Quality

Secretary Salazar's report is ignoring his own "expert panel" of six that stated in their June 16, 2011 report that the entire dam removal and restorations could boost salmon population in parts of the upper basin by 10%, only if all other water quality problems were solved first. Solving all the water quality problems would require reversing "mother nature's" naturally occurring phosphorus that is prevalent in the e ntire upper basin. This panel also recognized that fish would still have to be t

-2-

Comment 4 cont.

trucked around Keno dam and Keno reservoir. One of the experts, Wim Kimmerer, an environmental research professor from San Francisco State, went as far as to say "I think there is no way in hell that they are going to solve the basin's water quality problems." Wim Kimmerer also stated, "It doesn't seem to me like they've thought about the big picture very much." This same panel said this entire process amounts to a huge "experiment."

The cost of dam removal will be extremely expensive. Since rate payers will be paying for this cost, this will cause a large cost increase on electricity to rate payers, including home owners and elderly. I am very concerned about how the rate payers and tax payers are going to afford this increase in electricity costs, especially at a time when many have lost their jobs and prices at the grocery store and fuel prices continue to escalate. And lost jobs will create a further burden on the unemployment compensation fund already stressed by mega job losses. The actual cost of dam removal is largely believed to be in excess of $3 billion and we will be the ones to pay the price!!!

It is unclear who will be liable for the removal of the dams. If the Federal Government is going to incur the liability, then this cost, which will be huge, will be passed on to tax payers. Tax payers are already facing the daunting burden of repaying the national debt.

Comment 5 - Costs

WHEN IS THE GOVERNMENT GOING TO STOP SPENDING TAX DOLLARS THEY DO NOT HAVE?

Morgan Bradshaw
[illegible] Eastside Rd
Fall Brook, CA 96032

Comment Author	Troutman, M.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1110_474-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_LT_1110_474-2	Because the Four Facilities do not provide water supply for municipal and agricultural use, removal would not directly affect agricultural or municipal water supply. Master Response WSWR-4 Summary of Effects to Water Supply/Water Rights for Alternatives 2 and Alternative 3 for Municipal, Agricultural, and Tribal Use.	No
GP_LT_1110_474-3	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
GP_LT_1110_474-4	Concern #1: Secretary Salazar's report is ignoring his own "expert panel" of six that stated in their June 16, 2011 report that the entire dam removal and restorations could boost salmon population in parts of the upper basin by 10%, only if all other water quality problems were solved first. Response #1: The Draft EIS/EIR has been developed in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to analyze the potential impacts to the environment from removing four PacifiCorp Dams (J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate) on the Klamath River under the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA). The Draft EIS/EIR is not "Secretary Salazar's report". The parallel Klamath River Secretarial Determination process is developing a separate report entitled the "Klamath Dam Removal Overview Report for the Secretary of the Interior: An Assessment of Science and Technical Information". The latter report will be available for public review in winter/spring 2012. Master Response AQU – 17 Expert Panel Second Line of Analysis, Not the only line of Evidence. Master Response WQ-4D Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. Concern #2: Solving all the water quality problems would require reversing "mother nature's" naturally occurring phosphorus that is prevalent in the entire upper basin. Response #2: Master Response WQ-5 Upper Basin Geology and Land Use Implications for Water Quality.	No

Comment Author	Troutman, M.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Dam removal and KBRA implementation would not solve “all the water quality problems” in the Klamath Basin; however, their implementation would significantly improve multiple impaired beneficial uses in the Klamath River, including (very broadly) water supply, recreational use, cultural use, shellfish and support of fisheries for Coho salmon, as well as Chinook salmon, steelhead, and several other fish species (see Draft EIS/EIR Table 3.2-2, p. 3.2-4 to 3.26 for a listing of designated beneficial uses in the Klamath Basin). With respect to dam removal, Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. Concern #3: This panel also recognized that fish would still have to be trucked around Keno dam and Keno Impoundment/Lake Ewauna. Response #3: Master Response AQU-34A Trap and Haul/Keno Water Quality. Concern #4: One of the experts, Wim Kimmerer, an environmental research professor from San Francisco State, went as far as to say "I think there is no way in hell that they are going to solve the basin’s water quality problems." Wim Kimmerer also stated, "It doesn’t seem to me like they’ve thought about the big picture very much." This same panel said this entire process amounts to a huge "experiment". Response #4: Presumably this concern is in regards to the Chinook salmon expert panel report (Goodman et al. 2011), of which Wim Kimmerer was a member. We have no record of Dr. Kimmerer stating, "It doesn’t seem to me like they’ve thought about the big picture very much.” Thus, we cannot respond to this claim. There is also no record of the Panel saying that the process amounts to a huge “experiment”. However, the Panel (Goodman et al. 2011) did specify in their report that based on the Panel’s collective experience with other large-scale restoration programs, they were concerned with the implementation of KBRA and its ability to evolve and cope with uncertainty. The panel suggested that the following may help in the successful evolution of a large program such as KBRA: “[Establishment of] a governance structure for the overall program...that includes a science program with a strong Lead Scientist. The science program must be integrated with the rehabilitation program, and should be tasked and adequately funded to implement programs for modeling, monitoring, data management, analysis, assessment, and reporting.” The panel then noted that “the KBRA documents indicate a budget for science on the order of $100 million, which	

Comment Author	Troutman, M.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	seems adequate provided it is allocated and prioritized according to the needs of a strong science program as outlined above."	
GP_LT_1110_474-5	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate. Master Response COST-3 Cost of Power Surcharge.	No

GP_LT_1018_341

Information for Klamath Dam Removal Hearing
October 20, 2011 in Yreka

Prepared by Craig Tucker

Background

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed removal of the lower four Klamath Dams is available for public review. This week and next, Department of Interior will be holding meetings around the basin to solicit public input.

These public meetings are important for two reasons. First, the Agreements call on the Secretary of Interior to make a 'public interest determination' on the proposal in March, pending congressional authorization. This determination will be based largely on the Final EIS will include all public comments. We need to make sure there are as many pro-dam removal voices as con. Secondly, these events will garner widespread media attention. We cannot let the anti-agreement voices dominate the media which will in turn influence the congressional debate.

What's in the DEIS?

The DEIS describes major benefits associated with dam removal:

- an 81% increase in fall Chinook returns
- and end to blooms of toxic algae
- power customers will have lower rates than they would if dams were relicensed
- dam removal and restoration projects would create 6,000 jobs over next 15 years

The study also finds that dam removal will cost as little as $246 million – much lower than the $450 million price cap described by agreements. This means that dam removal is much cheaper than originally thought.

A link to a more extensive summary of DEIS is on front page of www.klamathrestoration.org

Our message

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Given that the DEIS is overwhelmingly positive for dam removal and the current national focus is on the economy, we want to emphasize the economic benefits of dam removal. Our slogan, which will be on banners and t-shirts, will read: Un-Dam the Klamath: Let the jobs flow!

Note there are two audiences we are addressing: the media and the Department of Interior. Staff will develope detailed technical comments for the DEIS. For the purposes of the public event we urge the council, staff, and activists to focus calling for dam removal as soon as possible and touting the economic benefits.

Public Comment

We will urge council, staff, tribal members, and non-tribal supporters to take advantage of the 3-minute opportunity for public comments. Below I provide a good outline for a good 3 minute comment followed by some potential scripts for comments.

Example Comments

Tribal Perspective

My name is _____. Thank you for being here today and taking comments on something so important. I support dam removal and the Restoration Agreement. The Karuk Tribe has depended on and cared for the salmon here for time immemorial. For us, these dams are weapons of genocide and cultural destruction. Toxic algae blooms and a lack of salmon affects our health, our religion, and our economic opportunities. We urge the Secretary to move as quickly as possible to remove the dams and restore our river. Thank you.

My name is _____. Thank you for this opportunity to weigh in on such an important issue. I whole heartedly support removing these dams and implementing the Restoration Agreement. For too long Tribes and Project Irrigators have fought over water in this basin. Finally we have an opportunity to settle the dispute. Many of the voices that oppose this agreement don't have their water, their culture, or their fishery at stake. Those who do – the Karuk Tribe and Klamath Project Irrigators – have reached a compromise. Its time we take out the dams and balance water use in the Basin so all our communities can survive.

My Name is _____. Thanks for taking comment on this issue. I support dam removal and the Restoration Agreements. I grew up on the River and I remember fishing/ceremonies/ smoking fish. Today – its hard for me to get any fish which means I'm losing my culture – who I am is at stake. Its time to remove dams and put this river back together.

Outdoorsman Perspective

My name is _____. Thank you for being here today and taking comments on something so important. I support dam removal and the KBRA. Having healthy fish runs will make for strong commercial and sport fishing businesses which will bring jobs and economic activity to the Basin. We all like to fish, hunt and enjoy this region – that's why we call it home. With the KBRA we will be able to restore the river and the wetlands to their potential, improve sport and commercial fishing, and ensure that the Basin is a place our grandchildren want to live, fish, and hunt. Thank you.

Jobs/Business Perspective

Good Evening I'm _____. Thank you for taking comment this evening. Some here say the KBRA is about fish. Some say it is about dams. Some say it is about a dam scam. That's not what this is about. The KBRA is about JOBS. The unemployment rate in Klamath County is over 12%. In Northern California it's even worse. Unlike the rest of the country who entered the recession in 2008, we have been in one for decades. It's time to turn that around and the KBRA will help us do that. By restoring habitat we will create hundreds of jobs and attract tourists and others to the region. The KBRA protects an economic powerhouse in our region – agriculture, and will make us a better place to do business. It just makes sense. If you protect an industry that pumps millions into your regional economy each year and create new opportunities, you automatically become a place where people want to do business. The KBRA is about jobs and I urge you to support moving this project forward.

Electric Customer:

I am _____. Thank you for letting me speak this evening. As a resident of the Klamath Basin, I support the KBRA because I believe it is the responsible path forward given the choices PacificCorp faces with relicensing. We can either pay more to retrofit the dams with fish ladders, or we can remove them, cap our liability as rate payers and restore critical fish habitat in the Basin. The fact is, energy costs are going to rise in the future, but costs to customers will be less under the KBRA than if PacifiCorp must pay to make these dams operational today. I know these agreements are controversial, but as a ratepayer in the region I urge you to support this plan. It gives us the most protection in the future.

Comment Author	Tucker, Craig
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1018_341-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1117_755

From: zackayak@gmail.com[SMTP:ZACKAYAK@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 6:55:48 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Remove Klamath Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Zachary Turner
Organization:

Subject: Remove Klamath Dams

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Please un-dam the Klamath river, to restore the eco-system, and the river economy.

Sincerely,
Zachary Turner

Comment Author	Turner, Zachary
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1117_755-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1103_372

----- Forwarded by Matt Baun/R8/FWS/DOI on 11/03/2011 03:27 PM -----

kneander1@gmail.com

11/03/2011 09:11 AM

To matt_baun@fws.gov
cc
Subject Web Inquiry: I support Alternative Two

Subject: I support Alternative Two

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Please take these damns out!

From: kneander1@gmail.com
Phone: 7072675423

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 3, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1103_372-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

GP_EM_1117_1078

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 9:13:53 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: (no subject)
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> <Mlproadrunner3@aol.com> 11/17/2011 1:23 PM >>>
Leave the Klamath Dams alone!

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_1078-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	**No**

GP_EM_1117_745

From: Mlproadrunner3@aol.com[SMTP:MLPROADRUNNER3@AOL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 2:23:07 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: (no subject)
Auto forwarded by a Rule
Leave the Klamath Dams alone!

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_745-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

GP_EM_1117_748

From: pzivot@sonic.net[SMTP:PZIVOT@SONIC.NET]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 2:57:49 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Cc: kathi@g-2.com

Subject: Tearing down the dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I think the plans by the Dept of Interior to tear down all those dams on the Klamath, and also Hetch Hetchy, are a bad idea. It seems to be over reach by Interior at the behest of environmentalists and fishermen.
Aren't there ways to help the salmon without tearing down dams? Given the negative impacts of destroying the dams, I think there should be more negotiations with all the parties affected before such a drastic move is put into effect.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_748-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1120_805

From: dyfan1@comcast.net[SMTP:DYFAN1@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2011 8:03:41 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: STOP DAM REMOVAL ON THE KLAMATH
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Please STOP THE REMOVAL OF THESE DAMS!

One in southern Oregon; the other three in northern California.

Allegedly, it is to save the Coho salmon. According to people in the area, dam removal will wipe out clean, affordable, electrical power to 70,000 homes, release tons of sediment from behind the dams and make the river less reliable for irrigation; the river will be a mere stream in the summer, a flood threat in the spring, and toxic.

Already government policies have removed miners and loggers from the area; now the target is ranchers and farmers. One reason California is in such bad shape economically is because of government policies in our rural areas. It's time we stood up and put a stop to any more destruction of our rural communities and their economies.

Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800

Please you will be harming the environment!

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 20, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_EM_1118_800 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1120_805-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

GP_EM_1121_1058

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 10:09:27 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: dam removal klamath river
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> "kbmac1@juno.com" <kbmac1@juno.com> 11/21/2011 10:36 PM >>>
the destruction of dams on the KLamath will ruin Tule lake refuge and the salmon run .The amount of silt alone will destroy water qaulity,not to mention limited flows in dry years! This whole idea is extremly foolish!!and a waste of precious resources

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_1058-1	The dams proposed for removal on the Lower Klamath River are not connected to the water supply for the Tule Lake refuge. Removal of the dams would not affect the refuge's water supply (see EIS/EIR Section 3.6, Flood Hydrology). The temporary impact to water quality from dam removal is recognized in the Draft EIS/EIR, but there would not be a long-term impact.	No

GP_EM_1121_859

From: Canon3rd@aol.com[SMTP:CANON3RD@AOL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 5:48:06 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; KSDcomments@dfg.ca.gov
Subject: Save the Klamath River Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

As both an American Citizen and a California resident, I challenge the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) which allegedly supports the removal of four dams from the Klamath River.

Comment 1 - Water Quality

The removal of the dams is driven by the supposition that it will save the Coho Salmon. What it will do is provide the salmon with an unnaturally warm and polluted breeding environment which may actually result in the elimination of the salmon from that river.

The headwaters of the Klamath river is naturally warm and polluted, for it is volcanic and rich in minerals, including basalt, magnesium and phosphorus. The present system of four dams filters out the minerals, allows the water to cool, and rids the waters of the pollution.

There are two basic questions that the DEIR and DEIS do not address. They are:

1. How will the release of toxic sediment into the river ecosystem, caused by the breaching of the dams, be mitigated, and how will the green, affordable energy currently provided by the four hydroelectric dams be replaced?

2. Why is it that our government intends to severely harm the people of this already economically decimated area where ranchers and farmers already are barely making a living off their land?

Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800

It is time for reason, logic and concern for the needs of the human inhabitants of this nation be included as factors in determining solutions to this nation's environmental concerns. It is obvious that they have been completely ignored in the deliberations resulting in the decision to remove the dams from the Klamath.

Comment 2 - Environmental Justice

Please reconsider and keep the dams intact.

Comment 3 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author Unidentified
Agency/Assoc. General Public
Submittal Date November 21, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment author's submittal coded GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this letter are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to comments provided in this letter that were not also submitted as a part of GP_EM_1118_800 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_859-1	Master Response AQU-16 Benefits to Coho. Master Response AQU-5 Will Benefit All Salmonids. Master Response WQ-1B Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements.	No
GP_EM_1121_859-2	The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes the potential socioeconomic impacts of dam removal, as well as impacts associated with agriculture, population and housing, public health and safety, and Environmental Justice. No final decisions have been made regarding dam removal. The Secretary of the Interior will review the Draft and Final EIS/EIR and the comments received on those documents, as well as the Klamath Dam Removal Overview Report for the Secretary of the Interior (a separate document containing additional technical information), and will then release a Record of Decision (at least 30 days after the public release of the Final EIS/EIR), that will include either an affirmative or Negative Determination on whether or not to remove the four Hydroelectric Facilities on the Klamath River. The Governors of California and Oregon must then concur with this decision to allow dam removal to move forward. The purpose of the Draft EIS/EIR is to disclose the significant environmental effects of implementing the alternatives to decision makers and the public, to help inform the final decision.	No
GP_EM_1121_859-3	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1204_977

From: lindapres@q.com[SMTP:LINDAPRES@Q.COM]
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2011 5:49:13 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Don't remove the dams!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 4, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1204_977-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	**No**

GP_LT_1019_081

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I AM AGAINST DAM REMOVAL

Comment 3 - Hydropower

Since we already are paying for Dam removal on the power bill, does this indicate Dam Removal is a done deal

Comment 2 - KBRA

Why are the Tribes involved? What benefit are they to receive ~~and~~ in ~~why~~? Is it to control the water or ~~is~~ it to money markerters, what do the tribes have to do w/ the dam ~~removal~~ removal

Comment 4 - KBRA

Will the KBRA be allowed to allocate water - they keep talking about "water" Who is paying KBRA big guns,?

Comment 6 - KBRA

Comment 5 - KBRA

How/why does KBRA have such clout - since they are a secret group why do they seem to be running the show.

Comment 7 - Other/General

On I-5 south out of Los Banos, Ca. thousand of acres are totally dead, hours and hours, mile after mile, these once beautiful almond trees and other crops sit vacant - running parrell with I-5 is the Calif. Via-duct - so it isn't a lack of water but a Delta Smelt that has usurped the farmers water and for the devestation, some of the owners are being paid off in cash to keep quite all because of the Endangered fish -does this sound familiar. Klamath B asin might look like this if the Dam removal occurs.

Comment 8 - Fish

If the Dams are removed, a question regarding the massive sediment that would be released - would this be detrimental to the fish that are supposed to be saved?

Comment 9 - Economics

If the Dams are removed, will the jobs KBRA keeps referring to be building new dams - temporary work? or government job

How ~~does~~ will decommissioned plants that provide electricity to 70,000 homes be replaced ~~and at whose expense~~?

Comment 10 - Hydropower

It would be mind boggling if we knew what the total cost of the Endangered Species has cost our nation and human lives.

Comment 11 - Not within Scope of EIS/EIR

Will these comments today be reviewed and given credenance or perhaps lost in the shredder.

Comment 12 - NEPA

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1019_081-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_LT_1019_081-2	Among the various provisions under full implementation of the KBRA, tribes that are parties to the agreement would agree to not exercise their senior water rights within the basin and to relinquish claims for natural resources damages (KBRA Section 15) in exchange for increases in fisheries (dam removal and fisheries habitat restoration programs) and assistance with acquisition of Mazama Forest.	No
GP_LT_1019_081-3	Master Response GEN-7: Unsubstantiated Information. Master Response GHG-2: Rate Increases.	No
GP_LT_1019_081-4	The Draft EIS/EIR analyzed water supplies in Section 3.8. This section does not find that removal of the Four Facilities would provide more water; rather, this section indicates that removal would not directly affect agricultural or municipal water supply because the Four Facilities do not provide water supply for municipal and agricultural use. The main water bodies that store water for agricultural use in the Klamath Basin are Upper Klamath Lake, a natural lake now controlled by Link River Dam; the Lost River; and the Klamath River from the Keno Impoundment. Upper Klamath Lake holds 83 percent of the total storage capacity of the reservoirs on the Klamath River (FERC 2007) and approximately 98 percent of active storage (Greimann 2011). Neither Link River nor Keno Dams are being considered for removal. As a result, the removal of the Four Facilities will not negatively affect agricultural water supply for these facilities. The KBRA does not supersede existing laws or regulations and does not exempt any actions from compliance with NEPA, CEQA, ESA, or CESA. As plans and programs are developed under the KBRA, they will be made in compliance with existing laws and regulations including opportunities for public review and comment.	No
GP_LT_1019_081-5	Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA.	No
GP_LT_1019_081-6	Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA.	No
GP_LT_1019_081-7	Master Response HYDP-1 Reservoir Water Rights.	No
GP_LT_1019_081-8	Master Response AQU – 1 Sediment amounts and effects to fish Master Response AQU – 2 Sediment Dredging Master Response AQU – 20 Bedload Sediment and Fish Habitat	

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Master Response AQU – 19 Chinook Expert Panel Proposed Action Better Than No Action	
GP_LT_1019_081-9	The KBRA includes 112 activities that would be implemented over a 15-year time period. Up to 44 of the activities are currently projected to extend for at least 14 years of the 15-year program. The activities vary in nature, including, but not limited to, restoration actions, monitoring programs, economic development programs, water agreements, power projects, and would create a range of job opportunities. Jobs would be full-time, part-time, and temporary and include construction, operations, biology, engineering, technical, field work, administrative, government, and other professional jobs. Money generated by these activities will benefit other economic sectors and households as it circulates through the economy. Appendix P describes potential job effects of the KBRA.	No
GP_LT_1019_081-10	Master Response GHG-3: Replacement Power.	No
GP_LT_1019_081-11	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_LT_1019_081-12	Master Response N/CP-20 Response to Public Comment.	No

GP_LT_1020_269

NEPA Specific Analysis

The federal lead agency, the DOI, is analyzing the KBRA as a connected action. NEPA defines connected actions as those actions that are closely related or cannot or will not proceed unless other actions are taken previously or simultaneously (40 CFR 1508.25(a)(1)(ii)).[3] Some actions or component elements of the KBRA are independent obligations and thus have independent utility from the KHSA, but the implementation of several significant elements of the KBRA package would be different, if the determination under the KHSA is not to pursue full dam removal. Recognizing that implementation of many elements of the KBRA are unknown and not reasonably foreseeable at this time, the connected action analysis is being undertaken at a programmatic level. Consequently, appropriate NEPA compliance will be completed for the ~~KBRA in the future.~~ Comment 1 - KBRA

what are these actions

For purposes of this analysis, the KBRA is viewed as a whole program even though some of its component parts are currently being implemented (those without a federal nexus or not subject to environmental review) or could be implemented on an individual basis without dam removal. One of the reasons the KBRA is treated as a whole for purposes of this analysis under NEPA is that the individual activities under the KBRA will be implemented, through adaptive management and in close coordination with committees comprised of stakeholders, in a manner that seeks to attain synergy and optimize benefits through a coordinated, holistic approach to restoration and water management. Implementing those KBRA activities that are not connected to facilities removal on an individual basis without the benefit of adaptive management and stakeholder input will likely not provide the same level of optimization.

NHPA Section 106 Process
DOI elected to utilize the NEPA process to meet the federal requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as allowed under 36 CFR Section 800.8(c). DOI defines the undertaking, for purposes of Section 106 of the NHPA, as the removal of the four PacifiCorp dams which may be a result of the Secretarial Determination. The proposed undertaking has the potential to affect historic properties triggering compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA. The analysis and consultations concerning any effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives on historic properties are integrated into the NEPA review and documentation pursuant to the criteria identified in 36 CFR Section 800.8(c)(1)-(4).

Consequently, for purposes of NEPA, in the EIS for alternatives where dams are not removed, the KBRA, as currently signed by the parties, would not be implemented. This is not a judgment about whether any particular measure in the KBRA will be implemented in the absence of dam removal. Rather, it is an assumption that in the absence of dam removal, the KBRA will not include all of the components present in their current form. This

[3] We acknowledge, however, that the KBRA could also be analyzed as a cumulative or similar action under 40 CFR 1508.25(a)(2) and (3). We note that all three definitions (connected action, cumulative actions, and similar actions) are within the section that provides parameters for the "scope" of the action, which determines both the range of alternatives and the impacts to be considered in an EIS. Ultimately, however, we believe the important point is not the labeling but the analysis and whether the decision (in this case whether to remove four dams) is informed by a EIS that is proper in scope.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1020_269-1	The KBRA components that are currently being implemented or that could be implemented on an individual basis without dam removal are analyzed under the No Action/No Project Alternative and are described in Section 2.4.2 of the EIS/EIR.	No

GP_LT_1020_272

I am strongly opposed to the removal of the four dams on the Klamath River.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

The adverse effects of this project far outweigh the benefits.

Comment 2 - Fish

Fish populations will suffer because of the decreased river flow in late season, the toxic materials released from the sediment deposits behind the dams, and the effect of all this sediment being deposited downriver.

Dam removal will not increase salmon populations at all. Salmon can't get over Putman Point, Moonshine Falls, or Kino Reef. Were fish ladders put into these locations, salmon populations wouldn't increase because of the lack of suitable stream bed conditions for building redds. The vast majority of the bedrock in the upper basin is basalt, and basalt doesn't produce the gravel needed for redds.

If the adverse downstream effects of dam removal exceed

on salmon populations would be devestatating. All the salmon cycles would be wiped out and it would take a long long time to recover. But if the river clears up as described, what happens to the salmon coming to spawn while the river is toxic? That cycle dies.

Comment 2 cont. Fish

All the downstream effects of dam removal is adverse.

Comment 3 - Hydropower

The economic effects of terminating the source of electricity will have significant negative economic effects on people in both California and Oregon.

That the majority of the funding for this project will be paid by those adversely effected is outrageous.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1020_272-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_LT_1020_272-2	Flows: Master Response AQU-11 NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management. Sediment: Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants. Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging. Historical Distribution: Regarding anadromous fish above Moonshine Falls and Keno Reef, the historical distributions of anadromous fish are described in the EIS/EIR in Chapter 3.3.3.1, Aquatic Resources. The occurrence of steelhead as well as spring-run and fall-run Chinook salmon above Keno Reef is documented in the FEIS in Chapter. 3.3.3.1, Aquatic Resources, in Chapter 3.3.3.2, Physical Habitat Descriptions and in Attachment B of the Final Alternatives Report in Appendix A. Historical records reviewed by Hamilton et al. (2005) and genetic information obtained from archaeological sites analyzed by Butler et al. (2010) show conclusively that Chinook salmon spawned in the tributaries upstream of Keno Reef in the Upper Klamath Lake, including the Sprague, Williamson, and Wood Rivers. The question of whether or not anadromous fish utilized available habitat above Keno Reef was also addressed in proceedings before Administrative Law Judge Honorable Parlen L. McKenna who concluded that agencies had met their burden of proof on this issue (EIS 1.2.6.2, Federal Energy Commission Relicensing). Among other findings, Judge McKenna determined that: • Chinook salmon (both spring and fall-run) were abundant in the tributaries of the Upper Klamath Basin , including the Wood, Sprague, and Williamson rivers as well as Jenny, Fall, and Shovel Creeks (Administrative Law Judge 2006; FOF 2A-4, p. 12). • Steelhead trout utilized habitat in Spencer, Shovel, Fall, Camp, and Scotch Creeks, and they were likely distributed as far upstream as Link River (Administrative Law Judge 2006; FOF 2A-5, p. 12). The comment provides no evidence to support the argument that salmon did not occur upstream of Keno reef. This statement is factually incorrect. Lack of Suitable Habitat In the Upper Basin: The Administrative Law Judge found that expansive bottomland areas with abundant low-gradient channels, which are preferred salmon habitat, are more common in the Upper Klamath Basin than in the remainder	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	of the Klamath system. Such areas are particularly extensive above Keno Dam and Upper Klamath Lake, where spring-fed streams include the Williamson and Wood Rivers, smaller springbrooks flowing into these two rivers, Sprague River, and various streams (Administrative Law Judge 2006; FOF 6.9, pg 33). The comment as written provides no evidence to support the argument that significant salmon habitat does not occur upstream of Keno reef. This statement is factually incorrect.	
GP_LT_1020_272-3	Master Response GHG-2: Rate Increases. Master Response GHG-3: Replacement Power.	No

GP_LT_1020_275

Under KBRA/KHSA any impacts to the City's water supply are to be defrayed by the commitments in the agreement and City is not to pay for these impacts.

Comment 1 - Alternatives

City concerns include, but are not limited to:

- COY was not engaged or asked about mitigation measure on water line realignment called a "pipe bridge"
- Reasonable alternative locations and alignments of pipeline (e.g. go underground) have not been explored in this document nor have they been explored with the City.
- A pipe bridge would be an attractive nuisance and liability to the City for resulting injuries
- A pipe bridge would be more vulnerable to vandalism
- A pipe bridge would be more vulnerable to flood damage than a buried pipe
- The City has insufficient resources to provide an alternative plan within the timeframes of the comment period
- Should consider other reasonable alternatives such as a compatible underground pipeline to avoid aesthetic impacts (an above ground pipe is ugly in the context of environmental enhancement of a river system).
- Current and future economic impacts of the proposed design are unknown and not discussed.

\\GOLDNUGGET\USERS\MARYFRANCES\MY DOCUMENTS\DOCUMENTS_WATER\FALL CREEK\SECRETARIAL DETERMINATION KHSA-KBRA\10-20-11 TALKING POINTS FOR DAM HEARING.DOC

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1020_275-1	The Lead Agencies recognize that less information is available about the replacement pipeline for the City of Yreka water supply than for other elements of the Proposed Action; therefore, the analysis of this element has been denoted as programmatic in the Final EIS/EIR. Chapter 2 has also been modified that other potential pipeline configurations would be considered in cooperation with the City of Yreka during the design phase. A new impact has been added to Section 3.18, Public Health and Safety, to discuss potential impacts associated with vandalism. The impact discusses that the area around the pipeline would be fenced to prevent access. PacifiCorp has an above-ground pipeline at J.C. Boyle, and they have found that the pipeline has occasionally been the target of vandalism (including shooting). The vandalism, however, has not penetrated the pipe or disrupted the use of the pipe. During the design process, the Lead Agencies would work with the City of Yreka to design the pipe walls and coating to be bullet and vandalism resistant, thereby reducing the potential public health impact.	No

GP_LT_1025_244

→ Represent Resighini Rancheria Consulting Fisheries Biologist

Comment 11 - NEPA

Dennis says comments are highly valued. Doesn't mean document will change.

Klamath Dam Removal DEIS/DEIR Major Problems Summary

Comment 1 - NEPA

- DEIS/DEIR does not use "best available science" as required by both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (i.e. Ignored National Academy of Sciences and KBRA Expert Panels advice on refilling Lower Klamath Lake to restore suckers and flows)

Comment 2 - NEPA

- The DEIS/DEIR only analyzes dam removal through the Klamath Hydropower Settlement Agreement (KHSA) but a positive Decision by the Secretary of Interior on March 2012 will also trigger implementation of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA)

- The DEIS/DEIR treats the KBRA as a "connected action" under NEPA but does not analyze cumulative watershed effects; this is illegal piecemealing under NEPA and also in violation of CEQA.

Comment 3 - NEPA

- NEPA call for development of "appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts" but there are no credible alternatives developed for implementation of the KBRA, which is highly controversial and unlikely to succeed according to Expert Panel reports.

Comment 4 - Alternatives

- The DEIS/DEIR does NOT discuss applying ecological restoration techniques and principals that are the only scientifically valid means of abating water pollution crisis and restoring native fishes, including suckers and salmon. An Everglades Restoration Program approach is needed where freshwater flows and wetlands are expanded to abate water pollution.

Comment 6 - Water Rights/Supply

Comment 5- Proposed Project/Action

- An affirmative Secretarial Decision would halt DOI's responsibility to uphold "water rights and tribal water or fishing right theories or tribal trust theories in a manner, or (ii) tribal water or trust rights, whatever they may be, in a manner that will interfere with the diversion, use or reuse of water for the Klamath Reclamation Project."

- KBRA implementation also disallows participation by federally recognized Tribes such as the Resighini Rancheria, Hoopa Valley Tribe and Quartz Valley Indian Reservation on committees and in decision-making related to fisheries or water quality for the 50 years, which constitutes major social injustice.

Comment 7 - ITAs

- An affirmative Secretarial Decision in combination with authorizing legislation will lead to the State of California issuing a "take" permit under the California ESA for Lost River and shortnose suckers, bald eagles, sand hill cranes and peregrine falcons and yet areas of impact within California are NOT even covered in the DEIS/DEIR.

Comment 8 - Terrestrial

Comment 9 - Fish

- Suckers will not be recovered under the KHSA/KBRA because rebuilding of populations will be blocked by land use allocations for farming in the lower Lost River, Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Lake, including on 20,000 acres of National Wildlife Refuges.

- Dam removal without reducing nutrients in the Upper Klamath Basin will increase nitrogen seasonally in the lower Klamath leading to continued fish disease epidemics.

Comment 10 -Water Quality

Dennis is a champion of the KBRA + made many statements w/o Basis

NO DISEASE FACTOR

FISH INCREASES

Flows actually depart further from historic norm

Improves Suckers

ON AVERAGE. Don't analyze Flushing Flows

See www.KlamathER.org for more information.

→ Increased flow
→ Water supply
→ fish health

BUT KBRA NOT ANALYZED

23 years working on Klamath
- LRP
- Mid Pg Eval
- KRIS
- Klamath Wa - com
- Klamath ER.org

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1025_244-1	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
GP_LT_1025_244-2	The KBRA is analyzed in the EIS/EIR. The applicable resources sections in Chapter 3 and the cumulative effects section in Chapter 4 provide a description of KBRA environmental effects at a programmatic level of detail. Master Response N/CP-13 KBRA is Analyzed as a Connected Action. Master Response N/CP-22 How KBRA Was Analyzed.	No
GP_LT_1025_244-3	Master Response N/CP-22 How KBRA Was Analyzed.	No
GP_LT_1025_244-4	Master Response GEN-13 Range of Alternatives Considered, describes the alternatives development process to meet NEPA and CEQA requirements. Master Responses GEN-3 Best Available Information and AQU-6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook, describe the uses and limitations of the Expert Panel reports and peer review process.	No
GP_LT_1025_244-5	Analysis presented in this EIS/EIR on the KHSA and KBRA utilized scientific analysis of the potential for improvements in water quality and aquatic resources. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information. Master Response WQ-4 Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality and Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements. Master Response AQU-5 Will Benefit all salmonids. Master Response AQU-11 NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management.	No
GP_LT_1025_244-6	Master Response TTA-1 Federal Trust Responsibility and the KBRA.	Yes
GP_LT_1025_244-7	Master Response TTA-7: Tribal Involvement in Future Discussion of Water Management.	No
GP_LT_1025_244-8	Master Response TERR-5 Incidental Take Permit.	No
GP_LT_1025_244-9	Water quality rather than access to habitat appears to be the factor that most impacts suckers. Although eutrophic conditions in Upper Klamath Lake have caused fish die-offs since the late 1800s, these have become more frequent and severe in recent years, with chubs and suckers being perhaps the hardest hit	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	species (Perkins et al.2000, Buchanan et al. 2011a, as cited in Hamilton et al. 2011; Draft EIS/EIR p. 3.3-70). Water shortages, combined with the need to balance supplies among the needs of ESA-listed species (suckers in Upper Klamath Lake and coho salmon in the Klamath River), national wildlife refuges, and farming communities have led to the reduction of irrigation water deliveries to farmers in dry years and years of conflicts over water usage (Executive Summary 7.2). The Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) speaks to the settlement of long-running disputes concerning the use of Klamath Basin water for irrigation, fish and wildlife. The KBRA does not seek to take land out of agricultural production; it seeks to resolve long-standing disputes over water use within the Klamath Basin and to improve water quality. Addressing the water-related issues within the basin is expected to benefit all species of resident fish, including suckers. As discussed in Section 3.3.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR under Alternatives 2 page 3.3-126) and 3, KBRA is expected to provide benefits to sucker populations through: nutrient reduction, reconnecting former wetlands to Agency Lake, reconstructing quality rearing habitat for early life stages, and restoring shoreline spring spawning habitat restoration, among others. The EIS/EIR concludes that based on improved habitat quality, the effect of the Proposed Action would be beneficial for Lost River and shortnose sucker populations in the Long Term (Draft EIS/EIR p. 3.3-127). The Resident Fish Expert Panel concluded that a dams out plus KBRA management scenario provides promise for preventing extinction of sucker species and for increasing overall population abundance and productivity (Buchanan et al. 2011).	
GP_LT_1025_244-10	The commenter appears to be linking increased nitrogen in the lower Klamath River following dam removal to increased periphyton growth, which in turn could provide additional habitat for the polychaete host of the C. Shasta and P. minibicornis parasites implicated in fish disease. Master Response WQ-27 Nutrient Retention With Dams, Nutrient Release Without Dams, and Periphyton. The anticipated increases in nutrients downstream of Iron Gate Dam would also be diminished by water quality improvements in Upper Klamath Basin. As described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.1 (pages 3.2-47 to 3.2-76), full attainment of the Oregon and California TMDLs would eventually be beneficial for water	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	quality in the Hydroelectric Reach; however, it could require decades to achieve and is highly dependent on improvements in Upper Klamath Lake and the Keno Impoundment. As described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2.10 (pages 3.2-125 to 3.2-132), resource management actions implemented under KBRA as part of the Proposed Action would accelerate long-term improvements in water quality, including those anticipated under the TMDLs. Additional detail on the interaction of the TMDLs and the Alternatives is provided by the Water Quality SubTeam (2011) (also referred to as the Water Quality SubGroup), as cited in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.5, page 3.3-241. This document, entitled "Assessment of Long Term Water Quality Changes for the Klamath River Basin Resulting from KHSA, KBRA, and TMDL and NPS Reduction Programs" can be found at http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies. Master Response WQ-6 Periphyton Growth and Fish Disease.	
GP_LT_1025_244-11	Master Response N/CP-20 Response to Public Comment.	No

GP_LT_1025_251

Settlement

I was the Salmon,
Born from the Stream,
That seeped from the crater,
Where Mount Mazama once stood.

Call me Ishyaat,
Spring Salmon of old,
We returned from the ocean,
In numbers untold.

Past Trinity, Ishi Pishi,
Over the Keno Reef,
Through Lake Euwana and Klamath,
To the highest reaches of…

The Sycan, the Sprague,
The Williamson and Wood,
When the river flowed free,
And the water was good.

Our flesh was the promise,
To the river people's prayer,
If they kept the balance,
We would always be there.

We would always be there,
If belief could contain,
The knowledge of salmon,
As deeply ingrained,
As the love of the family,
And respect for all life.

But the settlers came,
And in their hunger for gold,
Washed the mountains and valleys,
Into the river's fold.

Down at the lips,
The canneries sprang up,
Where a killing could be made,
With a net and a club.

Meanwhile upstream,
Where the springs bubble out,

The water was ditched,
To keep fields from drought.

And oxbows where beavers,
Once engineered ponds,
Fell dry and dusty,
When the beaver was gone.

The next to go,
Were the trees on the hills,
Where donkey machines,
Whisked them to mills.

The slash from the logging,
Stoked a powerful blaze,
That baked the soil so hot,
It all washed away.

Taking road crossings with it,
On its way down the creek,
And into the river,
Of which I speak.

For I am the salmon,
Born from the stream,
That flowed from the crater,
Where Mazama had been,

I have been shaped,
By millennia past,
By the river itself,
To whose stones I am cast,

But the river runs hot,
And there's disease in my guts,
I'm afraid we are dying,
From a thousand cuts.

There's still quite a scene,
Down at the lips,
Eight gill nets deep,
As it crosses the spit.

Miners are still dredging,
For the occasional gold,
Muddying the refugia,

Where salmon still hold.

And now every year,
Farmers take a little more,
Of the river down pipes,
That salmon restoration funds paid for.

And fires are increasing,
In intensity and size,
~~And~~ Now mountains ~~are~~ unravel~~ing~~,
Whenever a hard rain flies.

And as ~~we all dance~~ fish stocks balance,
On the brink of extinction,
Four dams still stand,
Blocking salmon migration.

To the Sycan and Sprague,
Williamson and Wood,
Where cold water still flows,
Though not quite as good.

But these cold water springs,
Are sufficiently masked,
By top release dams,
That heat water like baths.

And form a chartreuse brew,
Where liver toxin thrives,
Aerated through turbines,
It quietly claims lives.

~~And~~ Now salmon return
To the hatchery pens,
And are cut open and spawned,
Then conveyed into bins.

But not before spreading,
The Ceratomyxa disease,
That passes between salmon,
And a worm in the algae.

Growing below the dams,
Where floods never scour,
But unlike the dams,
We've underestimated it's power.

To infect young salmon,
On their way to the sea,
Which in some bad years,
Reaches 90% mortality.

Stakeholder are lined up,
From here to Washington,
To float or sink this deal,
For the fate of the Salmon.

Should the dams be torn down,
When, and by whom,
Should we do it slowly,
Or with one great boom!

Which voices need silencing,
Who can speak their piece,
Whose pockets need greasing,
And with how much grease?

Now the climate is shifting,
And the politics too,
The deadlines are coming,
For the deal to go through.

I am the salmon,
Born from the stream,
That flows from the crater,
Where Mazama once stood,
And I still remember,
Where the water is good.

But if politics are prayers,
If this deal is a dance,
If the dams finally come down,
Will we still have a chance?

Comment 1 - Other/ General

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1025_251-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

11/09/2011 12:41 510-21 GP_LT_1110_649 SARGENT FAX PAGE 01

11/9/11

Bureau of Reclamation

I do not want Dam Removal at Klamath dam. Save our future prosperity and welfare

Concerned citizen
Pauline Sargent
Richmond, CA 94805

BUREAU OF RECLAMATON
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
NOV 10 '11

CODE	ACTION	SURNAME & DATE
152	11/10	

SCANNED

Classification ENV-8.10
Project 12
Control No. 1108513
Folder I.D. 1190148-1
Date Input & Initials 11/10/2011 IN

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	GP_LT_1110_649

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1110_649-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

11/16/2011

GP_LT_1118_792

NOV 18 2011

152 11/18

November 2011

Klamath Draft EIS/EIR: I support Alternative 1

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comments: I support Alternative 1 of the Klamath Draft EIS/EIR proposal –No Action/No Project Alternative; leave the 4 dams in place.

These dams produce clean, consistent, renewable energy which we desperately need.

Comment 2 - Fish

Iron Gate Hatchery was built to off-set any effect of Hydro power producing dams being in place. With dam removal, this hatchery will be destroyed.

Comment 3 - KHSA

PacifiCorp has been forced into agreeing with dam removal. This is nothing more than government infringing on private property rights.

Again, I support Alternative 1.

Thank you for considering my opinion as a local taxpaying, voting citizen.

Signed----------

SCANNED

ENV-600
12
11086373
1190948
11/18/2011 JS

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1118_792-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_LT_1118_792-2	Master Response AQU – 18 Fate of Iron Gate Hatchery under Alternatives	No
GP_LT_1118_792-3	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_LT_1128_941

I do not think that alternative [illegible] removal [illegible] explored. Surely fish [illegible] trucking fish as is conducted on the Columbia River. [illegible] and general manager of Pacific Corp was quoted as saying the government made it very clear from a future licensing point of view that they did not want these dams relicensed. Once that became clear, we shifted our framework from relicensing to a settlement involving a post dam removal framework. The [illegible] interior [illegible] transfer of land from the [illegible] and not a [illegible] settle the issues with all [illegible] out the [illegible] to be trucked past [illegible] and the Kistiver. Why are we worrying about dam removal if our schools are having problems? The Klamath Schools need 47 million dollars to make the needed repairs but instead we are putting all our effort and money into dam removal. Obviously our priorities aren't straight. Therefore I am against dam removal

Comment 1 - Alternatives

I do not think that alternatives to dam removal were explored. Such as fish ladders, trucking fish as is conducted on the Columbia River. Dean Brockbank, Vice President and general counsel of Pacific Corp was quoted as saying "the Government made it very clear from a public policy point of view that they did not want these dams relicensed once that became clear, we shifted our framework from relicensing to a settlement involving a possible dam removal framework." This statement makes it clear that the top level officials within the Department of Interior conspired to orchestrate the removal of dams from the beginning and that the rest of his discussion was simply window dressing and not a sincere attempt to settle the issues with all options available. And even with dams out the fish well need to be trucked past Keno Dam and its resivoir. Why are we worrying about dam removal if our schools are having problems? The Klamath schools need 47 million dollars to make the needed repairs but instead we are putting all our effort and money into dam removal. Obviously our priorities aren't straight. Therefore I am against dam removal.

Comment 2 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1128_941-1	Appendix A of the Draft EIS/EIR includes a wide range of alternatives representing diverse viewpoints and needs based on internal and public scoping. The alternatives that moved forward for more detailed analysis in this EIS/EIR are those that best meet the NEPA purpose and need and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, are feasible, and represent a range of reasonable alternatives (see Appendix A for more information). Two alternatives that moved forward, Alternatives 4 and 5, include fish passage as suggested in the comment. Appendix A also included Alternative 9 - Trap and Haul Fish, which was not carried forward for further analysis in the EIS/EIR because it has been shown to be an ineffective technique (CDFG 2006, as cited in Appendix A of the Draft EIS/EIR). Because trap and haul is not effective for salmonid restoration, Alternative 9 does not meet the purpose and need under NEPA or most of the program objectives under CEQA.	No
GP_LT_1128_941-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_345

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathS

Website:
Kl

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Comment 1 - NEPA

Name: 1. Dennis Lynch in his introduction said likely, possibly, May + relative and could several times. Spending a million dollars on those words seems pretty risky.

Organization:

Title:

Address:

Email:

Comments:

Comment 2 - ITAs

2. The lack of ~~[illegible]~~ respect showed the Shasta by not inviting them was embarrassment. Roy Hall, Chairman of the Shasta Nation

Comment 3 - Fish

3. I doubt if fish that make love in sand will be making much love in muck for the next ~~100 yrs.~~ unknown number of years.

(4) my question for the fisherman that said 10% of the ocean catch is from the Klamath. Can he tell that because they have clipped fins

Comment 4 - Out of Scope

(5) I'd like to congradulate fish and game for state of the art keeping the fish hatchery in such good condition.

6. Is it true that the ~~[illegible]~~ property owner who owns the dams also owns the company bringing in the alternative form of energy (Ruby Pipeline) and that we are paying for it.

Comment 5 - Hydropower

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_345-1	Master Response N/CP-5 Use of "Would" and "Could."	No
GP_MF_1019_345-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of the Record.	No
GP_MF_1019_345-3	The Draft EIS/EIR acknowledges that Chinook salmon, coho salmon and steelhead habitat would be adversely affected by sediment in the short term (less than 2 years) following dam removal. The streambed downstream of Iron Gate Dam would be affected by dam-released sediment and reconnection of the natural sediment supply from upstream. The sediment stored within the reservoirs has a high water content and 85 percent of the particles are silts and clays (less than 0.063 mm) while 15 percent are sand or coarser (larger than 0.063 mm) (Gathard Engineering Consulting 2006; Stillwater Sciences 2008; Reclamation 2012d). As such, most sediment eroded from the reservoirs would be silt and clay (less than 0.063 mm) with smaller fractions of sand (0.063 to 2 mm), gravel (2 to 64 mm), and cobble (64 to 256 mm) (Gathard Engineering Consulting 2006; Stillwater Sciences2010a; Reclamation 2012d). A large portion of the silt and finer substrate would likely be transported as suspended sediment and would travel to the ocean shortly after being eroded and mobilized (Stillwater Sciences 2010a). Coarser (larger than 0.063 mm) sediment, including sand, would travel downstream more slowly, attenuated by channel storage and the frequency and magnitude of mobilization flows. The amount of sand transported in suspension would vary with discharge, with greater proportions of sand in suspension at higher discharges. A substantial amount of sand may deposit on the channel, potentially embedding larger substrate (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3-82). The effect of dam-released sediment and sediment resupply would likely extend from Iron Gate Dam to Cottonwood Creek (Reclamation 2012d). Estimates of reach-averaged stream power (the ability of the river to move sediment) show a decrease from Iron Gate Dam to Cottonwood Creek, with stream power then increasing again downstream of Cottonwood Creek. The increase suggests that short- or long-term sediment deposition, either from dam release or sediment resupply, is unlikely downstream of Cottonwood Creek. Using this point as the downstream extent of bedload-related effects, 8 miles of channel could be affected by sediment release and resupply. The affected channel represents 4 percent of the total channel length of the mainstem Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam (190 miles) (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3-82). The short-term release of sediment from the dams under the Proposed Action would be detrimental to Chinook and coho	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	salmon habitat during the months when sediment concentrations are elevated. In the long term, the Proposed Action would improve habitat for Chinook and coho salmon by restoring natural sediment transport processes, improving water quality and reducing the prevalence of disease outbreaks. The National Marine Fisheries Service has designated essential fish habitat (EFH) downstream of Iron Gate Dam as required under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Essential fish habitat includes those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity. Based on a substantial reduction in EFH quality during reservoir drawdown, the Proposed Action would have a significant effect on EFH for Chinook and coho salmon in the short term. Based on benefits to quality, the Proposed Action would have a beneficial effect on EFH for Chinook and coho salmon in the long term. (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-93). In the long term, all of these species are expected to benefit from the Proposed Action because of access to habitat and improvements in water quality (EIS/EIR Section 3.3). The comment as written provides no evidence that there would be a long-term impact on reproductive success of salmonids from sediment deposition.	
GP_MF_1019_345-4	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_MF_1019_345-5	The Four Facilities (dams proposed for removal) are owned by PacifiCorp. Ruby Pipeline is being constructed by the El Paso Corporation.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1114_696

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

SCANNED

Classification ENV-6.00
Project Owen 12
Control No. 11085076
Folder I.D. 1190948-1
Date Input & Initials 11/14/2011 SW

BUREAU OF RECLAMATON OF FICIAL FILE COPY RECEIVED
NOV 14 '11
152 11/15

Name:

Organization:

Title:

Address: 24990 Owen Ln. Klamath Falls, Or. 97603

Email:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comments: I favor ES 6.1 Alternative 1 - No Action No project Alternative. The phoney way this whole project was created is going to cost a loss of public confidence. The way prospective stake-holders were forced to agree to dam removal before they could be appointed stake holders, shows this was a done deal before prospective stakeholders were ever interviewed. If anyone seriously studied the history of Klamath River floods, You would realize the disasterous loss of lives & property dam removal will bring, not to mention the loss of fish habitat due to sediment being washed down the river. In the out of print book "Looking Back" by Alice Overton Hessig, she tells of the flood of 1890. "During the first part of February 1890, a warm chinook wind and rain came and melted all the snow. This caused the worst flood in the history of the area. The Klamath River reportedly raised 92 feet on the canyon walls near Happy Camp." The dams are flood control dams & need to remain in place.

Comment 3 - Hydrology

Comment 2 - KHSA

~~Public Disclosure: It is not~~ required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1114_696-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	**No**
GP_MF_1114_696-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information. Members of the Klamath Settlement Group, which negotiated the KBRA and KHSA, were not appointed. The Klamath agreements are examples of negotiations designed to resolve longstanding legal battles over the use of water resources in the Klamath Basin. PacifiCorp, tribes, environmental, fishing and agriculture interests are using these agreements to avoid litigation. Signing the KHSA was voluntary for all signatories and no signatory was required to sign to make KHSA a valid agreement.	No
GP_MF_1114_696-3	Master Response HYDG-1 Flood Protection.	No

GP_WI_1019_047

From: badbear99@earthlink.net[SMTP:BADBEAR99@EARTHLINK.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2011 12:38:28 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath Dam removal

Body: I support removal of the Klamath River dams in order to restore the river and improve fish habitat. There should be appropriate compensation to those suffering primary impacts, but mere loss of government subsidies in water or power costs does not rise to that level.

I live in the Yreka area, but do not wish my name to be public, as I fear violent reprisals by some of the extremists around here.

Please proceed with the dam removal and take the comments from the vested interests with a big grain of salt.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1019_047-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1108_394

From: sarcodes@gmail.com[SMTP:SARCODES@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2011 10:04:36 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Support for Alternative 2 Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Support for Alternative 2

Body: I support the alternative to fully remove all four dams. Thank you.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 8, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1108_394-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

GP_WI_1108_409

From: yewyewyew2003@yahoo.com[SMTP:YEWYEWYEW2003@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2011 9:01:45 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: river dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Yew
Organization:

Subject: river dams

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: support dam removals

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 8, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1108_409-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

GP_WI_1109_410

From: headhunter1942@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 10:46:40 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fw: Web Inquiry: dam removal options
Auto forwarded by a Rule
From the general mail box on KlamathRestoration.gov

Subject: dam removal options

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I support the removal of all four dams

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 09, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1109_410-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

GP_WI_1110_486

From: mjartistry@gmail.com[SMTP:MJARTISTRY@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2011 8:34:26 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Please respect our resources Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Comment 1 - General/Other

Subject: Please respect our resources

Body: I'm writing to ask to please respect our precious resources and help to save the wildlife and ocean mammals that flock to the mouth of that river. Have you been to the mouth of that river? If not, I'd like to ask you to drive out there and walk along that incredible shore line between the ocean and the river until you reach the end of the sand where the Klammath river mouth empties into the great pacific, there you will witness an abundance of sea otters and seals jumping and surfing the waves right on the shore next to you, the falcons, sea birds, many different types of cranes, and the pelicans dive bombing into the ocean, all there in search of the salmon and other types of fish that flow so steadily out of that river. You'll probably even witness the otters and seals swimming up stream, in fresh water, It's pretty mind blowing. I would say one of the most fertile places on this planet, which is sadly declining quickly. Let's do what it takes to keep this sacred spot the way it is. And please, don't make this decision without spending time in the place first.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1110_486-1	The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).	No

GP_WI_1110_489

From: arupasart@reninet.com[SMTP:ARUPASART@RENINET.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2011 7:11:15 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: removing dams from klamath river Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Subject: removing dams from klamath river

Body: remove those damn dams! it's about time... geez!

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1110_489-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

GP_WI_1111_541

From: brugman1@gte.net[SMTP:BRUGMAN1@GTE.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 4:25:47 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: I support Alternative #2 Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Subject: I support Alternative #2

Body: I support Alternative #2

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_541-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

GP_WI_1111_558

From: angevedo2@earthlink.net[SMTP:ANGEVEDO2@EARTHLINK.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 5:10:43 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath EIS/EIR
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Subject: Klamath EIS/EIR

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I support Alternative 2 of the Klamath Draft EIS/EIR proposal (full removal of the Iron Gate, Copco1, Copco2, and J.C. Boyle dams).

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_558-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

GP_WI_1111_567

From: tcli@frontiernet.net[SMTP:TCLI@FRONTIERNET.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 8:20:31 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath dams

Body: Please remove the dams to protect our declining fish stock

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_567-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1112_587

From: kirasmussen@yahoo.com[SMTP:KIRASMUSSEN@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2011 12:47:53 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: healkth of our streams & rivers Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Subject: healkth of our streams & rivers

Body: We must do everything possible to protect the cleanliness of our waterways.

Comment 1 - General/Other

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 12, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1112_587-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).	No

GP_WI_1113_644

From: ackermanjay@juno.com[SMTP:ACKERMANJAY@JUNO.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2011 9:33:49 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dams on the Klamath Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Subject: Dams on the Klamath

Comment 1 - Fish

Body: 4. In addition, I demand that an absolute minimum flow of 1,300 cubic feet per second at the Iron Gate gauge be established for the dry season. The National Marine Fisheries Service has required a minimum flow at Iron Gate pursuant to biological opinions to comply with the Endangered Species Act, and therefore the Secretary should include a minimum flow for fish.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 13, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1113_644-1	Master Response AQU-11 NMFS BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management. The NMFS BO does not require a minimum flow of 1,300 cfs downstream of Iron Gate Dam during all months and hydrological conditions.	No

GP_WI_1114_669

From: kwrigley@hughes.net[SMTP:KWRIGLEY@HUGHES.NET]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 6:46:07 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klammath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Subject: Klammath Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Please make complete dam removal your choce. This is not about being politically correct; it is about protecting and restoring water quality. Water is the most preciuos premium limited resourch on the planet and real protection and restoration is required at this time more than ever to suport all life. Fish and Game has debeen trying to protect water quality with wishy washy words on paper. It is way past the time when real protection and restoration is put first and foremost. With global warming we are expected to get between 10 to 20 inches less rain so every drop is ever more important. What we do now will determine the ultimate outcome of water; please choose complete removal of the Klamath dams for the benefit of all Californians and Oregoneons.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1114_669-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).	No

GP_WI_1116_718

From: zoe@humboldt.net[SMTP:ZOE@HUMBOLDT.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 12:34:29 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Salmon
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Subject: Salmon

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: The Klamath River used to have one of the largest coho salmon runs in the United States but now they're almost extinct. Please remove all dams on the Klamath.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16. 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_718-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1119_799

From: tdhc@sonic.net[SMTP:TDHC@SONIC.NET]
Sent: Saturday, November 19, 2011 11:39:50 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Against dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Subject: Against dam removal

Body: November 18, 2011

RE: Klamath Facilities Removal EIS/EIR

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I'm a taxpayer and am against the removal of the four dams as presented in the KHSA-KBRA-EIS/EIR Klamath Facilities Removal-H.R.3398 and all related costs.

There are several conditions of the KHSA/KBRA agreements that have not been implemented, the "Bond Measure", this exceeds the "State Cost Cap", no "Authorizing Legislation" has passed, and the "Secretarial Determination" has not been completed.

Comment 2 - Costs

- The California water "Bond Measure" has not been and will not be presented to the voters for approval until November 2012 at the earliest, with no guaranty of passage but the determination has to be completed by March 2012.
- The California "Bond Measure" is for the difference between the "Customer Contribution" and the actual cost for "complete Facilities Removal", not to exceed $250,000,000 (in nominal dollars).
- The "Customer Contribution" Klamath Surcharge is set at $200,000,000 (in nominal dollars) for Facilities Removal.
- This totals $450,000,000 for complete "Facilities Removal" which now has a projected cost, as stated by Interior Secretary Ken Salazar of about $290,000,000. This is a saving to the state of California of $160,000,000 that should be returned to the Bond Measure if or when enacted.

Background:

Comment 3 - KBRA

o PacifiCorp did not participate in the KBRA and has no obligations for the implementation of the KBRA, which in turn mean its customers will have no obligation to the KBRA for a change.
o The KHSA states, "this Settlement contemplates a substantial non-federal contribution in support".
o The Federal Government can not "expend federal funds not appropriated for that purpose by Congress" which H.R.3398 is attempting to authorize and fund.

The problem is this project really costs: $1,260,452,000

- The EIS/EIR Klamath Facilities Removal has total costs, unrelated to the $290,000,000 for "complete Facilities Removal", of $970,452,000 ($ 2007) as

Comment 4 - Costs

detailed in Appendix C-2 and delineated in Sections 5.3 through 34 of the EIS/EIR.

- The $290,000,000 is just 23% of the $1,260,452,000 total projected costs.
- H.R. 3398 - statements by Sen. Merkley and Rep. Thompson claim this legislation calls for funding of $536,000,000 from the Federal Government and $550,000,000 in non-federal funding for a total of $1,086,000,000. Is this $536,000,000 the same "substantial non-federal contribution" (49.22%) listed in the KHSA?
- Is it not true that 90% of the funds ($980,100,000) in H.R.3398 will be funded by the Federal Government under the ESA Section 6 (2) (ii) under "the conservation of endangered or threatened species" between two states, which is about $10,000,000 more than requested in the EIS/EIR?
- Is the $290,000,000 in non-federal funding for "complete Facilities Removal" included in H.R.3398 as part of the $550,000,000 non-federal funding component?
- If the $290,000,000 is included in H.R.3398 it creates a $174,452,000 short fall to the $970,452,000 cost projections in the EIS/EIR. Where will the additional monies come from?
- Has the "State Cost Cap", made-up of $200,000,000 from PacifiCorp ratepayers and the $250,000,000 from the California "Water Measure" been reduced to reflect the projected "complete Facilities Removal" cost of $290,000,000?
- Has there been a $150,000,000 reduction made to the "Water Measure" bond to reflect these cost savings? If not when can taxpayer expect such a reduction to the measure? If not why?
- Will the $150,000,000 be redirected to Siskiyou County for economic development?
- If the $290,000,000 is not included in H.R.3398 there will be a surplus of $115,548,000 as it relates to the EIS/EIR. What will this be used for? Why the extra money?
- The requirement in H.R.3398 calls for non-federal funds in the amount of $550,000,000, how will this be raised? By whom? Through what?
- Will the signatory's to the KSHA/KBRA, the 7 environmental organizations, the 24 irrigators, and the 3 tribes, contribute the $550,000,000 in non-federal funding that is required for their benefits?
- A cost benefit analyses based on $290,000,000 is quite different than one based on a total of $1,260,452,000. Provide a cost benefit spreadsheet comparison showing the difference between $290,000,000 and the $1,260,452,000 in real costs. The cost benefit analyses needs to include the $200,000,000 Klamath Surcharge and the rate increase caused by these dam removals based on 600,000 PacifiCorp customers for 50 years. And the rate increases to pay off the California "Bond Measure" over the life of the bonds through water use rate increases.
- Provide a cost benefit analyses based on the EIS/EIR Appendix C spreadsheets pages C-7, C-8, C-9. With a breakdown between Federal, State and Non-Governmental Organization (NGO's), administrative costs, field labor costs, and direct hard project costs, all summarized by each sub-area listed so each sub-area can be viewed in total. (Example Keno is listed with 6 line item which totals $60,290,000 in funding)
- In the KHSA "Customer Contribution" costs for dam removal surcharges were split 92% from Oregon and 8% from California with California picking up the difference for "complete Facilities Removal". What percentages of the "Settlement Measures and Commitments" costs are allocated between Oregon, California and the Tribes?

Comment 4 cont.

Comment 4 cont.

- Quantify the "PacifiCorp Billing Crediting System" for the Upper Klamath Water Users Association (UKWUA) and the Klamath Water and Power Agency (KWAPA) in dollars of benefit and to whom.
- Explain and provide for the public record, documentation supporting the meeting between the "Parties"; the federal government, the 2 states, the 7 environmental organizations, the 24 irrigators, and the 3 tribes addressing the "State Cost Cap" and all the "Settlement Measures and Commitments" which now make this project cost $1,260,452,000 and to justify that it is in the public interest when this is a 335% increase of $970,452,000.
- Of the $1,260,452,000, how much money is currently allocated to the Klamath River for restoration and mitigation efforts as a direct result of removing 4 dams?
- The KHSA states for an Affirmative Determination and whether the Interior will be the Dam Removal Entity a minimum level of supporting analyses needed to be provided that establishes baselines and is in compliance with Environmental Protection Agency EPA standards for a project of this complexity and magnitude:
  - o A cost estimate of Facilities Removal including "Settlement Measures and Commitments" along with their funding sources needs to be provided.
  - o Identification and management of risks and of foreseeable liabilities associated with Facilities Removal - this should include lawsuits related to reductions in property values by non-signatories and other affected "stakeholders".
  - o The environmental effects of Facilities Removal – this should include fish kills, affects to the streambed and related aquatic life for fish survival and a probability and quantitative analyses on fish reintroduction from the upper most dam reach to the ocean, including ocean impacts caused by the dams removal.
  - o The impacts on local and Tribal communities environmentally, monetarily and socially
  - o An economic analysis – this needs to include at least 3 alternative and their costs compared to dam removal in addition to leaving the dam in place. Costs need to include rate increases for dam removal; higher electric rates form other sources of comparable clean-green energy, bond-servicing costs through water rate increases. The $1,089,000,000 federal contribution and impact to tax payers. How will removing these dams further California's cap and trade laws and contribute to the 30% reductions in carbon emissions, which takes affect the same year, 2020, the dams are removed.
  - o Engineering – If there are no dam structural obsolescence issues and there are no safety or security issues why are the dams being removed? This category needs to include the same 3 viable alternatives, as listed above, for comparisons and their costs and cost benefits analyses compared to dam removal and compared to leaving the dam in place.
  - o Sediment Composition, Fate, Transport, full mitigation that is in compliance with all Federal and State water quality standards needs to be quantified and potential risks identified and addressed with costs.
  - o Water Quality – If known or reasonably expected sediment contaminates and carcinogens will be dislodged by dam removal how will they be addressed and because it is directly related to dam removal who will bear those project-related costs?
  - o Fisheries – Quantification of fish used to produce the annual production rates. How many years of no fishing will exist as the fish are reintroduced?

Comment 6 - Fish

Comment 5 - Costs

Comment 7 - Economics

Comment 7 - NEPA

Comment 9 - Water Quality

Comment 8 -Sediment Transport

Comment 10 - Fish

Comment 11 -Economics

o Economics – needs to account for the loss of hydropower and related tax losses from property taxes, operation and subsequent conversions. This needs to include agricultural profitability related to changes in water rights and quantification of the over all reduction in living standards caused by increased electric and water rates.

o Liability and Risk Management

Comment 12 - KBRA

• KRBA page 171 includes an interim fishing site for the Klamath Tribes between Iron Gate and the I-5 Bridge – Will this be an exclusive right and will it become permanent? Has this been approved by the non-signatory Tribes as it may encroach on their historic hunting grounds.

• It has been stated that this project will create 4600 new jobs of which 1400 are for dam removal and another leaves 3200 other "jobs" for "Settlement Measures and Commitments". The question is how many man-hours does this equate into and at what hourly rate. Then the true impact to the areas local economy can be determined and quantified

Comment 13 - Economics

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1119_799-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No
GP_WI_1119_799-2	Comment noted.	No
GP_WI_1119_799-3	Funding for KBRA will not come from PacifiCorp or its rate payers.	No
GP_WI_1119_799-4	The purpose of the Draft EIS/EIR is to display environmental impacts to the affected region and thus it does not contain a benefit-cost analysis. 40 CFR Sect. 1502.23 addresses benefit-cost analysis, and states that if a benefit-cost analysis relevant to the choice among environmentally different alternatives is being considered for the Proposed Action, it shall be incorporated by reference or appended to the statement as an aid in evaluating the environmental consequences. A benefit-cost analysis was undertaken and is summarized in the Secretarial Determination Overview Report. Details of the benefit-cost analysis can be found in the Economics and Tribal Summary Technical report prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation (available on Klamathrestoration.gov). The Draft EIS/EIR is intended to focus on the effects of the KHSA and KBRA. Dam removal costs provided in the Draft EIS/EIR were estimated by Reclamation engineers using standard estimating techniques. KBRA costs reflect the funding levels specified in that agreement minus agency base funds that would be spent for KBRA activities under the No Action/No Project alternative. Any assumptions regarding availability of funding for either dam removal or KBRA would be speculative at this time, as no bond measures or government appropriations have been enacted. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1119_799-5	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate. The financial liabilities associated with potential litigation generated by a Positive Secretarial Determination are speculative and not included in the cost estimate presented in the Detailed Plan.	No
GP_WI_1119_799-6	A summary of existing poor water quality in the Upper Klamath Basin is described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.1 Existing Conditions (p. 3.2-19 to 3.2-33). Additional details are provided in Appendix C (p. C-1 to C-86). The presence and operation of the Four Facilities affect many aspects of water quality in the Klamath River, including slower transport of water downstream, interception and retention of sediment, organic matter, nutrients, and other constituents that would otherwise be transported downstream, and alteration of seasonal water temperatures when compared to free-flowing stream reaches. Existing data and numeric models described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2 (p. 3.2-76 to 3.2-125) indicate that dam removal will improve water quality in the Hydroelectric Reach and the Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam by decreasing late summer/early fall water temperatures, increasing seasonal dissolved oxygen concentrations, decreasing seasonal pH levels*, and decreasing or eliminating high seasonal chlorophyll-a and algal toxin concentrations (see also Table 3.2-14, p. 3.2-149 to 3.2-161). Water quality improvements in Upper Klamath Basin, including the Keno Impoundment, are critically important to water quality further downstream in the Klamath River. After implementation of the Proposed Action, flows in the Klamath River would more closely mimic the natural hydrograph. The removal of the dams could also provide habitat for anadromous fish (Hetrick et al. 2009). In the absence of the reservoirs, hydraulic residence time in this reach would decrease from several weeks to less than a day, and water quality would also be improved by nutrient assimilation in this reach (Hamilton et al. 2011). Evaporation from the surface of the reservoirs is currently about 11,000 acre-feet/year and after dam removal the evapotranspiration in the same reaches is expected to be approximately 4,800 acre-feet/year, resulting in a gain in flow to the Klamath River of approximately 6,200 acre-feet/year (Reclamation 2012d). The reservoir drawdowns would allow tributaries and springs such as Fall, Shovel, and Spencer Creeks and Big Springs to flow directly into the mainstem Klamath River, creating patches of cooler water that could be used as temperature refugia by fish (Hamilton et al. 2011). Water quality conditions would also improve further downstream in the Hydroelectric Reach. From Copco 1 to Iron Gate Reservoir,	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	removal of the Four Facilities would result in a 2-10oC decrease in water temperatures during the fall months and a 1-2.5oC increase in water temperatures during spring months (PacifiCorp 2004a, Dunsmoor and Huntington 2006, NCRWQCB 2010a, Perry et al. 2011; see also EIS/EIR, Section 3.2.4.3.2.1), an increase dissolved oxygen concentrations (PacifiCorp 2004b, NCRWQCB 2010; see also EIS/EIR, Section 3.2.4.3.2.4), and eliminate reservoir habitat that creates ideal conditions for seasonal nuisance and/or noxious phytoplankton blooms (see EIS/EIR, Section 3.4, Algae). Master Response AQU-25 Habitat Upstream of Iron Gate. The National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council (NRC) reviewed the Instream Flow Study Report (Hardy et al. 2006a) in their publication “Hydrology, ecology, and fishes of the Klamath Basin” which is cited as NRC 2008 in the Draft EIS/EIR. According to the NRC, the most important outcome of the Instream Flow Study was that it indicated increases in existing flows downstream from Iron Gate Dam probably would benefit fish populations (NRC 2008, p. 194). Table 3.3-4 (Draft EIS/EIR, Section 3.33.3, p. 3.3-43) presents the minimum flows below Iron Gate Dam and lake elevations for Upper Klamath Lake from the 2010 Biological Opinion for coho salmon. The minimum flows required by the current Biological Opinion are similar to those recommended in Hardy et al, 2006a. Maintaining minimum flows as described in Hardy (2006a) would contribute to restoration of salmonids in the Klamath Basin, but as the NRC noted, that would not address the other factors that are causing the decline of anadromous fish populations. The ability of the mainstem Klamath River to support the rearing and migration of anadromous species is reduced by periodic high water temperatures during summer, poor water quality (low DO and high pH; see Sections 3.2.3.5 and 3.2.3.6), and disease outbreaks during spring. Habitat quality in the tributaries is also affected by high temperatures (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.3.2, p. 3.3-27). As described in Section 3.3.4.3 of the EIS/EIR, Alternatives 2 and 3 which includes implementation of the KBRA, would result in flows more favorable to all life stages of salmonids, and would provide suitable habitat for resident riverine species, anadromous fish and lamprey in hydroelectric reach from the upstream end of J.C. Boyle Reservoir to Iron Gate Dam. In the lower Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam, over the long term, the Proposed Action would alter the hydrograph so that the duration, timing, and magnitude of flows would be more similar to the unregulated conditions under which the native fish community evolved (Hetrick et al. 2009).	

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	The Proposed Action would have significant short-term effects for macroinvertebrates; based on substantial reduction in the abundance of a year class. Effects in the long term would be beneficial based on increased habitat availability and improved habitat quality (EIS/EIR 3.3.4.3). While a large proportion of macroinvertebrate populations in the Hydroelectric Reach and in the mainstem Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam would be affected in the short term by the Proposed Action, their populations would be expected to recover quickly because of the many sources for recolonization and their rapid dispersion through drift or aerial movement of adults. Dam removal would increase connectivity between Upper Klamath Basin and the Hydroelectric Reach and would create additional riverine habitat within the Hydroelectric Reach. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) would be affected by sediments released by dam removal. The short-term release of sediment from the dams under the Proposed Action would be detrimental to Chinook and coho salmon EFH during the months when SSC concentrations are elevated. In the long term, the Proposed Action would increase habitat for Chinook and coho salmon (upstream of currently designated EFH) by providing access to habitats upstream of Iron Gate Dam. EFH quality would be affected by improved water quality, and decreased prevalence of disease, as described above for coho salmon critical habitat. Improved access to habitats (upstream of designated EFH), improved water quality and decreased prevalence of disease would provide a benefit to EFH for Chinook and coho salmon. Based on a substantial reduction in EFH quality during reservoir drawdown, the Proposed Action would have a significant effect on EFH for Chinook and coho salmon in the short term. Based on benefits to quality, the Proposed Action would have a beneficial effect on EFH for Chinook and coho salmon in the long term. (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-93). It is anticipated that as a result of the Proposed Action the summer and winter steelhead within the Klamath River watershed would have an increase in abundance, productivity, population spatial structure, and genetic diversity. Based on increased habitat availability and improved habitat quality, the effect of the Proposed Action would be beneficial for summer and winter steelhead in the long term (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-119). Analysis of the effects of the Proposed Action on the Klamath Estuary and nearshore environment is provided in the EIS/EIR in Sections 3.2 (Water Quality), 3.3 (Aquatic Resources) and Section 3.4 (Algae). An extensive analysis of the effects of suspended sediment and bedload sediments on anadromous salmonids is presented in Appendix E and Appendix F.	

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	As described in Section 3.2 of the EIS/EIR the effects of the Proposed Action on the marine nearshore environment would be less-than-significant for suspended sediment concentrations, nutrients, and sediment-associated inorganic and organic contaminants. The Proposed Action would result in no changes to water temperature, dissolved oxygen, and pH.	
GP_WI_1119_799-7	The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes a total of five alternatives. The cost associated with three of those alternatives (No Action/No Project, Proposed Action and Partial Facilities Removal of Four Dams) are quantified. Costs associated with the other two alternatives (Fish Passage at Four Dams and Fish Passage at Two Dams, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate) are not individually quantified. As indicated in the Draft EIS/EIR (p. 3.15-82): "However, that unavailable data is not essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives because potential impacts can be compared to the data developed for the No Action/No Project Alternative, the Proposed Action, and Partial Facilities Removal of Four Dams Alternative. The range of impacts anticipated for the two alternatives for which data is missing falls within the range of impacts analyzed and data developed for the remaining alternatives, though the ratio of expenditures to impacts might not have the same proportional effect across the various economic sectors. The comparative analysis required by NEPA is achieved using this qualitative method." Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_WI_1119_799-8	The Klamath Hydroelectric Project is regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). The original 1956 license for these dams expired in 2006. The 1956 PacifiCorp license did not include prescriptions (Section 18 of the Federal Power Act [16 USC 811]) for fish passage over or around the dams; only J.C. Boyle Dam has fish passage facilities, but these fishways do not meet current criteria (Administrative Law Judge 2006). On February 24, 2004, PacifiCorp filed an application with FERC for a new operating license for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project. FERC prepared a final EIS for relicensing the project, but no license has been issued. As part of the process for the 2004 relicensing application, a variety of stakeholders (individuals, tribes, fishing interests, and conservation groups) expressed a strong desire that the four hydroelectric dams be decommissioned and removed to address declining fisheries in the lower Klamath River and reopen approximately 43 miles of blocked mainstem river habitat between Iron Gate and Keno Dams and hundreds of	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	miles of stream habitat in Upper Basin tributaries. Fish considerations were a major subject during the relicensing process. For more information please see Chapter 1, p. 1-16 through 1-19 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Master Response N/CP-18 Process to Select Alternatives for Detailed Analysis. Master Response ALT-8 Inclusion of Alternatives Solely Based on Cost. Master Response GEN-13 Range of Alternatives Considered. The Draft EIS/EIR discloses environmental effects associated with the affected region and is not required to provide a benefit-cost analysis. However a benefit-cost analysis has been prepared as part of the Secretarial Determination process and is available at klamathrestoration.gov and summarized in the Secretarial Determination Overview Report. 40 CFR Sect. 1502.23 states that if a cost-benefit analysis relevant to the choice among environmentally different alternatives is being considered for the Proposed Action, it shall be incorporated by reference or appended to the statement as an aid in evaluating the environmental consequences.	
GP_WI_1119_799-9	Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants.	No
GP_WI_1119_799-10	Master Response WQ-1B-G Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants. In both the 2009-2011 study and a prior 2004-2005 study by Shannon and Wilson, Inc. (2006), numerous organic and inorganic chemicals were analyzed in reservoir sediments. Results from both studies indicated generally low levels of metals, pesticides, chlorinated acid herbicides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds SVOCs, cyanide, and dioxins. As discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2.7 (see p. 3.2-121 to 3.2-125), there were no positive exceedances of applicable freshwater or maximum marine sediment screening levels, with the exception of a small number of sediment samples from J.C. Boyle Reservoir, which exceeded the applicable marine screening level for legacy pesticides dieldrin and 2,3,4,7,8,-PECDF. There were also no exceedances of human health screening levels for non-carcinogenic chemicals. A subset of samples exceeded human health screening levels for arsenic and nickel; however, these screening levels were developed assuming a very conservative	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	soil ingestion exposure pathway. Additionally, the measured values are well within typical background concentrations for the Klamath Basin (arsenic may be naturally elevated in the Upper Klamath Basin). Elutriate samples representing the water that results when sediments are re-suspended did exceed freshwater quality criteria and human health criteria for some chemicals (i.e., ammonia [reservoirs only], chromium, phosphorus, copper, chloride [Estuary only], lead, total PCBs, mercury, aluminum, nickel, arsenic, zinc [J.C. Boyle only]); however, the expected dilution and mixing that would occur during reservoir drawdown is likely to be sufficient such that the minimum relevant criteria would be met and these chemicals would not be problematic. Master Response AQU-2A Sediment Dredging. As discussed in Draft EIS/EIR Section 1.3.1.2 (p. 1-20), the KHSA sets a cost cap of $450 million for removal of the Four Facilities. Of this, an amount not to exceed $200 million would come from additional charges to PacifiCorp ratepayers residing in California and Oregon, and up to $250 million would come from the sale of bonds in California or other means deemed appropriate financing mechanisms to cover removal costs in excess of the rate-payer contributions. The United States government would not be responsible for the costs of facilities removal. Costs of any mitigation for contaminants are not anticipated since the effects of sediment release, transit, and potential downstream river-bank deposition on humans and aquatic species (freshwater and marine) due to low-level exposure to sediment-associated inorganic and organic contaminants in the lower Klamath River would be less-than-significant.	
GP_WI_1119_799-11	The Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA), Section 11, describes the development of the fisheries reintroduction and management plans. The Program would present specific management options for managing Chinook salmon, coho salmon, steelhead trout and Pacific lamprey in the Klamath Basin, where anadromous Fish were historically present. These include: • An implementation plan to identify near-term and long-term actions necessary to address key uncertainties and develop specific strategies for achieving the goals of reintroduction. o Key investigations that do not require fish passage through the Hydroelectric Project (e.g.,stock selection, outmigrant behavior, and reintroduction methods) will begin as soon as funding is available.	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	• Introduction of Chinook salmon into Upper Klamath Lake and tributaries. This phase will require active intervention and movement of fish into habitats above Upper Klamath Lake. A variety of release and rearing strategies will be utilized to optimize opportunities for success. An adaptive management approach will be utilized to determine appropriate race(s) and life history of Chinook to release (spring and/or fall Chinook) with best opportunities for successful rearing, emigration to the ocean and return. • Monitoring and evaluation of natural re-colonization of native Chinook and coho salmon, steelhead trout and Pacific lamprey into the Klamath River and tributaries below Upper Klamath Lake. No active intervention or movement of Fish will be immediately proposed to re-establish salmon, steelhead or lamprey in these stream areas during the initial portion of Phase I Reintroduction. However, if monitoring reveals that re-colonization is not occurring or is too slow, the Fish Managers may pursue active reintroduction of salmon and lamprey into habitats below Klamath Lake. • On a continuing basis, the Fish Managers shall ascertain the status of reintroduced or recolonized populations of anadromous Fish in the Klamath River and tributaries. The Fish Managers shall include participation by interested Parties and other entities capable of adding technical expertise to the process. Once self sustaining populations of Chinook salmon and steelhead are established in the Upper Klamath Basin, at levels of population productivity consistently above replacement, Phase II will be initiated. • Implementation of management actions to achieve objectives identified in the Phase II plan that will guide basinwide management of the re-established fish populations. The reestablished populations in the Upper Klamath Basin will contribute to the Fisheries of the basin as a whole. • Management actions will insure that tribal, commercial, and sport harvests are managed in a way that provides for escapement of salmon and steelhead into the Upper Klamath Basin at levels that sustain healthy populations. To the extent possible, adult salmon returning to Upper Klamath Lake and tributaries from reintroduction efforts shall be protected to minimize their harvest in sport, commercial and tribal fisheries until the Phase II Reintroduction Plan is adopted.	

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) was established by the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 and has regulatory jurisdiction over salmon fishing within the 317,690 square mile exclusive economic zone from 3 miles to 200 miles off the coast of Washington, Oregon and California. Jurisdiction over commercial and recreational salmon fishing regulations in nearshore areas, within 3 miles of shore, lies with the respective States. However, the States generally adopt regulations consistent with those established by the PFMC. The Salmon Fishery Management Plan developed by the PFMC describes the goals and methods for salmon management. Management tools such as season length, quotas, and bag limits vary depending on how many salmon are present. There are two central parts of the Plan: Conservation objectives, which are annual goals for the number of spawners of the major salmon stocks (“spawner escapement goals”), and allocation provisions of the harvest among different groups of fishers (commercial, recreational, tribal, various ports, ocean, and inland). The Council must also comply with laws such as the Endangered Species Act. Since the management of salmon considers many factors that can fluctuate greatly from year to year (population abundance and environmental conditions) it is impossible to predict how future management decisions regarding the specific harvest of Klamath Basin salmon might change as a result of the Proposed Action. Given these uncertainties, the EDRRA Chinook salmon life cycle model developed Hendrix (2011) assumes that current management rules (fishery control rule) established by the PFMC for management of Klamath River Chinook salmon would remain in place throughout the fifty year period of analysis. In addition, the model assumes reintroduction efforts described in the KBRA would fully seed available fry habitats upstream of Iron Gate Dam, including the Upper Klamath Basin upstream of Upper Klamath Lake, in 2019 prior to dam removal in the year 2020.	
GP_WI_1119_799-12	Section 3.18 evaluated effects of lost hydropower to the region in terms of public utilities. The national economic effects of lost hydropower are evaluated in the Benefit-Cost Analysis completed for the Secretarial Determination process, which is detailed in the Hydropower Technical Report and summarized in the Secretarial Determination Overview Report (available to the public at the following website: http://klamathrestoration.gov/.) Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	P. 3.15-64 discusses the effects of reduced PacifiCorp property tax payments to counties under the Proposed Action. California and Oregon law requires the States to pay the current assessed value on transferred lands. If the counties receives in-lieu payments of equal value to PacifiCorp property tax payment, there would be no net effect to county revenues under the Proposed Action relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Section 3.15 also evaluates the regional economic effects of changes in operations at the Four Facilities, which would result in a loss of 49 jobs because of reduced O&M. Lastly, Section 3.15 also discusses estimated changes to agricultural income relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Over the period of analysis, the agricultural sector is anticipated to be an important part of the regional economy. The removal of the Four Facilities would not negatively affect the water supply for Reclamation's Klamath Project. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes the KBRA as a connected action to Alternatives 2 and 3. Water supply and water rights effects of the KBRA are analyzed on p. 3.8-18 to 3.8-24. As discussed on p. 3.8-18, a primary purpose of the KBRA is to increase water supply reliability. The KBRA would establish water diversion limitations that would be more reliable in the long-term and simultaneously develop programs to address decreased diversions. The KBRA would include the Water Use Retirement Program (WURP), a voluntary program for the purpose of supporting fish populations restoration by permanently increasing inflow to Upper Klamath Lake by 30,000 acre-feet per year. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes impacts from the WURP on p. 3.8-21 and 3.8-22, and concludes that "Implementation of the WURP is anticipated to have a less than significant impact to water rights because rights would be voluntarily retired. Implementation of the WURP is expected to have no effect to water supply because there would be no changes to diversions." Future hydrologic conditions, including agricultural water supply, are discussed in the technical report entitled "Hydrology, Hydraulics and Sediment Transport Studies for the Secretary's Determination on Klamath River Dam Removal and Basin Restoration," which can be found on www.klamathrestoration.gov.	
GP_WI_1119_799-13	The Klamath Tribes have petitioned the California Fish and Game Commission to establish an interim fishing site in the reach of the Klamath River between Iron Gate Dam and the Interstate 5 Bridge. The grant of this petition is one of the key milestones toward implementation of the KBRA. The site would be for the exclusive use of Klamath Tribal members but it would not be permanent. The interim site is intended to provide the Klamath Tribes access	No

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	to historic fish resources until such time as the dams are removed and salmon again have access to the upper reaches of the Klamath River. Whether the petition is granted would include consideration of other tribes' rights as well as potential effects on the Pacific coastal fisheries and may also require approval from the Pacific Fisheries Management Council.	
GP_WI_1119_799-14	Tables 3.15-65 and 3.15-66 summarize the regional economic impacts, including employment impacts, of all of the alternatives. In addition, tables 3.15-41 and 3.15-62 display the regional economic effects of dam decommissioning. Employment impacts related to dam decommissioning range between 1,423 for Alternative 2 and 1,138 for Alternative 3. These employment estimates are specific to dam decommissioning and are not meant to be subtracted from the employment effects associated with KBRA activities. Estimated jobs include full time, part time, and temporary positions. The sectors which are impacted vary widely depending on the activities; therefore it is not possible to predict the number of labor hours and associated wages. However, labor income was estimated in this analysis. Labor income is defined as the sum of employee compensation and proprietor income.	No

GP_LT_1128_947

Sheriff – DA – Department of Fish & Game Meeting

March 3, 2011

Authorities for ITP, 1600 & 1602 actions

Protocols

- Notification to land owners
- Notification to Siskiyou County Sheriff's Office
- Consultation on legal issues arising from citizen contacts
- Fish & Game Code violations in Siskiyou County

Perceptions of citizens

- Ranchers and farmers claim threatening demeanor by DFG at times
- Ranchers and farmers claim intrusions & water flow incidents without notification
- Ranchers and farmers claim water and property rights being abridged

Possible solutions

- Public meetings
- Cooperation and notifications to Sheriff's Office (DA is great resource)
- Collaboration & coordination (e.g., notifications when operating in county)
- Notification to land owners (e.g., fish screen maintenance, etc.)
- Public relations (educate public)
- Avoid tactics which involve any form of coercion or intimidation
- Regular meetings to discuss issues and problem mitigation

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1128_947-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_WI_1204_965

From: r4jalgi@pacbell.net[SMTP:R4JALGI@PACBELL.NET]
Sent: Saturday, December 03, 2011 7:58:56 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Restore the Klamath's Steelhead and Salmon Populations Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Restore the Klamath's Steelhead and Salmon Populations

Body: Dam removal will restore healthy numbers of Chinook, Coho, and Steelhead/Redband Rainbow trout by allowing them to access native spawning grounds. Dam removal is estimated to result in 1,400 jobs in its year of construction and implementation of restoration programs of the KBRA is estimated to result in 4,600 jobs over its 15 year implementation. A number of commercial fishing jobs will also be generated.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 4, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1204_965-1	Comment Noted. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1206_971

From: dtonn@hotmail.com[SMTP:DTONN@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 2:56:34 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Remove the Klamath Dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Subject: Remove the Klamath Dams

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: The dams on the Klamath are a harm to salmon populations and native peoples as a result. Furthermore, they spoil the land for purposes of enjoying the natural scenery and use of the river, and provide obstacles for other wildlife.

On top of this they are expensive to keep in place, more expensive than removing them.

So the choice is to pay money to hurt everyone and everything around the dams, or save money and make everyone around the dams happier and better off.

Not really much of a choice.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 6, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1206_971-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1230_1195

From: ruk53@q.com[SMTP:RUK53@Q.COM]
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2011 8:07:30 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Comment 1 - ITAs

Subject: dam removal

Body: The tribes in Klamath have proven they cannot manage anything. A select few live well and the rest are in poverty.We paid them 21 millionfor the ruby pipeline, where did that money go?The dams are there and should stay, How can we supply water without some form of storage.We have done enough for this bunch who are self-serving and will never work for the wholeof the tribe.

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 30, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1230_1195-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of the Record.	No

GP_EM_1204_975

From: AMPUB[SMTP:MAIL@ONESTOP-MAIL.INFO]
Sent: Sunday, December 04, 2011 10:44:04 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Education & Community development available
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Press Release:

Comment 1 - Out of Scope (Entire Doc)

The American Grants and Loans Catalog is now available. Our new and revised 2012 edition contains more than 2800 financial programs, subsidies, scholarships, grants and loans offered by the US federal government.

In addition you will also have access to over 2400 programs funded by private corporations and foundations. That is over 5200 programs available through various sources of financial providing organizations.

NEW: You will also have access to our live Database that is updated on a daily basis. This product also provides daily email alerts as programs are announced.

The Database is also available with IP recognition. This allows you to login without a username or password (Great for libraries or educational institutions who want their users to access the database).

Businesses, students, researchers, scientists, teachers, doctors, private individuals, municipalities, government departments, educational institutions, law enforcement agencies, nonprofits, foundations and associations will find a wealth of information that will help them with their new ventures or existing projects.

The document is a fully searchable PDF file for easy access to your particular needs and interests. Simply enter your keywords to search through the publication.

It is the perfect tool for libraries and educational institutions to use as a reference guide for students who require funds to pursue their education.

Contents of the Directory:

-Web link to program announcement page
-Web link to Federal agency or foundation administering the program
-Authorization upon which a program is based
-Objectives and goals of the program
-Types of financial assistance offered under a program
-Uses and restrictions placed upon a program
-Eligibility requirements

-Application and award process
-Regulations, guidelines and literature relevant to a program
-Information contacts at the headquarters, regional, and local offices
-Programs that are related based upon program objectives and uses

Programs in the Catalog provide a wide range of benefits and services for categories such as:

Agriculture
Business and Commerce
Community Development
Consumer Protection
Cultural Affairs
Disaster Prevention and Relief
Education
Employment, Labor and Training
Energy
Environmental Quality
Food and Nutrition
Health
Housing
Income Security and Social Services
Information and Statistics
Law, Justice, and Legal Services
Natural Resources
Regional Development
Science and Technology
Transportation

CD version: $69.95
Printed version: $149.95

To order please call: 1-888-341-8645

Please do not respond to this message. This is a post-only mailing.
If you do not wish to receive information from us in the future please reply here: abort105@email.com

This is a CANSPAM ACT compliant ad broadcast sent by:
American Publishing Inc., 7025 County Road 46A, Suite 1071,
Lake Mary, FL, 32746-4753

Comment Author	Unidentified
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 4, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1204_975-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No

GP_MC_1018_134

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MR. MARC VALENS: I'm Marc Valens, V-a-l-e-n-s.

I live on the Sykan River, 15 miles north of

Beatty.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

There are so many reasons why Alternative 2,

total removal of all four dams, is the best choice. The

science clearly shows it gives us the path to cleaner

water and healthier fish, it supports tribal peoples,

farmers and ranchers, commercial and sport fishermen,

power consumers, and livable communities.

To relicense the dams, today's laws would have

Comment 2 - Hydropower

to be followed. The cost would be very high. The dams

are private property and the owner wants them to come

down. Those who want to force a private company to keep

them would force PacifiCorp to run them at a net annual

loss. This can only lead to dramatically higher power

rates for all of us, farmers, business owners, and home

owners.

For many of us who live close to the rivers of

the basin, our quality of life will go up, as well as our

property values. I dream of steelhead and spring Chinook

on my stretch of the Sykan.

Comment 3 - Alternatives

My only significant problem with Alternative 2

is that it waits until 2020 to remove the dams. I say

let's get started sooner.

Comment Author	Valens, Marc
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_134-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1018_134-2	Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_MC_1018_134-4	Master Response ALT-3 Elimination of Alternative 13 - Federal Takeover of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project from Detailed Study.	No

GP_MC_1019_180

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM

---o0o---

CHILOQUIN, OREGON

OCTOBER 19, 2011

---o0o---

MR. MARK VALENS: Mark Valens, V-a-l-e-n-s. I did turn a card in at the table this evening. I hope it didn't get lost.

I spoke last night in Klamath Falls. One point I wanted make -- I was rather inartful, so thank you for a chance, a second chance to make my point.

Comment 1 - Real Estate

It's about property values. The Draft EIS says that property values along Copco Reservoir would decline in value. I would say those properties are already declining in value.

I flew over the reservoirs last summer, and they were lime green. And the toxic algae in there that they are having to post signs along there, says don't go in the water. And if somebody wants to sell their property under the law they have to disclose everything that is wrong with it. They have to tell the buyer that there's bad algae there in the summertime.

Once the river is restored, those properties, from there to the river, is going to be public land. And so they could, if they want to sell, they could sell their property as having premiere fishing access.

So I'm not sure the buyers actually are going to decline that much. The use will change, yes.

Much of the property here in Klamath County will increase in value, both of those right along the rivers, and we've got lots in the Klamath River, and the Williamson, the Sprague, the Sycan, the Wood River, lots of other places. But also other properties around, Keno and Chiloquin, I think particularly attract a lot of retirees, and people who can work from home. And anybody who wants to fish, they are going to be looking for a house in these places.

So some individuals regrettably will have losses.

But I believe there will be a substantial net gain in property values throughout the Basin. And I hope when you revise the draft you have some mention of this.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Valens, Mark
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC-1019_180-1	Master Response RE-1E Real Estate Evaluation Report. Master Response RE-2 Changes in Property Values.	Yes

GP_WI_1219_1097

From: Stephanie_VanHoose@Patagonia.com[SMTP:STEPHANIE_VANHOOSE@PATAGONIA.COM]
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2011 11:44:13 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath River

Body: The Klamath River has incurred way too much human destruction. It's time to remove as much of our impact as we are able, so that the Klamath can recover. Please support Alternative 2- Full Dam Removal.

Comment Author	VanHoose, Stephanie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1219_1097-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

GP_LT_1121_870

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

Comment 1 - General/Other

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

[illegible]	K. Falls
[illegible]	K Falls
Mike Madden	K FALLS
[illegible]	K-Falls
[illegible]	CHILOQUIN, OR
Nadine Northrup	CHILOQUIN, OR.
James Johnson	Merrill, Or
[illegible]	K-Falls
[illegible]	K-falls
[illegible]	Keno, OR
Robert N. Jones	Merrill Or.
HR Mueller	Klamath Falls

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Cynthia R. Mueller	Klamath Falls
John Ray	Klamath Falls
Patricia J. Bell	Chiloquin
Richard Lahmeyer	Klamath Falls
Shirley C. Bell	Merrill, Or.
Julie Ashley	Klamath Falls, Ore
Bryan Ellison	Klamath Falls
	KLAMATH FALLS
Jaime Unger	KF
George H. Manning	Keno, Or 97627
	K. FALLS, OR 97603
	K. Falls, OR 97603

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Jason Bowman	FA
Ellen McKay	Malin, Oregon
Richard Quigil	Malin, Or 97632
MICHAEL DUKE	SPRAGUE RIVER OR 97639
Becky Duke	Sprague River, OR97639
Nelson T Palmer	Chiloquin
Ernest Nichols	Bonanza, OR
Rae Ann S. Nichols	Bonanza OR
James W. Harris	Klamath Falls, Oregon
Steve McKinley	Malin OR
Susan McKinley	Malin OR
Frank Wallace	Klamath Falls

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed their way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Bob King	King Farms & Ranch
Maudie Smith	Klamath Falls, OR.
Tom Smith	K. Falls
Mike King	King Farms & Ranches
[illegible]	KLAMATH FALLS OR
[illegible] McCook	Klamath Falls OR
Linda Scott	Klamath Falls
Diane Tooker	Klamath Falls
[illegible]	B. Klamath Co.
[illegible]	Klamath Co.
Dana Delong	Klamath Co.
Marian Cantrell	KLAMATH Co.

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Terry Swaze	Klamath Falls OR
Rick Howard	Klamath Fall OR
[illegible]	Dairy, OR
Brent Thayne	Klamath Falls, Oregon
[illegible]	Klamath Falls, Oregon
Stanley [illegible]	Klamath Falls
Colene Smith	Klamath Falls
Bryan Williams	Klamath Falls OR
Maria Dean	Klamath Falls, OR
[illegible]	Klamath Falls, OR

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Joan Quinlan	406 N 9th St K. Falls Or 97601
Russell Tidball	4667 Haskins Bonanza Or
Cheri Tidball	4667 Haskins Rd, Bonanza Or. 97623
R.W. Humphry	32842 Rivers Dr Chiloquin 97624
[illegible]	32842 Rivers Dr Ch, loquin 97624
Robert Langley	13220 Henry Hill K. Falls Or 97603
Laurel Morisset	12373 Hwy 66 K. Falls, OR 97601
Wayne Scott	13350 Mann Rd K Falls 97603
Van L. Morisset	12373 Hwy 66 K Falls, OR 97601
Sandra Williams	2148 Hope Street, Klamath Falls, OR 97603
Nick Bohrnsen	9305 Bisbee K F OR 97603
Judy Todd	3593 Old Midland Rd KF 97603

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you NO KBRA!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

[illegible]	Chiloquin, Or
[illegible]	Chiloquin, OR
[illegible]	K. Falls, OR
Peggy Davis	K. Falls Ore.
Lynda D King-Clegg	Bly Oregon
William [illegible]	Klamath Falls Oregon
[illegible]	K-Falls, OR
[illegible]	Klamath Falls, OR
[illegible]	Klamath Falls
Ann Clark	Klamath Falls
Amy E. Farrow	Klamath Falls
[illegible]	K Falls

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes to our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Bob Grace	7129 Turner Ct. K Falls 97603
Sandy Grace	7129 Turner Ct K Falls, OR 97603
Donald L Grant	3620 Rio Vista K Falls 97603
Mildred E. Grant	3620 Rio Vista K. Falls, Or. 97603
Charlene Shaw	5215 Peggy Ave. K Falls OR 97601
Connie Haley	10231 Wright Ave K. Falls OR 97603
Alicia Lee	4909 W. Langell Valley Rd. Bonanza 97623
Jason Lee	4909 W. Langell Valley Rd. Bonanza 97623
Steve Davenport	4728 Range St K.E. OR 97603
Michael Tucker	9560 Hill Rd KF OR 97603
Gabriele Reinitz	P.O. Box 407 KENO OR 97627
Melissa Tucker	9560 Hill Rd KF OR 97603
Valerie Wiseman	6024 Teal DR - 97623
Michael J Wiseman	6024 Teal Dr. Bonanza 97623
[illegible]	5215 Peggy AV. (over)

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes to our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

[illegible]	Keno, OR
Felix Kelly	Klamath Falls, OR
[illegible]	Klamath Falls, Or.
[illegible]	Keno OR 97602
[illegible]	Klamath Falls OR
[illegible]	Klamath Falls, OR
Mieke Vaccaro	Klamath Falls, OR
[illegible]	Klamath Falls OR
[illegible]	La Pine OR
Bonnie Wickersham	K-Falls, OR
Myrle Carpenter	K Falls
Carolyn Carpenter	K. Falls

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes to our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

[illegible]	3205 Maple Chiloquin OR
Terry Leeper	10400 McKinnon Merrill, Ore
[illegible]	1005 3 West B Rook Ave K. Falls OR 97603
Bill Whitney	24449 Seattle St Bonanza 97623
Sandra Whitney	PO Box 114 Bonanza 97623
Kevin Lindwig	708 Jefferson SE Klamath Falls OR
Aaron Johnson	PO Box 193 Merrill OR 97634
Robert Johnson	" " "
[illegible]	3001 Reeder Rd Klamath Falls
Sherry Leanders	P.O. Box 1442 KFS 97601
[illegible]	Sprague River OR
Nadine Fly	Keno OR.

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes to our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Nicholas L Coyle	Klamath Falls
Clyde A. Burt	Klamath Falls
Lynn A. Burt	Klamath Falls
Shawn Toolson	Klamath Falls
[illegible]	Klamath Falls
Ken Woodell	Chiloquin
[illegible]	Chiloquin
[illegible]	Klamath Falls
[illegible]	Klamath Falls
[illegible]	Klamath Falls
[illegible]	Klamath Falls
Mark [illegible]	Chiloquin OR

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes to our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you NO KBRA!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Lindsey McClure	
Darell Hoppe	
Jerrie Garrett	
Vince Harwood	
Jerry Gray	
Jeff Chadwick	PO Box 27 Merrill
Bob Tuley	6920 Albany Dr. K.F.
[illegible]	4965 Pine Grove Rd
Michael L Griffin	1045 Thomas Dr., K.F.

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Sandy Snedekin	Chiloquin, OR
Cheore Crapelano	K Falls, Or 97603
Earle Hartman	K Falls, OR 97601
Patsy Hartman	K-Falls - OR 97601
Marvin Wessel	Bly. Or 97622
Ron WESSEL	
Charles R Johnson	MORRILL OR. 97633
Bob Hall	7992 SHORT RD.- Klamath Falls 97603 Bly, Or
Ole Emmons	510 Round Lake Rd 97601
[illegible]	2320 APPLEGATE AVE 97601
Doug L West	3708 Summer Lake 97603
Kathryn Beatlin	PO Box Cave Junction OR 97523

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Robert Jamison Robert Jamison	628 Pacific Terrace, KFO. '01
Rebecca Moulder Rebecca Moulder	794 Covered Br Rd Rogue River OR
MARK MARKINSON Mark Markinson	26830 Hwy 140 E Bonanza OR.
Mary Makinsen Mary Makin	Same
Rodney Beady Rodney Beady	3242 Shasta Way K. Fe, Or.
Marilee K. Beady	"
Billy Brown	9700 Egert Rd, Merrill, OR
[illegible]	2391 Brownsboro-Meridian Rd Eagle Pt Or 97524
[illegible]	12030 Spring Lake Rd Klamath Falls, OR 97603
TREVOR Postus	Bonanza OR
[illegible]	Fort Klamath OR
Jon [illegible]	K F A L S

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes to our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Barbara Schinkunst	595 Jeanie Way CS 97752-3
Eric Bertlin	Box 2145 Cave Junction OR 97523
[illegible]	P.O Box 342 Merrill OR
Thomas W. Dubs	8037 Hwy 140 E Klamath Falls OR 97603
Karen L. Dubs	8037 Hwy 140 E K Falls OR 97603
Chrissie Wilson	PO Box 445, Keno 97627
Pat Lunde	17957 S. Poe Valley Rd, K Falls 97603
Steve [illegible]	12110 Lupinsky Klamath Falls 97603
[illegible]	12110 Lupinsky Klamath Falls 97603
Mayen Anderson	5492 Shasta Way K Falls 97603
[illegible]	3930 Summerset K Falls 97603
[illegible]	6767 Tilly Lake Dr.

Attention to all irrigation districts, and governing Boards

We've been assessing how the radical environmentalists have wormed there way into almost every water district in the U.S. They start at the water manager and offer him future positions and under the table deals. After the manager is in cahoots with radical enviros, they get the manager to bring their deal to the table with the board members that manager works for. The board members that fall into the manager's recommendation on agreements with radical environmental groups have at this point started representing the water manager's interest and not the people who elected them to the board. This has happened in every water take over re; Central Valley Project Improvement Act , SanJoquin river settlement ,and again in the Klamath river restoration that is so mixed up the farmers are kept out of secret meetings.

We as business men do not let our irrigators tell us how to or who to buy sell or trade important assets of our farms. So why are we allowing our water managers to negotiate our most vital asset to our farms for us with the radical environmentalists. Board members need to wake up and remember who they represent or be replaced. No more water managers should be sitting at the table when it comes our property negotiations. Board members please protect the property owners that ELECTED you.NO KBRA!!!!

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Dennis White	6205 Reeder Rd Klamath Falls, OR
Victor L Brannan	8727 Short Road, KF OR
Evelyn Brannan	8721 Short Rd KF Or 97603
Jack Ginister	17550 So. Poe Valley Rd. KF OR 97603
Tonya Ginister	17550 So. Poe Valley Rd KF OR. 97603
Fred Crockett	3703 La Mirada KF
Mike Whitlock	11028 Rive ST Keno OR
Elizabeth Merkley	7070 Teare LN Bonanza Or 97623
Carson Merkley	7070 Teare LN Bonanza Or "
Elizabeth Merkley Lowry	3447 Hwy 39, Klamath Falls, OR 97603
Richard Delsoth	1070 Cedar Ridge Dr K-Falls OR
Dan B.	6750 S. 6th St.
Peg White	6750 S. 6TH ST.
Kim J. More	1731 Riverside Dr. K-Falls U.S.A.

CITIZENS PROTECTING RURAL OREGON (CPRO)

The following citizens are adamantly against the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) and the Klamath Hydro Electric Agreement (KHSA)

This is a strong message from the following citizens of Klamath County.

Signature	E-mail or address
Mike a King	MKingcgwest@Yahoo.Com
Tom Mallard	Tmbrokenbox ranch@gmail.com
Jim Grant	Jim Grant Grant Myers X @ G mail
[illegible]	13345 HOPKINS RD SACK ARMSTRONG BONANZA
[illegible]	23655 S. Poe Valley Rd. K Falls.
[illegible]	20990 Hwy 140E DAIRY
Maryann Gutzell	21566 South Poe Valley Rd, Klamath Falls
Garth Kinney	P.O. box 45 Bly, OR. 97622

Copied 5-6-2011 By Mike King

CPRO Citizens Protecting Rural Oregon

Petition

Petition	Enter Name signature address email if so desired
	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act to Stop the Validation of the KBRA and Hydro agreements and amend the ESA

Printed Name	Signature	Address	email	Date
Jennifer Crook	Jennifer Crook	10245 Modoc Ave Klamath Falls OR 97603		5/6/11
LINDA DOTSON	Linda L Dotson	37120 Hwy 62 Chiloquin OR	linda1dotson@yahoo.com	5/6/11
Kathy Walker	Kathy Walker	Crescent City, 95531 P.O. Box 2147	—	5/6/11
Dona Miller	Dona Miller	Fort Jackson Co 95538 P.O. Box 433	—	5-6-11
Linda Scott	Linda Scott	13864 Spring Lk Rd		5/6/11
Diane Tooker	Diane Tooker	7280 Henley Rd	sheshuto@com steel interest	5/6/11
Tony Orella	Tony Orella		TORELLA4150@Gmail	5/6/1
Nancy Orella	Nancy Orella		orelladairy@hotmail.com	5/6/11
Diana Nelson	Diana Nelson		bearpaw@clearwire.net	5/6/11
Ron Tidball	Ron Tidball	4667 Haskins Rd	? Deanwan2@aol.com	5/6/11
Cheree Tidball	Cheree Tidball	4667 Haskins Rd.	cherewa@aol.com	5/6/11

Printed Name	Signature	Address	email	Date
R W Humphrey	R W Humphrey	32842 Rivers Dr.	None	5-6-11
Wayne Scott	Wayne Scott	13350 Mann Rd Klamath Falls	Cell 541-331-7721	
Laurel Morrisett	Laurel Morrisett	12373 Highway 66 K. Falls		5-6-11
Robert Langley	Robert Langley	13270 Hwy 140E		
Van L. Morrisett		12373 Highway 66 K. Falls OR.		5-6-11
Nikki Cochran	Nikki Cochran	4305 Bisbee KF, OR	4nikkibc@gmail	
Sandra Williams	Sandra Williams	2148 Hope Street KFO	aspiringauthor@charter.net	05-06-11
Al Bauer	Al Bauer	3210 Maple	Callemin@e-isco	
Chad Smith	[illegible]	10053 W Crystal Brook Ave		5-6-11
Sonny Rychard	Sonny Rychard	15580 Fairhaven Rd Klamath Falls		5-6-11
Sandra Whitney	Sandra Whitney	PO Box 114	bsearch@bbextreme.com	5-6-11
Kevin Ludwig	Kevin Ludwig	708 Jefferson St 97601	Kevin.Ludwig@oit.edu	5-6-11
Sharon Johnson	Sharon Johnson	PO Box 193 Midland OR 97634		5-6-11
Richard L. Johnson	Richard L. Johnson	" ✓		" ✓
Sherry Leanders	Sherry Leanders	P.O. Box 1442 KFls 97601	—	5-6-11
Shelbee Hudson	Shelbee Hudson	Spring Rm	LSHUDSON10@ GMAIL	5-6-11

Printed Name	Signature	Address	email	Date
NADINE Hoy	Nadine Hoy	13910 Hwy 66 K. Falls OR	TiAllyhoheya@MSN.COM	5/6/11
Chuck Hoy	[illegible]	13910 Hwy 66 K Falls	" "	5/6/11
Linda Hammerich	Linda Hammerich	15666 Elangell Vly Rd	fhammerich@aol.com	5/6/11
Jared Thompson	[illegible]	P.O. BOX 68 Keno OR. 97627	223YOTEBUSTER @G-MAIL.COM	5/6/11
Derek Thompson	[illegible]	121 DAHLIA Klm 97601	DJTHMPSN.Gmail.Com	5/6/11
Karl Cline	[illegible]	3803 Hope St. K.Falls 97603	Karlcline@charter.net	5-6-11
Joe Vaccaro	[illegible]	1125 ADAMS ST SUITE D	PLAYTIGERMITE@LIVE.COM	5-6-11
Mieke Vaccaro	Mieke Vaccaro	1125 Adams St Suite D	miekevaccaro@yahoo.com	5/6/2011
CAROL JURGENSEN	[illegible]	P.O. Box 2688, 97375	sweetdivens@yahoo	5/6/11
Kimberlee Jorgensen	[illegible]	231 Jennings St. Lebanon OR 97355	jorgensenokim@yahoo	5/6/11
Shane Jorgensen	[illegible]	231 Jennings St Lebanon OR 97355		5/6/11
Duke Lewis	[illegible]			

cell

Name	Organization	Business Phone	Home Phone	E-Mail address	FAX number
YRIS Moody	Basin Fert	798-5655	798-5708	BFCHSM@WIZARDS.NET	798-5741
NDREW STUEBLI	Economic Development	882-9600	891-9565	KLEDGAS@cdsnet.net	882-7646
ian Janz	Economic Development	882-9600	273-0246	N/A	882-7648
as Kampwerth	F.A.R.M	883-8111	545-3425	emporiumonline.com	883-8113
ick Carleton	FOF/PFUSA	798-5653		DCard123@aol.com	
oe Bair	F.A.R.M.	882-6009	Same	bairj@AOL.com	cell 591-1556
ARBARA MARTIN	F.A.R.M.	883-3781 884-4640 891-0901	884-4640	BABI1112@AOL.com	891-0901
AN + Rarry Nielsen	"		884-0992	RanryA@AOL.com	891-2500
Bill Rawson		891-5601	884-4893	BoggieBill@Aol.com	
Bob King	Farm	883-2850			883-2850
Joe Bair	FARM/FOF/PFUSA	591-1556	882-6009	bairj@aol.com	
Frank H. Hammerich	Hammerich Ranches LLC	545-6620	545-6620	fhammerich@aol.com	545-6620
Dick Carleton	FOF/PFUSA	798-5653	Same	DCard123@aol.com	
Hipaw Baghoot	Klamath Water Foundation	891-1977	884-9464	cascadiaranch@aol.com	883-3454
Luther Horsley	Farmer/KPD	891-7594	882-7982	lutherhorsley@AOL.com	884-5133
Holly Swanson	Operation Green Out!	541-830-1446	[redacted]	cwb@internetcds.com	541-830-1448

Comment Author	Various
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1121_870-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No

GP_WI_1116_716

From: waterbill@peoplepc.com[SMTP:WATERBILL@PEOPLEPC.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 1:33:04 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: time
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: William Vaughan
Organization:

Comment 1 - Alternatives

Subject: time
Body: Salmon cannot wait until 2020. Our sons and daughters cannot wait until 2020. Take down the Klamath dams now.

Comment Author	Vaughn, William
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_716-1	Master Response ALT-3 Elimination of Alternative 13 - Federal Takeover of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project from Detailed Study.	No

GP_WI_1206_973

Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 5:29:51 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Restoration Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Amy L. Vibrans
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Restoration

Body: I urge you to restore the Klamath River to its natural state. Restore the habit and fishes. I see no other way to achieve this but to remove all dams.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Vibrans, Amy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 6, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1206_973-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1019_070

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: Edwin J. Vieira

Organization:

Title:

Address: 32821 Sprague River OR 97639

Email:

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment 2 - NEPA

Comments: I am opposed to the removal of the dams! The major concern I have is the lack of scientific evidence. As a retired educator, having taught in elementary enclosed classrooms for 25 years, I know the basic "Scientific Method" of making decisions was not used. The "best available data" and "biological opinion" of experts was used to make this monumental decision. There should be enough data collected in the past ten plus years to indicate if projects implemented in the Upper Klamath Basin are being effective.

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Vieira, Edwin
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1019_070-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No
GP_MF_1019_070-2	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No

GP_EM_1117_1137

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 9:17:02 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Dam Removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> Virginia <vbfritch@gmail.com> 11/17/2011 7:14 PM >>>
To Whom it may Concern:

Comment 1a - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment 2 - Sediment Transport

Please leave the dams alone! If you allow this project to continue, an estimated 22 million cubic yards of sediment will sludge its way down the Klamath River and into the Trinity river and destroy salmon runs, kill fish and wildlife and affect water clarity and purity for generations!!! This will destroy tourism in our county!!! I can't even believe you are considering removing the dams. Stop it!

Comment 3 - Economics

Comment 1b - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Sincerely,

Virginia Fritch

P.O. Box 427

Weaverville, CA 96093

Comment Author Fritch, Virginia
Agency/Assoc. General Public
Submittal Date November 17, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1117_1137-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No
GP_EM_1117_1137-2	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging.	No
GP_EM_1117_1137-3	Estimated economic impacts relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative, including those related to recreation, which is generally related to tourism are discussed in Section 3.15. Losses in reservoir and whitewater recreation are expected to be offset by improvements in sport fishing (both ocean and in river) and refuge recreation. These changes are anticipated to have a positive net effect on the local and regional economy.	No

GP_WI_1111_507

From: anne@avitale.com[SMTP:ANNE@AVITALE.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 2:23:41 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam Removal on the Klamath Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Anne Vitale
Organization: Golden West Women Flyfishers

Subject: Dam Removal on the Klamath

Body: The time has come to remove all four dams on the Klamath. They have outlived their inteded usefulness and have become not only a liabilty to the region but remain a MAJOR hinderence to the steelhead and salmon runs that once were so abundent on the Klamath River.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Vitale, Anne
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_507-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1116_723

From: robert@peakdemocracy.com[SMTP:ROBERT@PEAKDEMOCRACY.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 11:17:45 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: undam Klamath
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Robert Vogel
Organization:

Subject: undam Klamath
Body: Please undam the Klamath

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Vogel, Robert
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1116_723-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement

EIS/EIR PROCESS

GP_MF_1025_259

Comment Form

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
25 2011

CODE	ACTION	SURNAME & DATE
150	✓	

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Date Input & Initials

Name: [illegible]

Organization:

Title:

Address: 13524 Tarpon Dr., Montague, CA 96064-9453

Email: clkay@sisqtel.net

Comments: I noticed most of the speakers had an agenda of one sort or another. Primarily the ones in favor of dam removal. I got the impression they would benefit in some way. Even the science is skewed towards dam removal. Problem there is it is very clear to me that this is going to be a billion dollar plus experiment. This at a time when both the Federal and California governments are "broke". This is DUMB! Remove 4 perfectly good hydro electric dams and replace them with? Probably carbon based electricity. What about "Climate Change"? Or the fact we are in an energy "crisis"? DUMB!

Comment 1 - NEPA

Comment 2 - Costs

Comment 3 - Hydropower

It is apparent there is no real idea what will happen to the river once the dams are removed, just a bunch of guesses. Look at the Savage Rapids Dam Removal on the Rogue River by Grants Pass, OR. Didn't quite work out as planned. There is a law of unintended consequences that often comes into play. It may well be the devil we know will be better than the one we create.

Comment 4 - Fish

Salmon runs are decreasing on all North Coast Rivers. The dams cannot be the cause. So we remove the habitat of lake fish - Bass, Perch, Bluegill for nothing. This goes beyond insanity! There is not one argument in favor that makes sense, when put in to the "Big Picture". It is all related.

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	W. Kivela, Lee
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 25, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1025_259-1	Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
GP_MF_1025_259-2	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate.	No
GP_MF_1025_259-3	Comment noted.	No
	Master Response GHG-1: Green Power.	
	Master Response GHG-3 Replacement Power.	
GP_MF_1025_259-4	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of the Record.	No
	Master Response REC-2 Recreational Use at Restored River.	
	Master Response REC-8 Flat Water Fishing.	
	Master Response AQU – 5 Will Benefit All Salmonids.	
	Master Response AQU – 19 Chinook Expert Panel Proposed Action Better Than No Action.	
	Master Response AQU – 16 Benefits to Coho.	
	Master Response AQU – 21 NRC Dam Removal Help Coho.	

GP_MC_1020_184

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MS. ANNE WALENT: Hi, my name is Anne Walent, A-n-n-e --

Welcome to our county. Well, for 47 years I

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

have lived here out of my 57, and I really don't want the

dams out.

I have talked to old timers, and they have said

that the river was always slower and warmer than most,

it's kind of its geological nature, it's a little

bass-akwards (sic), mountains at the end instead of at the

beginning.

Comment 2 - KHSA

An assemblyman came to the tea party meeting

the other night, Dan Logue, and he knows more about the

inner workings of some of the organizations involved in

this, and he says that their intentions aren't honorable

and it's collusion.

He indicated that the World Communist Agenda

21, goaded and loaded by George Soros, we all know that,

wants this place to be a park with services.

And I can't believe that a lifelong decision is

going to be made by one man, one man only. Ken Salazar is

going to make a lifelong decision for me. I mean, I feel

like I've been convicted by a judge, because we think we

know what his decision is, based on what we have even seen

and heard here tonight.

So, um, anyway, it's just rough when voters

aren't listened to and appointees by corrupt

administrations are.

Comment Author	Walent, Anne
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_184-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the Draft EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.	No
GP_MC_1020_184-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities. Master Response GEN-23 Agenda 21. Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information.	No

GP_WI_1122_897

From: donrwalker@gmail.com[SMTP:DONRWALKER@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2011 5:08:18 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Don Walker
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dams

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Io feel that it is imperitive that the dams on the Klamath be removed as soon as possible. I urge governmental agencies to move expeditiously on this matter.

Comment Author	Walker, Don
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 22, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1122_897-1	The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).	No

GP_WI_1229_1198

From: walkers@4fast.net[SMTP:WALKERS@4FAST.NET]
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2011 11:06:18 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Dam Removal -- Transmission Lines Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Ryan Walker
Organization:

Subject: Dam Removal -- Transmission Lines

Body: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that was issued in connection with the Klamath Restoration Plan and the anticipated removal of several hydro-electric facilities on the Klamath River.

Comment 1 - Hydropower

My comment relates to failure of the EIS to adequately address the environmental impact of the high-voltage transmission lines associated with the decommissioned hydro-electric facilities. I am commenting specifically on the double high-voltage lines running south from the Copco plants because I have the most familiarity with those lines. I assume, however, that my comments may be applicable to transmission lines running from all of the facilities to be decommissioned.

When the Copco hydro plant was installed in 1918, California Oregon Power Company obtained power line easements from local land owners to allow for the transmission of power generated at the newly constructed plant. Implicit in these agreements was the understanding that the transmission line easements were needed to support the local production of electricity and the creation of the new dam and lake on the Klamath River.

Overtime, two large transmission lines were installed on the easements. Today there is a large double wood structure transmission line and a single pole transmission line on the easement. These structures are serviced by many miles of dirt roads and four-wheel-drive trails. These roads were often pushed up in haste due to the pressing need for maintenance or repair. The roads are not graveled, do not have water bars to reduce erosion, or culverts at most watercourses. Repairs are often required to be done in the winter causing these roads to become severely rutted. As a result, these power lines and the roads associated with them have become a conduit for fine soil particles and a contributor to sedimentation of local creeks and tributaries of the Klamath River. These tributaries have been determined by the EPA to be impaired for sedimentation under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

It is my concern that, if the power line easements survive dam removal, Pacific Corp. will reroute other electricity through the existing power lines. Use of these power lines after removal of the Copco hydro facilities not only violates the original understanding by which the easements were granted, but more importantly, continued use of the easements will exacerbate the sediment impairments in the local watersheds. Accordingly, the Klamath Restoration Plan should require the removal of the high-voltage transmission lines associated with

the decommissioned hydro facilities and the power line easements should lapse back into the deeded interest in the land. Such a requirement will act to mitigate some of the increased sedimentation that will be caused by dam removal.

Comment Author	Walker, Ryan
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 29, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1229_1198-1	As described in Section 4.0 of the Detailed Plan for Dam Removal (Reclamation 2012b), all existing transmission lines no longer needed by the Klamath Hydroelectric Project, will be decommissioned, the structures removed, and any disturbance rehabilitated. As noted in the Draft EIS/EIR, Land Use Section 3.14.1.5, PacifiCorp owns the electric transmission and electric distribution facilities, that would not be removed as described in the Detailed Plan for dam removal, and would remain under its ownership, (Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement [KHSA] Section 7.6.1), and are not analyzed further in the EIS/EIR. It is unknown what PacifiCorp would do with these transmission facilities following implementation of the KHSA, and to do so in this EIS/EIR would be too speculative.	No

GP_EM_1104_354

From: laurie wallace[SMTP:LWALLACE2000@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 1:41:20 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Mrs. Vasquez - please do NOT remove the klamath dam!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I am not a paid person, I am a concerned citizen of California. Please do not let the environmentalists run this state into the ground.
We need this dam, and I'd like you to protect it!!

Thank you, Laurie Wallace

Comment Author	Wallace, Laurie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 4, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1104_354-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1019_179

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM

---o0o---

CHILOQUIN, OREGON

OCTOBER 19, 2011

---o0o---

MS. KATHLEEN WALTER: Kathleen Walter, W-a-l-t-e-r.

I'm from Chiloquin, ranch and farm here.

I am a Republican. And I don't believe that the

Republican Party here represents me. I'm very upset with

him. Thank you very much.

I want to thank you for all your scientific work,

and I apologize for people that say you haven't done your

job properly because I guess they have had a lot more

schooling and experience than you all have, so...

But the bottom line is -- and I will echo what's

Comment 1 - General/Other

already been said -- is the dams are private property of

PacifiCorp. And it ultimately is their business whether

they keep them in or not. They have decided it is cheaper

to remove them. Bottom line.

And Mr. Jefcoat is incorrect. Two commissioners do

support the KBRA.

In 20 years, at least 20 years, at least 20 years

have been put into these agreements. And if Mr. Jefcoat

complains about being left out, maybe he hadn't moved here

yet from Orange County.

I personally was not at the meetings. But I was

represented at the meetings by folks more eloquent than

myself and so forth. And I was able to talk to them and

find out what was going on and put my input in.

The bottom line is I believe, I believe that we

were given water and land to use wisely. And I don't

believe that any specie should suffer for someone to raise

cattle or alfalfa. I think if we do it right, it can be

helpful to everyone.

Comment 2 - Costs

And also, after re-licensing those dams will run

about a $20 million per year deficit. And I don't think

the county can afford that.

Comment 3 - Approves Dam Removal

So I think you're doing a great job. I support the

tribes in their efforts. And I do support dam removal.

Thank you very much.

Comment Author	Walter, Kathleen
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1019_179-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the KHSA and KBRA.	No
GP_MC_1019_179-2	Master Response GEN-20 PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities.	No
GP_MC_1019_179-3	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_166

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MR. MATT WALTER: My name is Matt Walter, W-a-l-t-e-r.

Comment 1 - Other/General

I want to applaud to the panel for their good, hard work that they did and their outcome findings in the EIS. I also applaud you for doing it in a timely fashion. It seems like, a lot of times, these studies just get waylaid longer and longer. This is a critical component in the KBRA, so the timely fashion in having it completed will help us toward or goal with the KBRA. I don't envy your position of the panel, standing up here tonight and the next couple of nights and having to listen to the attacks on your professional credibility. It kind of reminds me of a statement from a very popular author who writes about current events -- he says, to paraphrase, scientists do everything in their power to avoid becoming politicians, but politicians will not hesitate to become expert scientists. So on that kind of note, I applaud you for sticking this out.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

The other issue that I was kind of surprised about is the ratepayer. I'm a ratepayer, and everybody has been talking about the power rates going up, complaining about the power rates going up. It seems to

be that nobody has studied PacifiCorp's position.

PacifiCorp's position has stated that it's in

the best interest -- PacifiCorp, which is a private,

for-profit company that owns the dams as private property

-- I'd like to say that it's in the best interest of their

ratepayers to remove these dams.

If you look at their statements and their

figures that they have written down, they are estimating

somewhere close to a half a billion dollars to upgrade and

maintain those dams, and at the same time, they'll operate

at approximately a twenty-million-dollar loss. So we will

be -- the ratepayers, not anybody else but the ratepayers,

will be subsidizing this, because that's the way utilities

work.

So that's the major concern for me when it

comes to, um, the dams staying in: We'll have to end up

paying for them, one way or the other. With -- with them

staying in and being no cap, it will always be paying for

those dams, and I betcha half a billion dollars will be

minimal compared to ten years from now when we are still

trying to update, meet the Clean Water Act, meet

requirements for fish and everything else.

Comment 3 - KBRA

The other one of the statements I want to make

is that -- about the KBRA -- is, in that building right

next door, many years ago, I remember listening to a representative from the Bush Administration telling us that if this community -- and this community is from Gearhart Mountain, all the way to the mouth of the river -- if this community doesn't get together and solve this issue, the government is going to come and solve it for us and, most likely, we are not going to like what we get. So the idea of it being status quo, um, and leaving it as it is is just not going to happen. Something is going to happen and we are not -- if we lose our ability to control some of our destiny, somebody else is going to control it for us.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Walter, Matt
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_166-1	Comment noted.	No
GP_MC_1018_166-2	Comment noted. Master Response GHG-2: Rate Increases.	No
GP_MC_1018_166-3	The Secretary of the Interior will consider this and all other comments in making his decision relative to the KHSA and KBRA. These agreements were developed by local stakeholders to resolve water conflicts in the Basin.	No

GP_MC_1019_176

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM

---o0o---

CHILOQUIN, OREGON

OCTOBER 19, 2011

---o0o---

MR. MATT WALTER: My name is Matt Walter,

W-a-l-t-e-r, I'm a Project irrigator and also a ratepayer,

so tonight, I'm going to come here as a ratepayer and I'm

putting aside the KBRA, the KHSA, all of that stuff. I'm

just really interested in the issues of being a ratepayer,

and this is similar to what I did the last time you guys

were here, and made -- I made a presentation; um, it was

about being a ratepayer, and I presented similar --

similar topic matter.

So most people are going to read this summary

right here and this is what they are going to look at, and

Comment 1 - Alternatives

what I see in the summary -- what I want to address is

option 1 and 4.

Options 1 and 4 basically are the same thing

because if those dams stay in there, the FERC relicensing

is going to have to continue, and eventually, they are

going to have to do, um, the same -- the same issues with

fish ladders, water quality, and all that stuff.

Comment 2 - FERC

But what I don't see -- when you talk about

option 4, I don't -- what I don't see in the summary is, I

don't see the emphasis on the uncapped liability that the ratepayers are going to have. Otherwise, the ratepayers --

You make statements about how much it's going to cost but you don't -- you don't push -- you don't emphasize the issue that this is just like the tip of the iceberg. This is just going to start going on, you know. If those dams -- if they try to relicense those dams, the ratepayer is going to be on the hook.

You do mention that the ratepayers -- all the cost will be passed right along with the ratepayers or to the ratepayers for all those costs, and I -- it's not emphasized enough, as far as I'm concerned.

I'm going to read a passage from a letter from Scott Bolton to the Honorable Wally Herger. This letter is dated April 1, 2010, and I'm just going to read a paragraph out of it that they stated.

Among the additional cost impacts customers would face under a relicensing scenario are, one, the potential increase in the scope and cost of the required PM&E measurements; two, potential for additional requirements of PM&E measurements; and three, potential costs related to the Clean

Water Act and the Endangered Species Act's

compliance and permitting. These additional

costs cannot be accurately measured at this

time but could be substantial. Understand

that these potential impact -- understanding

these potential impacts' continuation down

the path of relicensing would present a

greater cost and risk for our customers than

the settlement path taken by PacifiCorp.

So they are stating it right there, that this

-- you know, between tribal trust and the ESA and all

these things, it could be a long, long, drawn out thing,

and that is not enough emphasis for people to realize, and

I don't see it in the summary, so that's one point.

Um, and it kind of changes a little bit. I

don't see a whole lot of signs -- I don't see a lot of

signs about saving our dams, but I kind of want to address

that issue.

I don't know whether it's dishonesty from

these people, but the idea of saving our dams, as far as

I'm concerned, as a ratepayer, they are just selling the

ratepayer down the river -- sorry for the pun -- but

they --

Comment 3 - Hydropower

Those dams are private property, they are owned

by PacifiCorp. PacifiCorp is a for-profit company and

that's the only -- that's their main motive is to make a

profit for their shareholders.

This idea that the dams belong to us is just --

is just ludicrous, and along that same line, if you go to

page 13 in your summary, you state -- you state, um, that

we are talking about close to half a billion dollars in

upgrades that will be responsible for PacifiCorp if the

fish ladders and clean water and all those issues are

brought up. And also, you state that the ratepayers --

this cost will be directly related to the ratepayers.

So instead of having a cap at two hundred million dollars

and that subsidy going out that we are paying, the

surcharge going out right now, we have an unended -- an

open checkbook that can never end, you know, and people

are not addressing that at all.

So as a ratepayer, that -- that little bit of a

surcharge could look like nothing compared to what it

could be in ten years down the road.

Comment 4 - Hydropower

And the other fact, as I keep hearing, "Oh,

it's cheap power," but right here, you state, and it's in

the FERC report -- all this information has been around

for years and years, it just didn't come out yesterday --

that in -- that these dams would operate at a loss, um,

otherwise meaning that that power that is generated is

going to cost more than you could go buy that power on the

open market, so how can that be cheap power?

Once again, as a ratepayer, I'm getting sold

down the river, so all this stuff about, um, oh, it's

green power, it's cheap power, and all that stuff, they

are not reading all of the issues and they are not

studying everything that's in here.

Comment 5 - Approval of Dam Removal

From the business aspect and from my pocketbook

aspect, it just makes no sense to keep those dams in, so

I'm favorable of your findings and, um, with either 2 or

3, as far as the dams go.

Thank you very much.

Comment Author	Walter, Matt
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1019_176-1	Under Alternative 1 as described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 2.4.2, PacifiCorp would need to obtain a long-term operating license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to replace the existing annual license. PacifiCorp would resume relicensing proceedings with FERC to obtain the required long-term operating license. Until that unknown time, PacifiCorp would continue to operate under an annual license. The No Action/No Project Alternative, as described, is the most reasonable assumption of future conditions. Among the action alternatives, Alternative 4: Passage at Four Dams, as described in Section 2.4.5, describes a scenario where KHSA terminates and the requirements for fish passage as set forward by the prior FERC relicensing proceedings are implemented.	No
GP_MC_1019_176-2	PacifiCorp provides electricity to about 1.7 million customers in six western states, including residential and commercial customers in southern Oregon and northern California (PacifiCorp 2004). Section 3.18, Public Health and Safety, Utilities and Public Services, Solid Waste, and Power, further describes PacifiCorp hydroelectric facilities and service. PacifiCorp is subject to regulations established by utility authorities in each state, which influences operations, customer rates, and cost recovery. PacifiCorp sets customer rates based on multiple factors, including energy prices, future demands, resource adequacy, overhead costs, and long-term investments. PacifiCorp uses customer rates to recover a portion of operating and investment costs. If expenditures are not directly offset by any associated project revenues or cost reductions, the utility's rates increase, subject to regulatory approvals. As part of the process for relicensing the hydroelectric facilities on the Klamath, PacifiCorp must provide fish passage and meet numerous other conditions required by the Clean Water Act (CWA) and other state and federal statutes. PacifiCorp has concluded it would cost less to remove the hydroelectric facilities than it would cost to relicense them. These costs must be borne by ratepayers if the facilities are relicensed. The economic reality of implementing fishways and meeting CWA 401 Certification at the facilities combined with the prospect of annual loss of revenue, and the protection of prudent and reasonable utility rates for its customers encouraged PacifiCorp to enter into collaborative discussions with basin stakeholders to identify ways to improve basin fisheries. These discussions resulted in PacifiCorp signing the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA). (Executive Summary 2.2.2)	No

Comment Author	Walter, Matt
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Potential electric rate impact to ratepayers is discussed for each alternative in Section 3.15.4.2. Under the KHSA implemented in the Proposed Action (Alternative 2) and Alternative 3, PacificCorp's ratepayer liability is capped at $200 million. PacifiCorp has added an approximately 2 percent surcharge to customer rates in Oregon and California to cover costs of dam removal. Under the Proposed Action and Alternative 3, customer rates would not likely increase above the existing surcharges as a direct result of dam removal costs (Section 3.15.4.2). Under Alternatives 1, 4 and 5 fish passage and other mandatory terms and conditions required as part of dam relicensing could result in increased energy rates for PacifiCorp customers. PacifiCorp estimated that costs to develop fish passage consistent with the Mandatory Conditions imposed by the DOI and the United States Department of Commerce (DOC) would cost more than implementation of the KHSA (OPUC 2010). In its ruling to approve KHSA surcharges, the OPUC concluded that PacifiCorp "has demonstrated that customer costs under the KHSA are capped below projected costs to relicense and continue operation of the Klamath dams." The Oregon Public Utility Commission (OPUC) further concluded (quoted in Section 3.15.4.2) that Ratepayers "will be responsible for significant future costs for the Klamath Project (regardless of the disposition of the dams). The nature and scope of these costs has been unclear, however, since 2000 when Pacific Power [PacifiCorp] first provided notice of the Company's need to seek federal relicensing of the Project. We are persuaded that continued pursuit of the relicensing option would pose significant risks to ratepayers. The nature and scope of the costs involved with relicensing would remain uncertain and subject to significant escalation for a considerable period of time."	
GP_MC_1019_176-3	Master Response GHG-2: Rate Increases.	No
GP_MC_1019_176-4	Master Response HYDP-2: Power Production at the Four Facilities. Master Response GHG-2: Rate Increases.	No
GP_MC_1019_176-5	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement
EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1229_1191

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

Fax:
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by ~~November 21~~, 2011. December 30, 2011

(Please print legibly)

Name: Anita Ward

Organization: Aro-en-Ciel

Title: President/Researcher

Address: 129 Southshore Lane
Klamath Falls, OR 97601-9117

Email: wardadj@charter.net

Comments:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Dear Department of Interior Staff,

After attending various public hearings, scoping meetings and researching alternatives, I have concluded that Alternative 2 is the best for the long-term environmental health and economy of the Klamath River region along w/ KBRA + KHSA.

The success of other dam removals, i.e. Savage Rapids, Elwah, and Condit demonstratively predict likewise success with the Klamath River Dams.

Comment 2 - Other/General

I would like to see consideration/compensation for Siskiyoo Co + Shasta Tribe for their losses with flooding, etc.

If possible, I request protection/diversion of Lost River Suckers and Shorthose Suckers in the upper reaches of the Klamath River by the Keno Dam/Reach in the transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation.

Sincerely yours, Anita Ward

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comments to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment 3 - Fish

Comment Author	Ward, Anita
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 29, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1229_1191-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the KHSA and KBRA.	No
GP_MF_1229_1191-2	Section 3.6 evaluates potential effects from flooding and proposes mitigation measures.	No
GP_MF_1229_1191-3	Under State and Federal regulations, Federally listed suckers would receive full protection if Keno Dam is transferred to Reclamation.	No

GP_MC_1018_152

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING
(Directly to Court Reporter

MR. GEORGE WARNER: George Warner, W-a-r-n-e-r.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to

voice my opposition to both of these agreements.

To begin with, the present administration seems

eager to fund all kinds of green energy projects, many of

which are financially unsound because there is no public

demand for their products; as an example, look at

Solyndra, on which this administration has thrown away

about a half a billion, that's billion with a

"B," taxpayer dollars.

The dams on the Klamath River are already green

energy producers. There is a demand for the product of

these dams: We need their electricity, so allow the

electricity.

Some environmental hard-liners don't want

coal-fired plants and/or nuclear generating plants, others

don't want solar panels in the desert, disturbing the

native plants and animals, and others say that windmills

kill too many birds.

The brahmins in Massachusettes don't want their

view from their Cape Cod cottages spoiled by the off-shore

wind generators, and some Floridians don't want

oil-drilling platforms off there shores, even if they

could hardly see them and even when they find that the

public wants what they produce.

You have to want to see these dams to see them.

They don't spoil anyone's views and they already produce

electricity that we need.

Why would you approve the destruction of this

in-place, successful green operation? It doesn't make

Comment 2 - Fish

sense. And if you do approve it, what will happen to all

the fish when that hot, algae-filled water from Klamath

Lake isn't allowed to cool off behind the dams? These

dams are deep, they have cold water to start with through

the winter, and this is water that I have seen at 78

degrees in the summertime. If that would just pour down

the river, it would kill the fish.

Comment 3 - Alternatives

Have you ever considered letting out more water

down from the Trinity? The water from the Trinity Alps is

cold water. Fish love cold water, they don't like hot

water.

Now, I understand the farmers and ranchers

would like to settle the water problems so they can --

I've got to hurry --

Comment 4 - KHSA

I am a stakeholder because I am a ratepayer,

and I have already been paying for dam removal even before the agreements that have taken place. We ratepayers have been excluded.

Comment 5 - KBRA

What does the word, "restore," really mean?

That is, restore what? Just the fishery?

Among other things, the KBRA includes millions and millions of taxpayer dollars for buying timberlands and then giving them to the people who sold them for taxpayer dollars years ago. Something seems wrong with that. If I sell a truck to my neighbor, am I allowed to force my neighbor to give me the truck back without returning his money to him?

This kind of fuzzy thinking seems to abound in the hallowed halls of Congress and in the White House, and maybe even in Salem, but a lot of folks here don't think they like it.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Warner, George
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_152-1	Comment noted. Master Response GHG-1: Green Power. Master Response GHG-2: Rate Increases. Master Response GHG-3: Replacement Power.	No
GP_MC_1018_152-2	**Master Response WQ-15 Klamath Dams Do Not Supply Cool Summertime Water to Downstream River Reaches** In addition, the sole water supply for Iron Gate Hatchery withdraws cold water from the deeper water of Iron Gate reservoir; depleting or exhausting this cold water pool during the summer would likely seriously impair hatchery operations during any year that such hypolimnetic releases occur (FERC 2007, p3-147). Alternative 1 does not include modification of outlets to use hypolimnetic water. **Master Response AQU – 5 Will Benefit all Salmonids** **Master Response AQU – 6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook** **Master Response AQU – 14 Expert Panel Resident Fish** **Master Response AQU – 15 Expert Panel for Lamprey** **Master Response AQU – 17 Expert Panel Second Line of Analysis, Not the only line of Evidence** **Master Response AQU – 16 Benefits to Coho** **Master Response AQU – 21 NRC Dam Removal Help Coho** **Master Response AQU – 31 Thermal Lag and Diel Temperatures**	No
GP_MC_1018_152-3	The Trinity River enters the Klamath River close to the Pacific Ocean; changes to Trinity River releases would affect only a relatively small segment of the Klamath River. The Trinity River has been the subject of a separate restoration study resulting in the Trinity River Restoration Program. Changes to Trinity River flows would not address the NEPA purpose and need or CEQA project objectives; therefore, they were not included as alternatives to the Proposed Action.	No
GP_MC_1018_152-4	Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA. Master Response GEN-16 Public Involvement	No

Comment Author	Warner, George
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_152-5	In the context of the KBRA, restoration programs are largely focused on the restoration of fisheries habitats. As described in section 2.4.3.9 of the EIS/EIR, habitat restoration activities might include: • Floodplain rehabilitation work includes activities to improve or restore connections between channels and floodplains to create and maintain off-channel habitat accessible to overwintering juvenile salmonids. Floodplain rehabilitation could include activities such as riparian planting and understory thinning, to facilitate the development of mature riparian stands that would provide shading and large and small wood to stream channels and floodplains; wetland restoration; and levee setback or dike removal to reconnect floodplain hydrology. • Large woody debris placement could include both mobile wood and complex structures and could be used to create off-channel habitat or provide cover in pools. • Correction of fish passage issues could include culvert upgrades or replacement to meet current fish passage standards and correction of other fish blockages to provide access to new or historic habitats. • Cattle exclusion typically includes the construction of fencing to prevent cattle from trampling stream banks, which allows riparian vegetation to grow. Cattle exclusion is often conducted in conjunction with riparian planting. • Mechanical thinning and prescribed burning are used to mimic some of the functions and characteristics historically provided by a natural fire regime. Thinning and prescribed burning reduce the potential for more catastrophic fires and the erosion that often follows. • Purchases of conservation easements and land from willing sellers allow for more direct land management for habitat enhancement purposes. • Decommissioning of roads could reduce road densities in areas with a high potential for failure and could stabilize slopes. Road failures can be a major source of chronic sediment inputs into stream systems. • Gravel augmentation involves the direct placement of spawning-size gravel into the stream channel. • Most of the above activities would also reduce fine sediment inputs into stream systems. Treatment of fine sediment sources could include a broad array of actions including management of stormwater runoff from roads and other developed areas, agricultural and forestry management practices, and other specific actions depending on the sources of fine sediments.	No

GEORGE WARNER

GP_LT_1031_265

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opposition to both of these Agreements !!

Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_152

~~REGARDING THE KHSA~~: TO BEGIN WITH, THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION SEEMS EAGER TO FUND ALL KINDS OF "GREEN ENERGY" PROJECTS....

MANY OF WHICH ARE FINANCIALLY UNSOUND BECAUSE THERE IS NO PUBLIC DEMAND FOR THEIR PRODUCTS.

AS AN EXAMPLE, LOOK AT SOLYNDRA ...ON WHICH THIS ADMINISTRATION THREW AWAY ALMOST **HALF A BILLION** *[THATS BILLION WITH A "B".]* ~~**DOLLARS OF**~~ **TAX PAYOR DOLLARS.**

THESE DAMS ON THE KLAMATH RIVER ~~CAN ALSO BE CONSIDERED~~ "GREEN ENERGY PRODUCERS" THERE ***IS***, ~~HOWEVER, NO~~ A DEMAND FOR THE PRODUCT OF THESE DAMS. WE NEED ELECTRICITY !!

SOME ENVIRONMENTAL ~~EXTREMISTS~~ DON'T WANT COAL-FIRED PLANTS, AND/OR NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANTS. OTHERS DON'T WANT SOLAR PANELS IN THE DESERTS TO BE DISTURBING THE NATIVE PLANTS AND ANIMALS.....AND OTHERS SAY WINDMILLS KILL TOO MANY BIRDS.

THE BRAHMINS IN MASSACHUSETTS DON'T WANT THE VIEW FROM THEIR CAPE COD COTTAGES SPOILED BY OFF-SHORE WIND GENERATORS.....AND SOME FLORIDIANS DON'T WANT OIL-DRILLING PLATFORMS OFF THEIR SHORES....EVEN IF THEY COULD HARDLEY SEE THEM..... AND EVEN IF THE PUBLIC WANTS WHAT THEY PRODUCE. ~~ACCORDING TO OUR NEWSPAPER, WE RATE PAYORS WILL BE FORCED TO PAY FOR IT.....WHICH I ASSUME MEANS NO FEDERAL TAX DOLLARS WILL BE INVOLVED.~~

WHY WOULD YOU APPROVE THE DESTRUCTION OF THIS IN-PLACE, SUCCESSFUL "GREEN" OPERATION ???? AND IF YOU DO APPROVE IT, WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO ALL THE FISH WHEN THE HOT, ALGY FILLED WATER FROM KLAMATH LAKE ISN'T ALLOWED TO COOL OFF BEHIND THE DAMS, AND THEY HAVE TO LIVE IN IT??

NOW ABOUT THE KBRA.

Comment 1 - General/ Other

Duplicate cont.

WE ~~[illegible]~~ ALL UNDERSTAND THAT FARMERS AND RANCHERS WOULD LIKE TO SETTLE THE WATER PROBLEM SO THEY CAN KNOW WHAT THE FUTURE HOLDS. ~~FOR THEM.~~

SOME OF THESE FOLKS APPROVE OF THE KBRA AND MANY SURELY DON'T. THE HERALD & NEWS CALLS THEM "STAKE HOLDERS" ~~AND I CAN SEE THAT THEY ARE.~~

BUT I AM ALSO A STAKE HOLDER BECAUSE I AM A RATE PAYER! AND I'M ALREADY PAYING FOR DAM REMOVAL.....EVEN BEFORE THE AGREEMENTS HAVE BEEN APPROVED. AND IN MOST, IF NOT ALL, OF THE MEETINGS THAT HAVE BEEN TAKING PLACE, WE RATE PAYERS HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED.

WHAT'S THE WORD "RESTORE" REALLY MEAN?? THAT IS, RESTORE WHAT??? AMONG OTHER THINGS, THE KBRA INCLUDES MILLIONS AND MILLIONS OF **TAX PAYOR DOLLARS** FOR BUYING TIMBER LANDS....AND THEN GIVING THEM TO PEOPLE WHO SOLD THEM, **FOR TAX PAYOR DOLLARS**, YEARS AGO. SOMETHING SEEMS WRONG WITH THAT.

IF I SELL A ~~CAR~~ TRUCK TO MY NEIGHBOR, AM I ALLOWED TO FORCE MY NEIGHBOR TO GIVE ME ~~MY CAR~~ THE TRUCK BACK WITHOUT RETURNING HIS MONEY TO HIM ?? THIS KIND OF FUZZY THINKING SEEMS TO ABOUND IN THE HALLOWED HALLS OF CONGRESS AND IN THE WHITEHOUSE.....BUT A LOT OF FOLKS HERE, DON'T LIKE IT.

MAYBE IN SALEM.

THANKS FOR LISTENING TO MY CONCERNS.

JUST THE FISHERM.

WHAT PERSON IS ALIVE NOW THAT EVER SAW A SALMON ABOVE KENO.

Comment 2 - Economics

YOU TALKED ABOUT LOCAL COMMUNITIES — AND WENT THROUGH SOME NUMBERS OF JOBS = HOW DO YOU PROPOSE TO GUARANTEE THAT THE MAJORITY OF THESE JOBS GO TO PEOPLE IN OUR LOCAL COMMUNITIES?

Comment Author	Warner, George
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 31, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1031_265-1	Master Response 2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information.	No
GP_LT_1031_265-2	The regional economic effects stated within Section 3.15, including job effects, are estimates. The estimated employment is modeled to occur in the identified economic regions and would be available to residents in the region. The purpose of the Draft EIS/EIR is to describe impacts, not to guarantee employment to certain individuals. Estimated jobs include full time, part time, and temporary positions. Full realization of employment changes may not occur to the extent that businesses deal with changes in spending by adjusting the workload of existing employees or increasing their use of capital relative to labor.	No

GP_LT_1019_083

October 18, 2011

PUBLIC HEARING RE:
DAM REMOVALS ON THE KLAMATH RIVER
KLAMATH FALLS, OREGON

Partial Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_136

My name is CAROL A. WARREN, and I have been following this issue for many months. I have yet to hear any good reason to tear down these 4 dams. And I am talking about good reasons for human beings, which come first in my book. I presume these dams were built in the first place to create cheap hydroelectric energy to enrich the lives of people, and to control flooding for the farmers and ranchers.

It simply makes NO sense to tear down these dams as long as they are producing "green" energy for humans. This is a clean, renewable energy source. Our monthly electric bills are sky-high now. Why would you encourage more costly generation of electricity? Just like gasoline, when the cost of basic electricity goes up, everything we use to maintain our standard of living goes up in cost.

Everything I've read is preceded by the word '*COULD*'. To my mind, that means: no one really knows what the outcomes will be - there are no guarantees on future flooding, number of jobs created, how much our electric rates will rise, how many fish will make it to the ocean, etc., etc.

Comment 1 - Out of Scope of EIS/EIR

It is unforgivable that state & federal authorities, along with private environmental organizations, would just allow those 30,000 salmon to die off in 2002. Were they too lazy to dredge Upper Klamath Lake to remove the toxic algae blooms, or was it just too hard?. The Columbia River, in northern Oregon, is dredged almost every year to remove foreign plant material, killer fish, sediment, etc. Why do you find it necessary to remove dams before you can remove toxic material?

Comment 2 - Alternatives

Comment 3 - KBRA

And lastly, I am sorry to tell you, **we-the-people** are not obligated to pay for the Tribes to acquire that private timberland, or more fish. I do feel empathy, and real sadness, that they still hold grudges for the way their ancestors were treated by our ancestors. But, it was their choice to sell the land those many years ago. If the federal government says the Tribes were cheated, then I cannot argue about giving their money back -- but nothing more. Please understand, it has nothing to do with me. We are all responsible for ourselves, our own families, and helping those who cannot help themselves. Nothing more. And so, I am asking, just this one time: put humans before the fish. Keep the dams.

Carol A. Warren
3003 Butte Street
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Comment Author	Warren, Carol
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 19, 2011

Portions of this letter are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment coded - GP_MC_1018_136. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this comment document are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_MC_1018_136. Responses to comments provided in this comment document that were not also submitted as a part of GP_MC_1018_136 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1019_083-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record.	No
GP_LT_1019_083-2	The intent of the proposed action is to improve salmonid recovery by removal of the dams. As a consequence of the proposed action, some sediments behind the reservoirs would be transported downstream along with associated contaminants. Master Response AQU-2A Sediment Dredging. Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants.	No
GP_LT_1019_083-3	Master Response KBRA-5 KBRA and Klamath Tribes.	No

GP_MC_1018_136

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. CAROL WARREN: Hello, my name is Carol Warren, W-a-r-r-e-n.

I want to thank you for this opportunity to, um, express my opinions. I have been following this issue for many, many months and I have yet to hear any good reason to tear down the four dams, and I'm talking about reasons for human beings, which is first in my book.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I presume the dams were built in the first place to create cheap electricity to enrich the lives of humans and to control flooding for the farmers and the ranchers.

Comment 2 - Hydropower

I have four points I'd like to make. It simply makes no sense to tear down these dams as long as they are producing this green energy that our administration loves so much. This is a clean, renewable energy source, and our monthly electric bills are sky high now. I hate to think what is going to happen if they tear them down. I do not understand why you would even encourage more costly generation of electricity. Just like gasoline, when electricity goes up, everything in our lives goes up in cost.

Comment 3 - NEPA

Everything I have read is preceded by the word, "could." To my mind, that means nobody really knows what the outcomes are going to be, there is no guarantees on future flooding, the number of jobs created, how much our electric rates will rise, how many fish will make it to the ocean, et cetera, et cetera.

Comment 4 - Algae

And I have to make a comment about the toxic algae blooms. I spent a lot of time on the computer, looking at the website and, uh, it seemed like the website was blaming the dams for those 30,000 fish that died in 2002. I say, shame on the state, shame on the Feds, shame on all these environmental agencies. Why didn't they just dredge the lake? It could be done. You can't get rid of everything but you can get rid of the toxic stuff. It's a shallow lake. So now it's your fault that the fish died, it's not ours.

Comment 5 - KBRA

Now, the last thing is not pleasant but it needs to be said. Nontribal people are not obligated to pay for the tribe's desire to purchase the forest land or more fish. They need to negotiate with the Feds, themselves, for this forest land or to create a hatchery, whatever they want to do -- I'm in favor of it but don't ask me to pay for it, I don't have the money.

So please understand, what the tribes want,

what the tribes need, is not my problem.

Comment Author	Warren, Carol
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_136-1	The Executive Summary provides a list of reasons for removing the Four Facilities on the Klamath River. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_MC_1018_136-2	Comment noted. Master Response GHG-1 Green Power. Master Response GHG-2 Rate Increases.	No
GP_MC_1018_136-3	Master Response N/CP-5 Use of "Would" and "Could."	No
GP_MC_1018_136-4	As discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.3.3 Habitat Attributes Expected to be Affected by the Project (pages 3.3-36 to 3.3-40), the September 2002 fish die-off of adult (primarily) Chinook salmon in the Klamath River downstream from Iron Gate Dam is attributed to fish disease (not toxic algae blooms). Although this die-off is also mentioned on page 3.3-39 of the Draft EIS/EIR, there is no discussion of the causative factors of the September 2002 adult fish die-off in the Draft EIS/EIR. There are two reports addressing the causative factors. In the fall of 2002, an epizootic outbreak of Ich and columnaris disease was associated with what proved to be the largest salmon die-off ever recorded in the western United States, which resulted in the mortality of tens of thousands of adult salmon (USFWS 2003; California Department of Fish and Game [CDFG] 2004). It appears that conditions favoring explosive growth of Ich and columnaris were created that year due to high densities of returning Chinook salmon, low September flows and warm water temperatures that likely inhibited migration of adult fish further upstream (USFWS 2003). These causative factors have been addressed in the Final EIS/EIR (Section 3.3.3.3.9 Disease and Parasites). KBRA flows for the river are consistent with recommendations by CDFG to avoid flows and conditions that occurred when the 2002 adult fish die-off took place (Section 17.4 (p.5), KBRA Operations, Reclamation 2012c). It is unclear if the comment author is referencing dredging as a potential long-term management option for removing algal toxins in sediment deposits behind the dams or for minimizing short-term suspended sediment concentrations and potential exposure to associated contaminants in the Klamath River following dam removal. If the former, note that the fish die-off was not attributed to toxic algal material or algal toxins being transported from the Project reservoirs into the Klamath River. If the latter, while the Alternatives Formulation Report identified the option of mechanical	Yes

Comment Author	Warren, Carol
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	sediment removal as mitigation for sediment erosion impacts associated with removal of the dams, subsequent analysis found this measure to be infeasible (Lynch 2011) Lynch, D. 2011. Infeasibility of the mechanical removal of reservoir bottom sediments if Klamath River dams are removed in 2020. (http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/lynch.memo.8.30.11.mech.dredge..pdf). See also Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging.	
GP_MC_1018_136-5	Master Response KBRA-5 KBRA and Klamath Tribes.	No

GP_WI_1201_950

From: cowboy444@myway.com[SMTP:COWBOY444@MYWAY.COM]
Sent: Thursday, December 01, 2011 1:42:22 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath River Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Randy Waters
Organization:

Subject: Klamath River Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Body: I'd like to take this time to make my feelings known about the Klamath River Dam Removal.
I am against the removal of any of the Dams that are in place today.
They help control water flows and retain water for irrigation.
Removing Dams will flush millions of tons of sediment downriver choking fish and covering spawning beds killing billions of eggs and salmon fry.

DON'T REMOVE THE DAMS !!!

Comment 2 - Sediment Transport

Comment Author	Water, Randy
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 1, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1201_950-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_WI_1201_950-2	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish.	No
	Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging.	

GP_WI_1028_245

From: tvwearing@att.net[SMTP:TVWEARING@ATT.NET]
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2011 10:09:44 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: remove the dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Tom Wearing
Organization: self

Comment 1 - Approve of Dam Removal

Subject: remove the dams
Body: I am a resident of Siskiyou County, California. I favor removal of the dams which now exist on the Klamath River.

Comment Author	Wearing, Tom
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1028_245-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_LT_1101_309

Edward Webb
5175 Patrick Creek Dr.
Mckinleyville, CA 95519-8022

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
NOV 1 '11

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

2011 OCT 31 PM 4:13
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
MID-PACIFIC REGION

Classification	PRS 13.00
Project	12
Control No.	110820528
Folder I.D.	1153134
Date Input & Initials	11/1/2011

SCANNED

Date: Oct 28, 2011

Dear Ms. Vasquez:

Comment 1 - Approves Dam Removal

I support Klamath Dam Removal as described in Alternative 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR on Klamath Faciliti°es Removal because:
it is the best option and promotes salmon restoration and the river habitat

Sincerely,

Name (printed clearly) Edward Webb

Signature Edward Webb

Comment Author	Webb, Edward
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 1, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1101_309-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1118_781

From: jweil@mac.com[SMTP:JWEIL@MAC.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 4:28:00 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam's
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: James Weil
Organization: Cal Trout, IEEE, IA - CLIA

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath Dam's

Body: Because of Man's myopic vision and greed, fish are dying and land is being flooded. It is not too late to turn this around. Please respect the land and the gifts we have been given by removing the Klamath Dams.

Comment Author	Weil, James
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1118_781-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the KHSA and KBRA.	No

GP_WI_1118_766

From: pmw1@humboldt.edu[SMTP:PMW1@HUMBOLDT.EDU]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 11:27:05 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Draft EIS/EIR Public Comment Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Patrick Wenger
Organization:
Subject: Draft EIS/EIR Public Comment

Body: From: Pat Wenger, Ph.D.
11/18/2011

2340 17th St.
Eureka CA 95501
Email: pmw1@humboldt.edu
Ph. 707 443-8883

To: The Secretary of Interior and to reviewers of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project Facilities Removal Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Subject: Public comments to be reviewed and entered into the record of factors considered
in decision making regarding the DEIS and DEIR

Dear Secretary of Interior and Reviewers:

I recommend in the strongest possible terms the immediate rejection of the DEIS and DEIR. An examination of these documents reveals that they have been drafted to clearly favor the interests of big money and of agricultural water use relative to the Klamath situation. The interests of sportsmen, of Native Americans and of Del Norte County have been excluded from major parts of the report preparation and appear to be excluded from management considerations for decades should these two documents be approved. I am sure that these documents can be challenged in court should they be approved, but when documents come before you with such blatant bias I implore you to reject them. Please reject the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement and the Klamath Hydropower Settlement Agreement as the one-sided power-grabs that they represent. Additionally, the health of the Klamath River as a somewhat natural waterway will be greatly enhanced by letting the dam die a natural death, which it most surely do in the absence of the so-called agreements noted above. By rejecting the DEIS and DEIR and not enacting KBRA 15.3.9 you can take actions which both avoid a serious injustice to democratic society AND guide the Klamath basin toward a better natural health.

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Yours Truly,
Pat Wenger

Comment Author	Wenger, Patrick
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1118_766-1	Master Response KHSA-1 Negotiations in Private. Master Response GEN-3 Best Available Information. Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information.	No

GP_MC_1020_210

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. TOM WETTER: Tom, T-o-m, W-e-t-t-e-r.

The thing I want to point out is what's going on

in this basin today is at the behest and direction of the

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management,

Department of Fish and Game.

How this all came to be was by implementing

their plans and programs. I have concern just on general

principle that this time they are going to get it right.

Comment 1 - Economics

What I do know is that these dams and all of the

structures put into the rivers and streams in this county

were put there to enhance the environment, the economic

environment of this county.

I'm not sure how you can tell me, if you read

Dr. Gallo's report closely, how that is going to impact or

provide opportunities of Siskiyou County. It's not. What

Dr. Gallo's report says is that 78 percent of the benefits

will accrue to Del Norte and Humboldt counties and coastal

fisheries.

Comment 2 - Out of Scope

Today you can't fish in the Shasta River or

Scott River. Today if you go to the Shasta River or the

Scott River, you have fences on both sides of the river,

not only to keep the cattle out but to keep the people out as well.

So the issue is about the economy. We are the seventh poorest county in California. We had timber here until 1995. We had 22 operating mills. We had 6,000 living wage jobs. We have two mills left in this county, and I think there is something like 300 employees.

So I don't know how you can overcome that type of a loss. We lost dredge mining because of North Coast Regional Water Quality Control -- North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board's actions and decisions about dredge mining.

Comment 3 - Economics

So all we have left is agriculture. It's a marginal place to run agriculture, it always has been. We only get water on average once every seven years, that is how often Lake Shasta even fills, every seven years. What we do need to be concerned about is sustainable economy, not a sustainable environment.

Comment 4 - Hydroelectric

If you look at the growing economies in this world. Brazil, the fastest growing economy in this world, 80 percent of their electrical power comes from hydroelectric.

if you look at China, that amazing economy you might know about, they are putting in hydroelectric to

power their economy. If you look at India, they are

putting in hydroelectric to power their economy.

I'm not sure how agriculture in this county is

going to be able to survive when they are forced to pump

water from wells to irrigate their fields and raise their

crops.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Wetter, Tom
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_210-1	The regional economic analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR evaluates economic effects to various economic regions, depending on where economic activities occur in the Klamath Basin. Economic regions are made up of groups of counties and the analysis does not evaluate effects individually by county. Siskiyou County is included in the regional economic region for dam decommissioning, reservoir recreation, in-river sport fishing, whitewater boating, irrigated agriculture and KBRA effects. Section 3.15 also evaluates effects to property values and local revenues in Siskiyou County. Del Norte and Humboldt counties are in the economic region for commercial and ocean sport fishing analyses. Effects of the Proposed Action on ocean fishing would not be expected in Siskiyou County. The Gallo report focuses on major features of the KHSA and KBRA (construction, restoration) but does not (as Dr. Gallo himself notes) address all of the economic impacts associated with the two agreements. The Draft EIS/EIR is more comprehensive in this regard and is based on more definitive dam removal cost estimates, KBRA cost estimates, fishery projections and other information that were largely unavailable at the time of the Gallo report (Economic Impacts of the Klamath Settlement Agreements. Prepared by: Dr. David Gallo, October 2010).	No
GP_MC_1020_210-2	The proposed project does not involve actions on the Shasta or Scott Rivers.	No
GP_MC_1020_210-3	Water supply at Lake Shasta is beyond the scope of the Draft EIS/EIR.	No
GP_MC_1020_210-4	Comment noted.	No

GP_WI_1111_561

From: silverstrand_inspector@yahoo.com[SMTP:SILVERSTRAND_INSPECTOR@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 5:07:01 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Iron Gate Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Mark Whelan
Organization: Matilija Fly Fishers

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Iron Gate Dams

Body: It would be such and event, and such a wonderful statement to our youth if those blockages could be removed or made to be part of a free flowing system in the Klamath River in upper CA and Lower Oregon. Ive been there, and the complacent, still watered, areas above the dam seem out of place, along with the overall development around the dammed areas. Please vote to remove these systems of dams.

Comment Author	Whelan, Mark
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_561-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_144

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter

MS. MARY WHITE: Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Mary White. Last name is spelled W-h-i-t-e. I, again, want to thank you for this opportunity because there is no one in this Basin that loves water more than I do. I'm president elect of the Friends of Crater Lake. And my great great grandfather was on the search party that found Crater Lake in 1853. My heritage and my life, I pray every day, I love all of these people. And I just think if we take a step back in this study that we could maybe come to a better agreement than removing our dams and the KBRA.

Comment 1 - Alternatives

And I just want to thank everyone for coming here tonight because it is such an important issue. And I just pray and hope everyone in this Basin will in God's love come to a good agreement. I do not support the KBRA as written or removal of the dam. Thank you.

Comment 2- Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	White, Mary
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_144-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as a Part of the Record	No
GP_MC_1018_144-2	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as a Part of the Record	No

GP_WI_1118_759

From: mike white[SMTP:LUMBERGUY73@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 7:39:34 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Auto forwarded by a Rule

To the Bureau of Reclamation,

Comment 1a - Disapproves of Dam removal

I am against the destruction of the four perfectly-good,

hydro-electric dams

the Klamath River.

Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_729

The four hydro-electric dams have been producing enough for 70,000 homes and businesses AND has potential to produce enough to power 150,000 — How will it be replaced? This is a true green electricity.

– There are alternatives to aid returning salmon past the dams BUT the federal agencies and CA DFG will not consider them.

– Also, the settlement agreement does not appear to provide any assurances that the irrigation water inside or outside the Klamath Project will be delivered.

Please reconsider this experiment.

Comment 1b - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Thanks for listening,

Mike White

Comment Author	White, Mike
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 18, 2011

Portions of this comment document are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment coded - GP_EM_1116_729. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this comment document are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_EM_1116_729. Responses to comments provided in this comment document that were not also submitted as a part of GP_EM_1118_800 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1118_759-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_121

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MR. DOUG WHITSETT: First, I want to thank you

folks for coming and taking the time --

THE FACILITATOR: Could you speak up.

MR. DOUG WHITSETT: Yes. First of all, I would

like to thank you people for coming and listening tonight.

I think it is very important.

My name is Doug Whitsett, W-h-i-t-s-e-t-t.

Comment 1 - General/ Other

The decision to remove the dams on the Klamath

River is a political decision. It is not based on science

and certainly isn't based on economics.

An Associated Press article by Jeff Barnard best

describes the situation written in 2009. He was

interviewing PacifiCorp vice-president and general counsel

Dean Brockbank. He said the turning point for removing

four Klamath River dams in Oregon and California came in

the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia.

Folks, that wasn't in Oregon or in California or

Klamath Basin. In Virginia.

It goes on to say Michael Bogert, an aide to then

Interior Secretary Dirk Kempthorne, summoned

representatives of PacifiCorp, and the governors of Oregon and California, to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service National Conservation Training Center there in May of 2008. They would find a way to find peace in the Klamath after decades of battling over water, fish, power and farming.

Mr. Brockbank is quoted as saying: We re-license our hydro projects. That is the regular course of business.

In this case Governor Ted Kulongoski, Arnold Schwarzenegger and Secretary Kempthorne made it very clear from the public policy point of view that they did not want these dams to be licensed, they wanted the dams removed.

It goes on to say: Once that became abundantly clear, we shifted our framework from re-licensing to settlement involving possible dam removal framework. Up until that point people talked aspirationally about taking dams out, but PacifiCorp was not going to take the dams out, end of quote.

The Federal Department of Interior, the same agency now in charge of the science, related to dam removal. That same agency was instrumental in politically forcing PacifiCorp into the position of agreeing to dam removal as

a matter of public policy.

The same political motivation drove SB76 through

the Oregon legislature. That bill required $200 million

to be collected from PacifiCorp to pay for the removal of

the dams. That debate focused upon economics, sediment,

and liability, liability inherent to the 200,000 and 20

million cubic yards of sediment behind the dams.

Two years later nothing has changed. Still no one

knows any answers but the political motivation to remove

the dams remains.

Comment 2 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I believe that Congressman Tom McClintock says it

best when he says the removal of four perfectly good

hydroelectric dams of the Klamath River is insane. Thank

you.

Comment Author	Whitsett, Doug
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_121-1	Section 3.15 evaluates economic effects. Master Responses GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information. Additional detail on economic effect of dam removal are provided in the Economics and Tribal Summary Technical Report prepared by the Brueau of Reclamation. (Available of www.klamathrestoration.gov)	No
GP_MC_1018_121-2	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1020_190

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE KLAMATH DAM
REMOVAL DRAFT EIS/EIR
---o0o---
YREKA, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

MR. DOUG WHITSETT: Thank you for being here

tonight.

I think it's important that you listen to the people.

D-o-u-g, W-h-i-t-s-e-t-t.

Comment 1 - Sediment Transport

The FERC report points out that there is an

estimated 20 million cubic yards of sediment accumulated

behind the four hydroelectric dams. The CBA report

worries that that may a gross underestimate of the actual

amount of sediment.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement does

not appear to mitigate that sediment away. In fact, the

Department appears to be planning on just blowing the dams

and allowing the sediment to go down the river and see

what happens. As the good doctor said, a grand experiment

to see what happens to our river.

Dennis, you and I go back a long time. I have

to question your science on this. That amount of sediment

is equal to two million ten yard dump trucks of river

sediment, silt and organic material. Two million dump

trucks, regular ten wheelers, lined up from head to heel,

will stretch about 12,500 miles. Halfway around the

planet.

If you look at it in a different way, if you

were to dump one truck load every five minutes, every day,

every week of every month of every year it would take

nearly 20 years to dump all that sediment into the river.

It appears that our government has two sets of

standards, two sets of regulations. One of them for our

private citizens wherein they hold the private citizen to

a standard that severely restricts and virtually bars

their activities in or near rivers.

That standard holds private citizens legally

responsible for contaminating the rivers with sediment or

other lead products.

The other standard essentially allows the

government to do whatever they wish so long as that

purpose is politically correct and adheres to the desires

of the environmentalist's agenda. The standards simply

chose to ignore the potential liabilities.

It further attempts to absolve PacifiCorp and

all authorities of a legal responsibility for all that

sediment. How can we justify dumping the equivalent of

two million dump trucks of sediment into the Klamath River

to expedite the politically correct demolition of the

Klamath River dams, while at the same time citing and

prosecuting foresters, farmers and lands owners and cattlemen for stirring up a little sediment for making a living.

Thank you.

Comment Author	Whitsett, Doug
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1020_190-1	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging.	No

GP_LT_1018_348

Senator Doug Whitsett

R- Klamath Falls, District 28

Phone: 503-986-1728 ■900 Court St. NE, S-303, Salem, Oregon 97301
Email: sen.dougwhitsett@state.or.us
Website: http://www.leg.state.or.us/whitsett

E-Newsletter 10/11/11

Turbidity is a measure of water clarity. The loss of clarity is usually caused by mud, silt, organic material and chemical precipitates suspended in the water column.

Turbidity has been measured in Oregon in nephelometric turbidity units (NTU) since 1990. That method essentially measures how deep into a water column we can see with the naked eye. An average person can see an object nearly three feet under water at a turbidity level of 5 NTU. That also happens to be the normal allowable standard for drinking water. In contrast, relatively clear lakes often have turbidity of 25 NTU, visibly muddy water may measure 100 NTU, and at 2,000 NTU water is virtually opaque.

Current standards (OAR 340-041-0036) set allowable summer turbidity in Oregon water bodies at levels less than or equal to the established 5 NTU drinking water standard. The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality has set about the minimum level for the protection of aquatic life and their habitats. In many Oregon water bodies this standard leaves little if any margin for anthropogenic activities. In fact, the preponderance of eastern and southern Oregon water bodies may have normal background levels that already exceed that standard during much of the summer and fall.

The ODEQ is currently in the process of adopting new administrative rules regarding that allowable turbidity in Oregon water bodies. I have deep concerns regarding the Department's process in creating the new rules, their proposed level of enforcement, and the apparent lack of consistency in exerting their current enforcement power.

In my opinion the proposed composition of the committee is heavily weighted toward representatives of government agencies and environmental organizations. The committee will not operate under consensus but will function under majority rule. Those expressing minority positions will have the opportunity to have their concerns noted.

Moreover, ODEQ staff will create the background legal and environmental frameworks from which the committee will work. They will suggest the content of draft rules, and will edit any of the committee's proposed changes in the rule drafts. The staff will record committee positions on flip charts and then develop brief summaries of those positions for the committee and the public. There is no mention of requirements to either record the meetings or to keep accurate and comprehensive minutes of the meetings.

The protocol makes clear that ODEQ may or may not accept the committee recommendations. In my opinion, ODEQ staff has a long history of systematically ignoring public input that does not support their intended actions. The too familiar structure of the committee protocol suggests that will not change.

ODEQ staff will then recommend their draft rules that are supposedly blessed in this manner by the public committee, to the Environmental Quality Commission. The final rules adopted by the EQC must then be approved by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Comment 1 - Sediment Transport

The Savage Rapids and Gold Ray dams on the Rogue River were demolished without regard to the decades of sedimentation that had accumulated behind the dams. That sediment was summarily turned loose down the River for the people and the aquatic species to deal with. Many people who live on the Rogue River have stated that they believe that the River below the dam sites is sick, being smothered by that sediment plume moving down river. I know of no government studies even attempting to measure either the amount of the sediment behind those relatively small dams or the damage that the sediment may be causing.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement recently issued by the Department of Interior proposes the demolition of the four hydropower dams on the Klamath River without regard to an estimated 20 million cubic yards of sediment accumulated behind those dams. They propose to simply let nature take its course and wash the sediment downriver. That amount of sediment is equivalent to about 2 million ten yard dump truck loads of silt, sediment and organic muck. To put that amount into perspective, lined up head to tail, 2 million dump truck loads of river muck would stretch about half way around the planet. Another report previously commissioned by the Department of Interior, the Camp, Dresser & McKee report, suggests the 20 million cubic yard estimate may be a gross underestimation of the actual amount of sediment accumulated behind the dams.

Comment 1 cont.

It appears that our government regulations have two standards.

One standard holds private citizens to a standard that severely restricts, or virtually bars their activities in or near water bodies. Removal and fill activities, recreational mining, as well as forest road construction and maintenance require obtaining expensive time consuming permits. Often the permits are denied citing too much potential sediment disturbance and release. We are told that large fines are routinely levied for minor infractions of the sediment and turbidity rules.

The other standard allows government entities to do pretty much whatever they wish so long as their purpose is politically correct and adheres to the desires of the environmentalist agenda.

How can we justify dumping the equivalent of two million dump truck loads of sediment into the Klamath River to expedite the politically correct demolition of hydroelectric dams, while at the same time citing and prosecuting foresters, agriculturalists and recreationalists for stirring up a little sediment in their pursuit of family entertainment?

Please remember, if we do not stand up for rural Oregon… no one will.

Best Regards,

Doug

Comment Author	Whitsett, Doug
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1018_348-1	Master Response WQ-11. Comparisons With Rogue River and Downstream Sediment Effects. Master Response AQU-1. Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-2. Sediment Dredging. Master Response WQ-10 Permitting Sediment Release.	No

GP_MC_1018_123

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MS. GAIL WHITSETT: My name is Gail Hildreth Whitsett, W-h-i-t-s-e-t-t.

I'm a geologist by education

and profession. My area of expertise is in stratigraphy

and sedimentation. The following represents my opinion.

Comment 1 - Water Quality

The EIS, EIR is based on geologic data that is

partially incorrect. The Upper Klamath Lake TMDL is a

flawed document regarding both the original of the

elemental phosphorus, which is the primary nutrient

causing the overgrowth of algae and poor water quality

throughout the Klamath River System; and the sediment

stratigraphy used in the TMDL's, which are being used to

support dam removal.

The Upper Klamath Lake TMDL stratigraphic science

was based upon one single small sediment lake core taken

in the late 1990s. The author of the report on the core

failed to write in his report for subsequent peer review

that the core was contaminated with living and migrating

Chironimid (midge) larvae. This single core is the basis

for determining not only the TMDL's for the upper

watershed, but for the USGS -- excuse me, US Fish and

Wildlife Biological opinions on the sucker and salmon and the water quality basis for removal of the Klamath dams.

The author attempted to delineate stratigraphic boundaries by year for sediment deposition in the lake from anthropogenic causes, but in reality stratigraphic delineation would be impossible from an actively bioturbated core, such as the one used.

The TMDL for Upper Klamath and the Klamath River should be re-done and new cores should be taken before any determination can be made on dam removal.

Comment 2 - Water Quality

The ODEQ, which is responsible for the TMDL's in Oregon, has spent about $500 million in the ensuing decade on its budget but has failed to find enough money to redo even one single core to correct the stratigraphic science of the multiple TMDL's upon which dam removal is based.

Comment 3 - Water Quality

In addition to the incorrect stratigraphic science in the TMDL's, the ODEQ and the California Water Quality Control Board have failed to attribute the correct origination of phosphorous in Klamath Lake and the Klamath River system.

The Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries commissioned a Ph.D. geochemist from Franklin and Marshall College in Pennsylvania to collect bedrock from the uplands surrounding Upper Klamath Lake. This

geochemist provided detailed chemical analyses showing phosphorus assemblages which have been eroding in to Upper Klamath Lake over the last 100,000 years.

The phosphorus will continue to erode into Upper Klamath Lake as long as there are mountains surrounding the lake and no significant reduction in phosphorus can ever be expected in either Upper Klamath Lake or the Upper Klamath River System whose water supplies the Klamath dams.

THE FACILITATOR: If you could finish your time.

MS. GAIL WHITSETT: I would just like to say as a former member of the Hatfield group, I do not agree with Jim Carpenter. I do not support the removal of the Klamath dams.

Comment 4 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Whitsett, Gail
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_123-1	The comment implies that phosphorus loading from natural sources is so large that the water quality in Upper Klamath Lake cannot be improved. Furthermore, the comment implies that removal of the dams (KHSA) and implementation of KBRA will not meet the objectives of fish recovery because of the problem of large natural phosphorus sources to the lake. It is important to note that the KHSA and KBRA are not a direct result of the Oregon and California Klamath River TMDLs. These agreements were developed as a response to FERC relicensing, among other factors. PacifiCorp has recognized that meeting the likely conditions of relicensing would cost more than the amounts set out in the KHSA, and that dam removal is therefore in the interests of their ratepayers. KBRA is a separate, but complimentary agreement to the KHSA, and PacifiCorp is not a party to the KBRA. Implementation of the TMDLs is a separate process under the jurisdiction of the states of Oregon and California and the USEPA. Implementation of the KHSA and KBRA is expected to improve water quality downstream of the reservoirs regardless of changes in Upper Klamath Lake, as described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2 Proposed Action (Water Quality) relative to Water Temperature, Dissolved Oxygen, and pH, all of which are critical for fish. However, the draft EIS/R also acknowledges that Upper Klamath Lake is an important contributor to water quality in the river downstream, and improvements in water quality exiting the lake are important to future prospects for fish recovery in the upper basin. The draft EIS/R analysis of nutrient conditions in Upper Klamath Lake considers peer reviewed research conducted by J.M. Eilers, J. Kann, J. Cornett, K. Moser and A. St. Amand and published in the journal Hydrobiologia and a separate study by J.P. Bradbury, S.M. Colman, and R. L. Reynolds and published in the Journal of Paleolimnology. These publications are cited in FINAL EIS/R [Appendix] Section C.3, page 3-20). Based in part on the findings of these scientific studies, a more general discussion of anthropogenic impacts to water quality in Upper Klamath Lake and Klamath River is presented in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.1 Existing Conditions (Water Quality) (see page 3.2-19). While not originally cited in the Draft EIS/EIR, peer-reviewed research by S. M. Colman, J. P. Bradbury and J.G. Rosenbaum and published in the Journal of Paleolimnology ("Paleolimnology and paleoclimate studies in Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon, 31: 129-138, 2004) is also relevant to the scientific understanding of human impacts on nutrients and water quality in the Klamath Basin. Based on more than 40,000 years of continuous paleoclimatic record for Upper Klamath Lake, Colman	Yes

Comment Author	Whitsett, Gail
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	et al. (2004) concluded that both diatoms and remains of blue-green algae mark progressive eutrophication of the lake in the 20th century, especially after about 1920. Colman et al. (2004) state: "These conclusions are compatible with a parallel study of recent limnological changes by Eilers et al." Further, Colman et al. (2004) conclude: "The results also provide a comparison between natural conditions in Upper Klamath Lake and current, anthropogenically disturbed conditions, and show that the lake has been significantly impacted by human activities." A citation for Colman et al. (2004) has been added to the Final EIS/EIR to supplement existing citations to Eilers et al. (2004) and Bradbury et al. (2004). Based on these studies, it is reasonable to conclude that future improvements in Klamath Basin water quality can be achieved if anthropogenic, external loading is controlled, although it may take decades. Funding provided through KBRA is intended to help accelerate this process, as described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.5, page 3.3-241. This document, entitled "Assessment of Long Term Water Quality Changes for the Klamath River Basin Resulting from KHSA, KBRA, and TMDL and NPS Reduction Programs" can be found at http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies ODEQ staff responded to similar comments during the TMDL development process (see Response to Public Comments, Upper Klamath Lake Drainage TMDL/Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) at http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/tmdls/klamath.htm).	
GP_MC_1018_123-2	The Draft EIS/EIR analysis of nutrient conditions in Upper Klamath Lake considers research published in peer reviewed journals and based on multiple sediment cores (Bradbury et al. 2004, Eilers et al. 2004). While not originally cited in the Draft EIS/R, another study by Colman et al. (2004) has been added to citations used in the final document. Comments very similar to this one have already been addressed by ODEQ during development of the Upper Klamath Lake Drainage TMDL (2002) (see http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/tmdls/klamath.htm) and the Upper Klamath and Lost River Subbasins TMDL (2010) (see http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/tmdls/docs/klamathbasin/uklost/KlamathLostRTC.pdf). ODEQ staff have also met with Whitsett, Gail and Joe Eilers on several occasions to discuss issues with the sediment core analysis. It is important to note that the KHSA and KBRA are not a direct result of the Oregon and California Klamath River TMDLs. These agreements were developed as a response to FERC relicensing, among other factors. PacifiCorp has recognized that meeting the likely conditions of relicensing would cost more than the amounts set out in the KHSA, and that dam removal is therefore in the	Yes

Comment Author	Whitsett, Gail
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	interests of their ratepayers. KBRA is a separate, but complimentary agreement to the KHSA, and PacifiCorp is not a party to the KBRA. Implementation of the TMDLs is a separate process under the jurisdiction of the states of Oregon and California and the USEPA.	
GP_MC_1018_123-3	The Draft EIS/EIR does not dispute the fact that volcanic geology in the upper Klamath Basin is a natural source of phosphorus to Upper Klamath Lake. The Draft EIS/EIR analysis of nutrient conditions in Upper Klamath Lake considers peer reviewed research conducted by Eilers et al., (2004) and a separate study by Bradbury et al. (2004). These publications are cited in Draft EIS/EIR [Appendix] Section C.3, page 3-20). Based in part on the findings of these scientific studies, a more general discussion of anthropogenic impacts to water quality in Upper Klamath Lake and Klamath River is presented in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.1 Existing Conditions (Water Quality) (see page 3.2-19). Although the agencies readily acknowledge that there are abundant natural sources of phosphorus in the basin, we disagree with the commenter's assertion that "no significant reduction in phosphorus can ever be expected in either Upper Klamath Lake or the Upper Klamath River System". The geochemical work that the commenter refers to was carried out by Dr. Stanley Mertzman of Franklin and Marshall University, who has published numerous reports on age-dating and geologic mapping of the Klamath Basin. One paper that includes rock chemistry data was published by Mertzman (2000); none of Dr. Mertzman's papers address phosphorus loading to the aquatic systems in the Upper Klamath Basin, nor were they intended to. Officials from The Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality addressed this question directly in 2008 (Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, 2008). They stated: "These geochemistry data indicate that many rocks in the area have a relatively high concentration of phosphorus, although the areal distribution of high phosphorus rocks was not determined. This initial result has been widely reported as a determination by DOGAMI that phosphorus concentrations in water are an outcome exclusively of the geology of the basin, and that no other sources of phosphorus are relevant to water quality. This interpretation is incorrect …. The recently published work by DOGAMI did not have as its goal an estimate of phosphorus partitioning from solid (rock) phase to water or particulate phosphorus transported downstream to Agency and Upper Klamath Lakes. No water samples were collected as part of this work. Further, DOGAMI scientists never	Yes

Comment Author	Whitsett, Gail
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	made this direct connection, although there were some general comments made about the likelihood of high phosphorus concentrations associated with this composition of rock. Consequently these data do not lead to the conclusion that Upper Klamath Lake water quality problems are caused entirely by naturally occurring phosphorus, and do not contradict assumptions made by DEQ regarding levels of naturally occurring phosphorus and contributions of phosphorus by land use activities”. While not originally cited in the Draft EIS/EIR, peer-reviewed research by Colman et al. (2004) is also relevant to the scientific understanding of human impacts on nutrients and water quality in the Klamath Basin. Based on more than 40,000 years of continuous paleoclimatic record for Upper Klamath Lake, Colman et al. (2004) concluded that both diatoms and remains of blue-green algae mark progressive eutrophication of the lake in the 20th century, especially after about 1920. Colman et al. (2004) state: "These conclusions are compatible with a parallel study of recent limnological changes by Eilers et al." Further, Colman et al. (2004) conclude: "The results also provide a comparison between natural conditions in Upper Klamath Lake and current, anthropogenically disturbed conditions, and show that the lake has been significantly impacted by human activities." A citation for Colman et al. (2004) has been added to the Final EIS/EIR to supplement existing citations to Eilers et al. (2004) and Bradbury et al. (2004). Based on these studies, it is reasonable to conclude that future improvements in Klamath Basin water quality can be achieved if anthropogenic, external loading of phosphorus to Upper Klamath Lake is controlled, although it may take decades. Funding provided through KBRA is intended to help accelerate this process, as described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.5, page 3.3-241. This document, entitled "Assessment of Long Term Water Quality Changes for the Klamath River Basin Resulting from KHSA, KBRA, and TMDL and NPS Reduction Programs" can be found at http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies ODEQ staff responded to similar comments during the TMDL development process (see Response to Public Comments, Upper Klamath Lake Drainage TMDL/WQMP at http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/tmdls/klamath.htm). As an additional note, the commenter’s assertion regarding erosion and phosphorus control implies that soils transported to Upper Klamath Lake via erosion are the main transport mechanism to the lake. One reasonable conclusion of such a hypothesis, combined with the peer reviewed research indicating	

Comment Author	Whitsett, Gail
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	that the lake's chemistry has been significantly changed by human activities (i.e., wetland draining, agriculture, ranching, logging, and water diversions), is that control of soil erosion in the upper Klamath Basin is critical to returning the lake to a more natural chemistry and nutrient regime. This conclusion is consistent with efforts by natural resource management agencies to control human sources of erosion and phosphorus in the basin.	
GP_MC_1018_123-4	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1114_661

From: waterouzel16@yahoo.com[SMTP:WATEROUZEL16@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 1:43:57 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Falls Resisdent Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Thomas Whittemore
Organization: private citizen

Subject: Klamath Falls Resisdent

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: Salmon runs should be restored as a historic and traditional native run of fish in the Klamath Lake and William River system. Historically, tourist trade will increase with the restoration of Salmon runs and will offset any economic losses due to the removal of the Dams.

Comment Author	Whittemore, Thomas
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 14, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1114_661-1	Section 3.3 evaluates effects to fisheries. Section 3.15 evaluates economic effects, including tourism and recreation. Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the KHSA and KBRA.	No

GP_EM_1121_846

From: Matt_Baun@fws.gov[SMTP:MATT_BAUN@FWS.GOV]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 1:44:40 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fw: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dams
Auto forwarded by a Rule

----- Forwarded by Matt Baun/R8/FWS/DOI on 11/21/2011 12:44 PM -----

Mark_Wiest@yahoo.com

11/21/2011 11:44 AM

To matt_baun@fws.gov
cc
Subject Web Inquiry: Klamath Dams

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Sum: 3
Subject: Klamath Dams
Body: Please DO NOT REMOVE THE DAMS ON THE LOWER KLAMATH RIVER!!

My family has sixty acres of river frontage on the Williamson River southwest of Chiloquin. It is the last place on the ditch in the Modoc Point Irrigation District. We have owned the property for over fifty (50) years and we are very disturbed/concerned about this removal plan. I can not see how it can not be detrimental in numerous aspects to our water right, allocation, etc.
Please DO NOT REMOVE THE DAMS ON THE LOWER KLAMATH RIVER!!

Thank you,

Mark W. Wiest
541-261-1088
From: Mark_Wiest@yahoo.com
Phone: 541-261-1088

Comment Author	Wiest, Mark
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_846-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal. Removal of the Four Facilities on the lower Klamath River will have no affect on water rights or allocations of water users recieveing water from Modoc Point Irrigation District.	No

GP_EM_1116_695

From: James Wineteer[SMTP:JIMJUNA@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 9:41:04 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Cc: Mark Johnson
Subject: Dam removal:
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Sediment Transport

Dear sirs:

I live in Grants Pass, Oregon. We recently had two, long time dams removed from our river (irrigation dams, on Rogue river). I have lived in a river frontage home on the Rogue for fifty five years (three different homes in close proximity). I strongly urge you to be extremely skeptical about any dam removal. When our dams were removed, large amounts of silt moved down stream, settling in spawning beds,and in large new sand bars. Two of our boat ramps are nearly unusable because of silt and mud that has been washed downstream from the dam sites. It remains to be seen what affect the silt will have on our salmon runs, but this year the salmon started spawning much later than usual, and I have witnessed salmon spawning in areas where they were not seen before, and much fewer numbers in areas where they typically are seen. Our irrigation water is now delivered by electric pumps that are problematic, and expensive (and also energy consuming, instead of energy neutral).

Thank you for your time and consideration;

James L. Wineteer

Comment Author	Wineteer, James
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_695-1	Master Response WQ-11 Comparisons With Rogue River and Downstream Sediment Effects. Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging.	No

GP_WI_1111_527

From: paul.winkler@sotech.com[SMTP:PAUL.WINKLER@SOTECH.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 2:36:36 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: removal of klamath dams Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: paul winkler
Organization:

Subject: removal of klamath dams

Body: These Dams are inefficient, are throttling the fish population and the resulting economic effects that industry could have which would benefit local economies and indian tribes, AND the dams cause toxic releases of blue green algae that make the river unusable for everyone. Clearly they need to be removed, and the only argument against it is a dent to a company's profitability. Time to start putting profits ahead of common sense, human welfare, and basic river ecology .

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Winkler, Paul
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_527-1	Master Response GEN-1 Comment Included as Part of Record. The Secretary of the Interior will consider this comment along with all others in making his determination relative to the KHSA and KBRA.	No

GP_EM_1121_849

From: Kathi Wolfsohn[SMTP:KATHI@G-2.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 3:30:38 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Proposed demolition of four dams on the Klamath River
Auto forwarded by a Rule
Bureau of Reclamation

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I am writing to oppose the destruction of four dams on the Klamath River, for several reasons. The first is that the ranchers and farmers, who live in the area and are most effected by said destruction have not been included in the discussions. They stand to lose their homes, their property and their livelihood. This is a clear violation of their emminent domain rights.

Comment 2 - Real Estate

Comment 3 - Fish

Destroying the dams will not protect the Coho salmon (the alleged reason for the desstruction), but will instead render its habitat unliveable because of volcanic pollutants from the Klamath Basin and the increased temperature of the water. The Coho was introduced into the Klamath River about 100 years ago, so it isn't even native to the area.

Comment 4 - Hydropower

Seventy thousand homes will lose their electricity should the dams be destroyed. There seems to be no plan to replace that.

I urge you to consider all of the damage you will create should you destroy the dams.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathi Wolfsohn
Millbrae, CA
kathi@g-2.com

Comment Author	Wolfsohn, Kathi
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_849-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1121_849-2	Master Response RE-4 Takings.	No
GP_EM_1121_849-3	Concern #1 Destroying the dams will not protect the Coho salmon (the alleged reason for the desstruction), but will instead render its habitat unliveable because of volcanic pollutants from the Klamath Basin and the increased temperature of the water. While Coho salmon are the only threatened or endangered salmon species in the Klamath Basin, dam removal is being considered as a potential action that could improve multiple impaired beneficial uses in the Klamath River, including (very broadly) water supply, recreational use, cultural use, shellfish and support of fisheries for Coho salmon, as well as Chinook salmon, steelhead, and several other fish species (see Table 3.2-2, pages 3.2-4 to 3.2-6 for a listing of designated beneficial uses in the Klamath Basin). Existing data and numeric models described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2 (pages 3.2-76 to 3.2-125) indicate that dam removal will improve water quality in the Hydroelectric Reach and the Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam by decreasing late summer/early fall water temperatures and returning the river to its natural thermal regime, increasing seasonal dissolved oxygen concentrations, decreasing seasonal pH levels*, and decreasing or eliminating high seasonal chlorophyll-a and algal toxin concentrations (see also Table 3.2-14, pages 3.2-149 to 3.2-161). Contrary to the comment, the anticipated improvements to water quality following dam removal would be generally beneficial for fish species, including coho salmon. **Master Response AQU – 21 NRC Dam Removal Help Coho** Access to habitat within the Project Reach would benefit Coho salmon by: a) extending the range and distribution of the species thereby increasing the Coho salmon's reproductive potential; b) increasing genetic diversity in the Coho stocks; c) reducing the species vulnerability to the impacts of degradation; and d) increasing the abundance of the Coho population (Administrative Law Judge 2006). *Summer time increases in pH levels and daily variability could occur in the Klamath River immediately downstream of Iron Gate Dam due to periphyton colonization. These increases would be less-than-significant.	No

Comment Author	Wolfsohn, Kathi
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	Concern #2 The Coho was introduced into the Klamath River about 100 years ago, so it isn't even native to the area. **Master Response AQU – 3 Coho Native Status not Critical to NEPA or CEQA** **Master Response AQU – 4 Coho are Native** The comment, as submitted, provides no evidence to support the claim that coho salmon are not native to the Klamath River.	
GP_EM_1121_849-4	Master Response GHG-3: Replacement Power.	No

GP_EM_1121_860

From: shirley wood[SMTP:RED0409@LIVE.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 6:34:09 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Do not destroy the Klamuth river dam!!
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

I am writing today to urge you to NOT destroy the Klamuth river Dams.

Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800

How will taking out dams improve water quality? Klamath is naturally warm and polluted up stream. Years of built up, toxic sediment will be released Toxic sediment will pollute water, banks, riparian plant life, fish and underground aquifers Toxicity of river and acquifers may last 100 years or more. How will the green, affordable energy currently provided by the four, hydroelectric dams be replaced?

A major impetus for dam removal is concern over the Coho salmon, a non-native species to the Klamath River; why?
Coho salmon are not native to the Klamath and were planted in the river in the late 1800's Coho are not natural to the Klamath and yet millions of fish produced at the Iron Gate fish hatchery are not included in the river population because they are not considered natural. Coho typically spawn within 30 miles of the ocean; first dam on the Klamath is 187 miles upstream

.Salmon breed and grow in cold water near the mouth of the river. During global cooling the salmon will become more prolific. Blowing the dam has nothing to do with salmon.

Comment 2 - Fish

Again, I urge you to NOT remove these dams!!

Shirley Wood

Comment Author Wood, Shirley
Agency/Assoc. General Public
Submittal Date November 21, 2011

Portions of this email are verbatim duplicates of comments submitted in the comment coded - GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to those initial comments that were duplicated in this email are presented in this EIS/EIR alongside GP_EM_1118_800. Responses to comments provided in this email that were not also submitted as a part of GP_EM_1118_800 are listed below.

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1121_860-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No
GP_EM_1121_860-2	There is ample evidence and documentation regarding the fact that anadromous salmonids historically occurred above Iron Gate Dam (river mile 190) in the mainstem Klamath River and several tributaries. There is also ample evidence and documentation regarding anadromous salmonids, native to the Klamath River, will recolonize this historical habitat given the opportunity. Evidence includes: • Several published reports which provide a sound basis for the occurrence and distribution of salmon (including Chinook and Coho) and steelhead above Iron Gate Dam. These include: o Hamilton et al., 2005 o Butler et al., 2010, which corroborates findings of Hamilton et al. • On October 16, 2006 Administrative Law Judge Honorable Parlen L. McKenna's Decision included the following findings of fact (FOF) in his decision: o While the precise geographic distribution is uncertain, historical records and Tribal accounts demonstrate that anadromous fish (Chinook salmon, Coho salmon, and steelhead trout) migrated past the present site of Iron Gate Dam which provided a viable ecosystem and habitat for those stocks of fish. (FOF 2A-3, page 12). o Chinook salmon (both spring and fall-run) were abundant in the tributaries of the Upper Klamath River basin, including Jenny, Fall, and Shovel Creeks, as well as the Wood, Sprague, and Williamson rivers. (FOF 2A-4, page 12). o Steelhead trout utilized habitat in Spencer, Shovel, Fall, Camp, and Scotch Creeks, and they were likely distributed as far upstream as Link River. (FOF 2A-5, page 12). o Coho salmon spawned in Fall Creek. (FOF 2A-6, page 12).	No

Comment Author	Wood, Shirley
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 21, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
	o The record shows that those anadromous fish proximate to Iron Gate Dam are genetically most similar to those populations that existed in the Upper Klamath basin prior to the construction of the dams. (FOF 2A-22, page 15). o Anadromous fish are highly adaptive to differing conditions typically can readily migrate into and colonize new habitat or recolonize historic habitat. FOF 6-3, page 32). **Master Response AQU – 5 Will Benefit all Salmonids** **Master Response AQU – 6 Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook** **Master Response AQU – 7 Expert Panel Uncertainty Likelihood of Success**	

GP_WI_1210_1016

From: hwdwrd@gmail.com[SMTP:HWDWRD@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2011 7:13:49 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: In Support of Removal of all Four Lower Dams on the Klamath
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Hope Woodward
Organization:

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: In Support of Removal of all Four Lower Dams on the Klamath

Body: As a professional wildlife biologist tasked with the management, protection, and restoration of the wildlife on over half a million acres of public lands in the mid Klamath watershed in California, I am writing to support the proposed removal of all four lower dams on the Klamath River.

Removing all the dams on the Klamath supports fish, wildlife, plants, and restoration of the ecosystem. It also supports human uses of the river for economic, cultural, social, and spiritual values for both tribal and non-tribal members, recently arrived and visitors alike.

The Klamath watershed has suffered catastrophic damages since the 1800s in the form of hardrock, dredge, and in-stream mining, logging (including using the riverways and streams as log skids), genocide (effect of removal of a top predator that respectfully took non-human life and practiced restoration and subsistance, not market extraction of resources), water removal and diversions, and contamination of water quality.

Removal of the lower four dams will, in a significant way, begin the recovery of Klamath watershed health, and thereby the health (in the largest sense) of all its occupants and users.

Comment Author	Woodward, Hope
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 10, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1210_1016-1	Comment Noted. Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_MC_1018_161

Klamath Falls Hearing - 10-18-2011

---o0o---

STATEMENT PROVIDED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

(Directly to Court Reporter)

MR. JEFF WOODWICK: I'm Jeff Woodwick. I'm chairman of the local Republican party, W-o-o-d-w-i-c-k. Apparently the fish have a very powerful lobby in this agreement. They come out -- a lot of thought has been put into what would benefit them over human interest. We have entered into a very expensive trend of elevating the scientific experiments aimed at returning long-gone and imagined pristine ideal like ecosystems.

And I've been struck by the sheer amount of resources that's expended at that agenda. It is vast, a lot of very well paid government jobs, lobbyists, consultants, all aimed at restoring what I think are imagined or idyllic ecosystems.

Comment 1 - Costs

This is an enormously expensive tact to take. Unless your study takes into account the full costs that you pursued into, of the dam removal, estimates range from 250 million to four or five billion, depending how you mitigate all of the results of removing the dams. I don't think you really have a sound basis on which to judge the decision.

Comment 2 - Sediment Transport

I think there are probably unintended consequences

in the silt that alone would probably disqualify at this point.

Comment 3 - Alternatives

To be specific, I think building fish ladders and making them a workable passage for fish is in everybody's interest. It's a win-win for everybody.

That's basically what I have to say. That's my position. And I thank you all for having us here.

Comment Author	Woodwick, Jeff
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MC_1018_161-1	Master Response COST-1 Cost Estimate. Master Response GEN-7 Unsubstantiated Information.	No
GP_MC_1018_161-2	Master Response AQU-1 Sediment Amounts and Effects to Fish. Master Response AQU-2 Sediment Dredging. Master Response WQ-1 Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants.	No
GP_MC_1018_161-3	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

CONCERNS ABOUT REMOVAL OF DAMS ON KLAMATH RIVER

GP_LT_1011_024

We have lived in Klamath 59 years. Dale worked in timber industry,first at Crescent Plywood, then Arrow Mills and then Simpson Timber Co for 28½ yrs. until retirement time, after spotted owl got his job.

When we came here they had everything we needed, so didn't need to go to Crescent City for anything. There were grocery stores, motels, restaurants, bars, service stations, garages, school, churches, drug store, movie theater, hardware store, baseball field, Greyhound bus service, a very close knit area with air field for service in case of fires etc..

In 1953 there was a flood. We lived in Terwer Valley, Klamath Glen area in a 1 bedroom cabin with 2 yr. old daughter. When the flood came, friends cam to stay with us. Some homes were lost of river side of air landing strip.

In 1955 we lived north of Klamath at CAmp Marigold. All homes by air fiel were lost & many on river side of Terwer Riffle Road. and lots of damage and homes lost in Klamath town site. We helped people and businesses clean up to get back in business. In 1956 our 3rd child was born, a daughter.

In 1958 we bought property in Klamath Glen, at our present location and lived in a trailer while we built our own home as we could afford it. We move into it about Xmas in 1962, still had mop boards and door and window trims to d

At Xmas time in 1964 another flood hit us. It wiped out everything on bot sides of air field and river side of Terwe r Riffle Road and a few others.

54 We had 54 inches of water in our house. Our front window was broken out and back sliding glass door. Our living room furniture floated out and into garage, the living room door. We didn't have a door on garage yet. OUr Tv was out back by the shed and lots of stuff floated around and found things by river later. 1964 flood washed Klamath out and we need it back.

We had 2 ft. of mud inside the house, We scooped it up and threw it out the windows to haul off later. we had to take off sheet rock and take outthe insulation in the inside walls. Then we had the fire truck come in and hose out all of the inside of the house after we had everything moved out of the hous It had to dry before we could replace anything. All drawers were warped and ha to build new drawers. We had to do it all as we got the money to do it, We had mud all under house and had to build a sled to take under and fill and pull out and haul the mud out. The whole ground in all of the valley was 2 foot or more taller than before from mud and stuff floating down the river from all the other damage above us, many river banks washed out so much all along.

THey brought in trailer houses from Knob Nester, MO. and we lived in it until we could move back into the house. It was 2½ or 3 yrs. to have enough money to buy and time to re do everything. No money to hire help, all our owr

We had friends from Eureka came up and helped us pull mud from under house. It washed out part of the bridge, so had to come in and out on ferry crossing the river.

We had to throw all food away that was in water, that wasn't in tin cans as it could get into all things that were not mechanically sealed, lots got some poisoning from not throwing out.

Please do not take the dams off the river as no one will be safe and fish= ing will be bad from all the silt coming down the river, it won't 'help fishing

All people should be considered & it has been much better since the dams were built to keep us all safer.

We know many of the Indian families were in the flood too and all would be washed away and nothing of Klamath left.

THe dams are the best thing that has happened for Klamath to still be on the map. We get our power from there too and that will be very damaging to all of us physically,mentally and financially.

WE are urging that you all work against removing the dams and see that it does not happen, Leave the dams up and keep us safe and dry.

Yours truly,

Dale and Delores Worker

Dale E Worker
Delores J Worker

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Mr. Dale E. Worker
471 Terwer Riffle Rd.
Klamath, CA 95548-9306

Mr. Dale E. Worker
471 Terwer Riffle Rd.
Klamath, CA 95548-9306

RECEIVED
OCT 11 2011
CDM SACRAMENTO

EUREKA, CA 955
08 OCT 2011 PM 1 T

USA FIRST CLASS FOREVER

Bureau of Reclamation
C/o CDM
2295 Gateway Oaks Dr.
Suite 240
Sacramento, California
95833

95833 4210

Comment Author	Worker, Dale & Delores
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_LT_1011_024-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

Klamath Settlement EIS/EIR PROCESS

Comment Form

GP_MF_1020_287

Please mail your comments to:

Ms. Elizabeth Vasquez
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OR

Mr. Gordon Leppig
California Dept. of Fish and Game
Northern Region,
619 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Email:
KlamathSD@usbr.gov

Website:
KlamathRestoration.gov

F
(916) 978-5055

All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by November 21, 2011.

(Please print legibly)

Name: MARJORIE Wyett

Organization:

Title: hove the LAND + WATER

Address: 2413 HAWAY 3 ETNA CA 96027

Email:

Comments: DEAR MR KEN SALAYER,

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

We the people of Siskiyou County Do Not wont the DAM's removed I Nov. of 2010 We the people voted 79% to Keep the DAM's. Do you hear us? I hope so.

Thank you
Marjorie Wyett

Public Disclosure: It is not required that you submit personal information. If you decide to do so, please note that this information may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comment Author	Wyett, Marjorie
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	October 20, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_MF_1020_287-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_522

From: wyroco@comcast.net[SMTP:WYROCO@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 3:19:10 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Kalamath dam removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: John Wyro
Organization:

Subject: Kalamath dam removal

Body: I support the dam removal program and restoration of the fish habitat.

Comment 1 - Approves Dam Removal

Comment Author	Wyro, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_522	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1111_544

From: gyandell@me.com[SMTP:GYANDELL@ME.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2011 6:17:52 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: George Yandell
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Body: I support Alternative 2 of the Klamath Draft EIS/EIR proposal (full removal of the Iron Gate, Copco1, Copco2, and J.C. Boyle dams).
I am an avid fisherman and businessman. We can have both a vibrant fishery and a strong economic community.
Please remove the dams now.

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Yandell, George
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 11, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1111_544-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_0928_012

From: yee.erin@gmail.com[SMTP:YEE.ERIN@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2011 1:25:18 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Hope this gets approved Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:Erin Yee
Organization:

Subject: Hope this gets approved

Comment 1 - Approval of Dam Removal

Body: I this this is a long overdue project, and I sincerely hope that the river gets restored to its natural state as soon as possible. I'm sympathetic to the plight of the homeowners who may see the value of their homes depreciate, and the people whose jobs may be lost if the dam is removed. However, the benefits of removal seem to far outweigh these costs, and Californians will reap the benefits of the dam's removal for years to come.

Comment Author	Yee, Erin
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	September 28, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_0928_012-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1218_1087

From: jbyost@gmail.com[SMTP:JBYOST@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, December 18, 2011 11:13:11 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath EIR
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: John Yost
Organization:

Subject: Klamath EIR

Body: Having studied the alternatives and being very familiar with the Klamath as a rafter, hiker and fishermen, I believe that alternative 2 is the best choice--complete removal--in the long run. In the short run the cost savings of 3 has some merit, but we should be thinking of seven generations,not just a few years!

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Yost, John
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 18, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1218_1087-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1116_1077

From: KSDcomments KSDcomments[SMTP:KSDCOMMENTS@DFG.CA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 9:00:58 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Fwd: Dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

>>> Denise Young <damsel1950@yahoo.com> 11/16/2011 7:19 PM >>>
Mr. Gordon Leppig,

Comment 1 - Hydropower

I have listened to many comments some professional, some emotional, some rude, and some with thought behind the comment. What strikes a cord with me is the ability to work with nature and the environment to enhance our planet and further mankind.
The dam system in it's present form supplies a level of green and earth friendly power that has the potential with further research to supply a great deal of energy.
I started caring about the coexistence of our land and the fact that man inhabits parts of it in the 70's. I am sixty-one now and have not changed from that position except in one area. That area is alternative avenues of energy production.
I recently purchased a hybrid vehicle. Most people who know me thought that would never happen. People and things change. I see the worth of opening up my thought process to areas of energy less traveled.
I have spent most of my life teaching people how to talk to each other in an open forum of ideas and discussion. Please look forward and beyond a comment that might seem derogatory to your methods and see past it to the bigger picture.
There are people I have met that just want what they want. But there a far more people that do want the same thing and that is a clean, protected, safe, and reasonably regulated landscape where hiker and hunter dwell in harmony.
Destroying something already green just doesn't seem to fit the description.

Thank you for the opportunity to give my opinion. I wish you luck in your endeavors,

Denise Young

Comment Author	Young, Denise
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 16, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1116_1077-1	Comment noted.	No

GP_WI_1113_628

From: geraldcyoung@gmail.com[SMTP:GERALDCYOUNG@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2011 11:14:57 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath restoration Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: Gerald C. Young
Organization:

Comment 1 -Approves of Dam Removal

Subject: Klamath restoration

Body: The Klamath has been " chained" by the dams in question for far too long. Let's implement the agreements and get rid of those dams!

Comment Author	Young, Gerald
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 13, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1113_628-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1107_378

From: jaz.zaitlin@gmail.com[SMTP:JAZ.ZAITLIN@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 4:51:43 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Klamath Dam Removal Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name: J.A. Zaitlin
Organization:

Subject: Klamath Dam Removal

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: I support Alternative 2 – full dam removal and to improve fish habitat and, to increase jobs.

Comment Author	Zaitlin, J.A.
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 7, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1107_378-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_EM_1109_411

From: Conniecipperly@aol.com[SMTP:CONNIECIPPERLY@AOL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 11:35:35 AM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd
Subject: Dam removal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

We really need more bright people to get involved in saving "America" and her freedoms. We ask that you gather together a group of brilliant minded souls who love God and Country and wish to conserve what our Nation was founded on. What is happening now is socialist/communist trying to take control and take away our rights and freedoms and this must be taken seriously and stopped quickly.

Please see diligence in saving our lands, our dams and our freedoms.

Thank you,
D & C Zipperli

Comment 1 - Disapproves of Dam Removal

Comment Author	Zipperli, D and C
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	November 09, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_EM_1109_411-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal, Others Oppose Dam Removal.	No

GP_WI_1215_1040

From: zoe@humboldt.net[SMTP:ZOE@HUMBOLDT.NET]
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2011 1:01:26 PM
To: BOR-SHA-KFO-Klamathsd; werner@wrinkledog.com
Subject: Web Inquiry: Salmon
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Name:
Organization:

Subject: Salmon

Comment 1 - Approves of Dam Removal

Body: If you don't act SOON and take down all the dams, there won't be any SALMON left to worry about. It's called extinction.

Comment Author	Zoe
Agency/Assoc.	General Public
Submittal Date	December 15, 2011

Comment Code	Comment Response	Change in EIS/EIR
GP_WI_1215_1040-1	Master Response GEN-2 Some People Approve of Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal. Master Response AQU-5 Will Benefit all Salmonids.	No

Chapter 12
References

Ackerman, N.K., Pyper, B., Courter, I., and Cramer, S. 2006. Estimation of returns on naturally produced coho to the Klamath River. Review draft. Klamath coho integrated modeling framework technical memorandum No. 1 of 8. Prepared by Cramer Fish Sciences, Gresham, Oregon, for the Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Basin Area Office, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

Administrative Law Judge. 2006. Decision, In the Matter of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project (License Applicant PacifiCorp). Docket Number 2006-NMFS-0001, FERC Project Number 2082, dated September 27, 2006. Alameda, California, U.S. Coast Guard, 94 pp.

Aldous, A., McCormick, P., Ferguson, C., Graham, S., and Craft, C. 2005. Hydrologic Regime Controls Soil Phosphorus Fluxes in Restoration and Undisturbed Wetlands: Restoration Ecology, vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 341-347.

American Rivers. 2011. Elwha River Restoration. Accessed on December 6, 2011. Available at: http://www.americanrivers.org/our-work/restoring-rivers/dams/projects/elwha-river-background.html.

Anderson, David. 2012. Email Communication between D. Anderson, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and C. Anderson, U.S. Geological Survey. Re: Draft - Background Metals Guidance Document, June 25, 2012.

Araki, H., Berejikian, B.A., Ford, M.J., and Blouin, M.S. 2008. Fitness of hatchery-reared salmonids in the wild. Evol. Appl. 2008; 1:342-355.

Armstrong, N., and Ward, G. 2008. Coherence of nutrient loads and AFWO Klamath River grab sample water quality database. Technical Report. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, Arcata, California.

Asarian, E., and Kann, J. 2011. Phytoplankton and nutrient dynamics in Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs, 2005-2010. Technical Memorandum. Prepared by Kier Associates, Eureka, California, and Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon, for the Klamath Basin Tribal Water Quality Work Group.

Asarian, E., Kann, J., and Walker, W.W. 2009. Multi-year nutrient budget dynamics for Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs, California. Prepared by Riverbend Sciences and Kier Associates, Eureka, California; Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon; and William Walker, Concord, Massachusetts for the Karuk Tribe, Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California.

Asarian, E., Kann, J., and Walker, W.W. 2010. Klamath River nutrient loading and retention dynamics in free-flowing reaches, 2005-2008. Final Technical Report to the Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Klamath, California.

Backer, L.C., McNeel, S.V., Barber, T., Kirkpatrick, B., Williams, C., Irvin, M., Zhou, Y., Johnson, T.B., Nierenberg, K., Aubel, M., LePrell, R., Chapman, A., Foss, A., Corum, S., Hill, V.R., Kieszak, S.M., and Cheng, Y-S. 2010. Recreational exposure to microcystins during algal blooms in two California lakes: Toxicon, vol. 55, No. 5, pp. 909-921.

Bartholomew, J.L., Atkinson, S.D., Hallett, S.L., Zielinski, C.M., and Foott, J.S. 2007. Distribution and abundance of the salmonid parasite *Parvicapsula minibicornis* (Myxozoa) in the Klamath River Basin (Oregon-California, USA). Diseases of Aquatic Organisms 78:137-146.

Bartholomew, J.L., and Foott, J.S. 2010. Compilation of Information Relating to Myxozoan Disease Effects to Inform the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/Disease%20synthesis_11-1_final.bartholomew.foott.pdf.

Baxter, R., Breuer, R., Brown, L., Conrad, L., Feyrer, F., Fong, S., Gehrts, K., Grimaldo, L., Herbold, B., Hrodey, P., Mueller-Solger, A., Sommer, T., and Souza, K. 2010. IEP 2010 pelagic organism decline workplan and synthesis of results. Interagency Ecological Program Report. Available at: http://www.water.ca.gov/iep/docs/FinalPOD2010Workplan12610.pdf.

Bender Rosenthal, Inc (BRI). 2011. Iron Gate and Copco Dams Removal, Dam Removal Real Estate Evaluation Report. Prepared for U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Reclamation, March 22, 2012. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

_____. 2012. Dam Removal Real Estate Evaluation Update Report, December 2004 and 2006, Siskiyou County, California. Prepared for U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Reclamation, July 16, 2012. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

Bernot, M.J., and Dodds, W.K. 2005. Nitrogen retention, removal, and saturation in lotic ecosystems. Ecosystems 8:442-453. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/25053841.pdf.

Beyer, J.M. 1984. Rainbow Trout Fishery and Spawning Stock in the Upper Klamath River Wild Trout Area, Copco, California. Faculty of Humboldt State University. Arcata, California, Humboldt State University, 62 pp.

Blue Green Algae Work Group. 2010. Draft Voluntary Statewide Guidance for Blue-Green Algae Blooms – July 2010. Blue Green Algae Work Group of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), California Department of Public Health (CDPH), and Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). July 2010. Available at: http://www.cdph.ca.gov/HealthInfo/environhealth/water/Documents/BGA/BGAdraftvoluntarystatewideguidance-07-09-2010.pdf.

Bohlen, C., and Lewis, L.Y. 2008. Examining the Economic Impacts of Hydropower Dams on Property Values Using GIS. Journal of Environmental Management, July 2008.

Born, S.M., Genskow, K.D., Filbert, T.L., Hernandez-More, N., Keefer, M.L., and White, K.A. 1998. Socioeconomic and Institutional Dimensions of Dam Removals, The Wisconsin Experience. Environmental Management 22(3): 359-370.

Bradbury, J.P., Colman, S.M., and Reynolds, R.L. 2004. The history of recent limnological changes and human impact on Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon: Journal of Paleolimnology, vol. 31, pp. 151-165.

Brockbank, D.S. 2011. Testimony regarding benefits of the Klamath Hydropower Settlement Agreement for PacifiCorp rate payers versus the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing process. Dean S. Brockbank, Vice President and General Counsel of PacifiCorp Energy, Portland, Oregon, 16 pp.

Brown, L.R., and Moyle, P.B. 1991. Status of Coho Salmon in California. Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service. Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, University of California, Davis, California.

Buchanan, D.V., Hanson, M.E., and Hooton, R.M. 1997. Status of Oregon's bull trout: distribution, life history, limiting factors, management considerations, and status. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland, Oregon.

Buchanan, D., Buettner, M., Dunne, T., and Ruggerone, G. 2011a. Klamath River Expert Panel FINAL REPORT Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives on Resident Fish, with the assistance of Atkins (formerly PBS&J): 94 pp. + appendices. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/Resident%20Fish%20Final%2004%2011%2011.pdf.

Buchanan R., Townsend, R., Skalski. J., and Ham, K. 2011b. The effect of bypass passage on adult returns of salmon and steelhead: an analysis of PIT-tag data using the program ROSTER. Draft report. Prepared by Battelle, Pacific Northwest Division, Richland, Washington, for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla District, Washington.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1990. Final Eligibility and Suitability Report for the Upper Klamath Wild and Scenic River Study. March 1990. BLM, Klamath Falls Resource Area, Klamath Falls, Oregon. Available at: http://soda.sou.edu/awdata/040224a1.pdf.

_____. 2002. Instream flow analysis for the Bureau of Land Management Federal Reserved Water Right, Claim Number 376, for the Klamath Wild and Scenic River in Oregon.

Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). 2005. Natural Flow of the Upper Klamath River. Report dated November 2005. Accessed on September 19, 2012. Available at: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/kbao/docs/undepleted_klam_fnl_rpt.pdf.

_____. 2011. Reservoir Area Management Plan for the Secretary's Determination on Klamath River Dam Removal and Basin Restoration, Technical Report No. SRH-2011-19. Prepared for the Mid-Pacific Region, Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated June 2011. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

_____. 2012a. Benefit Cost and Regional Economic Development Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon. Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated December 2011; updated January 2012. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

_____. 2012b. Detailed Plan for Dam Removal – Klamath River Dams. Klamath Hydroelectric Project FERC License No. 2082, Oregon-California. Report dated September 15, 2011. Accessed on November 2, 2011. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

_____. 2012c. Economics and Tribal Summary Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon. Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated December 2011; updated January 2012. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

_____. 2012d. Hydrology, Hydraulics and Sediment Transport Studies for the Secretary's Determination on Klamath River Dam Removal and Basin Restoration. Technical Report No. SRH-2011-02. Prepared for the Mid-Pacific Region, Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated April 2011; updated January 2012. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

_____. 2012e. Hydropower Benefits Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon. EC-2011-02. Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated August 2011; updated 2012. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

_____. 2012f. Irrigated Agriculture Economics Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon. Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated September 2011; updated 2012. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

_____. 2012g. Facts and Figures for the Lease Land Program. June 12, 2012. Available at: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/kbao/operations/land_lease/.

_____. 2012h. Removal of Iron Gate and J.C. Boyle Earth Dams on the Klamath River. Technical Memorandum No. KM-8311-1 dated April 2012. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

Bureau of Reclamation and PacifiCorp. 2012. Agreement in Principle for Transfer of Keno Dam. Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, Sacramento, California, August 2012.

Butcher, J. 2008. Nutrient dynamics in the Klamath. Memorandum from J. Butcher, Tetra Tech, Inc., Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, to the Klamath TMDL Technical Team, February 12.

Butler, V.L., Miller, J.A., Yang, D.Y., and Misarti, N. 2010. The use of archaeological fish remains to establish predevelopment salmonid biogeography in the Upper Klamath Basin. Final Report. Portland State University Department of Anthropology, Portland, Oregon.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 1954. Fish Bulletin No. 98: The Life Histories of the Steelhead Rainbow Trout (*Salmo gairdneri gairdneri*) and Silver Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) With Special Reference to Waddell Creek, California, and Recommendations Regarding Their Management.

_____. 1994. Petition to the Board of Forestry to list coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) as a sensitive species. Redding, California, 109 pp.

_____. 2002. Status Review of California Coho Salmon North of San Francisco. Report to the California Fish and Game Commission, Appendix D. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.

_____. 2006. Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Klamath Hydroelectric Project, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project No. 2082-027. Sent November 29, 2006, by Donald Koch, Regional Manager, Northern California-North Coast Region, Redding, California.

_____. 2009. Technical Memorandum: Preliminary Evaluation of the Hart Bypass as Proposed in Siskiyou County's Congressional Briefing Paper: Solutions and Alternatives for the Klamath River.

California Energy Commission (CEC). 2011. Commission Guidebook, Renewables Portfolio Standard Eligibility, 4th Edition.

California Fish and Game Commission (CFGC). 1913. Twenty-second Biennial Report for the years 1910-1912. Sacramento, California.

California, Oregon, U.S. Department of the Interior, and PacifiCorp (CA, OR, DOI, PacifiCorp). 2008. Agreement in Principle (to Negotiate Dam Removal). November 13, 2008. Agreement signed by all parties, 32 pp.

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). 2011. In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp (U901E), an Oregon Company, for an Order Authorizing a Rate Increase Effective January 1, 2011, and Granting Conditional Authorization to Transfer Assets, pursuant to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement. May 6, 2011. Available at: http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/FINAL_DECISION/134812.htm#P56_1425.

_____. 2012. California Renewable Portfolio Standards Program Overview. February 1, 2012. Available at: http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Renewables/overview.htm.

California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2011. California Electronic Water Rights Information Management System. Accessed on December 17, 2011. Available at: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/ewrims/.

_____. 2012. California Electronic Water Rights Information Management System. Accessed on May 17, 2012. Available at: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/ewrims/.

Camp, Dresser & McKee (CDM). 2011a. Klamath Settlement Process Sediment Management in the Reservoirs. June 2011. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

_____. 2011b. Screening-level evaluation of contaminants in sediments from three reservoirs and the estuary of the Klamath River, 2009–2011. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Interior, Klamath River Secretarial Determination, Water Quality Sub-Team, Sacramento, California. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

Chorus, I., and Bartram, J. 1999. Toxic cyanobacteria in water: a guide to public health consequences, monitoring and management. Für WHO durch E & FN Spon/Chapman & Hall, London.

Christian, R.R., Jr., Bryant, W.L., and Stanley, D.W. 1986. The relationship between river flow and *Microcystis aeruginosa* blooms in the Neuse River, North Carolina. Project No. WRRI 85-02-70037. Prepared by Biology Department and Institute for Coastal and Marine Resources, East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina.

Cobb, J.N. 1931. Pacific Salmon Fisheries. Appendix XIII. Report of the United States Commissioner of Fisheries for the Fiscal Year 1930. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Fisheries, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington.

Colman, S.M., Bradbury, J.P., and Rosenbaum, J.G. 2004. Paleolimnology and paleoclimate studies in Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon. Journal of Paleolimnology 31: 129-138.

Connor, W.F., Sneva, J.G., Tiffan, K.F., Steinhorst, R.K., and D. Ross. 2005. Two alternative juvenile life history types for fall Chinook salmon in the Snake River Basin. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 134: 291-304.

Coots, M. 1962. Klamath River 1957 and 1958 King Salmon Counts, Klamathon Racks Siskiyou County. Redding, California, Inland Fisheries, California Department of Fish and Game.

Dean, R. 2010. Siskiyou County Environmental Health Department. Telephone communication with Alexandra Kleyman, CDM, on December 2, 2010.

Deas, M. 2008. Nutrient and organic matter fate and transport in the Klamath River: June to September 2007. Prepared by Watercourse Engineering, Inc., Davis, California, for PacifiCorp, Portland, Oregon.

Deas, M.L., Vaughn, J.C., and Tanaka, S.K. 2009. Algaecide Pilot Study, Copco Reservoir 2008. Available at: http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Hydro/Hydro_Licensing/Klamath_River/2008AlgaecidePilotStudy.pdf.

Deas, M., Vaugh, J., and Limanto, E. 2010. Copco Reservoir and Klamath River Particulate Matter Settling Pilot Study: 2008. Memo dated October 8, 2010, submitted to PacifiCorp.

Department of the Interior (DOI). 1993. Memorandum from John D. Leshy, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, to the Secretary of the Interior, regarding Fishing Rights of the Yurok and Hoopa Valley Tribes, 32 pp. + appendices.

_____. 2003. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation Economic Analysis of Dam Decommissioning. EC-2003-01. Available at: http://www.usbr.gov/pmts/economics/reports/DamRemovalPaper2.pdf.

_____. 2007. The Department of the Interior's Filing of Modified Terms, Conditions, and Prescriptions. Klamath Hydroelectric Project No. 2082. Sacramento, California, 650 pp.

_____. 2008. Data Quality Management Guide (Version 4.5). August 2008, Washington, DC. Available at: http://www.nps.gov/gis/egim/library/DataQuality_2008_0824_DOI%20Data%20Quality%20Management%20Guide.pdf.

_____. 2011. Potential Effects of Implementing the KHSA and KBRA on Trust Resources and Cultural Values. Sacramento, California. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

_____. 2012b. Assessment of Potential Changes to Real Estate Resulting from dam removal: Klamath Secretarial Determination Regarding Potential Removal of the lower Four Dams on the Klamath River. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

DOI, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). 2012a. Current Effects of Pacificorp Dams on Indian Trust Resources and Cultural Values. Sacramento, California. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

DOI and Department of Commerce (DOC), National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service. 2012. Klamath Dam Removal Overview Report for the Secretary of the Interior. An Assessment of Science and Technical Information. October 2012. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

Dunne, T., Ruggerone, G., Goodman, D., Rose, K., Kimmerer, W., and Ebersole, J. 2011. Klamath River Expert Panel Final Report: Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives on Coho Salmon and Steelhead. Published April 25, 2011. Funded by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service but produced with assistance from Atkins Company, San Diego, California, 380 pp.

Dunsmoor, L., and Huntington, C. 2006. Suitability of Environmental Conditions within Upper Klamath Lake and the Migratory Corridor Downstream for Use by Anadromous Salmonids. Technical Memorandum for the Klamath Tribes, 80 pp.

Eilers, J.M., Kann, J., Cornett, J., Moser, K., and St. Amand, A. 2004. Paleolimnological evidence of change in a shallow, hypereutrophic lake: Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon. Hydrobiologia 520: 7-18.

Evermann, A.M., and Clark, H.W. 1931. A distributional list of the species of freshwater fishes known to occur in California. California Division of Fish and Game, Fish Bull. No. 35, 67 pp.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). 1995. Decommissioning Policy.

_____. 2007. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Hydropower License, Klamath Hydroelectric Project, FERC Project No. 2082- 027, FERC/EIS-0201F. Washington, DC, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of Energy Projects, Division of Hydropower Licensing.

_____. 2009. Public Meeting on Agreement in Principle for Klamath Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Proceeding FERC Project No. 2082. Powerpoint presentation. January 29, 2009. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of Energy Projects, Division of Hydropower Licensing. Available at: http://www.klamathbasincrisis.org/Poweranddamstoc/nodams/toc.htm.

Fetcho, K. 2008. 2007 Klamath River blue-green algae summary report. Final Report. Prepared by the Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Klamath, California.

Fetcho, K. 2010. Re: October 26 and 27 phytoplankton results posting lifted. Memorandum to Klamath River BGA Workgroup from K. Fetcho, Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Klamath, California. November 12.

Foott, S. 2012. Email communication with J. Hamilton. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, January 23, 2012.

Foott, J.S., Bartholomew, J.L., Perry, R.W., and Walker, C.E. 2011. Conceptual Model for Disease Effects in the Klamath River. 11p.

Fortune, J.D., Gerlach, A.R., and Hanel, C.J. 1966. A study to determine the feasibility of establishing salmon and steelhead in the upper Klamath Basin. Oregon State Game Commission and Pacific Power and Light, 129 pp.

Fry, D.H. 1973. Anadromous fishes of California. California Department of Fish and Game, 112 pp.

Gannett, M.W., Lite, K.E. Jr., La Marche, J.L., Fisher, B.J. and Polette, D.J. 2010. Ground-Water Hydrology of the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon and California. U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2007-5050, Version 1.1, April 2010. Available at: http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2007/5050/.

Gatschet, A.S. 1890. The Klamath Indians of Southwestern Oregon. USDI U.S. Geographical and Geological Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region: 1-106.

Good, T.P., Waples, R.S., and Adams, P. (editors). 2005. Updated status of federally listed ESUs of West Coast salmon and steelhead. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-66, 598 pp.

Goodman, D., Harvey, M., Hughes, R., Kimmerer, W., Rose, K., and Ruggerone, G. 2011. Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives on Chinook Salmon. Final, June 3, 2011, funded by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service but produced with assistance from Atkins Company, San Diego, California, 172 pp.

Green, M. 2012. Email communication with E. Vasquez. Bureau of Reclamation, June 11, 2012.

Greimann, B.P. 2011. Hydraulic Engineer, Reclamation, Denver Federal Center. Email correspondence with C. Park, CDM, March 16, 2011.

Greimann, B.P. 2012. Hydraulic Engineer, Reclamation, Denver Federal Center. Email communication with Renee Snyder, Bureau of Land Management, May 15, 2012.

Groot, C., and Margolis, L. (editors). 1991. Pacific Salmon Life Histories. UBC Press, Vancouver, 564 pp.

Hackett, S., and Hansen, D. 2008. Cost and Revenue Characteristics of the Salmon Fisheries in California and Oregon. Technical report prepared for the National Marine Fisheries Service, October 3, 2008.

Hamilton, J.B., Curtis, G.L., Snedaker, S.M., and White, D.K. 2005. Distribution of anadromous fishes in the upper Klamath River watershed prior to hydropower dams - a synthesis of the historical evidence. Fisheries 30: 10-20.

Hamilton, J., Hampton, M., Quinones, R., Rondorf, Dennis, Simondet, J., and Smith R. 2010. Synthesis of the Effects to Fish Species of Two Management Scenarios for the Secretarial Determination on Removal of the Lower Four Dams on the Klamath River. Prepared by the Biological Subgroup (BSG) for the Secretarial Determination (SD) Regarding Potential Removal of the Lower Four Dams on the Klamath River, final draft, November 23, 2010.

Hamilton, J., Rondorf, D., Hampton, M., Quiñones, R., Simondet, J. and Smith, T. 2011. Fish Species of Two Management Scenarios for the Secretarial Determination on Removal of the Lower Four Dams on the Klamath River.

Hardy, T. 2008. Support for the Klamath Settlement Agreement. April 23, 2008.

Hardy, T., Addley, C., and Saraeva, E. 2006. Evaluation of instream flow needs in the lower Klamath River. Phase II, final report. Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC, Institute for Natural Systems Engineering, Utah Water Research Laboratory, Utah State University, Logan.

Hartman, R. 2012. National Weather Service (NWS). Telephone conversation with Dennis Lynch, USGS. Re: Klamath River Forecasting Plans if the PacifiCorp Dams are Removed, May 11, 2012.

Hendrix, N. 2011. Forecasting the response of Klamath Basin Chinook populations to dam removal and restoration of anadromy versus no action. R2 Resource Consultants, Inc., Redmond, Washington.

HDR. 2009. Jackson County Gold Ray Dam Sediment Assessment Report – Final. October 2009. HDR, Inc., Portland, Oregon.

Hetrick, N.J., Shaw, T.A., Zedonis, P., Polos, J.C., and Chamberlain, C.D. 2009. Compilation of information to inform USFWS Principals on technical aspects of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement relating to fish and fish habitat conditions in the Klamath Basin, with emphasis on fall Chinook salmon. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, Arcata, California. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

Huisman, J., Sharples, J., Stroom, J.M., Visser, P.M., Kardinaal, W.E.A., Verspagen, J.M.H., and Sommeijer, B. 2004. Changes in turbulent mixing shift competition for light between phytoplankton species. Ecology 85: 2,960–2,970.

Huntington, C.W. 2006. Estimates of anadromous fish runs above the site of Iron Gate Dam. Clearwater BioStudies, Inc., Canby, Oregon.

Huntington, C.W., and Dunsmoor, L.K. 2006. Suitability of environmental conditions within upper Klamath Lake and the migratory corridor downstream for use by anadromous salmonids. Technical memorandum prepared for the Klamath Tribes.

Hurst, C.N., Holt, R.A., Bartholomew, J.L. 2012. Dam Removal and Implications for Fish Health: Ceratomyxa shasta in the Williamson River, Oregon, USA. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 32(1), pp. 14-23.

Kann, J. 2008. Microcystin bioaccumulation in Klamath River fish and freshwater mussel tissue: preliminary 2007 results. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon, for the Karuk Tribe of California, Orleans, California.

Kann, J., and Asarian, E. 2006. Longitudinal analysis of Klamath River phytoplankton data 2001-2004. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon, and Kier Associates, Blue Lake and Arcata, California, for the Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Klamath, California.

Kann, J.. and Bowman, C. 2012. Middle Klamath River toxic cyanobacteria trends, 2010. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland,

Oregon, and Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California, for the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California.

Kann, J., and Corum, S. 2009. Toxigenic *Microcystis aeruginosa* bloom dynamics and cell density/chlorophyll a relationships with microcystin toxin in the Klamath River, 2005-2008. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon, and the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources for the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California.

Kann, J., and Smith, V.H. 1999. Chlorophyll as a predictor of elevated pH in a hypereutrophic lake: estimating the probability of exceeding critical values for fish success using parametric and nonparametric models. Can. J. Fish Aquat. Sci 56: 2262-2270.

Kann, J., and Walker, W.W. 1999. Nutrient and hydrologic loading to Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon, 1991-1998. Draft report submitted to the Klamath Tribes, Chiloquin, Oregon, and the Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

Kann, J., Bowater, L., and Corum, S. 2010. Middle Klamath River toxic cyanobacteria trends, 2009. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon, and the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources for the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California.

Kann, J., Bowater, L., Johnson, G., and Bowman, C. 2011. Preliminary 2010 microcystin bioaccumulation results for Klamath River salmonids. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences LLC for the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California.

Kirk. S. 2011. Draft Issue Paper: Water Quality Certification Procedures for Klamath River Restoration Project. October 2011. 18 p. Available at: http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/standards/klamath.htm#docs.

Klamath Fish Health Assessment Team (KFHAT). 2005. End of Year Report, 2004. March 16, 2005.

Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (KRBFTF). 1991. Long range plan for the

Klamath Basin Conservation Area Fishery Restoration Program. Prepared with assistance from William M. Kier Associates, Sausalito. City of Yreka, California.

Klamath Settlement Group (KSG). 2007. The Best Hope for Solving the Klamath River Crisis. July 27, 2007. Eureka Times Standard, Eureka, California. Available at: http://www.times-standard.com/allopinion/ci_6488120.

_____. 2008. Proposed Klamath River Basin Restoration Agreement for the Sustainability of Public and Trust Resources and Affected Communities (Draft 11).

January 15, 2008. Available at: http://www.klamathbasincrisis.org/settlement/ProposedKlamathBasinRestorationAgreement011508Draft11.pdf.

_____. 2009. Proposed Klamath River Basin Restoration Agreement for the Sustainability of Public and Trust Resources and Affected Communities (Working Draft). May 6, 2009. Available at: http://www.klamathbasincrisis.org/settlement/documents/KBRA050609.pdf.

_____. 2010. Summary of Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement. May 2010. Available at: http://216.119.96.156/Klamath/Summary%20of%20Klamath%20Settlement%20Agreements%204-5-10.pdf.

Klamath Water Users Association. 2011. Klamath Water Users Association Annual Report 2010. Klamath Falls, Oregon. Available at: http://kwua.org/sites/kwua.org/files/3-31%20FINAL%20AM%20REPORT-TJ.pdf.

Kope, R.G. 1992. Evaluating Management Options for Klamath Chinook. Salmon Management in the 21st Century: Recovering Stocks in Decline. Proceedings of the 1992 Northeastern Pacific Chinook and Coho Workshop. Boise, Idaho, September 28-30, 1992. Idaho Chapter of the American Fisheries Society and the Western Division of the American Fisheries Society, pp. 214-223.

Kruse, S.A., and Scholz, A.J. 2006. Preliminary Economic Assessment of Dam Removal: The Klamath River. Published by Ecotrust.

Lawson, P.W. 1993. Cycles in ocean productivity, trends in habitat quality, and the restoration of salmon runs in Oregon. Fisheries 18(8): 6–10.

Leitritz, E. 1970. A History of California's Fish Hatcheries 1870-1960. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 150, Inland Fisheries Branch, Sacramento, California.

Lindley, S.T., and Davis, H. 2011. Using model selection and model averaging to predict the response of Chinook salmon to dam removal. Review draft report, May 16, 2011. National Marine Fisheries Service, Fisheries Ecology Division, NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Santa Cruz, California. Accessed on December 21, 2011. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/lindleyDavis%20Review%20Draft.pdf.

Ly, J., and Ruddy, Z. 2011. Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Recovery Domain, 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation of Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Coho Salmon ESU. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Long Beach, California.

Lynch, D. 2011. Infeasibility of the mechanical removal of reservoir bottom sediments if Klamath River dams are removed in 2020.

Lytle, M. 2000. Water Quality Data Review and Wetland Size Estimate for the Treatment of Wastewaters from the Klamath Straits Drain. Draft technical memorandum, July 28, 2000. Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Project Office, Klamath Falls, Oregon, 15 pp.

Mackie, T. 2005. Cyanobacteria Field Survey: Upstream and Downstream of the Irongate Dam, Klamath River, Siskiyou County. California Department of Health Services, September 16, 2005.

Maule, A.G., VanderKooi, S.P., Shively, R.S., Hamilton, J., Stocking, R., and Bartholomew, J. 2009. Physiological Development and Vulnerability to Ceratomyxa shasta of Fall-run Chinook Salmon in the Upper Klamath River Watershed. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 29: 1743-1756.

Mauser, D., and Mayer, T. 2011. Effects of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement on Lower Klamath, Tule Lake, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Tulelake, California, 75 pp.

Mefford, B. 2011. Review of proposal entitled "Proposal alternative tunnel route Shasta Nation anadromous fish bypass," by J. Bacigalupi and H.L. Lake. Letter to John Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, November 8, 2011, 2 pp.

Mertzman, S.A. 2000. K-Ar results from the southern Oregon-northern California Cascade Range: Oregon Geology, vol. 62, No. 4, pp. 99-123.

Miller, M.A., Kudela, R.M., Mekebri, A., Crane, D., Oates, S.C. et al. 2010. Evidence for a novel marine harmful algal bloom: cyanotoxin (microcystin) transfer from land to sea otters. PLoS ONE 5: e12576. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0012576.

Moisander, P.A., Ochiai, M., and Lincoff, A. 2009. Nutrient limitation of *Microcystis aeruginosa* in northern California Klamath River reservoirs. Harmful Algae doi:10.1016/j.hal.2009.04.005.

Moyle, P.B. 1976. Inland fishes of California. University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 415 pp.

Murray Pacific Company. 1995. Amendment to the Habitat Conservation Plan and Incidental Take Permit PRT-777837 for the Northern Spotted Owl on Timberlands Owned by the Murray Pacific Corporation. Lewis County, Washington.

Myers, J., Busby, P., Grant, S., Iwamoto, R., Kope, R., Mahnken, C., Matthews, G., Roni, P., Schiewe, M., Teel, D., Wainwright, T., Waknitz, F.W., Waples, R., Williams, J., Bryant, G., Wingert, C., Lindley, S., Adams, P., Wertheimer, A., and Reisenbichler, R. 1997. Review of the Status of Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) from Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, West Coast Chinook Salmon Biological Review Team, 480 pp.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service. 1997. Endangered and threatened species: threatened status for southern Oregon/northern California coast evolutionarily significant unit of coho salmon. Federal Register 62: 24588-24609.

_____. 2006. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: threatened status for Southern Distinct Population Segment of North American green sturgeon: final rule. Federal Register 71: 17757-17766.

_____. 2007. National Marine Fisheries Service Modified Prescriptions for Fishways and Alternatives Analysis for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project (FERC Project No. 2082), 151 pp.

_____. 2008. Southwest Regional Office – Protected Resource Division. Available at: http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/deter/index.htm. Accessed on October 18, 2010.

_____. 2010. Biological opinion on the operation of the Klamath Project between 2010 and 2018. Prepared for Bureau of Reclamation by NOAA Fisheries Service, Southwest Region. Available at: http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/klamath/FINAL-Klamath_Ops_031510.pdf.

_____. 2012. Ocean Sport Fishing Economics Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.

National Research Council (NRC). 2004. Endangered and Threatened Fishes in the Klamath River Basin - Causes of Decline and Strategies for Recovery. National Research Council of the National Academies, National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

_____. 2008. Hydrology, Ecology, and Fishes of the Klamath River Basin. National Research Council of the National Academies, National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

North American Electric Reliability Corporation. 2010. 2010 Long-Term Reliability Assessment. October, 2010.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB). 2010. Klamath River total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) addressing temperature, dissolved oxygen, nutrient, and microcystin impairments in California, the proposed site specific dissolved oxygen objectives for the Klamath River in California, and the Klamath River and Lost River implementation plans. Final Staff Report with Appendices. North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Rosa, California.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2012. Toxicological Summary and Suggested Action Levels to Reduce Potential Adverse Health Effects of Six Cyanotoxins.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, California Environmental Protection Agency, Sacramento, California, May 2012. Available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/peer_review/docs/calif_cyanotoxins/cyanotoxins053112.pdf.

Oosterhout, G.R. 2005. KlamRAS results of fish passage simulations on the Klamath River. Final report, Eagle Point, Oregon.

Oregon Agricultural Information Network (OAIN). 2010. Klamath County 2010 Data. Available at: http://oain.oregonstate.edu/SelYearCharts.asp?sCountyName=Klamath&sCountyId=18.

Oregon Department of Energy. 2012. Summary of Oregon's Renewable Portfolio Standards. January 19. Available at: http://www.oregon.gov/ENERGY/RENEW/RPS_Summary.shtml.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). 2006. Letter from Hydro Power Program Biologist, High Desert Region, to John Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Re: PacifiCorp Fish Salvage Records, August 7, 2006.

_____. 2011. Letter from Lead Project Manager, Fish Screening and Passage Program, Re: Proposed By-Pass Alternatives to Dam Removal on the Klamath River, December 30, 2011, 12 pp.

Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. 2008. Letter to Honorable Senator Doug Whitsett, Oregon Senate. May 13, 2008, 2 pp.

Oregon Health Authority. 2012. Algae Bloom Advisories. Available at: http://public.health.oregon.gov/HealthyEnvironments/Recreation/HarmfulAlgaeBlooms/Pages/Blue-GreenAlgaeAdvisories.aspx. Accessed on September 28, 2012.

Oregon Historical Society. 2002. The Oregon History Project, Link River Dam, 1938. Available at: http://ohs.org. Accessed on May 18, 2012.

Oregon Public Utilities Commission. 2010. Order No. 10-364. Entered September 16, 2010. In the Matter of PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power Application to Implement the Provisions of Senate Bill 76. Available at: http://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2010ords/10-364.pdf.

Pacific Fishery Management Council. 2011. Preseason Report III: Analysis of Council Adopted Management Measures for 2011 Ocean Salmon Fisheries. (Document prepared for the Council and its advisory entities.) Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon.

Pacific Lumber Company. 1999. Habitat Conservation Plan for the Properties of the Pacific Lumber Company, Scotia Pacific Holding Company, and Salmon Creek Corporation.

PacifiCorp. 2008. 2008 Integrated Resource Plan, Volume I. PacifiCorp IRP Resource Planning, Portland, Oregon. Available at: http://www.pacificorp.com/es/irp.html. Accessed on November 30, 2010.

_____. 2009. Plan for Water Quality Management Actions for Copco and Iron Gate Reservoirs. Portland, Oregon. April 30, 2009. Available at: https://www.google.com/url?q=http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/docs/klamath_ferc2082/wq_activities043009.pdf&sa=U&ei=A95kUIjNLcf62AW0x4HoCw&ved=0CAcQFjAA&client=internal-uds-cse&usg=AFQjCNHdJtox7ilvamDsQ3b2i5n5eq_v5g.

_____. 2011. Condit Overview. Available at: http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Hydro/Condit_Overview.pdf. Accessed on December 6, 2011.

_____. 2012. Energy Gateway: Bringing New Transmission to the West. Available at: http://www.pacificorp.com/energygateway.

Perry, R.W., Risley, J.C., Brewer, S.J., Jones, E.C., and Rondorf, D.W. 2011. Simulating water temperature of the Klamath River under dam removal and climate change scenarios. U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 2011, U.S. Department of Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia.

Peterson, J., Glazier, E., Wagschal, A., Pomeroy, C., Madge, L., Stanley, L., Scalf, R., Stevens, J., Godde, P., and Stevens, M. 2010. North Coast Pre-MLP A Community Based Socioeconomic Characterization and Risk Assessment. Technical report prepared by Impact Assessment, Inc., for the County of Humboldt Headwaters Fund.

Pierce, R. 1998. Klamath Salmon: Understanding Allocation. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force, 32 pp.

Poff, L., Allan, D., Bain, M., Karr, J., Prestegaard, K., Richter, B., Sparks R., and Stromberg, J. 1997. The natural flow regime. Bioscience 47(11): 769-784.

Poff, N.L., Allan, J.D., Palmer, M.A., Hart, D.D., Richter, B.D., Arthington, A.H., Rogers, K.H., Meyer, J.L., and Stanford, J.A. 2003. River flows and water wars: emerging science for environmental decision making. Frontiers in Ecology 1(6): 298-306.

Power, M.E., Parker, M.S. and Dietrich, W.E. 2008. Seasonal reassembly of a river food web: floods, droughts, and impacts of fish. Ecological Monographs 78: 263–282.

Prager, M.H., and Mohr, M.S. 2001. The Harvest Rate Model for Klamath River Fall Chinook Salmon, with Management Applications and Comments on Model Development and Documentation. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 21:533–547, 2001.

Provencher, B., Sarakinos, H., and Meyer, T. 2008. Does Small Dam Removal Affect Local Property Values? An Empirical Analysis. Agricultural and Applied Economics, Staff Paper Series No. 501, July 2006.

Radford, Linda. 2011. Email communication with J. Vorpagel. California Department of Fish and Game, November 17, 2011.

Raymond, R. 2008. Results of 2007 phytoplankton sampling in the Klamath River and Klamath Hydroelectric Project (FERC Project No. 2082). Final report prepared by E&S Environmental Chemistry, Inc., Corvallis, Oregon, for PacifiCorp, Portland, Oregon.

_____. 2009. Results of Cyanobacteria and Microcystin Monitoring in the Vicinity of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project. June 8, 2009. Available at: http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Hydro/Hydro_Licensing/Klamath_River/Results_of_Cyanobacteria_and_Microcystin_Monitoring_June_8_2009.pdf.

_____. 2010. Phytoplankton species and abundance observed during 2009 in the vicinity of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project. Prepared by E&S Environmental Chemistry, Inc., Corvallis, Oregon, for PacifiCorp Energy, Portland, Oregon.

Roninger T. 2012. Memorandum to the file prepared by Trisha Roninger, July 2, 2012. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

Salter, J.F. 2003. A Context Statement Concerning the Effect of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project on Traditional Resources Uses and Cultural Patterns of the Karuk People Within the Klamath River Corridor. Report prepared for PacifiCorp.

Samarin, P. 2012. Email communication with D. Van Dyke. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, February 29, 2012.

Sandercock, F.K. 1991. Life history of coho salmon. In Pacific salmon life histories, C. Groot and L. Margolis, editors. UBC Press, Vancouver, Canada, 564 pp.

Shannon & Wilson, Inc. 2006. Sediment sampling, geotechnical testing and data review report: segment of Klamath River, Oregon and California. Prepared by Shannon & Wilson, Inc., Seattle, Washington, for California Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, California.

Shapovalov, L., and Taft, A.C. 1954. The life histories of the steelhead rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri*) and silver salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) with special reference to Waddell Creek, California, and recommendations regarding their management.

Simplexity Health. 2012. Available at: http://www.simplexityhealth.com. Accessed on May 2, 2012.

Simpson Timber Company. 1992. Habitat Conservation Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl on the California Timberlands of Simpson Timber Company.

Snyder, J.O. 1931. Salmon of the Klamath River, California. Division of Fish and Game, Bulletin No. 34.

Spier, L. 1930. Klamath Ethnography. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.

Stanford, J., Ward, J., Liss, W., Frissell, C., Williams, R., Lichatowich, J., and Coutant, C. 1996. A general protocol for restoration of regulated rivers. Regulated Rivers: Research and Management, vol. 12, pp. 391-413.

Stillwater Sciences. 2008. Klamath River dam removal study: sediment transport DREAM-1 simulation. Technical report prepared by Stillwater Sciences, Arcata, California, for California Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, California.

_____. 2009a. Dam removal and Klamath River water quality: a synthesis of the current conceptual understanding and an assessment of data gaps. Technical report prepared by Stillwater Sciences, Berkeley, California, for State Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, California.

_____. 2009b. Effects of sediment release following dam removal on the aquatic biota of the Klamath River, Arcata, California. Prepared for the California State Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, California, 91 pp.+ figures.

_____. 2010. Anticipated sediment release from Klamath River dam removal within the context of basin sediment delivery. Final report prepared by Stillwater Sciences, Berkeley, California, for State Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, California.

Stocking, R.W., and Bartholomew, J.L. 2007. Distribution and habitat preference of Manayunkia speciosa (*Polychaeta/Sabellidae*) and infection prevalence with the parasite Ceratomyxa shasta (*Myxozoa*) in the Klamath River. Journal of Parasitology 93: 78-88.

Strassburger, M. 2011. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Written communication with J. Jones (via Chris Park), CDM, July 5, 2011.

Taylor, R. 2010. Water Manager for the City of Yreka. Email communication with T. Hepler, Bureau of Reclamation, August 24, 2010.

Tinniswood, W. 2006. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Written communication Re: Summary of Klamath Redband and Steelhead Comparisons with J. Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, June 28, 2006.

_____. 2011. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Email communication with J. Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, December 21, 2011.

Tolhurst, J.W. 1995. Historic Analysis of Geomorphic Channel Changes, Lower Mad River, Humbodlt County, California. Department of Geology, Humboldt State University, Arcata, California.

Tsosie, R. 2003. The Indian Trust Doctrine after the 2002-2003 Supreme Court Term. 39 Tulsa Law Review, pp. 271, 272.

United States, California, Oregon, and PacifiCorp. 2008. Klamath Hydroelectric Project Agreement in Principle between California, Oregon, PacifiCorp, and the United States. Signed November 13, 2008. 32 pp.

U.S. Commission on Fish and Fisheries. 1895. Report of the Commissioner of Fisheries, 1895.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2004. Cumulative watershed effects analysis for the Klamath National Forest. Quantitative models for surface erosion, mass wasting, and ERA/TOC.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2003. EPA Region 10 Guidance for Pacific/Northwest State and Tribal Temperature Water Quality Standards. EPA 910-B-03-002, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, 49 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2004. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: 90-day finding on a petition to list three species of lampreys as threatened or endangered. Federal Register 69: 77158-77167.

_____. 2007. Formal Consultation on the Proposed Relicensing of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project, FERC Project No. 2082, Klamath River, Klamath County, Oregon, and Siskiyou County, California, City of Yreka, California. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office, p. 156.

_____. 2008. Formal Consultation on the Bureau of Reclamation's Proposed Klamath Project Operations from 2008 to 2018. April 2, 2008.

_____. 2011. Lower Snake River Compensation Plan. July 8. Available at: www.fws.gov/lsnakecomplan.

_____. 2012a. Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Pacific Southwest Region. Available at: http://www.fws.gov/klamathbasinrefuges/lowerklamath/lowerklamath.html. Accessed on June 12, 2012.

_____. 2012b. Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Pacific Southwest Region. Available at: http://www.fws.gov/klamathbasinrefuges/tulelake/tulelake.html. Accessed on June 12, 2012.

U.S. Fish Commission. 1913. Report of the Commission of Fisheries for Fiscal Year 1913.

VanderKooi, S.P., Burdick, S.M., Echols, K.R., Ottinger, C.A., Rosen, B.H., and Wood, T.M. 2010. Algal toxins in upper Klamath Lake, Oregon: linking water quality to juvenile sucker health. U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2009-3111, U.S. Geological Survey, Western Fisheries Research Center, Seattle, Washington. Available at: http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2009/3111/pdf/fs20093111.pdf.

Van Rijn, L.C. 1984. Sediment transport, Part II: Suspended load transport. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering 110(11): 1613-1641.

Wales, J.H. 1951. The Decline of the Shasta River King Salmon Run. Bureau of Fish Conservation, California Division of Fish and Game, April 10, 1951, 82 pp.

Walker, W.W. 2001. Development of a phosphorus TMDL for Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

Ward, G., and Armstrong, N. 2010. Assessment of primary production and associated kinetic parameters in the Klamath River. Draft report prepared for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, Arcata, California.

Watercourse Engineering, Inc. 2011. Klamath River baseline water quality sampling, 2009 Annual Report. Prepared for the KHSA Water Quality Monitoring Group.

Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC). 2009. 2009 Power Supply Assessment. October 1, 2009. Available at: http://www.wecc.biz/Planning/ResourceAdequacy/PSA/Documents/2009%20Power%20Supply%20Assessment.pdf.

White, D. 2011. Preliminary evaluation of fish passage alternatives to dam removal. Memorandum from David White to Rick Wantuck, National Marine Fisheries Service, and John Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, October 13, 2011, 2 pp.

Wilson, R. 2012. University of California, Davis. Email communication with Michael Green, Bureau of Reclamation, June 13, 2012.

Withler, F.C. 1982. Transplanting Pacific Salmon. Canadian Tech Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 1079, 27 pp.

Wong, S., Barry, M., Aldous, A., Rudd, N., Hendrixson, H., and Doehring, C. 2011. Nutrient Release from a Recently Flooded Delta Wetland: Comparison of Field Measurements to Laboratory Results. Wetlands, vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 433-443.

World Health Organization (WHO). 2003. Guidelines for Safe Recreational Water Environments, Vol. 1: Coastal and Fresh Water, World Health Organization, Geneva.

_____. 2009. Guidelines for Safe Recreational Water Environments, Vol. 1: Coastal and Fresh Water with Addendum. World Health Organization, Geneva. Available at: http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/bathing/srwe1/en/index.html.

Yurok Tribe Environmental Program. 2008. Final 2008 Klamath River Nutrient Summary Report. YTEP Water Division, Klamath, California, 37 pp.

Zedonis, P., Anderson, C., Keydel, S., Dillon, J., Cook, C. and Vorpagel, J. 2011. Assessment of Long Term Water Quality Changes for the Klamath River Basin Resulting from KHSA, KBRA, and TMDL and NPS Reduction Programs. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.