

From: Kim Sinclair
To: [Wr401program](#)
Subject: Copco lake removal
Date: Sunday, July 22, 2018 12:23:47 PM

Kimberly Sinclair
17501 Patricia Ave.
Montague CA. 96064

To whom this may concern

I'm a resident of Copco Lake and I own a house that is on the lake. First and foremost I am an environmentalist, with my degree in natural resource management. Among other things, I was involved in implimenting the Bonneville dam fish ladder. Also i was involved in the savage Rapids dam removal. So let me Begin by saying that I am not completely against the damn removals to restore the Klamath River.

I

However, I have thoroughly gone over the Proposal that they have drawn up. I do not feel about this dam removal is even close to removal stages.

First, from an environmental standpoint: The sheer size of the removal overwhelms the research they have available. It seems as though they are using this as an experimental damn removal, lacking in evidence and planning. There is far more at stake than the smaller dam removals in the past. The unknown of what will happen with the sediment alone is enough to question this plan. Water quality and fish survival should be the first concern, though it seems to be an afterthought in the proposal. I would also like to know what your plans are for the number of osprey and Eagles that rely on the lakes for fishing. also the lake is full of endangered Suckerfish. Are they less important of an endangered species? I do happen to know that Salmon ladders work, so why isn't this an option?

Secondly the cost of the dam removal, involving tax payers, without the vote of the tax payers is a complete injustice. I'm trying to understand how Pacificorp can make money for a hundred years off of these dams, and then charge the taxpayers to remove their dams. The sheer size of the restoration will deplete this money within months. The plan says nothing at all about the compensation to the homeowners. It gives very little detail about restoration on the land beyond the river that will be affected by the receding lake. Nor does it give any details about landowners who will lose their water wells, their aesthetic value, and their recreation.

I don't know that you will even read this or listen to it. In fact I'm quite sure that it will be ignored along with all the other pleas and concerns. But I can honestly say, without biased, that this project is only at infrantry stages and will need far more research and planning than the 2000 page travestry they call a plan. The EIS alone lacks pertinent facts and research.

Thank you for your time.

Kimberly Sinclair