

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION

--oOo--

RE:

PUBLIC MEETING FOR

LOWER KLAMATH PROJECT

LICENSE SURRENDER

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

CERTIFIED COPY

--oOo--

Audio Transcription of Public Meeting

of February 15, 2019

--oOo--

Transcribed by: Denise D. Thompson, Stenographer

CSR No. 9688

1 PUBLIC MEETING FOR LOWER KLAMATH PROJECT LICENSE
2 SURRENDER DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3 February 15, 2019

4 --oOo--

5 (Audio begins.)

6 MS. RAGAZZI: Good afternoon, everyone. I
7 appreciate you folks coming out today and I want to
8 welcome you to the last of four meetings we're holding to
9 accept comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report
10 for the Lower Klamath Project.

11 I'm Erin Ragazzi with the State Water Board's
12 Division of Water Rights. And although we have a small
13 room here, I need to speak into the microphone because
14 we're web-casting today. So it's a reminder that
15 everyone should speak into the microphone, for two
16 reasons; one, we want folks on the webcast to be able to
17 hear what you have to say today, but also because we're
18 recording this. And so any comments that folks provide
19 are ones that we want to be able to respond to and get
20 transcribed accurately. So please make sure that you use
21 the microphone.

22 I have a couple of logistics to go over. If we
23 happen to be in an unfortunate situation of having the
24 fire alarms go off while we're having this meeting, we
25 would want to exit through the exit door nearest to you,

1 go downstairs, and then we would convene at Cesar Chavez
2 Park. And hopefully it will not be raining outside if
3 that were to happen.

4 As soon as we got the "all clear" we would come
5 back and reconvene here. So just make sure you follow
6 one of the staff here and we can make sure you get back
7 in.

8 If you need to use the restroom, you go out that
9 door, go right or left. When you get down to the end of
10 the hallway turn left and the restrooms will be right
11 there.

12 The purpose of today's meeting is mainly to
13 solicit comments from folks regarding the Lower Klamath
14 Project License Surrender Draft Environmental Impact
15 Report. And so we're going to do a brief presentation,
16 but then we're really going to dive into the actual
17 comment period.

18 First of all, I want to introduce other folks
19 that are here with me today. So, over to my left is
20 Kristen Gangl; she is with the State Water Board's
21 Division of Water Rights. She's going to be our first
22 presenter.

23 We have Marianna Aue with the Office of Chief
24 Counsel at the State Water Board. And then to her right
25 is Parker Thaler, also with the Division of Water Rights

1 here at the State Water Board.

2 And assisting us over there is Michelle Siebal
3 who will be monitoring the e-mail account.

4 So if folks are out there and they want to
5 e-mail in comments that we want to put into the record
6 they can do that. They will want to e-mail those to
7 WR401Program@waterboards.ca.gov. I'm not expecting
8 people to be madly writing that down. It's scrolling on
9 the bottom of their webcast as well. So, just so folks
10 know.

11 I want to point out a couple things. Two
12 handouts that you definitely want to grab if you just
13 came in and you want to speak, you want to grab the
14 speaker card. If you'd fill out the speaker card you can
15 hand it to Kristin or Michelle and we'll get you in the
16 queue to provide comments.

17 The other important document is the Notice of
18 Availability. The Notice of Availability has all the
19 information about how to submit comments as well as to
20 how to sign up for our e-mail list so that you can
21 receive future updates about this project.

22 And with that I will go into ground rules. So
23 if you happen to have an electronic device with you
24 today, cell phone -- we don't do pagers really any
25 more -- but please take a moment to silence your

1 electronic devices so that they don't interfere with
2 today's meeting.

3 Also want to make sure that we respect all
4 speakers and all points of view today. Again, we already
5 said, please make sure you speak into the microphone.

6 And we have a limited number of folks here today
7 so I don't think we're going to have a real problem with
8 time limits, but we would want people to respect time
9 limits and be aware of -- of folks in the room.

10 And if you don't want to speak today, you can
11 provide written comments on the speaker card. Just don't
12 check the box saying that you want to speak. Or,
13 alternatively, you can submit comments in writing. As I
14 mentioned, the information on how to submit those
15 comments is on the Notice of Availability. And those
16 comments are due by noon on February 26th.

17 With that I will turn it over to Kristen Gangl
18 to kick off the presentation.

19 MS. GANGL: I'm just going to start with a quick
20 background about the project and then talk about the
21 authorities related to hydroelectric project licensing.
22 I'll talk a little bit about why we're here today and
23 then walk us through the water quality certification
24 process, and then also the California Environmental
25 Quality Act process. And then I'll turn it over to

1 Parker for an overview of the Draft Environmental Impact
2 Report.

3 Here is the project area. The Klamath River
4 Renewal Corporation, or the KRRC, has applied with the
5 State Water Board to decommission and remove the facility
6 shown in red in the upper right-hand corner. In Oregon
7 that is JC Boyle and in California it's Copco 1 and 2 and
8 Iron Gate.

9 At the moment the four facilities are owned by
10 PacifiCorp, but they've applied with the Federal Energy
11 Regulatory Commission to transfer ownership of those four
12 facilities to the KRRC. And then the KRRC has separately
13 applied to remove the facilities.

14 There's other facilities associated with the
15 Klamath Hydroelectric Project, which is different from
16 the Lower Klamath Project. And those four facilities are
17 East Side and West Side, you know, in Oregon, and Fall
18 Creek in California. And at this time those remain under
19 PacifiCorp's ownership.

20 So when it comes to the authority over licensing
21 hydroelectric projects, there's two main authorities at
22 the federal level; you have the Federal Energy Regulatory
23 Commission, or FERC. And they are the federal agency
24 with broad authority over all aspects of a hydropower
25 project whether it's continued operation of maintenance

1 or decommissioning. And they can really control all
2 aspects of a project.

3 At the state level you have the State Water
4 Resources Control Board, or the State Water Board. And
5 they are the state agency with regulatory authority to
6 certify whether or not a proposed project can meet water
7 quality standards and also to impose conditions. And in
8 this case it is through the water quality certification.
9 And those conditions would help protect water quality as
10 associated with the proposed project.

11 So we are here today because the Klamath River
12 Renewal Corporation, again, KRRC, have applied to the
13 State Water Board for a water quality certification for
14 the Lower Klamath Project. And in order for the State
15 Water Board to take action on an application we first
16 need to comply with CEQA, which is the California
17 Environmental Quality Act. And in order to comply with
18 CEQA we've issued a Draft Environmental Impact Report, or
19 EIR. And at the moment it is out for public review and
20 comment. So that's why are here today, is to collect
21 public comment.

22 The water quality certification process was
23 instigated when the KRRC submitted an application to the
24 State Water Board for a water quality certification in
25 late 2016. And so we started drafting the conditions

1 that we thought might help protect water quality, and we
2 issued a draft water quality certification in June of
3 2018. That public input period went from June 7th to
4 July 23rd. And at this point in time we're in the
5 process of reviewing and considering all the comments we
6 received regarding the draft water quality certification.

7 And our next step would be to issue a final
8 decision on that application for the certification for
9 the Lower Klamath Project.

10 But before we do that we have to take a look at
11 CEQA. The California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA,
12 is a state policy that requires any agency to review and
13 assess the potential impacts, environmental impacts
14 associated with the proposed project and to identify ways
15 to avoid, minimize or mitigate where feasible those
16 impacts. So, it also evaluates a range of alternatives
17 to the project and it involves agency and public
18 involvement.

19 So when we received the KRRC's application for
20 water quality certification, we shortly thereafter issued
21 a Notice of Preparation and held several public meetings
22 to solicit public input. And that public comment period
23 went from December 20th to beginning of February 2017.

24 So, we reviewed those comments along with a lot
25 of the other data and other issued stuff that was out

1 there regarding the Lower Klamath Project and we released
2 a Scoping Report, which is a compilation of all the
3 comments we received on our -- during our Notice of
4 Preparation. And that was issued in April of 2017, and
5 it is available on our website.

6 At this point we've issued a Draft Environmental
7 Impact Report, and we are in the middle of our public
8 comment period. And that went from December 27th and it
9 goes until February 26th, like Erin said. After that we
10 would respond to public comment and then take final
11 action on the certification.

12 So you can see how these two processes although
13 separate can run concurrently. But because the CEQA
14 process informs the water quality certification process,
15 we can't take a final action on the water quality
16 certification application until we finalize our
17 Environmental Impact Report.

18 So that's kind of the culmination of all this,
19 is a Final Environmental Impact Report and a final
20 decision regarding the application for water quality
21 certification.

22 I'll turn it over to Parker to talk about the
23 actual document.

24 MR. THALER: So, for the second half of today's
25 presentation I'll be discussing the Draft Environmental

1 Impact Report, or Draft EIR's content in organization.
2 And you can see on this slide the Draft EIR was divided
3 into two volumes. Volume one included information such
4 as the Executive Summary, introduction, the KRRC's
5 proposed project, environmental settings, impacts and
6 mitigation measures, alternatives to the KRRC's projects
7 and other requirements of CEQA.

8 And volume two are appendices. We had 23 total
9 and they contained information that helped support
10 determination in volume one.

11 So what I will be doing is going through each of
12 these sections discussing a little bit more about how
13 they are organized and structured.

14 And starting with the Executive Summary, it
15 includes a lot of useful information in our document such
16 as an overview of the KRRC's proposed project,
17 identification of areas of controversy, some details of
18 our public involvement process and our CEQA objectives.

19 They are summarized on this slide. And these
20 were the objectives that we used when we analyzed the
21 KRRC's proposed project as well as alternatives to those
22 -- to the proposed project as a whole.

23 And the objectives, in summary, included
24 improving long-term water quality conditions associated
25 with the Lower Klamath Project, advancing long-term

1 restoration of natural fish populations in the Klamath
2 Basin, restoring volitional or unaided anadromous fish
3 passage, and reducing disease conditions for Klamath
4 River salmonids.

5 And I note here that the State Water Board's
6 CEQA project objectives are different and do differ from
7 the KRRC's proposed project objective, which is to remove
8 sufficient portions of the Lower Klamath Project to
9 create a free-flowing Klamath River and provide for
10 volitional fish passage.

11 One other useful item in the Executive Summary
12 is table ES-1. It's a little lengthy and located at the
13 back of the Executive Summary, but it's a table that
14 lists every single potential impact as well as impact
15 determination for the proposed project and for
16 alternatives to the proposed projects. So it is a
17 helpful tool if you're looking to hone in on a specific
18 portion of the CEQA document.

19 Moving on to Section 1. Section 1 of our
20 document, the introduction had an overview of our CEQA
21 document similar to what I'm providing today as well as
22 some details of where we got information for our
23 document. Some of those are highlighted on this slide,
24 and I'd like to go through them.

25 The first being public comments on our Notice of

1 Preparation. As Kristen and Erin mentioned, in the CEQA
2 process we released a Notice of Preparation in December
3 of 2016 and we held public meetings similar to these and
4 collected over 1300 public comments, all of which we
5 reviewed and considered when we developed our Draft EIR.

6 From tribal consultation you'll note that there
7 are two different items up here. We had formal Assembly
8 Bill 52, government to government tribal consultation
9 with three Native American tribes, those being the Shasta
10 Indian Nation, the Shasta nation and the Yurok tribe.
11 And additionally we had informal discussion with the
12 Karuk and Hupa Valley tribe.

13 We also used information from federal, local and
14 state entities as well as a large body of scientific
15 information and information provided by the KRRC, such as
16 their application and additional information submittals.
17 All of which those have been posted to our Lower Klamath
18 Project web page. And I will have the link up to that at
19 the end of the presentation.

20 The next section is the KRRC's proposed project.
21 And in summary, it's the removal of four facilities shown
22 here on the slide. And details of the removal such as
23 the drawdown rate or restoration actions are all included
24 in Section 2.

25 And for our Section 3, Environmental Settings,

1 Impacts and Mitigation Measures, up on this slide is a
2 list of each resource area that we analyzed in our
3 document in relation to potential impacts from the
4 proposed project as well as alternatives.

5 And to list a few, we had items such as water
6 quality, aquatic resources, historical and tribal
7 cultural resources, public services, utilities, traffic
8 and transportation, and noise.

9 And for each of these items as we analyzed them
10 separately we ordered them in five components, which are
11 shown here. And those five components include an area of
12 analysis, which is the physical limits or boundaries of
13 the proposed project or project-proposed actions effects
14 to an environmental resource. And that can vary by
15 resource. And I will have examples of that up in the
16 next few slides.

17 We have environmental setting or baseline, which
18 is a description of the current environmental setting or
19 existing conditions of what essentially what it looks
20 like before the action is taken.

21 We have significance criteria which is criteria
22 used to compare actions to the baseline or existing
23 conditions to determine the severity of a potential
24 impact.

25 We have our impact analysis approach which is a

1 description of how the analysis of the potential effect
2 as undertaken for each environmental resource area.

3 And then we have potential impacts and
4 mitigation measures which identifies potential impacts
5 associated with project implementation. It analyzes the
6 potential impact and describes any feasible mitigation
7 for the impact that would be used to reduce significance.

8 And so to run through what this looks like in
9 the document, we have the water quality section being one
10 of the core focuses of the State Water Board's process
11 area of analysis up on the slide. And so each of those
12 resource areas that I explained has those five
13 components. And for water quality, our area of analysis
14 began on the Klamath River just above JC Boyle, ran down
15 river through JC Boyle, Copco No. 1, Copco No. 2, and
16 Iron Gate Reservoirs, went the entire 190 river miles
17 down Iron Gate to the Klamath River estuary, includes the
18 Klamath River estuary and the Pacific near shore
19 environments.

20 So, in summary, it begins above JC Boyle and
21 runs all the way down river to the Pacific Ocean. And so
22 in this instance for the area of analysis for the water
23 quality section we looked at potential impacts associated
24 with a proposed action a great deal away from where the
25 action would be occurring.

1 And for our environmental setting, or baseline,
2 as I said before, that is a description of existing
3 conditions before the undertaking of an action. And so
4 that can include information such as, you know, what are
5 the current water quality conditions and what's our
6 understanding of water quality processes in the system.

7 And so shown on this slide is a general
8 reservoir stratification process that occurs in most
9 reservoirs, most large reservoirs and does for Iron Gate
10 and Copco.

11 And for our significance criteria, which as I
12 stated before, was the criteria you use to compare a
13 proposed action to the existing conditions to determine
14 how significant that action is. And our impact analysis
15 approach are both shown on this slide.

16 And to summarize our significance criteria that
17 we used for water quality, it exceeds or substantially
18 contributes to an existing exceedance of a water quality
19 standard, cause a change in water quality that would
20 result in failure to meet an existing beneficial use of
21 water or protect water quality, or results in a
22 substantial adverse impact to human health or
23 environmental receptors.

24 And our impact analysis approach described items
25 such as our definitions of short and long-term for the

1 purposes of the water quality section. And those
2 definitions vary by your different resource areas.

3 We defined water quality parameters for items
4 such as dissolved oxygen, PH, temperature, turbidity, and
5 we described models that we use to inform our impact
6 analysis.

7 And so up on this slide is a very summarized
8 example of a potential impact in mitigation process, or
9 listing out of the water quality section. And I would
10 note that some of these are quite lengthy, and so we've
11 done our best to summarize up here.

12 And to walk through this, a potential impact
13 taken out of our document is a short and long-term
14 alteration in water temperature due to conversion of a
15 reservoir to a river. And our impact analysis looked at
16 what is the current conditions in comparison to what
17 would the conditions be if the project were implemented.

18 And so looking at that modeled condition with
19 current conditions or known data, we've determined that
20 water temperatures below Iron Gate are anywhere between
21 four to 18 degrees Farenheit warmer in the summer and
22 fall with the dams in than with implementation of the
23 proposed project. And water temperatures below Iron Gate
24 are between two and five degrees cooler in the spring
25 with the dams in than with implementation of the project.

1 And then the analysis concludes that
2 implementation of the project removes temperature impacts
3 associated with the dams. And so for our significance
4 determination, that was determined to be a beneficial
5 impact in the hydroelectric reach spanning the middle
6 Klamath River down to the Salmon River. And then for the
7 Salmon River down to the Pacific Ocean, that was found to
8 be not a significant impact.

9 And because no significance criteria were
10 exceeded here, no mitigation was required for this
11 particular impact.

12 And so I've kind of gone through these a little
13 bit, but to list them, the different determinations we
14 can make in our document for an impact are listed on this
15 slide. And they range from being beneficial to being
16 significant and unavoidable with mitigation. And in the
17 middle you will have no significant impact or no
18 significant impact with mitigation.

19 And we just wanted to note that analysis, as you
20 saw in this example, your determinations can vary by
21 region or time scale. And so in this example we had two
22 determinations because different portions of the river
23 were effected differently. And so that's the caveat at
24 the bottom of here.

25 And so stepping out of the water quality section

1 and going back to the entire Section 3, all of the
2 resource areas we analyzed are again listed here.

3 And for items listed in purple are resource
4 areas where at least one impact or potential impact was
5 found to have a short and long-term beneficial effect
6 associated with implementing the project.

7 And for items listed in blues are areas where at
8 least one impact in that resource area was found to have
9 a long-term beneficial impact but not a short term.

10 And to clarify, that's not to say for water
11 quality in general that the project would have a
12 beneficial impact. But what this is instead showing is
13 that at least one potential impact in the water quality
14 section was found to be beneficial in the short and
15 long-term associated with implementation of the project.

16 And then to move to the other spectrum, the
17 significant and unavoidable shown on this slide in orange
18 are resource areas where there was at least one potential
19 impact that was found to be significant and unavoidable
20 in the short term.

21 And for items in green were resource areas where
22 at least one impact was significant and unavoidable in
23 the short and long term.

24 And then for the blue, the one being flood
25 hydrology, it was found to have at least one long-term

1 significant and unavoidable impact but no short term.

2 Then to move on to Section 4. Section 4
3 includes the project alternatives or alternatives we
4 analyzed separate from the KRRC's proposed project.

5 The beginning of this section we have a list of
6 all of the alternatives we considered; some were provided
7 during public comments on the Notice of Preparation and
8 others were examined from previous environmental
9 documents. And all of those are kind of tabled and
10 discussed which ones were moved forward for further
11 analysis. And those included a partial removal
12 alternative, which, in summary, was removing enough of
13 each facility to create a free-flowing river but leaving
14 some items like penstocks; continued operations with fish
15 passage alternative which meant that the project would
16 continue to operate under some capacity and some
17 ownership with fish passage facilities. We had a
18 two-dam removal which had Copco No. 2 and JC Boyle
19 remaining in place, but Iron Gate and Copco No. 1 being
20 removed. We had a three-dam removal alternative which
21 removed all of the California facilities but left JC
22 Boyle in place. We analyzed the impacts of a no
23 hatchery. And we also looked at a no project
24 alternative.

25 And so please submit -- or, in summary, you

1 know, comments are due by noon on February 26th. You can
2 submit them via e-mail and hard copy address shown up on
3 the slide.

4 And, as I said earlier, shown at the bottom of
5 this slide is the Lower Klamath Project web page that the
6 State Water Board has. We post a lot of really good
7 information related to our process, such as this
8 presentation, public comments, the Draft EIR. So it is a
9 really good resource to check out.

10 And how to stay informed, we have a Lower
11 Klamath Project e-mail subscription list and information
12 how to how sign up, and a web link is listed here. And I
13 think this is one of the best ways to stay up to date,
14 because any time we take a large action like release of a
15 Draft EIR, everyone who subscribes to this list gets an
16 e-mail notice letting them know that it's happened and
17 usually a link of where to go locate that document.

18 And with that I will turn it over to Erin.

19 MS. RAGAZZI: Thanks, Kristen and Parker.

20 We're going to shift gears now for public
21 comment period. I do want to make a couple of reminders,
22 because I'm -- we've had people float in. I'm going to
23 ask people to come up and use the microphone when they
24 make their public comment so that people who are on the
25 webcast -- and also we're recording this so that we can

1 transcribe the comments and make sure that we reply to
2 them as part of our response to comments process.

3 To that end, I'm going to ask that when you come
4 up please state your name and spell it for the record.
5 That would just make things a little bit easier on the
6 person who has to transcribe the record later.

7 And we do have some folks that want to speak
8 first so that they can hit the road. It is a long drive
9 and not the greatest weather out there.

10 And then I also want to say, I'm going to ask
11 folks to limit their comments to five minutes at this
12 time, just so everyone can go through. If someone wants
13 to come up after that point then they are welcome to do
14 so.

15 So, again, speak and state your name.

16 The first person is going to be Thomas H. Joseph
17 followed by Marva Jones, followed by Samuel Sedillo,
18 followed by Matt Cox, followed by Debbie Bacigalupi. I
19 apologize if I say anybody's name incorrectly.

20 So come on up. And I'm going to sort of
21 transition you so you can turn however you want to speak
22 to whoever you want.

23 NEW SPEAKER: Thank you. My name is Thomas
24 Joseph. First name T-h-o-m-a-s, last name, J-o-s-e-p-h,
25 and I'm here as a Hupa tribal member on the Trinity

1 River, which is the largest contributory to the Klamath.
2 And I'm here to support all methods and measures to dam
3 removal.

4 This is the second presentation that I attended
5 and, you know, I support dam removal. And you guys have
6 outlined the necessities of it and why we do need to move
7 forward.

8 But I also want to recognize that the Klamath
9 River is a living entity, that she breathes, that she
10 knows how to communicate, and have relationships, and
11 that she -- she has a spirit. And all of your
12 documentation has failed to recognize that.

13 And the State of California has failed in their
14 neglect of recognizing the relationship of Mother Earth
15 and the land that they live on, and it has caused grave
16 turmoil not just here locally by the destruction of our
17 local rainforest, and our rivers, and our streams, and
18 our water quality and air quality, but it has caused
19 tremendous travesties worldwide. And it's at the fault
20 of us. It's at the fault of this state. It's at the
21 fault of the citizens. And that we need to change that
22 path not just for the protection of the Klamath River,
23 you know. She's been locked up for a long time.

24 We reflect our environment. California had a
25 problem with locking up its citizens after it had a

1 problem with locking up its rivers. We will always
2 reflect our environment. But the more that we continue
3 to abuse her and disrespect her the more pain our
4 communities will feel.

5 And we know that people of color will probably
6 be the primary bearers of those effects of climate
7 change. But it's going to effect all of us.

8 And these dams need to come down so we can start
9 to recognize how we can rebuild this relationship, that
10 we can start to understand and have a greater
11 understanding on how we can live in a non-destructive
12 manner. We need to not just do this for northern
13 California, but we need to set a precedence. We need to
14 show the world and the citizens of California that things
15 have to change.

16 And I guarantee, when we see the Klamath River
17 run free, we will see the power of her restoration and
18 the example that she'll give our communities to how to
19 restore our communities back to livable standards, how to
20 be in community with each other, how to be in
21 relationship with each other. She's waiting to give us
22 that example.

23 So I urge you to move forward. I hope that
24 these tactics of delay aren't continued. We were
25 promised 2020. Now we're promised 2021. The State has a

1 long history of delay tactics. We need to move forward
2 promptly, not just for the restoration of the Klamath
3 River, but for all of us.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

6 Marva Jones followed by Samuel Sedillo. And if
7 anybody came in and wants to speak today, please grab a
8 speaker card from the back, fill it out and hand it to
9 Michelle.

10 MS. JONES: (Unintelligible.) Marva Jones. I'm
11 (unintelligible.) And I come here to speak on behalf of
12 dam removal.

13 It is our only choice. We know that we're
14 killing the river right now with the diseases going on
15 there and the blue-green algae that's affecting the
16 river. I mean, we can't even swim in the river. And
17 it's affecting our fish family as we all know. And
18 Oregon is already on board and has approved the petition
19 to go forward. And I'm just here to support dam removal.
20 And just like Thomas said, it's a direct link of the
21 healthiness of our health. And it's a direct link of our
22 wellness. So obviously we need to restore the river.

23 (Unintelligible.)

24 MS. RAGAZZI: If you could state your name and
25 spell it, that would be great.

1 MR. SEDILLO: Hi. My name's Samuel Sedillo, and
2 that's spelled S-a-m-u-e-l S-e-d-i-l-l-o, and I'm here
3 representing Trout Unlimited.

4 I work here in California as the public lands
5 coordinator. And the Klamath River is our organization's
6 number one priority. And ourselves along with many of
7 the sportsmen and women and guides that use the river
8 believe that dam removal is the key to restoring salmon
9 and steelhead runs up along the Klamath. We believe that
10 a collaborative plan is the key to addressing the
11 concerns of those regarding utility and the concerns of
12 those regarding the fish. We believe that any dam
13 removal should follow the clean water rule moving
14 forward.

15 And lastly, we really appreciate the State Water
16 Board taking a hard look at dam removal to restoring the
17 river. And with that I'd just like to say thank you for
18 having us here and having the meeting.

19 Thanks.

20 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

21 So we have Matt Cox, followed by Debbie
22 Bacigalupi, followed by Ken Payne.

23 MR. COX: Thank you. My name is Matt Cox,
24 M-a-t-t C-o-x. I'm the communications director for the
25 Klamath River Renewal Corporation. I'm speaking on their

1 behalf.

2 Klamath River Renewal Corporation is part of a
3 cooperative effort to reestablish the natural vitality of
4 the Klamath River for all communities in the basin.
5 KRRC's job is to take ownership of the four PacifiCorp
6 dams then remove these dams, restore formerly inundated
7 dams and implement required mitigation measures in
8 compliance with all applicable federal, state and local
9 laws.

10 KRRC is seeking regulatory permits to accomplish
11 this project including water quality certification by the
12 State of California.

13 The DEIR is an impressive and thorough review of
14 the potential benefits and impacts of removal of the
15 Lower Klamath Project hydroelectric dams on the Klamath
16 River. KRRC commends Water Board staff and your
17 consultants for its work on this analysis, and we think
18 there is quite a bit for community members and
19 stakeholders to learn from it.

20 The DEIR shows the proposed project to be
21 environmentally superior compared to the six alternatives
22 to the project that the Water Board analyzed in terms of
23 both project benefits and negative impacts.

24 The report shows that most potential impacts
25 from the project are small and short term, and can be

1 reduced with mitigation.

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

7 The DEIR shows the proposed project protects
8 water quality by restoring the free-flowing condition of
9 the river and ensures volitional fish passage and that
10 the project will be a boom to salmon and steelhead
11 populations.

12 Many of the species expected to recover
13 following dam removal are tribal trust species that are
14 important to the culture and health of some tribes on the
15 Klamath River.

16 The DEIR also shows an expected increase in
17 recreational and commercial fishing industries. KRRC is
18 pleased with these findings in the DEIR and looks forward
19 to continued work with regulators and communities to
20 finalize the EIR and other permits and then implement the
21 project including mitigation measures to enhance benefits
22 and reduce adverse impacts.

23 KRRC will be submitting written comments
24 regarding that DEIR in the near future. We are
25 encouraged that this DEIR brings KRRC one step closer to

1 project approval.

2 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

3 NEW SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Debbie Bacigalupi,
4 D-e-b-b-i-e B-a-c-i-g-a-l-u-p-i.

5 And I'd like to start off by saying I've been to
6 many meetings now over the decades from when USGS was
7 holding public comment meetings in the town of Yreka to
8 some meetings here in this very room where we sat in a
9 big circle with cooperating agencies, cooperating
10 federalists. And it has been really maddening to just
11 hear all the questions, the concerns, the "if," "well
12 maybe," "perhaps." For the largest dam destruction
13 project in worldwide history, it would seem to me that we
14 should be certain.

15 I've interviewed over the years and not be using
16 words like "well maybe," "it could." For example with
17 the sediment, there is over 20 million cubic yards of
18 sediment. That's like, if you laid it out flat, it's
19 like 12,500 miles, half way around the earth of
20 pollutants that would wash out to sea. Over 60 plus
21 years is the estimate.

22 And even the EIR, the original EIR and EISs
23 admit this. The original peer reviews admit this. In
24 fact, they even stated -- and I read these because I had
25 to provide public comment, it's hours and hours of

1 reading. We have spent our time, our energy, our own
2 money traveling to different conference -- or different
3 meetings throughout the state, and I'm sure we can go
4 even beyond to Washington, D.C., which people have to try
5 and say wait a minute, we're missing so many pieces in
6 this big puzzle.

7 So why are we -- why are we on this agenda to
8 destroy dams instead of get down to the truth. There are
9 so many conflicting stories even within the original peer
10 reviews. And so my concern is that we're not using
11 common sense, base solutions, evidence-based solutions.

12 As an aside, I got my master's in evidence-based
13 theory. And I can tell you, I can use any kind of
14 evidence for any kind of outcome I want. And -- but, you
15 know, I believe that the people deserve the truth.

16 And with this project it is so huge and it's
17 going to impact so many people. My request for -- you
18 know, is that we slow down and we really, really look at
19 all evidence not just a focused evidence.

20 I have a couple of examples. And I'm glad
21 somebody brought up climate change. Something that I
22 really like to do is see and hear things for myself,
23 that's why I'm here; I'm not from Sacramento. I'm from
24 just below the Oregon border, just below the Klamath
25 River. But I like to go to meetings and conferences all

1 over so that I can hear for myself what's going on.

2 I've flown over the Klamath. I've interviewed
3 all -- a bunch of different tribal members including the
4 Karuk who have said off camera that when -- if and when
5 those dams come out they fear a future of flooding again.
6 Which means in the past before the dams were in there was
7 flooding.

8 I've interviewed Fish and Game employees who
9 work at the Iron Gate hatchery just last year -- I got
10 all these things on camera and on video -- and the Fish
11 and Game Wildlife employees who are waiting to retire,
12 the only reason they are not saying anything is because
13 they have a retirement pension waiting. They don't want
14 to get fired. But what they said -- so when I was asking
15 them about the different fish runs -- there is one fish
16 run that is completely protected so it has very few fish
17 compared to the other fish runs.

18 So the fish runs -- if you haven't been to the
19 fish hatchery, you should go and investigate it for
20 yourself and talk to the employees who work there. So
21 the Fish and Game employees who are waiting to retire but
22 don't want to say anything because they don't want to get
23 fired because they don't want to miss out on their
24 retirement would tell you -- if they think that you're
25 not for dam removal, let me tell you that -- the truth.

1 And what they see. These guys have worked at this
2 hatchery -- this is their career.

3 So I asked them -- okay, so there's this fish
4 run that has tons of fish labeled, "Chinook." Actually,
5 there's a couple. And then you see all these nets and it
6 says "coho." And my question to them was, "Why are there
7 so few coho?"

8 And he said, well -- first of all, I said, "Why
9 the netting?"

10 And he said, "Because these are fragile fish
11 compared to the Chinook."

12 So I said, "If they are fragile fish, why is
13 there so many fewer fish in this tank than there are in
14 the Chinook tanks?"

15 And he said, "Because we are required to keep
16 the fish count low."

17 "Why?"

18 And his answer was, "Because it's all about dam
19 removal."

20 So if we keep the fish count low, the coho, then
21 we have a low number of returning fish and therefore we
22 can keep the number low and therefore say this is
23 required. We need to get these dams destroyed because
24 there's too few fish.

25 Go interview. I don't mean to sound -- I'm

1 nervous -- I don't mean to sound mean, but go interview
2 them. Go interview them.

3 In March of 2015, there's a Mary Nichols,
4 California Air Resource Board. She testified in
5 Washington, D.C. on a topic called Carbon Dioxide
6 Emission Rules. And in the questioning it was talking
7 about greenhouse gases and is California meeting theirs.
8 And she agreed with one of the congressmen that if we
9 included the Klamath River, the hydroelectric energy, the
10 clean, green, renewable energy dams that provide drought
11 control, fire control, fire suppression, irrigation,
12 recreations -- and it's just a gorgeous river, I have
13 spent over 20 years on that -- on and around that
14 river -- she admitted that California right now would be
15 meeting if not exceeding our greenhouse gas emissions
16 goals if we included the Klamath and hydro in our
17 renewable energy mix. So why are we destroying them?

18 I just got back from the most recent United
19 Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference
20 in Poland. I was in a panel discussion with Cathy
21 Woollums, the senior vice president of and the chief
22 sustainability officer of Berkshire Hathaway, another
23 Warren Buffet -- just like PacifiCorp, another Warren
24 Buffet company.

25 And in the panel discussion question part I

1 asked her about the Klamath. And I corrected her on a
2 statement. And this is a public -- this was a public
3 panel discussion -- and I corrected her on a statement
4 where she said that their -- their customers across the
5 board are receiving -- are paying lower rates. And I
6 corrected her and I said that is not true. Because in
7 the Klamath area we are being charged, PacifiCorp, owned
8 by Warren Buffet, we rate payers are being charged for
9 dam destruction, which is to me just disgusting.

10 It's -- it's -- it's disgusting that there are
11 over almost 80 percent of the voting population in Yreka
12 voted to retain those dams, keep them. And this also
13 happened in the -- in southern Oregon in Klamath Falls.
14 They voted overwhelmingly, people who live with and are
15 impacted immediately by those dams, voted overwhelmingly
16 we want to keep our clean, green, renewable energy.

17 And then, you know, we haven't even looked at
18 the truck and haul. So if we are going to go through
19 with the largest dam destruction in worldwide history,
20 wouldn't it make sense to see if there is even habitat
21 suitable to sustain the coho salmon. Those studies have
22 not been done. So that to me common-sense-wise seems
23 like a very, very good first step in this whole thing.

24 I look outside and -- oh, and you know, I love
25 it. I did -- I was born in Mt. Shasta but raised here in

1 Sacramento and one of my favorite nutritional stores is
2 Elliott's. And I love Elliott's. It's got, like, the
3 best food. I love my raw milk. I love my, you know,
4 clean food. And it's so fun to see in that refrigerator
5 blue-green algae from the Klamath as a health supplement
6 for human beings. So -- and that comes from the Klamath
7 River.

8 Lastly, I want to say that, you know, pulling up
9 to the EPA building today in Sacramento, California, I
10 was saddened to see across the street a bunch of tents
11 and tarps of our homeless problem. And it would seem to
12 me that we have bigger issues than -- on -- in California
13 than a project, a worldwide project that has been nothing
14 but in all these meetings if you continue to go to them
15 with the experts, the experts cannot answer the
16 questions. They say "maybe." They will use words like,
17 "Well, perhaps if we take out the dams." "Well, how much
18 is it going to cost?" "Well, we're not sure." "What are
19 you going to do with the sediment?" "Well, we think."
20 All these uncertain, not positive, not complete answers.

21 But there are homeless people out there right
22 now just across the street from this EPA -- this
23 government building, and it seems to me that cooperative
24 federalists have more urgent, life-saving matters than
25 destroying dams that are in almost perfect condition and

1 that people question, question, question the political
2 agenda behind it.

3 And so, this -- these dams are, for those who
4 don't live up there like we do, they are 24/7 reliable
5 energy dams. They provide over nine hours of flood
6 control. If there is going to be a flood, people are
7 given over nine hours to get out of there. You take out
8 those dams and just like Jody Wadell said of the Karuk
9 tribe, "If those dams come out we don't know if we'll be
10 able to survive, because we've had floods in the past
11 that have destroyed towns down river from Iron Gate."

12 And one more thing -- sorry -- Rex Casalia
13 (phonetic) is a rancher who's lived on the Klamath just
14 below the Iron Gate dam his entire life. That means
15 before the Iron Gate dam went in, which is where the
16 hatchery is, which is where the Fish and Game employees
17 would tell you this is nothing but a political agenda.
18 Rex Casalia remembers as a child growing up walking
19 across the river and his feet didn't get wet. So -- and
20 this is many times throughout the year, throughout the
21 years.

22 So, if it's all about coho and giving them more
23 habitat to swim upstream, before the dams were in the
24 coho would need wings to fly upstream in certain years.
25 So is this really about protecting the coho? Because let

1 me tell you, they wouldn't make it upstream. Or is this
2 another agenda? Because for so much uncertainty, it
3 seems like this is an agenda. It's not based on science.
4 It's not based on fact. It's based on feelings.

5 Thanks for letting me share.

6 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

7 We have Ken Payne followed by Rick Feher.

8 And, Ken, if you could state your name and spell
9 it for the record, that would be great.

10 MR. PAYNE: Yes. Ken Payne, K-e-n P-a-y-n-e.

11 I guess it is an understatement to say that's a
12 tough act to follow. And I'm sort of speechless after
13 hearing from Ms. Bacigalupi.

14 I used to work in this building on the 11th
15 floor for the Department of Toxic Substances Control.
16 And at that time I was working in Resource Recovering.
17 Since that time I've worked in Permitting and even before
18 that Site Mitigation. But we had a process for
19 everything. There was a process for permitting. There
20 was a process for recycling hazardous waste. There's a
21 process for site cleanup. Several different processes
22 for site cleanup. But it's my understanding that the
23 process for this EIR and for this project has not been
24 followed.

25 First of all, it's my understanding that in

1 order for this project to go forward, FERC has to agree
2 to transfer the license to KRRC, which it hasn't done.
3 FERC would also have to decide to remove the dams, which
4 it hasn't done. So the Water Board is really analyzing
5 an incomplete (unintelligible) process.

6 If FERC decides to remove the dams then there
7 would have to be a new environmental impact statement
8 done. The last one was done in 2012 and it's -- it would
9 be -- it would have to be updated.

10 The other part of my understanding is that since
11 the 2012 Environmental Impact Statement was never acted
12 upon by the FERC, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,
13 there was never a record of decision, then the CEQA
14 process is really -- cannot be based on that
15 Environmental Impact Study since it was never really
16 adopted. It's really not -- in a sense, not legalized
17 because there was no record of decision.

18 Anyhow, that's my exertion to the Board today,
19 that there's a process to follow for every project, for
20 every permit, for every site cleanup, and for everything
21 else. For every recyclable material there's a process to
22 follow. And so the process has to be followed, otherwise
23 you can never get to the end.

24 So I think it's a little bit cart before the
25 horse right now and things should probably hold off until

1 -- until everything -- the rest of the process catches
2 up.

3 Thanks, very much.

4 MR. FEHER: Before attending this meeting I was
5 attending --

6 MS. RAGAZZI: One second, Rick. Could you state
7 your name and spell it for the record, please.

8 MR. FEHER: (Unintelligible.) F-e-h-e-r.

9 The last speaker seemed to be part of the
10 process and I can find faults in the process and I
11 respect that the process is -- the process seems to be
12 that the public can comment in CEQA proceedings. The
13 comments and answers are required to be provided but I --
14 I want to -- and can I ask a question of Parker, because
15 he's been involved in this for a long time.

16 Was it accurate that FERC was not a party to the
17 agreement?

18 MS. RAGAZZI: So we're not responding to
19 comments today. So it's fine for you to ask --

20 MR. FEHER: So the process wins then, I guess.
21 So if the process wins I will just say something
22 supportive of dam removal, of the river and the long
23 view, the long-term vision.

24 Big concrete obstructions, river people who I
25 know, a brother who is in the river reporting along with

1 his observations speaking with Fish and Game -- the fish
2 runs are in trouble and it's critical. And that means
3 that I agree with Thomas which is the first speaker that,
4 you know, that occurs there's a process that must be
5 followed. That seems to be a fall-back position when
6 wanted to do something like build a freeway or something
7 in the 1950's. Of course that's going backward in time.
8 We're not there.

9 We have completely different set of procedures,
10 very much different. (Unintelligible.) But there is an
11 emergency like after let's -- let's say after
12 (unintelligible) thought that certain freeways need for
13 people to move. Well, this needs to be restored on an
14 emergency basis (unintelligible). With populations
15 declining year after year and over the long-term there
16 may be some variation. But it's not a happy situation
17 for people. The possibility that the river can be
18 restored at (unintelligible) project in Oregon --
19 Washington State, excuse me, that the gill rot removal
20 was -- books that I've read quite successful in the --
21 for instance (unintelligible).

22 I anticipated writing something. I'm usually
23 better doing that, submitting comments in writing and I
24 anticipate (unintelligible) and procedural issues. And I
25 hope you don't get drowned in procedural issues

1 (unintelligible) with the agreement.

2 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you. That was the last
3 comment card I have.

4 Are there any other people who want to comment
5 today?

6 I do want to say for the record that we do
7 intend to respond to all of the comments that we had here
8 today that are related to this project. So each of your
9 questions will be something that will be responded to in
10 the record.

11 Folks who just came in the back of the room, are
12 you planning to speak today? Okay.

13 Well, in that case, happy travels to everyone.
14 Thank you so much for coming today. And if you have
15 questions or comments that you want to talk with the
16 Water Board folks about, you're welcome to come up and
17 speak with any of us. Thank you.

18 (Recordings ends and then resumes.)

19 MR. THALER: We're back for part two and we have
20 a few more speakers. And so our next speaker is Jolene
21 McCovey.

22 And just, as our ground rules, if you could
23 please state and spell your last name for the record and
24 then provide your comment. Thank you.

25 If you want to move the podium, feel free.

1 MS. McCOVEY: Okay. (Unintelligible.) Hello,
2 my name is Jolene McCovey. I am a Yurok woman from the
3 Village of Srey-gon. My last name is spelled
4 M-c-C-o-v-e-y.

5 So the Yurok people have lived along the Klamath
6 River since time and memorial; it is an integral part of
7 our culture, our spirituality and our food source. I'm
8 so thankful for all of the things that this river has
9 provided for my people. Since time beginning -- well
10 that's bad -- but I'm also aware and observed the
11 detrimental impacts of the dams. Our water flows are too
12 low. The river is too warm. This allows algae and
13 disease to flourish which is making our fish sick. It is
14 killing them. Our traditional spawning grounds are
15 inaccessible, right? So these are very, very negative
16 impacts.

17 Traditional knowledge and cultural wisdom tell
18 us that in order for our river to be healthy once begin,
19 it needs to be restored into its original being; the form
20 that it was before these dams were imposed, right? In
21 order to do that the dams need to come down. This is our
22 relief.

23 The scientific studies that have been performed
24 and conducted support Yurok belief that dam removal is
25 the most efficient and best way to restore a healthy

1 river. But removing these dams our water flows will be
2 stronger. The water will be colder. Disease will be
3 flushed. Algae will not grow as easily. Our fish will
4 be healthier; they will be stronger; their spawning
5 grounds will be accessible once again. Our spring coho
6 salmon will return. This will feed our people. It will
7 nourish our spiritual. It will support our culture.

8 This is immensely important to me. This is
9 important for my children. This is important for my
10 children's children. Fighting for this is important and
11 for all those who came before and fought for me to be in
12 this place to speak today.

13 I support dam removal. I support being a good
14 steward of the land. And I support Yurok people
15 reclaiming what is ours.

16 (Unintelligible.)

17 MR. THALER: Thank you.

18 So our next speaker is Virginia Hedrick,
19 McCovey -- sorry. Virginia Hedrick. Sorry.

20 MS. HEDRICK: (Unintelligible.) Virginia
21 Hedrick. (Unintelligible.)

22 I want to thank my niece for her words, sharing
23 about the importance and the cultural significance of the
24 Klamath River.

25 I live here in the Sacramento Valley and I have

1 for over a decade. I'm raising five children here. I
2 was born and raised on the Yurok reservation. I am the
3 youngest of ten.

4 Everyone else lives back home within the Klamath
5 basin and on ancestral territory, and what I've learned
6 as a Sacramento resident is that all of these things are
7 connected, right? So for our Sacramento River to be
8 healthy, water is diverted from the Trinity River. The
9 Trinity River is a major tributary to the Klamath River.
10 So if the Klamath River is not doing well, the Sacramento
11 River won't do well.

12 And as indigenous people we've long understood
13 the connection of water and life, and forest and trees
14 and, you know. Right now we hear stories and we know
15 about, you know, cap and trade and exchanging one health
16 for another health. And I think when we talk about
17 Klamath dam removal we have to talk about it in that
18 scope, that it's not just everyone down river from those
19 dams. The rivers and the water basins are so widely
20 connected that here in the Sacramento Valley and the rest
21 of California we have to think about those impacts to who
22 we are.

23 And, you know, I always encourage where ever
24 people are to think about where the water is coming from
25 that you're drinking. If you're buying a bottle of water

1 from the store, where was it bottled? Is it tap water?
2 Is it spring water? Who's losing for you to be able to
3 have that bottle of water? You go into a restaurant here
4 in Sacramento -- I talk to Sacramento residence here and
5 they don't know. They don't know that the Trinity River
6 water is diverted to the Sacramento River. They don't
7 even know where the headwaters of the Sacramento River is
8 or the Feather River.

9 So my children are also Midu and they are from
10 the headwaters of the Feather River. And people don't
11 know that. They don't know that the Feather River is a
12 tributary to our basin here or what the impacts of those
13 dams are and to this valley.

14 I spent a number of years living in Los Angeles
15 and well understand what the people of the Owen Valley
16 are giving up for the Los Angeles water. For that dust
17 pool that is created in the Owens Valley is so that Los
18 Angeles can have water.

19 And I know in the scope of it seems like it
20 doesn't make sense of it, why we're talking about this,
21 but as Indian people we well understand that. And my
22 family, we have a story that my namesake Queen James has
23 shared with us, my great, great aunt, that there was a
24 time where people were polluting the river and we had a
25 lot of illegal dumps happening and they were flowing into

1 the river and the river was full of trash. And she went
2 down to the river, and the river spirit came out of the
3 water and spoke to her and warned her that if you keep
4 treating the river this way and you have me dammed in
5 seven places, if you keep treating the river this way I
6 will go and so will the people.

7 And I think for many people we have thought that
8 meant Yurok people, that Yurok people would go. But what
9 I want to tell the people in this room and people who are
10 listening is that it's not a literal interpretation.
11 It's all people. Human life will go without water. We
12 will all go.

13 And I think, you know, we're having these large,
14 political discussions at the national level about global
15 warming and impacts to the environment. And we have an
16 opportunity in California to do the right thing. We have
17 an opportunity to engage in one of the largest dam
18 removals to restore health. Not only for Indian people
19 but for all people upstream and downstream, that these
20 kind of upstream changes have the opportunity to make
21 widespread impact.

22 Many people don't care if we have fish to eat.
23 They don't care about indigenous people on the Klamath
24 River. I just heard a public comment around a cannabis
25 grow on the Klamath River and people calling it their

1 ancestral territory and saying they've been there since
2 1973. People don't care. That's something I've
3 understood. That people don't always care about
4 indigenous people and our rights. But you should care
5 about yourself. We should care about who we are and the
6 children that you're raising and the water that they
7 might have access to or not have access to.

8 I took my child recently on a field trip to the
9 Nimbus Dam here. And we talked about the life cycle of
10 fish, and they talked about, you know, the spawning
11 grounds and we watched them do this man-made spawning in
12 front of them.

13 But what they didn't talk about is why. Why
14 it's occurred this way. Or the 600 miles of spawning
15 ground in the Folsom area and the basin that are no
16 longer accessible to fish. Why we have a fish hatchery.
17 Why we have manipulated our planet in this gross, gross
18 way. And the mis-education to our youth and our young
19 people, and have to pull my son aside and say this is
20 what's happening here. This is a man-made interplay
21 because they built a dam and cut off spawning ground to
22 fish who have been here long before us.

23 We have a fish in our river, the sturgeon, who's
24 prehistoric, pre-dates the human as we know it today that
25 has -- dates back to an earlier time when spirits walked

1 among us.

2 So who we think we are in this small frame right
3 now, we talk about Klamath dam removal. And many of you
4 are showing up to a job and, you know, you're policy
5 analysts, and you have the impact of one thing. And
6 today when we ask you that we want to give comment I want
7 to appreciate and respect that you turn these back on,
8 that you made time for this space. That that's
9 important. And that you as an individual play a role in
10 this, that you're hearing a story today. And what our
11 old Indian people tell us is stories have power. So when
12 you hear this story you have to do something about it.
13 You have a personal responsibility.

14 And so I want to appreciate that you took that
15 personal responsibility, you heard our words, you put it
16 back on. For this reporter here who is a storyteller in
17 his own right, in a way that Indian people have been
18 doing since the beginning of time, that that's his
19 responsibility is to share these stories and to
20 communicate with people in a way in which we live, and
21 behave, and care-take this land, that we all as humans
22 have that responsibility.

23 It's not about who gets what and who needs water
24 and who needs food. We all need it. It's our
25 responsibility to care-take this world. It's our

1 responsibility to care-take the Klamath River even if you
2 live six hours away. Even if you may not realize the
3 impact it has to you and to the people who come after you
4 and the generations that you will never meet and that
5 we'll never see, the impacts, the decisions we make today
6 will have for generations to come.

7 In 2002 we had a mass fish kill on the Klamath
8 River. At the time my grandmother was in her late 70's,
9 early 80's. And from her porch, from our porch we could
10 smell death. A smell I hope none of you in this room
11 ever have to smell, or fear, or know what that feels like
12 to smell death in your home. And she was immediately
13 triggered back to this time, does this mean the river's
14 going? Where we as people, as humans, not as Yurok
15 people exactly, but as humans, will this world as we know
16 it, is it changing?

17 We didn't know about gill rot the day we saw
18 these fish washing up on our shore. We didn't know what
19 it was caused. We didn't know that it was water flow
20 right away. We didn't know all the scientific things
21 that would come out of it, or that our scientists at
22 Yurok tribe and Karuk tribe and Hupa tribe, all the
23 science that would come out of it. My grandma didn't
24 know it at that time, but she knew something was wrong
25 and that this was one of the most horrific things she had

1 seen.

2 And let me tell you, she went to boarding
3 school. She moved over 13 hours from her home and went
4 to boarding school. And yet this fish kill was one of
5 the most horrific things she had seen.

6 It's not about our personal impact, what it
7 means to us. It's about a global impact. It's about the
8 impact to this people and the world. And we have to as
9 stewards of this land -- whether you choose to be or not,
10 you're a steward of this land -- we have to do the right
11 thing in this case. We have to.

12 And I know there was people here earlier that
13 supported keeping the dams up and maintaining the dams.
14 And maybe their families have livelihoods based on water
15 that's held on the upper basin. We know that the federal
16 government removed people to the upper Klamath basin and
17 they have farms there and they feel like they have that
18 trust responsibility. And again, I just want to say it's
19 not about that. It's not about the politics. It's not
20 about who wins and who loses. It's about us as human
21 people being good stewards of this land.

22 So, again, I just want to thank you for
23 reopening this, for taking the time, for hearing my
24 story, for hearing the story that came before me, the
25 stories that come after me, for the many people in this

1 room who we don't see who are here with us. The old ones
2 who wish they could be here and will watch this dam
3 removal. That's what's important.

4 When we talk about Indian people, a lot of us
5 think about, like, oh, 500 years ago. In California it's
6 recent memory. It wasn't 500 years ago for us.

7 California became a state in 1852. It's recent memory
8 for us. My grandmother's mom. So my great grandmother
9 was born in a time when non-Indian people first came.

10 And I'm taking a lot of time because I know -- I
11 know there's not a huge line. That's recent memory. And
12 I'm young; I'm in my 30's. I'm young. And I'm telling
13 you about my great, great grandmother. It's recent
14 memory.

15 And I'm hoping that my children who span the
16 ages from 18 to two will live to see a time when the
17 Klamath dams are gone and that their children will only
18 hear about these things in story. And the people in the
19 Sacramento Valley and upriver from us and downriver --
20 that's how we as Yurok people orient ourselves in the
21 world -- that we'll all feel the positive impact from
22 that. And that the people who are now
23 supporting/maintaining the dams will also benefit from
24 that.

25 That's our role in this world as world keepers

1 and world makers and balancing of the world, were
2 (unintelligible) people, we're world renewal people. We
3 don't just pray for our world. We pray for the whole
4 world. Even those that are opposing this. Even those
5 that want the dams to stay. We are praying for them. We
6 are praying for their people. We's praying them as well.
7 It doesn't have to be a battle at odds. We all should be
8 working on this together.

9 So, again, (unintelligible). Thank you.

10 MR. THALER: Thank you.

11 Our next speaker is Melissa Eidman.

12 MS. EIDMAN: I'm Melissa Eidman. My last name
13 is spelled E-i-d-m-a-n.

14 I'm here to talk really briefly. I think that
15 both Virginia and Jolene gave excellent stories here for
16 you to hear.

17 I'm coming from an urban Indian perspective. I
18 was born and raised here in Sacramento but my home has
19 always been on my reservation. My mom took me home
20 always. We always played in the river. That place is so
21 special to my heart. And our family has had ties to this
22 river for generations, generations that go longer than my
23 memory go. And the salmon have been a primary source of
24 food for -- for many of my family members.

25 And I just wanted to say really briefly that

1 these dams have caused so much harm and disease for so
2 long. And it's time that they are removed so that both
3 our people and our river can heal.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. THALER: Thank you.

6 Are there any other comments or anyone else
7 wishing to speak?

8 Okay. So I think we will go on pause again.

9 Thank you.

10

11

(End of recording.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, DENISE D. THOMPSON, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California, duly appointed and commissioned to administer oaths, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the audio file provided to me was reported in shorthand by me and thereafter transcribed into typewriting; that the foregoing is a true and correct record of the proceedings to the best of my ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereby certify this audio transcription this 5th day of March, 2019.



DENISE D. THOMPSON,
Certified Shorthand Reporter
State of California
License No. 9688