From:	Mark Dana
To:	Wr401program
Subject:	Klamath Dams
Date:	Friday, February 15, 2019 3:39:07 PM

Hello. My name is Mark Dana. I would have liked to have been there today, but I got stuck in Friday/holiday traffic in Vacaville coming from Oakland. Then, I couldn't get my Apple to show the webcast when I turned back. Now I'm listening to the webcast but it says it is on break.

Shasta Dam/Lake provides the same benefits as the Klamath Dams/Lakes only Shasta provides them on a larger scale. I am sure you all know that the Sacramento River salmon production was historically second only to the Colombia Riveron the West Coast. Dramatic declines in returning salmon numbers have been experienced over the last century on the Sacramento and were especially disastrous following the construction of Shasta Dam.

Why then, is nobody seriously proposing the removal of Shasta Dam to revitalize the salmon runs on the Sacramento?

It is because it is a stupid idea.

Shasta Dam provides significant hydropower that supplies electrical energy to customers throughout northern California. It provides water storage for drought years and flood control for wet ones. Shasta Lake and the surrounding forest are one of the top recreational areas in California. In addition, recent California fire events have shown the importance of readily available water sources for fighting wildfires.

These are the same benefits the lakes on the Klamath River system provide.

What are the differences between the Shasta Dam/Lake and Copco and other lakes on the Klamath? It is all about size. Shasta Dam and Lake is much larger and provides the same benefits, except that Shasta provides the benefits to a larger population, agriculture, and industrial base.

Guess what though, projections reported by California Department of Finance are that California population growth between 2016 and 2036 will increase by 6.5 million people. While you can expect this to impact already large population centers, it will also have major impacts to infrastructure and resources in the Klamath River Basin.

As with the Sacramento River, the impacts from population growth are much more than just the pressure on salmon numbers, whose importance unfortunately begins to pale in comparison. While hydroelectric is strangely no longer classified as "green energy" any power generation to support the growing demand for power should not be abandoned. The dams/lakes will be needed to control floods and fight wildfires that will threaten increased residential and commercial development in the region.

As more strain from population is placed on the recreational opportunities throughout California, including the Shasta region, the Siskiyou County Lakes that previously were always popular but relatively underutilized for recreation and commercial development to support those recreational benefits will be a major benefit to the regional economic and societal wellness.

Regrettably, the threat of dam destruction and lake elimination has already impacted the local economy. Less visitors and tourists are returning and with loss of business, the Copco Lake Store that once catered to seasonal tourism has shut its doors. The rafting companies and boaters that had previously enjoyed their stops for supplies and refreshments at the store no longer have it as an option, and have modified their habits to bypass the other amenities that the lake provides.

Meanwhile, at Shasta Dam, instead of proposing dam destruction, design work is currently in progress to actually raise the height of the dam and increase the storage capacity of theLake. One of the other benefits touted is that this change will improve Sacramento River temperatures and water quality in the Sacramento River for anadromous fish survival.

Which reminds us there are other options available. I have worked with numerous EIR/EIS reports in my career designing and managing large construction projects, but you don't have to have my experience to understand that almost any project can be environmentally cleared if there is enough demand for it and written properly with sufficient mitigations of significant impacts. Instead of removing the Klamath Dams, they need to be made better, like Shasta. You don't just get rid of a structure that is beneficial in most ways and just scrap the investment. We can keep the benefits of the dams and mitigate the impacts to salmon by installing fish ladders or other structures to provide access around the dams to the upper river. This is already in the EIR and all it takes is a desire and money.

Should one assume I am against salmon? Not at all. My father owned a sporting goods store and I have been a fisherman all ofmy life. While I recognize the efforts and the accomplishments of organizations such as Trout Unlimited in protecting habitat for salmon and trout, and promoting benefits for fly-fishermen, I think it is elitist to not respect the other fisherman who still enjoy fishing for what might be viewed as less-prestigious fish species like perch, bass, catfish and other fish species in addition to trout that reside in the lakes.

We appreciate the diversity and beauty and the abundant wildlife at the lakes. We see the destruction of the lakes as a major loss to the region that can't be replaced by additional river frontage. We enjoy the sunset cruises on a patio boat and the ability to paddle a canoe peacefully on slow moving water but still easily get access to the raging river sections nearby. Lakes offer so much more than the river does, especially when most of the river remains.

The dams began to be installed on the Klamath about onehundred years ago, and while salmon

may not be present in pre-Columbian numbers, they have been shown to be sustainable through the last 100 years. The question really is, would there really ever be enough salmon and eventually won't even these numbers be inadequate to support the population explosion, and how much will be able to be increased given
other formidable obstacles that need to be overcome given the need for increased water flows, the pressure from commercial fisheries, and increased predation from protected mammals.

Otherwise, the benefits realized by dam demolition, like it would be in the case of Shasta Dam, the demolition project really isn't worth a dam.

Thank you,
Mark Dana

1504 Beverly Place
Albany, CA. 94706

Mark.dana@sbcglobal.net
(510) 318-1080 mobile
Sent from my iPad