

From: [Roy hall Jr](#)
To: [Wr401program](#)
Subject: RE: Comments: RE: Public Review on the Draft EIR for the Lower Klamath Hydroelectric Project License Surrender, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project # 14803
Date: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 12:12:56 AM

Shasta Nation
PO Box 1054
Yreka CA 96097
February 24, 2019

WR401Program@waterboards.ca.gov

Ms. Michelle Siebal
State Water Rights-Water Quality Certification Program
PO Box 2000
Sacramento, CA 95812-2000

RE: Comments: RE: Public Review on the Draft EIR for the Lower Klamath Hydroelectric Project License Surrender, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project # 14803

Dear Ms. Michelle Siebal,

I will be quoting some of the materials that have been submitted and commenting on each. The next statements in Quotes are misleading and/or False and should be looked at carefully or removed from the Draft EIR.

Regarding: "Volume 1, 3. 12-15 December 2012. [Establishment of the Klamath Tribes Interim Fishing Site could result in impacts/effects of Trust Resources and other Traditional used resources.](#)"

Comment 1

The fishing site in question located between Iron Gate and Federal Interstate highway 5 (I-5). The area designated is wholly within the aboriginal lands of the Shasta Nation and its establishment is unacceptable. If the Klamath tribe believe that taking the dams out will 'make the fish return' to their lands then why would they ask for fishing sites below the dams? In Pre-contact times the Klamath tribe asked permission to come onto Shasta lands to fish. They did so because the fish were met with natural barriers and hot springs and NEVER traveled up the Klamath River into the Klamath Tribes lands. The Klamath Tribes did not protest the dams. They were offered fish ladders but refused because the fish would still not be able to get up the river past the hot springs to their lands. Trucking fish up stream was also declined because the river is a hostile environment for spawning and immature fish.

Regarding: "Appendix V KHSA 2012 EIS/EIR Section 3.12 Tribal Trust December 218 Volume II (Page:Vol, 3.12-16 December 2012)

3.12.3.2 Quartz Valley Community

3.12.3.2.1 Quartz valley Community History.

Quartz Valley Community History. Most of the Quartz valley Community's Tribal Members are descendants of people of Karuk Ancestry, although a few tribal members are also of Shasta Ancestry."

"(Therefore, their cultural traditions are similar to those described in the Karuk section of this report.)"

Comment 2

The two tribes do not have the same customs or cultures. Shasta's had rules and structure. The Karuk tribe lived a life without structure or laws. Prior to contact time, the Shasta did not interact with the Karuk unless absolutely necessary.

"The Quartz valley Community is a federally recognized tribe representing people of middle Klamath (Karuk) and Shasta Indian ancestry."

Comment 3

Quartz Valley is a Reservation that was created by the sole efforts of Fred Wicks, a Shasta Indian. The reservation was established for the Shasta Indians who lived in Scott and Shasta Valleys and for the Shasta Indians on the upper Klamath. (Upper Klamath refers to the Shasta Indian on the mid river. It does not mean 'upriver' as the Karuks call themselves). Karuks were allowed to become members of Quartz Valley because they were homeless and there were allotments available. That does not make them aboriginal to Scott Valley.

"Some tribal members are descendants of the same tribal leaders that signed the unratified 1851 Treaty 'R' negotiated between Indian agent Redick McKee and Indian inhabitants of Scott valley and the upper Trinity and Klamath Rivers."

Comment 4

Very misleading and incorrect. Only Shasta Indians signed Treaty "R" in Scott Valley. The Karuk tribe signed their own treaty down the River near the mouth of Salmon River. (The Karuk's treaty is Treaty Q/Supplement to 'the aforementioned treaty' signed by the Hoopa and Yurok)

Comment 5

Everything in this EIR re: Quartz Valley Shasta Reservation IS FALSE AND MUST BE DELETED. 'Refer to the Karuk History to learn about the Shasta Indians' is an insult to the separate customs, cultures and heritage the tribes fight hard to preserve. You have an excellent document in your possession to explain/ reveal the Shasta Nation history. The History of the Shasta by Brian Daniels. Use it.

Comment 6

The Shasta Nation has worked with and submitted information and relevant laws and California statutes directly related to the issues of dam removal, The Shasta Nation has been met either silence on all issues with no responses, resulting in default and dishonor. The dishonorable practice of KRRC inviting and involving any and all alien tribes to get a favorable consensus to move forward without Shasta Nation consent is biased and racist. Any and all tactics are acceptable as the Shasta Nation's Constitutional rights, Customs, Culture and Tribal Sovereignty is not recognized or respected. To address these biases, and racist attitudes and actions, we must revisit these issues to comply with working with the appropriate Native American Indian Tribe, Tribes.

Comment 7

The Shasta Nation is in support of clean, renewable, hydro power, rule of law, protecting property rights, and affordable power rates. The Shasta Nation supports Siskiyou County Supervisors, Siskiyou water users, and other local agencies and organizations who support re-licensing and keeping the dams on the Klamath River.

Comment 8

The Shasta Nation would like to see curtailing excessive off shore salmon fishing and unsupervised salmon take by tribes down river. Those two activities have a great impact on the returning salmon count. They deplete our returning salmon population and decimates the ability of the few returning fish to spawn and increase the amount of salmon produced by the river. Tribal tradition on the Klamath River is constantly being pushed in the comments. It was necessary, if all the Indians were to have plenty of salmon for food and spawning, and was strictly adhered to by ALL the tribes. Each tribe (Yurok, Karok, Shasta) had people watch the salmon come up the river. When enough fish had gone by for the villages and tribes up the river, and for spawning, then, and only then, did the tribes start to take their share of the salmon run.

Roy Hall, Chief
Shasta Nation