

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CALIFORNIA WATER BOARDS
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
D STREET NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA

. . .

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2019

TIME: 5:04 P.M.

PLACE: D STREET NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER
1301 D Street
Arcata, CA 95521

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

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

Steve Madrone:	24
Joe James:	26
Frankie Myers:	27
Toby Vanlandingham:	28
Regina Chichizola:	29
Felice Pace:	33
Eileen Cooper:	36
Michael Belchik:	37
Dave Meurer:	40
Amber Jamieson:	42
Craig Benson Madrone:	44
Rosada Martin:	46
Meriel Melendrea Mees:	47
Dave Bitts:	48
Vivian Helliwell:	50
K'nek'nek' Lowry:	52
Scott Greacen:	53
Erik Rydberg	54
Scott Ohman:	57
Kelsey Reedy:	58
Eli Naffah:	59
Merry Kate Lowry:	60
Carley Arrpup:	62
Bernadette Lincoln:	63
Jene McCovey:	64
Denver Nelson:	69
Steve Madrone:	71

1 **WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2019**

2 . . .

3 **5:04 P.M.**

4 . . .

5

6 MS. RAGAZZI: Good evening, everybody. I think
7 we're -- what? Just a little bit past 5:00. So I'm
8 going to go ahead and get started.

9 I want to thank everyone for coming this
10 evening, welcome everyone here. I really appreciate
11 people taking the time this evening.

12 Purpose of tonight's meeting is really to
13 solicit public comments on the draft environmental impact
14 report that has been released for the Lower Klamath
15 Project License Surrender.

16 So we're going to have a brief presentation up
17 front. But the main bulk of the evening is really to get
18 comments from folks.

19 So I'm Erin Ragazzi. I'm the Assistant Deputy
20 Director of the Division of Water Rights at the State
21 Water Resources Control Board.

22 With me tonight is Kristen Gangl, also with the
23 Division of Water Rights; Parker Thaler, Division of
24 Water Rights; Mariana Abbey with the Office of Chief
25 Counsel; Lauren McClure with Stillwater Sciences; and

1 Maia Singer, also with Stillwater Sciences.

2 So Stillwater is our consultant for the
3 environmental impact report development.

4 Additionally, Nancy is the one who is helping
5 you, in the back of the room, check in.

6 And also in the back of the room, with the -- I
7 don't know what kind of hat that is, but with the hat.
8 He's the only one with the hat back there. That's Tim
9 Moran. And Tim is with our Office of Public Affairs. So
10 if there's any media here tonight, he's the guy to talk
11 to.

12 The other person who's very important in the
13 room tonight is Connie. And Connie is sitting over there
14 taking notes very quickly. So I'm going to just say, if
15 Connie gives you a look of exacerbation or puts her hands
16 up like this, that means you're talking too fast. And
17 you'll want to slow down so she can actually transcribe
18 what you're saying tonight because we do want to know
19 what your comments are after we leave here today, even
20 though we'll be taking notes as well.

21 And we have other people videotaping and
22 recording. So there should be no shortage of being able
23 to get that.

24 A little bit on logistics, the restrooms are
25 right over here under the exit sign. So feel free to go

1 on over there if you need to.

2 As I mentioned, there's going to be a short
3 presentation up front really walking you through what the
4 environmental packet is so that you have a roadmap for
5 diving into that document and then the comment period.

6 So when you walked in, there should have been
7 two handouts. One of them is a speaker card. If you're
8 interested in speaking tonight, please fill it out now.
9 If you're not sure, fill it out and comment if needed.
10 But we want to know how many potential speakers we have
11 before we move into the comment period so that we can
12 allocate time appropriately to make sure everybody has
13 the ability to provide comments this evening.

14 The other handout you should have had is the
15 notice of availability. The notice of availability is
16 something that is useful and that, after you leave here
17 tonight, it has the comments deadline. It also has where
18 to submit written comments, and it has our website and
19 how to sign up for our email subscription list. So
20 one-stop shopping. If you leave with this tonight,
21 you'll be able to follow us after you leave today and
22 also provide us with comments.

23 So if you haven't signed in, please sign in in
24 the back of the room. That gives us an idea of who's
25 here tonight.

1 And, as I mentioned, we're really going to use
2 those speaker cards. So please fill them out and hand
3 them to Nancy.

4 A little bit on ground rules. We're going to
5 make sure that we have a successful meeting this evening.
6 People who have electronic devices, if they could silence
7 them right now, that would be great. Take a moment to
8 silence your phone.

9 We also want to ensure to respect all speakers
10 and all points of view this evening. Only one person
11 speaks at a time, and they have to use the microphone
12 that way Connie and everybody else is able to hear the
13 comments that folks make tonight.

14 We recognize that we have a short timeframe for
15 oral comments. So please respect the time limits. If we
16 have extra time at the end, you can feel free to come
17 back up and provide additional comments at that time.
18 But we want to make sure everyone gets their initial
19 comment time.

20 And written comments are always an option. So
21 if you aren't able to make all of your comments tonight,
22 feel free to send us written comments.

23 With that I'm going to turn it over to Kristen
24 Gangl to start off the presentation.

25 MS. GANGL: So I'm just going to start on a

1 little bit of background about the project, the Lower
2 Klamath Project, and then talk about the authorities
3 related to licensing -- hydroelectric licensing actions
4 in California.

5 Erin kind of addressed why we're here today,
6 but I'll touch on that as well, then we'll walk you
7 through the water quality certification process and also
8 the California Environmental Quality Act process which is
9 why we're here today.

10 Then I'll turn it over to Parker, and he'll
11 give us an overview of our draft environmental impact
12 report.

13 So over here we have the project area, the KRRC
14 or Klamath River Renewal Corporation proposes
15 decommission of four facilities, one in Oregon and three
16 in California. These are in the upper, right-hand corner
17 in red. Those are J.C. Boyle in Oregon; in California,
18 Copco 1 and 2 and Iron gate.

19 So PacifiCorp and Klamath River Renewal
20 Corporation filed a joint transfer application to
21 transfer the ownership of these facilities to the KRRC.
22 And the KRRC has subsequently proposed to decommission
23 the facilities. The other four facilities associated
24 with the Klamath Hydroelectric Project: Fall Creek,
25 Keno, and East Side, West Side currently remain under

1 PacifiCorp ownership.

2 And if you need more details of the KRRC's
3 Definite Plan from June of last year, that's available
4 online.

5 So in terms of authorities related to
6 hydroelectric licensing, at the federal level, we have
7 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC. And
8 they're the federal agency with broad authority to
9 stipulate to different aspects of -- any aspect of
10 hydroelectric projects. So operations, removal,
11 maintenance, navigation, all of that goes through FERC.

12 And, at the state level, we have the State
13 Water Resources Control Board or State Water Boards.
14 That's us. And we're the state agency that's responsible
15 to certify whether or not a proposed project can meet
16 water quality standards and protect beneficial use
17 associated with those.

18 So we'll impose conditions we think are
19 appropriate to help protect water quality associated with
20 the proposed project.

21 So we're here today because the KRRC submitted
22 an application for water quality certification to the
23 State Water Board. And in order for us to do anything
24 with that, we have to comply with CEQA or the California
25 Environmental Quality Act. And to comply with CEQA we've

1 issued a Draft Environmental Impact Report or EIR. And
2 that's out for public review and comment. And that's why
3 we're here today.

4 So once we received KRRC's application for
5 water quality certification in late 2016, we started
6 drafting conditions based on application and a bunch of
7 other material that was out there. Then we released our
8 draft water quality certification for public comment in
9 the middle of last year from June 7th to July 23rd.

10 And at this point, we're in the process of
11 considering all the comments we receive on our Draft
12 Water Quality Certification.

13 Our next step would be to issue our final
14 decision on our draft water quality certification. But
15 we can't do that until we take a look at CEQA because
16 CEQA informs our water quality certification. CEQA
17 requires an environmental impact report to undertake a
18 broad evaluation over projects for potential impacts and
19 identify different ways that we might be able to avoid,
20 minimize, or mitigate where that's feasible. And we're
21 looking at a broad range of resource areas when we're
22 addressing CEQA which also includes agency and public
23 involvement.

24 So here's our CEQA process, a little walk
25 through. After we received the KRRC's application for

1 water quality certification, we issued a notice of
2 preparation in late 2016. And that came up here, I
3 think, in January or February of 2017 to collect comments
4 then. And then in April of 2017, we released a scoping
5 report that compiled all of that. And that's available
6 online.

7 So then we continued drafting our environmental
8 impact report and released that in December of last year.
9 So right now we're in our public comment period for that.
10 And that closes in February on the 26th. And then that's
11 where we are now.

12 Then after that, we'll respond to -- review and
13 respond to those comments and work on our final
14 environmental impact report.

15 So you can see how the two processes are
16 separate but they're moving together because CEQA informs
17 our certification process. So that's -- I'll turn that
18 over to Parker now.

19 MR. THALER: Thank you, Kristen.

20 So for the second half of today's presentation,
21 I'll be focusing on the draft environmental impact report
22 or draft EIR's content and organization.

23 And you can see on this slide that the draft
24 EIR was divided into two volumes. Volume one had
25 information such as the executive summary, introduction

1 and proposed project. Section three was environmental
2 settings, impacts, and mitigation measures. Section
3 four, alternatives to the KRRC's proposed project and
4 other required CEQA considerations.

5 And volume two was appendices that had
6 information that supported the analysis in Volume 1. And
7 we have 23 total appendices.

8 And so what I'll be doing is working through
9 each of these sections, talking a little bit about their
10 contents.

11 And, starting with the executive summary, it
12 had a lot of really good information related to our
13 document such as an overview of the KRRC's proposed
14 project, a list of areas of controversy, some details on
15 our public involvement process, and our CEQA objectives,
16 which are listed on this slide.

17 And so when we evaluated the KRRC's proposed
18 project, as well as alternatives to the proposed project
19 that I'll be covering a little later, these were the
20 objectives that we applied when we looked at this project
21 as a whole. And they're summarized on this slide but
22 detailed in our document.

23 And to talk through those really quick, our
24 objectives were to improve long-term water quality
25 conditions associated with the Lower Klamath Project, the

1 advance long-term restoration of natural fish populations
2 in the Klamath River, to restore volitional or unaided
3 anadromous fish passage and to reduce disease conditions
4 for Klamath River salmonids.

5 And I'd like to note here that the KRRC has
6 their own project objectives that they've defined which
7 is to remove sufficient portions of the Lower Klamath
8 Project, to create a free-flowing Klamath River, and
9 provide for volitional fish passage. And those are
10 different than the objectives that we have listed on the
11 screen and that we used in our document.

12 Another last piece of helpful information in
13 our executive summary was at the back of it. It was a
14 table called Table ES-1. And it has a list of every
15 single impact and impact determination for our entire
16 document, whether it be for the proposed project or a
17 project alternative. And so it's a really helpful source
18 if you're trying to tune into a certain portion of our
19 document.

20 The next section is the instruction section.
21 And it contains kind of an overview or guide to the rest
22 of the document, similar to what I'm providing today as
23 well as the details on sources that we used to help
24 develop it. And I have some of the highlighted sources
25 listed up here on the slide and the first being public

1 comments on the notice of preparation. As Kristen
2 mentioned, we released a document back in December of
3 2016 and received comments and had public meetings. And,
4 during that process, we received over 1300 public
5 comments, all of which we reviewed and considered when we
6 developed our EIR.

7 The next item is tribal consultation. And I'll
8 note here that there were two additions. We had a formal
9 Assembly Bill 52, government-to-government consultations
10 with three Native American tribes separately. And those
11 included the Shasta Indian Nation, the Shasta Nation, and
12 the Yurok.

13 And then outside of Assembly Bill 52 formal
14 consultation, we had informal meetings with the Karuk and
15 the Hoopa Valley Tribe. We also used information from
16 federal, local, and state entities as well as a large
17 body of scientific information and -- and information
18 submitted by the KRRC such as their application and
19 additional submittals all of which we've been posting on
20 our website. And I'll have a link to that at the end of
21 the presentation.

22 And so in section 2, it was a description of
23 what the proposed project is by the KRRC. And, in
24 summary, it's to remove four hydroelectric facilities on
25 the Klamath River listed up here, J.C. Boyle, Copco

1 number 1, Copco number 2, the Iron Gate.

2 Details on the proposed project, such as
3 reservoir drawdown rate and restoration are included in
4 section 2 of our document.

5 Now, for section 3 which was, I believe, the
6 longest section of our volume 1, it was environmental
7 setting, impacts, and mitigation measures. And you'll
8 see listed on this slide is a list of various resource
9 areas. And each of these resource areas were evaluated
10 in our document in section 3. And I won't name them all.
11 But to just list through a few, we had water quality,
12 aquatic resources, and ground water, historical and
13 tribal, recreation and noise.

14 And for each of these resource areas, we looked
15 at -- or structured them through five components. And
16 those are listed here. And I'll read through those and
17 then show an actual example of how that looks for each
18 resource area.

19 The first one was an area of analysis. And
20 what an area of analysis is is it describes the physical
21 limits or boundaries of a proposed project's effects to a
22 different environmental resource. And so I would note
23 here that an area of analysis can vary by resource. And
24 so those are all described in each resource area of our
25 document.

1 The next item is environmental setting or
2 baseline which is a description of the current
3 environmental setting or existing conditions. So what do
4 conditions look like prior to implementation of an
5 action?

6 We then identify significance criteria. And
7 that is criteria that we use to compare a project action
8 to the baseline for environmental setting to determine
9 the severity of an impact.

10 We also had an impact analysis approach which
11 describes how far the analysis of a potential impact was
12 undertaken for each environmental resource area. And
13 that was followed by a list of potential impacts and
14 mitigation measures. And those are -- those identify
15 potential impacts associated with project implementation.
16 They analyze potential impacts and describe any feasible
17 mitigation for impacts that would be significant without.

18 And so to run through an actual example of what
19 these look like, listed on the slide is the area of
20 analysis we used for the water quality section. And I'm
21 running through this one because we're the State Water
22 Board; and water quality is one of our main purviews.

23 And so you can see listed here on this figure
24 that the area of analysis for the water quality section
25 began at the -- on the Klamath River just above J.C.

1 Boyle, in Oregon, and continued all the way down through
2 Copco number 1 and Copco number 2, down through Iron Gate
3 and then the entire 190 river miles below Iron Gate,
4 including the Klamath River Estuary and the Pacific
5 nearshore environment.

6 So you can see we -- our area of analysis, in
7 this situation of water quality, looked at potential
8 impacts quite a distance away from the proposed action.

9 The next item in the water quality section was
10 the environmental setting or baseline of existing
11 conditions. And that, as I said before, is a discussion
12 you have of what things looked like before the action is
13 undertaken. And that can include actual data or our
14 understanding of processes.

15 And so listed on this slide is a general
16 process of a reservoir stratification of how, you know,
17 through -- through the season, a reservoir heats and
18 separates in the water column and then starts back down
19 and starts to mix again. And that reflects part of our
20 understanding of how Iron Gate and other LKP or Lower
21 Klamath Project reservoirs function.

22 And so then for our significance criteria and
23 impact analysis approach for the water quality section,
24 as I said before our significance criteria is the
25 criteria we use to compare a potential impact associated

1 with a project to the baseline or existing conditions.

2 And so for the water quality section they're
3 listed in detail in that area. But they're, on the
4 slide, summarized. And to read through those, it's
5 exceed or substantially contribute to the existing
6 exceedance of a water quality standard, cause a change in
7 water quality that would result in a failure to meet an
8 existing beneficial use or to protect water quality, or
9 result in a substantial adverse impact to human health or
10 environmental receptors.

11 And our impact analysis approach discusses our
12 definition of short and long term and how those define
13 the water quality. We define water quality parameters
14 for items such as dissolved oxygen, pH, and turbidity.
15 And we described models used to inform our impact
16 analysis.

17 And so this potential impacts and mitigation
18 section can be a little lengthy as each impact can have,
19 you know, in upwards of 20 pages describing the potential
20 impact it could have on the environment, both -- I did my
21 best to summarize it up on the screen, how each of those
22 may -- how each of those works through with a real world
23 example out of our document. And the one I've listed is,
24 you know, the proposed project short- or long-term
25 alterations in water temperature due to the conversion of

1 reservoirs to river conditions.

2 And so our impact analysis looked at: What's
3 the existing condition? And how would that look with
4 implementation of the project or with the dams not in?

5 And so looking at water temperatures and
6 specific to this impact, we've evaluated that below Iron
7 Gate dam, the Klamath River is anywhere between four and
8 eighteen degrees warmer in the summer and fall with the
9 dams in than with the dams out. And water temperature
10 below Iron Gate is anywhere between two and five degrees
11 cooler in the spring with the dams in and that
12 implementation of the proposed project would remove the
13 temperature-related impacts to the Klamath River
14 associated with the proposed project or with the Lower
15 Klamath Project facilities.

16 And so, in this situation, our significant
17 determination, where we compare the potential impact to
18 the criteria looking at the baseline, determined that
19 implementation of the proposed project was beneficial for
20 the Hydroelectric Reach down to the Middle Klamath River
21 all the way to the Salmon River.

22 And then recognizing that different geographic
23 regions can be affected differently, we had two impact
24 significant determinations here. And for the Salmon
25 River down to the Pacific Ocean, we found that there was

1 no significant impact associated with implementation of
2 the project. And, since we didn't have an impact
3 determination of any significance, no mitigation was
4 required in this situation.

5 And so I've kind of touched on these going
6 through my presentation. But to discuss some of the more
7 specifics, we had these items or these categories listed
8 for what a potential impact could be classified as. And
9 on one end of the spectrum is beneficial. And on the
10 other end, you have a significant unavoidable impact with
11 or without mitigation. And, in the middle, you have a no
12 significant impact or no significant impact with
13 mitigation.

14 In other words, an impact that would have been
15 significant but is not because you've been able to
16 mitigate it to the level that it is not significant.

17 And just noting here, as in the earlier slide,
18 that impacts can vary on a time scale as well as
19 geographically. And we considered that, as we worked
20 through our document in evaluating the project as well as
21 alternatives.

22 And to take us back out of the water quality
23 section and look at all of the resource areas that I
24 listed up before and looking at that beneficial side of
25 our significance determination, for resources that are

1 listed in purple are areas where the implementation of
2 the proposed project would have a short- and long-term
3 beneficial impact to the environment. And for items
4 listed in blue, our resource areas were implementation of
5 the project would only have a long-term benefit and not a
6 short-term benefit.

7 I want to clarify here, that's not to say, for
8 example, the water quality section that, you know, the
9 project would have a beneficial impact in general water
10 quality. What this is actually showing is that for at
11 least one potential impact in the water quality section
12 there is determination that there was a short- and
13 long-term beneficial impact.

14 At the other end of the spectrum, being
15 significant and unavoidable impacts, those are also
16 listed on this slide. So for our resource areas that are
17 listed in orange, our resource areas we found that
18 implementation of the proposed project would have a
19 short-term significant and unavoidable impact.

20 And for items listed in green, we have found
21 implementation of the project would have both a short-
22 and long-term significant and unavoidable impact.

23 And for the blue, Flood Hydrology section,
24 there was no significant short-term impact, but there was
25 a long-term one.

1 And again, that's not saying -- because you'll
2 note water quality was listed as beneficial in the
3 previous slide. And on this slide it's listed as
4 unavoidable. And that's because this slide is pertaining
5 to one potential impact in that section, not discussing
6 this section as a whole.

7 So to move on to section 4, project
8 alternatives, when we were developing our project
9 alternatives, we considered the public comments we
10 received as well as looking at past environmental
11 documents. And, within section 4, there's an area of
12 section 4.1 that has a list of all of the alternatives
13 that have been proposed to the State Water Board, because
14 there was quite a number of them, and a list of why or
15 why not our determinations on which alternatives we're
16 using to move forward with the detailed analysis on.

17 And the ones we selected are listed here:

18 Partial removal alternative, which is removing
19 enough of each Lower Klamath Project facility to create a
20 free-flowing river but leave items like power houses;

21 The next one is continued operation with fish
22 passage, which meant that the facilities would remain in
23 operation in some capacity under some type of ownership
24 with fish passage facilities;

25 We then have the two-dam removal alternative in

1 which Copco number 2 and J.C. Boyle remained in place but
2 Copco number 1 and Iron Gate were removed;

3 There is also a three-dam removal alternative
4 that removed all of the California facilities, being
5 Copco number 1, Copco number 2, and Iron Gate. But
6 maintaining J.C. Boyle;

7 We analyzed the impacts of a no hatchery as
8 well as a no project. And for the no project, we had a
9 short- and long-term determination that's listed in our
10 document.

11 And for comments, comments are due by noon on
12 February 26th. They can be submitted to the email
13 address or our mailing address listed here.

14 As I mentioned we post a lot of relevant
15 information to our Lower Klamath Project web page in
16 relation to the water project process. And the web link
17 is listed on this. But all of this information is also
18 included on the document Erin mentioned at the back of
19 the room, the notice of availability.

20 So please, if you have any comments, submit
21 them by the 26th.

22 And we also have listed how to stay informed
23 through other means. There's a web link up here and
24 instructions to sign up for the State Water Board email
25 subscription list. I think that's one of the best ways

1 to stay up to date because anytime we take any action
2 related to the draft EIR, it's sent out through the email
3 system to everybody who's subscribed.

4 With that, I'll turn it over to Erin.

5 MS. RAGAZZI: I'm going to do another check.
6 Are there any other folks that want to provide comments
7 this evening? Can you raise your hand if you want to
8 provide comment this evening so I can figure out how many
9 speakers we have?

10 Okay. So if you can fill out your cards now, I
11 think we're going to have plenty of time. But I just
12 want to make sure we don't get a big rush and then people
13 don't have -- really have the time that they thought they
14 had or to change things.

15 I also want to point out there are seats
16 available out here in the front, middle. Everybody who
17 has a seat next to them, could you raise your hand.

18 If you don't want to stand, all these people
19 are happy share a seat next to them. So you can take a
20 seat.

21 I also finally want to mention that we are
22 going to take a break at about an hour and a half into
23 the meeting so Connie can rest her fingers and make sure
24 that she has the capacity to get the second half of the
25 comments.

1 So when I -- when I note a break, that's what
2 we'll be doing the break for.

3 So reminders, we're going to open the public
4 comment period right now. When you come up, can you
5 state your full name, spell your first and last name,
6 please.

7 I think we're going to have five minutes per
8 speaker which should be plenty of time for people to
9 speak slowly enough that Connie can track and follow what
10 people are saying. So, please, make sure you speak
11 clearly and use the microphone so everybody in the room
12 can also hear, in addition to Connie.

13 Respect that five minutes, please. And I'm
14 sure we can all follow the ground rules.

15 So with that, I'm going to kick off the public
16 comment period. If you can come up to this microphone
17 right here, that would be the best thing.

18 So we have Supervisor Steve Madrone.

19 MR. MADRONE: How's that? Great.

20 Good to see this big turn out this evening.
21 So, as first speaker, I just want to say that Humboldt
22 County is fully supportive of removing these dams and is
23 in support of the Tribes in that regard.

24 We recognize that there are going to be
25 short-term impacts from doing this. But the long-term

1 benefits far outweigh all of that. And so I'm just going
2 to keep my comments very brief so others get a chance to
3 speak.

4 And, you know, we look at all of the various
5 mitigation measures and other things that are
6 recommended. That seems adequate to me to be able to
7 move forward with this project. It's long overdue. It's
8 time to stop the damage or the damage, however you want
9 to look at that.

10 So I am very excited to be here in support of
11 this effort. Appreciate the work of the State Water
12 Board in regards to protecting our water. Clearly our
13 water quality has lots of problems.

14 Anyway, so clearly removing these dams does
15 provide tremendous long-term benefits to our water
16 quality, both in temperature as well as all the
17 pollutants from the blue algae and other things.

18 So I'm just going to leave it at that at this
19 point. Perhaps I might make some comments later with my
20 time. At this point, I just wanted to say we're fully
21 supportive with the Tribes in our community to make this
22 happen. So let's get started, get it done.

23 Thank you.

24 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

25 So the next speaker is Chairman Joe James,

1 followed by Vice Chair Frankie Myers, followed by Toby
2 Vanlandingham.

3 MR. JAMES: Good evening. Joe James, Yurok
4 Tribal Chairman. I want to thank the staff of the State
5 Water Resources Board for their work and their continued
6 work to move forward for the removal of all these dams.

7 I want to speak on behalf of the tribal
8 government, on behalf of myself, of my children, my
9 ancestors before me. We are looking and delighted for
10 the year of 2021 to walk the river banks of the Klamath
11 River pre-dam removal, to be part of that is what was
12 always out in front of us, being able to walk the banks
13 of the river knowing our river system, our natural
14 resources, our fish.

15 For the Tribes, it's been a long battle to be
16 on the front lines. And we couldn't have done it without
17 the assistance of our partners, the county, the residents
18 of Humboldt, Del Norte County, the tribes along the
19 Klamath River. This is truly a team effort and what we
20 have been moving forward for. It's getting exciting
21 to -- knowing that the process is coming near and we
22 actually support and encourage the removal of the four
23 dams immediately.

24 As I mentioned, we've had a lot of people that
25 worked hard on this -- on this project. And it means a

1 lot to us. And the river is our livelihood, our culture.
2 Its our way of life. That's who we are. That's why we
3 are so emotional, so demanding, so straightforward
4 because we know what the river not just provides for the
5 Yurok, what it also provides for the community that will
6 benefit from it.

7 And I thank you for your time.

8 And, again, Yurok tribal government strongly
9 encourages you to move forward with this process. At the
10 same time, we are also, on one end, already waiting for
11 the dams to come down.

12 Thank you for your time.

13 MR. MYERS: I am Frankie Myers, F-R-A-N-K-I-E,
14 M-Y-E-R-S.

15 I'd like to start out by saying thank you to
16 the Wiyot people for allowing us to come and meet in
17 their territory on this matter tonight.

18 I reiterate Chairman James. The Yurok Tribe
19 strongly supports moving forward with the project. We
20 appreciate the water board's effort to thoroughly vet out
21 the project. We feel like it has been done so in a good
22 way, in a good manner. The salmon for us are the soul of
23 our people. It's the heartbeat of where we come from.
24 And in that light, we want to make sure that, whatever we
25 do moving forward is in the best interest of the river

1 and the salmon.

2 We'd like to thank the board for allowing that
3 to take place, to make sure that this is going to be the
4 best option for the river. And we believe that it is.

5 We've waited a long time for this. And we've
6 worked many, many hours. We have sacrificed time.
7 Individuals have given their lives to this project. We
8 feel like we've done the consultation necessary. We've
9 done the signs necessary to move it forward.

10 And I will, once again, encourage the Board to
11 move forward for the health of the river, for the health
12 of the salmon, for the health of the Yurok people, and
13 for the health of the world in general. We believe that
14 all things are connected, and we are a part of the world.
15 A healthy river is a healthy community. It's a way to
16 bring us back into balance.

17 And although you may not share my beliefs, you
18 support them. And I want to tell you thank you.

19 MS. RAGAZZI: So we have Toby.

20 Please state and spell your first and last
21 name.

22 Followed by Regina Chichizola, followed by
23 Felice Pace.

24 MR. VANLANDINGHAM: Hello. I'm Toby
25 Vanlandingham, T-O-B-Y, VA-N-L-A-N-D-I-N-G-H-A-M.

1 I am tribal council member relating the
2 Weitchpec District. I'd like to reiterate what the chair
3 and vice chair said that, naturally, the dam removal is
4 good for everyone. And as someone who's actually had
5 children jump in the river, come out with rashes, I look
6 forward to the day where my grandchildren and great
7 grandchildren will live in a time -- think I got that
8 from vice chairman -- that they won't know what dams are
9 that are going through our water and way of life.

10 So on behalf of 6,200 Yurok Tribe members, we
11 agree that dams need to come down. And we're
12 appreciative at this point in time where we're almost to
13 that point in life where we can live a better life.

14 So I'd just like to thank everyone in saying
15 let's get this process started because we're ready.
16 We're more than ready. We've got generations of children
17 that are going to be grateful for the fight that the
18 people that have come before us went through to get this
19 done.

20 And we appreciate the water board for doing
21 their due diligence. So thank you all.

22 MS. RAGAZZI: So Regina Chichizola, followed by
23 Felice Pace, followed by Brian Wagner.

24 MS. CHICHIZOLA: Hi. My name is Regina
25 Chichizola, C-H-I-C-H-I-Z-O-L-A, here with Malcolm.

1 Malcolm, do you want to say anything?

2 MR. CHICHIZOLA: Save the salmon. That's all
3 I've got.

4 MS. CHICHIZOLA: I was here in Yreka yesterday
5 so I'll try to keep it short. But it was a lot harder to
6 concentrate in Yreka because there were a lot of people
7 opposed to dam removal.

8 But, as you know, dam removal will create a lot
9 of jobs and help water quality in the Klamath River and
10 help get rid of the fish disease issues that we've been
11 dealing with.

12 I've been working on dam removal now for 15
13 years, and I've testified to this board quite a lot. And
14 I wanted to speak to some of the misconceptions that came
15 up yesterday because I have been studying dam removal in
16 the Elwha River and other places. And a lot of times
17 there are a lot of complaints that there's going to be
18 sediment issues and flooding and things of that nature,
19 yesterday, in Yreka. When in reality, these are not
20 flood control dams as you guys know. And these dams
21 create the green algae creating these water quality
22 issues.

23 But also what happened in the Elwha River is
24 that the sediment that was released created quite a lot
25 of a habitat including new habitat for clams and oysters.

1 And it really helped the fisheries, even beyond the
2 salmon.

3 So I think it's important that people realize
4 that and also realize that some of the -- of that
5 sediment is gravel that needs to move throughout the
6 river and that that gravel movement will really help with
7 the Shasta Fish Disease.

8 So some of the things being brought up as
9 problems such as the release of the toxic algae or the
10 sediment are actually things that are good and part of a
11 dynamic watershed and dynamic river.

12 So I wanted to speak to the misconceptions from
13 Yreka last night because it was hard to deal with them
14 while we were there. So thank you for that.

15 I also wasn't to say I hope that you guys can
16 get this permit done as quickly as possible because the
17 Klamath Salmon and especially the spring Chinook Salmon
18 don't have very long to wait.

19 Last year I was part of the Salmon River fish
20 dives. And I think there was a few hundred spring
21 Chinook Salmon in the Salmon River which is one of the
22 last wild runs that the spring Chinook have.

23 And the Spring Chinook are very important to
24 the native people as the first fish that come up the
25 river. And a lot of people don't have a food source for

1 that part of the year without spring salmon. And not
2 having a food source leads to a lot of disease issues,
3 heart disease, diabetes, and things like that that people
4 replace salmon as a healthy food source with unhealthy
5 foods such as commodities.

6 So spring salmon is especially important here
7 and they don't have long to go. They're really facing
8 extinction right now. So I urge California to move as
9 quickly as possible for dam removal for those reasons and
10 because of the poor quality of the river and also bring
11 the salmon home to the basin to the cold, spring fed
12 creeks which I think is really important in light of
13 climate change.

14 As we know, salmon are really going to be
15 harmed by climate change. And dam removal is one of the
16 only ways to get salmon to habitat that is going to be
17 spring fed instead of snowmelt fed due to climate change.

18 So that upper basin -- the watersheds are a lot
19 different. And that's why it's important to bring them
20 up there too.

21 So I know that climate change wasn't something
22 that's been brought up in some of the past analysis and
23 now it is. And I think that's really important. And
24 with that, I just wanted -- not going to take up all my
25 time because I don't need to. But undam the Klamath.

1 Please, do it quickly and for all the people in the State
2 of California including the people in Yreka who will get
3 a lot of jobs out of it in the end and a healthy tourism
4 industry.

5 Thank you.

6 MS. RAGAZZI: So we have Felice Pace followed
7 by Brian -- I think it's Wagner. But I might be saying
8 it wrong. Followed by Eileen Cooper.

9 MR. PACE: Felice Pace, P-A-C-E. I'm with the
10 local North Group of the Sierra Club, but here I'm
11 speaking for myself. And I'm speaking mostly to the
12 people here because it's important that we use this
13 opportunity to understand -- better understand this
14 process.

15 The world -- I've been a climate activist for
16 about 35 years. I've lived 35 years up on the Scott.
17 And now I live in Klamath Glen near the mouth of the
18 river on the Yurok Reservation which I'm grateful to live
19 on and grateful to be able to be here at this meeting on
20 Wiyot land.

21 If the world was perfectly just, PacifiCorp
22 would be responsible for removing the dams which they own
23 which have become nonperforming assets. It's because, if
24 they were relicensed with the requirements that have
25 already been decided on by an administrative law judge

1 due to the work of some great biologists, they would lose
2 an estimated \$20 million a year. That's from the
3 California Energy Commission, I believe.

4 The KHSA is a sweetheart deal for a one percent
5 corporation as a result at tax payer and rate payer
6 expense, rate payers and customers. I'm both. But if
7 they get the dams out, I can live with that. And we
8 should be able to live with it. (*Inaudible.*) But if
9 more money is needed, it's the stockholders that should
10 step up. They're not contributing anything right now.
11 And that may be the case.

12 Also delays serve the corporation which gets to
13 continue making money without having to do very much to
14 help salmon. And I'm very hopeful that -- Hoopa Tribe
15 just won a lawsuit that I think will help us with that
16 and get more mitigation for water quality and Coho. The
17 water board should require that PacifiCorp do a lot more
18 to help salmon until the dams are actually out.

19 If the Klamath's Renewal Corporation fails -- I
20 hope it doesn't -- and we have representatives here if
21 you want to meet them later. The Hoopa Tribe will be
22 there to make sure the dams come out. They won that
23 lawsuit. They put a lot of time and money into it.
24 Their recent victory assures that the interim measures
25 will better protect salmon. I hope we'll see that too.

1 And the water board should require that be implemented
2 now.

3 But folks, if they have the delusion that the
4 dams remove -- the removal of four dams -- PacifiCorp
5 owns five on the Klamath, by the way -- will fix all the
6 Klamath's problems, the Bureau of Reclamation will still
7 control the Klamath flows and will do all they can, as
8 they have in the past, to minimize those flows in order
9 to maximize the delivery of irrigation water to federal
10 irrigators.

11 So if folks have the delusion, they should also
12 rethink the delusion that removing four dams will solve
13 the water quality problems. As you've heard in the very
14 excellent presentation, it will make some substantial
15 help to water quality.

16 However, a fifth PacifiCorp dam, Keno, will be
17 transferred -- should have been part of this process by
18 the way. Shouldn't have been deferred to later -- will
19 be transferred to reformation and will remain. That deal
20 has been done already but not implemented. It
21 receives -- Keno, the next dam up the river, at the top
22 of the Cascade Canyon, right before it enters the Cascade
23 Canyon from the upper basin in the river that is, it
24 receives the most of the highly polluted federal
25 irrigation water from 200,000 irrigated acres. It has

1 the worst water quality in the whole basin.

2 That water leaves Keno and flows down the
3 Klamath River. Fixing Klamath water quality requires
4 fixing Keno. And the water board, PacifiCorp, and
5 (*Inaudible.*) are remiss in not making that happen.

6 That's all about -- that's about all I have to
7 say. Thank you all for coming. Great to see all these
8 young people here for a change. At a lot of these
9 hearings it's just us old folks.

10 But I have a few copies of this which I'll
11 leave in the back for anybody that wants it. Thank you.

12 MS. RAGAZZI: So we have Brian Wagner, followed
13 by Eileen Cooper, followed by Mike Belchik, followed by
14 Dave Meurer.

15 Maybe no Brian.

16 Okay. Let's move to Eileen Cooper.

17 MS. COOPER: Eileen Cooper, E-I-L-E-E-N,
18 C-O-O-P-E-R. I'm vice president of Friends of Del Norte.
19 And we have been following this process for a very long
20 time. And it's exhaustive. We so appreciate all of the
21 hard work that this agency has put into making sure that
22 this analysis addresses what it needs to address here.
23 And we, at this point, feel that we cannot waste another
24 stitch of time.

25 The salmon need our help. Way back when this

1 process started, I was wondering: Wow, 2020 is so far
2 off. Will the salmon still be here to help them?

3 And here we are, almost there. And they're
4 waiting. We got lucky. We may not be so lucky in the
5 near future if we don't take this action now.

6 The salmon face longer, dryer summers. We see
7 this happening, and so please do not delay and make this
8 happen. Make this, what could be a dream come true,
9 real.

10 And we appreciate your great effort. More
11 needs to be done in the future, definitely. But this
12 would be a great stride forward.

13 Thank you.

14 MS. RAGAZZI: Mike?

15 MR. BELCHIK: Hello. My name is Michael
16 Belchik. That's spelled B-E-L-C-H-I-K. Pardon my voice.

17 But so anyway I've been working for the Yurok
18 Tribe as a senior water policy analyst for 23 years. And
19 the last 20 of it has been spent trying to get these dams
20 off this river. At its heart, this project is a
21 reservation project. That's what this is about.

22 Water quality's part of it too. But this would
23 be the largest fish restoration project in the history of
24 the world. And it's time to do it. I think personally
25 this is, literally, about the 500th, maybe more, meeting.

1 This is about the 100th public meeting that I've been to.
2 We have PacifiCorp's application, FERC EIS, the
3 (*Inaudible.*) EIS, and now this EIS which is quite
4 thorough and pretty high quality. But all in all, with
5 the scientific supporting documents, I think we have well
6 over a hundred thousand pages of studies, peer-reviewed
7 studies, and it's time for action now. The salmon need
8 it.

9 First of all, dam removal is effective. When
10 we see what happened on the Condit Dam and Elwha Dam and
11 we started off to get a pattern, especially in the
12 Pacific northwest, where the fish recover much faster in
13 the river, much faster than people give it credit for.
14 It's obviously good for water quality, including the
15 toxic algae. The Klamath River's posted for blue-green
16 algae every year.

17 As Regina mentioned, one of the most important
18 aspects of this project is being able to get fish to the
19 cold water. We can't get the cold water to the fish with
20 the dams there. The dams need to come out so that the
21 fish can get to the large cascade springs like J.C. Boyle
22 and up in the Williamson, that springer country.
23 Speaking of springers, this dam removal will open up
24 hundreds of miles of habitat.

25 And it's an ambitious project. We want to

1 resurrect a lost run of spring salmon on the Upper
2 Klamath River. This will help springers throughout the
3 basin, which have been petitioned to be listed. We're
4 losing them on South Fork Trinity. This geographic and
5 genetic diversity will help the overall runs of the
6 spring salmon.

7 The fish disease on the Klamath River has
8 reached crisis proportions. We've litigated successfully
9 over it with our partners on the river. And its
10 requiring very large flows to move sediment because
11 sediment -- the dams are locked in place. Dam removal is
12 going to free up the sediment movement and take a lot
13 less water to make it healthy, be what it was before.

14 So it's been a long road from when we started
15 off mentioning dam removal early in the meetings, we were
16 literally laughed out of the room. We weren't given
17 serious consideration. (*Inaudible.*) People have gone
18 there. And I see that now -- I've been working on this
19 24 years. And I see the next generation of young native
20 leaders coming in. And it's time -- it's time to take
21 these dams out and manage this as a free-flowing river
22 system.

23 Thank you.

24 MS. RAGAZZI: So we have Dave Meurer, Amber
25 Jamieson, and Craig Benson.

1 MR. MEURER: Good morning. My name is Dave
2 Meurer, M-E-U-R-E-R. I'm the community liaison for the
3 Klamath River Removal Corporation. I'm speaking on their
4 behalf tonight.

5 Klamath River Removal Corporation is part of a
6 cooperative effort to reestablish the natural vitality of
7 the Klamath River to support all communities in the
8 basin. KRRC's job is to take ownership of four
9 PacifiCorp dams and to remove those dams, restore
10 formerly inundated lands and implement required
11 mitigation measures in compliance with all applicable
12 federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

13 KRRC is seeking regulatory permits to
14 accomplish this project including water quality sensor in
15 the State of California. The DEIR is an impressive and
16 thorough review of the potential benefits and impacts of
17 removal of the Lower Klamath Project hydroelectric dams
18 on the Klamath River.

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

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

1 both project benefits, negative impacts. The report
2 shows that most potential impacts from the project are
3 small and short term and can be reduced with mitigation.

4 It also shows many project effects are
5 beneficial in the short and long term which is an
6 important finding for those who are interested in the
7 long-term health of the Klamath River and community and
8 the ecosystems that depend on it.

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

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

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

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

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

3 Thank you.

4 MS. JAMIESON: I'm Amber Jamieson,
5 J-A-M-I-E-S-O-N. And this is my son, Madrone,
6 M-A-D-R-O-N-E.

7 And I work for the Environmental Protection
8 Information Center. And I'm on the board of directors
9 for the Nature Rights Council. And I support the Klamath
10 Dam Removal Project. I want to applaud you for the
11 progress you've made towards decommissioning the dams and
12 also encourage you to act swiftly because our salmon runs
13 are disappearing at an alarming rate.

14 Today the Fish and Game Commission listed the
15 Salmon River spring Chinook as a candidate species under
16 the California Endangered Species Act. So that means
17 they're now getting full protections until permanent
18 protection can be put into place and determinations made
19 to do that.

20 This is very relevant because last year was one
21 of the lowest wild spring Chinook runs in the Klamath
22 River.

23 As Regina said, you know, when we did the fish
24 counts on the Salmon River, there were only a few hundred
25 left.

1 So unless we expedite the dam removal process,
2 we're going to miss our chance to restore the Klamath
3 salmon fisheries. And the dams are blocking, you know,
4 the upper basin which is the main habitat for the spring
5 Chinook.

6 And so, if we don't get these dams out right
7 away, spring Chinook fisheries may not survive. So this
8 is my seven-year-old son, Madrone. He's been fortunate
9 enough to grow up in a family with a fish biologist. My
10 husband (*Inaudible.*) is at a Fish and Game hearing
11 otherwise, he would be here testifying himself.

12 But we're on the brink of losing it all.
13 Although he's seen fish spawning in the wild, you know,
14 they might not be there for much longer.

15 So these fisheries are not only the lifeblood
16 of river communities and the tribes, but we see how
17 they're also a keystone species that holds our rivers,
18 our forests, and the ocean ecosystem in balance.

19 So for these reasons, I urge you to move as
20 swiftly as possible, within all your capabilities to get
21 these dams off of the Klamath River so that we can begin
22 restoring the salmon fisheries before it's too late.

23 Thank you for your work.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Undam the Klamath.

25 MS. RAGAZZI: Next is Craig Benson, followed by

1 Rosada Martin, followed by Meriel Melendrez, I think.

2 MR. BENSON: Good evening. What he said.

3 My name is Craig -- is that better? Okay.

4 My name is Craig Benson, C-R-A-I-G,
5 B-E-N-S-O-N.

6 I'm a natural resource professional speaking on
7 behalf of myself. I'm a resident in Eureka.

8 First, I wanted to thank you for making such a
9 robust public process, having it in multiple locations,
10 especially for coming out to the coast and, in
11 particular, being close to the university so that
12 students can experience and witness a robust and
13 meaningful public process.

14 I am in favor of the actions and preferred
15 alternative. And sometimes in work one has to do a
16 little bit of harm to do an awful lot of good. And I
17 think that's the case with this project. You know, there
18 may be one step backwards. But there is clearly a
19 hundred steps forward. And I, personally, can live with
20 that ratio. And I hope others can as well.

21 It's no surprise to me that one speaker spoke
22 of input on the sediment and turbidity section of the
23 draft EIR. That's an association that, while it is good,
24 could be better in terms of being the academic rigor and
25 being robust in explanation to assuage people's fears

1 about what sediment might do. 15. 1 million cubic yards
2 of sediment behind dams is an awful lot of sediment. I
3 don't want the image of how many thousands of dump trucks
4 that transfers into.

5 I think that there's -- the concerns that I
6 have is that the sediment -- that the turbidity spike
7 could easily exceed that 20 percent of background that's
8 called for in the document at least for a period of time.
9 It seems almost certain to me that that turbidity spike
10 could exceed 100 milligrams per liter over a two-week
11 period, at least in the short term, the first couple of
12 years, 'til that is scoured out, you know, behind the
13 dams.

14 And that was also the experience of the Elwha
15 river that was referenced earlier. And I just want to be
16 sure that those turbidity spikes don't exceed a fish kill
17 threshold which that's where some of the harm could take
18 place.

19 Also I didn't see a really robust analysis of
20 the courser sediments and the expected increase in stream
21 beds and, you know, impacting the health of the spawn and
22 travels downstream the dams. And if those could be
23 addresses a little bit better in the draft EIR that might
24 assuage some of those fears.

25 Thank you.

1 MS. RAGAZZI: Rosada Martin, Meriel Melendrez,
2 Dave Bitts.

3 MS. MARTIN: My name is Rosada Martin,
4 R-O-S-A-D-A, M-A-R-T-I-N. I just wanted to speak up
5 tonight because I was a commercial river guide for about
6 15 years. And the first time I ran -- I floated the
7 Klamath, I was about 10 years old. And I've floated
8 rivers all over California. And it was my livelihood all
9 through my 20s and 30s.

10 And often the clients would ask me, you know
11 what's the best river to run in California? What would
12 you recommend?

13 And I would always list off rivers like the
14 Smith, the Cal Salmon, the King, the Merced. And
15 suddenly, it dawned on me that these are all rivers that
16 are free-flowing. And, therefore, the water quality is
17 super high, the fish count is healthy.

18 And I could never recommend the Klamath and it
19 breaks my heart because all the dams on the river create
20 this poor water quality and the algae and the scum that
21 lives on the side of the river. And the fish are dying.
22 And it just breaks my heart that I can't recommend this
23 river to float and enjoy. And I think the tourism
24 potential is great on this river. If we could improve
25 the water quality and get the fish count up, we could get

1 people coming up here to run this river and fish. And
2 that could, you know, contribute greatly to the economy
3 and the quality of the area.

4 So it's just another thing to take into account
5 is the potential for tourism. And if you take care of
6 the river, the people will want to come there. And if
7 you take care of the fish, people will want to come
8 there.

9 MS. MEES: My name is Meriel Melendrez Mees.
10 That's M-E-R-I-E-L, M-E-L-E-N-D-R-E-Z, M-E-E-S. And now
11 my name has taken half of my time. But I wanted to come
12 and contribute my voice to this public process because
13 even though I'm a new resident here, I'm very grateful to
14 be able to live and study on unseeded Wiyot Territory.

15 I'm a graduate student in the environment and
16 community masters program at HSU. And I'm speaking for
17 myself tonight. But our program seeks to find the
18 connections -- I mean, actually, just look to destroy the
19 divide between people and nature.

20 And the Klamath undamming process is a really
21 clear example of that. It's well documented the damage
22 that the dams have done to both the salmon and people's
23 health. And I think that we all understand the good that
24 will come from removing these dams.

25 So I simply wanted to lend my voice in support

1 of that.

2 Thank you.

3 MS. RAGAZZI: We have Dave Bitts, followed by
4 Vivian Helliwell, followed K'nek'nek' Lowry.

5 MR. BITTS: Hi. I thought I heard my name.
6 I'm Dave Bitts.

7 MS. RAGAZZI: Yep. You're up.

8 MR. BITTS: I'm up. Okay. Good. That's
9 B-I-T-T-S. I'm a locally-based commercial salmon
10 fisherman. And I'm speaking on behalf of the Pacific
11 Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations.

12 We represent commercial salmon fishermen from
13 Crescent City to Santa Barbara. And we are -- although
14 most of the fish we catch come from the Sacramento River,
15 we do catch some Klamath fish. We're utterly dependent
16 on large, robust populations of Klamath fish in the ocean
17 in order to get the opportunity to go fishing at all and
18 hopefully to catch a lot of those Sacramento River fish.

19 We have been working on dam removal for close
20 to 20 years. We've been working side by side with the
21 Tribes and, for the most part, arm and arm with them.
22 And it has been, I think, a very fruitful process for all
23 of us.

24 Felice is right. Clearing these dams out is
25 not going to fix everything. But it's probably the

1 single biggest step that can be taken to improve water
2 quality below the dams, obviously to open up habitat
3 above to make life better for fish in the river and make
4 life more abundant, maybe better for all the people on
5 the river. And in the ocean we depend on these fish. I
6 find some irony that we need a water quality
7 certification to take the step that's going to improve
8 the water quality. But I guess that's the way it is.

9 And four of these things that are listed are
10 nutrients, organic enrichment, (*Inaudible.*), temperature
11 and blue green algae, this is the single biggest thing
12 that can be done to deal with all of those problems.

13 One thing that concerns me quite a lot -- I've
14 seen this for the first time in the overview section
15 here -- alternative of four-damn removal with no
16 hatcheries.

17 Now, I think we're all hoping that eventually,
18 no hatcheries will be needed. But it's been my
19 understanding that there is funding in the project
20 proposal to operate the existing hatchery or replacement
21 for it for eight years or thereabouts. And I would hope
22 that we are prepared to evaluate the progress of
23 increased natural runs in the river and adjust the
24 hatchery outflow accordingly until hopefully, eventually,
25 we don't need the hatcheries anymore. If we just shut

1 them down immediately, I think that would be a mistake.

2 Thank you.

3 MS. HELLIWELL: Hi. My name is Vivian
4 Helliwell, V-I-V-I-A-N, H-E-L-L-I-W-E-L-L. I'm watershed
5 conservation director for Pacific Coast Federation of
6 Fishermen's Associations for which Dave Bitts was just
7 speaking as president.

8 And our membership relies on a harvestable
9 surplus beyond a sustainable viable population of fish in
10 these rivers. And so after the escapement goals are met,
11 then we need more fish than that in order to have a
12 coastal economy of commercial fishing. We've been shut
13 down in the Klamath for over 20 years. And we rarely
14 have any fishing opportunity on any fish that come
15 through that area so that we avoid catch of Klamath River
16 fish.

17 We expect and hope from the evidence that's
18 been presented in these alternatives that the runs will
19 be able to improve because of taking these dams out and
20 accessing the hundreds of miles of habitat above them.
21 And, you know, we have -- what? 387 miles of wild and
22 scenic below the dams. A total of 286 miles on the
23 Klamath River so far.

24 None of these dams would be able to be built
25 today without fish ladders or access for the runs above

1 them. So we're in a new era where we take better care of
2 the fish. They've encountered so much disease when they
3 come back in from the bad water quality that we've been
4 losing incredible opportunity to stimulate the coastal
5 economy and have healthy local fish. Instead, we have
6 fish flown from in Alaska in our market place that people
7 can't even afford to eat. Flying salmon.

8 Local salmon would really help the health of
9 the local economy and the health of the people who can
10 eat the local salmon. The Klamath River process of
11 decommissioning resonates with the Eel River that frames
12 the Klamath management zone in the ocean. Our third
13 largest river -- salmon-producing river in California.

14 The State of California has a policy for
15 supporting naturally-sustained runs of salmon. And so
16 now we have dams on the Eel River that are up for
17 relicensing. And Pacific Gas and Electric, PG and E, has
18 decided to orphan their -- abandon their license
19 application. And so those dams are going through a
20 similar process that are modeled on the Klamath River
21 next to it.

22 So again, it would allow fish to go above a dam
23 that was built with no fish ladder. Scott dam, 130 feet
24 tall and produces negligent non-money making amount of
25 electricity. But the water's very important on the other

1 side of the hill and the Russian River.

2 So there's some negotiation that needs to take
3 place. The Klamath negotiations are an example of how
4 that can be accomplished. And, of course, we need to go
5 through the same FERC process for either auctioning off
6 the process, either relicensing or decommissioning of
7 those dams. They're going to have to have volitional
8 fish passage.

9 And so we will continue to participate, talking
10 with our neighbors, trying to meet everyone's needs as we
11 have been on the Klamath and try to get those fish back
12 and give them a wider range of opportunity in the upper
13 rivers, especially facing climate change.

14 So we look forward to the improvements that we
15 hope that these dam removals will make in the Klamath
16 River. And as Mr. Pace said, we still have work to do on
17 water quality other than this.

18 So it's an ongoing process. And we're willing
19 to be part of it, happy to be part of it, work with all
20 of our neighbors to make it happen.

21 Thank you for your part in it too.

22 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. We have K'nek'nek' Lowry,
23 Seth Greacen, and Erik Rydberg.

24 MR. LOWRY: I'm K'nek'nek' Lowry. And this is
25 my brother, Boy. My name is K, apostrophe, N-E-K,

1 apostrophe, N-E-K, apostrophe.

2 We don't need dam power for our power. We have
3 solar power and wind power. If we don't do something
4 quick about these dams: Bye-bye, salmon.

5 So take action or we're going to suffer a loss
6 of salmon. I and other Yurok children are the future of
7 the tribe. So we can make a change. Salmon is the core
8 of Yurok culture and the food. My family has fished the
9 Klamath River since time (*Inaudible.*). Walk now.

10 MS. RAGAZZI: Seth Greacen, followed by Erik
11 Rydberg.

12 Is there anybody else out there that wants to
13 speak this evening that hasn't handed in a speaker card?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

15 MS. RAGAZZI: Can you do so now, please? Can
16 you fill out a speaker card now, please?

17 MR. GREACEN: My name is Scott Greacen,
18 S-C-O-T-T, G-R-E-A-C-E-N. I'm conservation director for
19 Friends of the Eel River.

20 We strongly support Klamath dam removal. And I
21 want to echo the urgency that my colleagues have -- those
22 guys have expressed.

23 I want to pull back a little bit and think
24 about the larger significance of this process. It's
25 really important to learn how to fix our mistakes. We

1 all make 'em. But we've got to learn how to make things
2 better after we make them. And as your work shows, some
3 dams make sense, but some don't. And those that don't
4 make sense should be removed. And this process is
5 really, really important because, to restore fisheries,
6 to do justice, we need to understand what it is we've
7 done wrong and how we've messed things up.

8 So this is a historic opportunity, not only for
9 the Klamath but, as others have pointed out, for
10 California and for the greater American west. We've got
11 a lot of other dams that need to come out. Not all of
12 them, but some of them. And your work here and all the
13 efforts that have brought this movement to this moment is
14 going to echo in river canyons all over this country.

15 So thank you. This is really important.

16 MS. RAGAZZI: Erik Rydberg, followed by Scott
17 Ohman, followed by Kelsey Reedy.

18 And if there's any speaker cards, please pass
19 them up now. Thank you.

20 MR. RYDBERG: *(Inaudible.)* Ashokawna is my
21 watershed which is the Russian River. I just want to
22 second what our young relatives just said about culture,
23 how these things are absolutely dependent on our
24 watersheds that we've had for thousands of years. And
25 also Scott who just recently said this. It's much

1 bigger. Its decades and decades of struggle of local
2 people that are Wiyot or Yurok or Hoopa relatives here.
3 But that struggle, the success of that struggle has
4 ripple effects for communities that have been in similar
5 struggles throughout California.

6 My family's been a part of fighting for our
7 watershed for decades. The dams warm the springs. The
8 dam destroyed our basket-making materials through the
9 years of the California Indian Basket Weavers Association
10 that my family's been involved with. We had to simply --
11 all of the effects of these dams have just caused such
12 damage to culture, to our animals, our non-human
13 relatives.

14 So success here -- hard fought success here for
15 all these people, our indigenous relatives, will have the
16 kind of ripple effects for other people who are fighting
17 in other watersheds, tributaries of this watershed we're
18 fighting for here.

19 It's so important that this happen. Especially
20 in this time of climate change, including the reason
21 these dams are here in the name of this industrialized
22 progress that has caused such disaster all over the
23 globe. We're in a time of change, a time of realizing
24 that, you know, progress for profit or for means of
25 producing energy that are becoming irrelevant really

1 compared to other things that are optional. We're in a
2 time where we are going to need a change, massive change.

3 And this is one of those things that has such
4 ripple effects in such positive ways for all of our
5 indigenous relatives, for everyone who has made this
6 their home now, who are burying their dead on our
7 indigenous lands, now made it their home, it's going to
8 have positive ripple effects throughout the State of
9 California and serve as an example for the rest of the
10 country and the globe. Because what's happening here is
11 a very human situation that is happening all over the
12 globe.

13 And we need to collectively, as human beings,
14 realize that the earth -- we have no other option. The
15 earth is the only place we have to live. And, you know,
16 fossil fuels. We can't just burn gases and oil and get
17 out of anything. We're going to need our non-human
18 relatives. We're going to need our watersheds. And
19 we're going to need our forests to continue to survive
20 and raise our children and other generations.

21 So I beg you to take a look at what's being
22 asked here today -- tonight and push forward for the
23 removal of the Klamath dam. Thank you.

24 MS. RAGAZZI: So we have Scott Ohman, Kelsey
25 Reedy, and Anthony Sylvanto.

1 MR. OHMAN: Hi. My name is Scott Ohman,
2 S-C-O-T-T, O-H-M-A-N. And I'm -- unlike many of the
3 people you've heard speak tonight, I am not an engineer.
4 I am not a lawyer. I am not a professional. All I know
5 is I'm 42 years old. I grew up in Humboldt County. One
6 of my first memories is swimming and rafting with my
7 family on the Klamath and Trinity Rivers. And throughout
8 my life, I've watched these already damaged rivers from
9 my childhood be destroyed by these dams.

10 Last summer I was up on the Klamath River,
11 launched just below the dam, floated about 40 miles. We
12 thought -- it's early July. We brought three different
13 forms of water purification with us. We brought filters.
14 We brought tablets. We brought multiple levels. And we
15 thought that would be sufficient for our needs, that we
16 could take water from the river for our needs over this
17 five-day trip. And we found, immediately upon arrival,
18 that that was not the case. It was already posted,
19 warned by the rangers that this water is not drinkable
20 under any conditions, even boiled.

21 Additionally, again, early summer, early July,
22 we could see areas of the rivers, slow moving areas, that
23 were just choked. You didn't want to get in the water.
24 Several of us developed rashes throughout the trip.

25 And I'm going to paraphrase the words of the

1 youngest member of our group who said: How is this
2 possible? How is this allowed? If that was a polluting
3 factory upriver that was killing fish, that was giving
4 people rashes, that was making the water undrinkable,
5 there would be massive lawsuits. That factory would be
6 fined. It would be shut down. We wouldn't be talking
7 about a 20, a 40-year process. We wouldn't be talking
8 about a process that we've been discussing my entire
9 life. It would be taking action immediately.

10 So I just want to echo what many other people
11 have said, that -- and I want to thank everybody who's
12 been in this fight even longer than I've been alive.

13 But the time is now. Let's take down these
14 dams.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. REEDY: Hello. My name is Kelsey Reedy,
17 K-E-L-S-E-Y, R-E-E-D-Y. And I'm here as the chair of the
18 Green Party of Humboldt County and the coordinator of the
19 Humboldt Move to Amend. And we're here in full support
20 of the removal -- the complete removal of the dam. And
21 this is a pretty obvious thing for all of what it is that
22 we stand for. We stand for, you know, the rights of
23 nature. We should be putting the life of water and the
24 life of the creatures that are surviving off of the water
25 ahead of profit.

1 It is always people over profit; always planet
2 over profit.

3 And so we fully support the removal.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. RAGAZZI: Anthony Sylvanto, Eli Naffah, and
6 Merry Kate Lowry.

7 Anthony going once? Going twice?

8 Okay. Eli?

9 MR. NAFFAH: Eli, E-L-I, Naffah, N-A-F-F, like
10 Frank, A-H.

11 I'm here -- I am president of the Del Norte
12 Economic Development Corporation. And I used to be city
13 manager in Crescent City.

14 And we've been trying to grow the local
15 economy. And having lived in southern California before
16 and then also in the Bay Area and then 17 years between
17 Humboldt and Del Norte, we really need to focus on
18 whatever economic opportunities we do have. And the
19 fishing industry is one great opportunity that we could
20 build upon. Crescent City and northern California is the
21 number one harbor -- Crescent City's the number one
22 harbor as far as generating the crab fishing. And I
23 think we have a great opportunity, if we can get the
24 Klamath dams removed, so that we can bring the salmon
25 industry back and hopefully have the Crescent City Harbor

1 thrive like it did before.

2 I see a lot of activity now even with the crab.
3 And I think we can have so much more activity with the
4 salmon. As the Economic Development Corporation, we're
5 always interested in creating jobs between the
6 recreational and the commercial fishing industries. You
7 know, again, building on the businesses and helping those
8 businesses grow and succeed.

9 So our region, unlike some of the benefits that
10 you might have in the metropolitan area, where you can
11 have -- you know, like Silicon Valley and so on, there's
12 limited opportunities that we have here. We need to try
13 to capitalize on those opportunities. And growing the
14 fishing industry would be a huge benefit.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. RAGAZZI: Merry Kate Lowry.

17 MS. LOWRY: My name's Merry Kate Lowry,
18 M-E-R-R-Y, K-A-T-E, L-O-W-R-Y. I've been an educator
19 here in Humboldt County for about 20 years working with
20 native and non-native youth and community and families.
21 And when FERC first came here and there were hearings, I
22 brought some native youth that were my students. And --
23 and they spoke. And for some of them, that was the first
24 time that they had ever done any public speaking. It was
25 really empowering.

1 And through the process, I've seen youth, high
2 school, as well as elementary school students understand
3 that their culture was being endangered after the fish
4 kill. And I remember the fish kill and the energy that
5 went through the community and their worry and seeing the
6 process develop, where allies have come together with
7 native communities and the healing has happened from
8 generation and the generation before from genocides.

9 So these are healing, bringing people together.
10 And there's native youth and non-native youth.
11 Everybody's looking and there's hope. There's hope. And
12 I think that's one of the biggest things that I have seen
13 in this process that's kind of magical. And that, a lot
14 of times, doesn't get into these meetings.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you. I'm going to ask -- I
17 have three more cards here. Is there anybody else that
18 wants to speak this evening or is wanting to come back
19 up?

20 If you can raise your hands really high right
21 now? Okay. Because I want to check-in with Connie about
22 whether we want to take a break now or push through.

23 *(Court reporter interruption.)*

24 MS. RAGAZZI: Push through. Okay. Connie's a
25 trooper.

1 Carlrey Arroyo. I can't tell if this is Jene
2 J. McCovey?

3 Jene. Okay. And then Bernadette Lincoln.

4 And then anyone else can just fill out a
5 speaker card. Again, that would be great. Just so that
6 we have the record for it. I think I saw two hands over
7 there. One of them is supervisor, and then I'm not sure
8 who the other person was.

9 MS. ARROYO: Carlrey Arroyo. I want to say
10 thank you to the Wiyot people for allowing me to be here
11 today. And I also want to thank all of the Klamath and
12 salmon people who have been on the front lines for
13 decades. Thank you all for continuing this fight.
14 And I'm sorry that you have to continuously repeat your
15 trauma and the connection you all have to the salmon over
16 and over and over again.

17 Thank you all.

18 I just want to uplift the voices of all the
19 folks who spoke today. And say that undamming the
20 Klamath will have many benefits long term. I want to
21 thank Regina for clarifying the misconceptions about the
22 sediment that many people have because --

23 I don't want to hurt anybody's ears.

24 MS. RAGAZZI: If you step back.

25 MS. ARROYO: Okay. Cool. I'll just hold it.

1 Cool. I lost my train of thought.

2 But basically, I support the undamming of the
3 four dams now. And hopefully the fifth one that the
4 person earlier spoke to which should have been included
5 in this DEIR as well.

6 But I stand with all the indigenous people in
7 undamming Klamath and especially the little ones who
8 shouldn't have to come um here and say: Bring the salmon
9 home.

10 MS. RAGAZZI: Jene.

11 MS. LINCOLN: I'm switching with Jene. My
12 name's Bernadette Lincoln. I'm a Tlingit Indian. My
13 family consists of -- we represent Tlingit, Crow,
14 Wailaki, Pomo, Yurok, Karuk, and Tamawak in our home.

15 My children are traditional dancers. My son
16 just became a jump dancer. I'm a very proud mother.
17 Both my kids are bush dancers. We eat traditional food
18 in my house. I used to teach traditional cooking. But
19 now it's only for birthdays because we can't get our
20 hands on it.

21 I want to thank K'nek'nek' Lowery, if he's
22 still here who said what I wanted to say for my kids: We
23 have no candlefish anymore in the rivers, no freshwater
24 clams.

25 My daughter's name -- just to give you an

1 example of how important the river is to the Yurok
2 people, my daughter's name is Little Frog; my son's name
3 is Canoe Boy. Those are traditional names. And last
4 year, summer rain, and we heard a noise downtown Eureka
5 behind Walmart. And my daughter said, "What is that
6 noise?"

7 And I said, "What noise are you talking about?"

8 "That noise. What's that loud noise?"

9 It was frogs. My Yurok daughter, named Little
10 Frog, didn't know what that noise was.

11 Remember, I'm a traditional foods person. I
12 teach native cooking. My husband's a linguist. He does
13 language restoration. So bringing back the salmon,
14 bringing back the rivers, bringing them back to life is
15 so important to our culture and in so many ways, not just
16 birthdays.

17 And so I just plead with you that you talk to
18 your hearts and ask what's the right thing to do and that
19 you vote in favor of taking the dams down.

20 MS. RAGAZZI: Jene McCovey still plan to come
21 up?

22 Yes.

23 MS. MCCOVEY: (*Inaudible.*) Jene McCovey.

24 I was born in 1951 in the big Hoopa Hospital.
25 They took my mom up there when the mouth -- from the

1 mouth of the Klamath River. And they asked my father,
2 his sister if they would take me so that they could earn
3 money for the winter because the Klamath at that time, in
4 1951, there were three canopies there. And we were
5 talking tonight about the underground aquifers that are
6 coming out of the -- up out of the Klamath watershed and
7 how it's going to be the water that our fish are going to
8 come to. And we're talking about the -- talking about
9 the babies.

10 So when you talk about the 2002 fishtail, our
11 people were on Pecwan Creek. And we were dancing the
12 dance that we balance the world between good and bad. We
13 borrowed the dance with the medicine from the spirit
14 world. There's a place at the dance ground where the
15 spirits come to dance because they're not in the spirit
16 world; they're with us. The door of this time -- we
17 bring all of time together.

18 So the center man raises the basket upriver to
19 those who have gone on before us and downriver to those
20 who come after us. And then they all soothe the audience
21 which is a present. The creator gave us this job.

22 And so we were doing our dance. We were doing
23 what we were meant to do. How we left creator's spirit
24 world and come here to be who we are. I came here to be
25 my parent's child. And they gave me away so they could

1 go fish. And at that time, it was the first year of a
2 ten-year plan for the Klamath River. The United States
3 government got this plan going. They did not heed the
4 scientists. They did not listen of what was needing.

5 So depending on whose story you listen to, the
6 kill was 60,000 adults or 90,000 adults. But what they
7 haven't talked about much was the 300,000 babies that
8 have no place to grow, that when -- if you were the eagle
9 flying on top of the mountains, come down, you see this
10 gray snake. And there's this blue ribbon in it. That's
11 the river. There's no habitat. And so from 2019, 2020,
12 2021, this forum here has a cumulative effect on that
13 moon stock and the quality of water.

14 There's no q in the law when you compare an
15 *(Inaudible.)* fish with a potato or alfalfa or cattle.
16 The salmon can only come back to its native stream by
17 creator's design. By our prayers, we make this happen.
18 But the cumulative effect above and beyond this forum has
19 to deal with the quality water. And it's now. It's now.

20 I would like to say that our tribal government
21 has the control of the reservation. But we are the
22 keepers of the waters for the fish. So all the water
23 from the mouth of the river on up the river as we all
24 need to be taking care of that. We all need to be
25 responsible, helping our tribal people, our indigenous

1 people continue on with dances, continue on with helping
2 the (*Inaudible.*)

3 I think to share with you is we have the
4 audiences and the jump dance. We have the fire where the
5 medicine goes, and you have the dances. Then behind the
6 dances are the spirit world. In -- I won't say where
7 it's at. But the dance ground at the lagoon. My lady
8 friend went to the dance and said, "Jene, I saw a
9 thousand spirits."

10 I said, "Where did you see a thousand spirits?
11 Tell me."

12 And she says, "Well, you know when we went over
13 the lagoon, there's a big wall. And the dancers are
14 there." She says, "We've been watching the dance." And
15 one said there was a row of dancers watching behind the
16 dancers. Then there was another row of spirits, and they
17 were watching the audience. Then there was a third row,
18 and she looked back over the lagoon. And there was
19 nothing there.

20 When the dance started she heard the spirits
21 behind her in the lagoon. And she said there was a
22 thousand spirits.

23 And so it behooves us that -- I think that
24 those spirits are the ones who are coming. And we have
25 to save this place and the moon stock. And I think this

1 is one of the most precious things I could share that, as
2 human beings, here walking on this earth and
3 understanding that we're in connectivity with the trees.
4 For the fires that have burned and the forests that have
5 been logged and the bedrock is inundated with waste. And
6 it needs to be cleaned. And so it's a big job, but this
7 is -- a cumulative effect is recognizing that we can't be
8 clear cutting. We can't be cutting our trees. That's
9 our oxygen. We're completing with (*Inaudible.*).

10 We have to really take a look at what we're
11 doing and how we're doing it. And these little kids
12 talking about how -- it's something I would like to share
13 for them. And it's how we're connected, why our dances
14 are important, and why we were dancing that day, that
15 Sunday before the Monday that the fish kill came in 2002
16 that our dances have the (*Inaudible.*) off the big red
17 headdress. And there's a big tall feather that sits on
18 top of it. And it twittles. It's engineered to sit on
19 the -- our person's head. And it twitters in the wind.

20 And so dancers are here, the men in the fire,
21 the spirit is there. And then the audience -- the
22 audience looks on the dancers. When they see that, it
23 reminds us that when that salmon's going up the river and
24 his tail fin is up, out. And it twitters. And it
25 reminds us why we pray, why we do it.

1 The creator has set us to and how it is
2 important. So when the little people go and they watch
3 the elders dance and they see those feathers, they know
4 that that's the heart of their prayer. And its not just
5 for our people; it's for humanity. We are the children
6 of mother Earth. And we're -- she's in trouble.

7 And in 2002, that was the first President Bush.
8 And I wouldn't put it past to destroy what's left of our
9 stream. And we need to be vigilant and know that it
10 could be -- it is 1849 again. The mentality that we are
11 battling against is atrocious. And we need to be wise in
12 how we choose our battles.

13 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

14 I have no speaker cards right now. Is there
15 anybody else that still wishes to speak?

16 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. I have one last speaker.
17 Can I get your card, sir, please?

18 Denver Nelson. Can you state your name and
19 spell it for her, please?

20 MR. NELSON: Denver Nelson, D-E-N-V-E-R,
21 N-E-L-S-O-N.

22 MS. RAGAZZI: If you come right here? Okay.

23 MR. NELSON: D-E-N-V-E-R, N-E-L-S-O-N. It's
24 propitious that I speak after Jene because I was her
25 doctor when she had her accident. I've been -- I've

1 lived in Eureka for about 40 years.

2 I've had a place up on the Klamath River for
3 about 30 years because I like to fish there. And I love
4 the river. When I first became interested in the Klamath
5 River, I wasn't interested in dam removal. I was
6 interested in the government not building the Ah Pah Dam.
7 So many of you younger people here, you probably don't
8 even know about the Ah Pah Dam.

9 But it was going to be 900 feet tall. And it
10 was going to divert any (*Inaudible.*) of the flow of the
11 Klamath River to the Central Valley. It's still on the
12 books, you know. And if you drive down the Central
13 Valley to southern California you can get an idea.
14 There's a lot more of them than there are of us. And if
15 you sort of follow what's going on in the government,
16 it's possible that that dam diversion could still be
17 built. But it hasn't been built.

18 And so then I've been to hundreds of meetings
19 like this. And I think we've made some progress to get
20 four dams removed. But it's important to keep in mind
21 there are actually seven dams on the Klamath River.
22 Felice, where ever he is, was right that there's dam at
23 Keno that completely blocks the flow above that is the
24 Link Dam which diverts flow of the outflow of the Klamath
25 lake to irrigation district and downriver.

1 The upper Klamath Lake is probably where all of
2 the toxic products come from. And removing four dams is
3 not going to fix a lot of these problems. So I'm very
4 much in favor of removing the four dams. But I don't
5 think that we should stop there.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Our last speaker of the
8 evening, full circle, coming back to the supervisor.

9 MR. MADRONE: It is a full circle that we live
10 in. A circle of community and salmon and everything
11 else.

12 So you've received a letter from our board, the
13 board of supervisors from Humboldt County. Just mailed,
14 I believe, yesterday and supporting dam removal. And I
15 just want to make it clear that the Humboldt County Board
16 supported that letter unanimously. And for anybody that
17 knows our board here in Humboldt County, that is no small
18 achievement, right?

19 So a unanimous decision on our part to move
20 that forward. The supervisor from this district,
21 Supervisor Wilson, wanted to be here tonight. He's at a
22 meeting in freshwater working with that community working
23 on watershed planning and a lot of important things. So
24 lots going on in our community.

25 I did want to say a couple more things. Thank

1 you for the chance to come up again.

2 First of all, the draft EIR concludes that the
3 dam removal improves water quality. They got that right.
4 This includes getting rid of the blue-green algae and
5 fish disease problems below the dams. But I agree with
6 Denver Nelson and Felice that this is a beginning. It's
7 a good beginning. We absolutely need to do this. But we
8 have to be looking at these other dams as well.

9 The draft EIR says that the sediment impacts
10 will be temporary while the long-term benefits are
11 stronger runs of salmon and better water quality.
12 Excellent point.

13 The draft EIR clarifies that dam removal will
14 not affect irrigated agriculture. It will not affect
15 irrigated agriculture. None of the dams we are removing
16 provide agricultural diversions. And I know you all know
17 that. But that's an important thing because that gets
18 confused in the discussions open upriver. The draft EIR
19 clarifies dam removal will not affect summer river flows
20 that's controlled further upstream, the BOR project.

21 It's also true that power rates will be lower
22 for the customers with dam removal because keeping the
23 dams with the necessary repairs and building fish ladders
24 costs more than the electricity is worth.

25 We're seeing the same thing on the Eel River.

1 That will be next.

2 Furthermore, this was a comment about removing
3 the dams removes some water storage for fires. We are
4 certainly having some pretty catastrophic wildfires. But
5 that too can be mitigated with off channel storage. In
6 the Mattole River we've done a lot of work with storage
7 and forbearance.

8 I think we're all going to be storing our
9 winter rain water very soon here, all of us and
10 forbearing from pumping from our creeks and rivers in the
11 summer time so that the salmon have what they need in the
12 river to survive. So having that storage is another way
13 to solve a lot of our problems including firefighting
14 supplies.

15 So in sum, the Humboldt County Board of
16 Supervisors and, I believe, many people in our community
17 agree that the key findings of the document, we agree
18 with those key findings and we support the proposed
19 project. It is time for balance and healing. It is time
20 to stop the dam-age, the damage. And it's time to undam
21 the Klamath.

22 Thank you.

23 MS. RAGAZZI: I want to thank everyone for
24 coming tonight. If you didn't grab a notice of
25 availability when you walked in, please grab it.

1 Written comments are due by February 26th.

2 And if you have any questions for water board
3 folks and staff, please come up. We're here. And we're
4 happy to answer any questions you might have on the draft
5 EIR.

6 Thank you.

7 *(Proceedings concluded at 6:58 p.m.)*

8 . . .

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, CONNIE WEBB, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbered 1 through 75, are a true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes take on February 6, 2019.

Dated this 20th day of February, 2019.

CONNIE WEBB, CSR NO. 10811