

Volume III

Klamath Facilities Removal Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report



State Clearinghouse
2010062060



U.S. Department
of the Interior



CA Department
of Fish & Game

December 2012

Mission Statements

U.S. Department of the Interior

The U.S. Department of the Interior protects America's natural resources and heritage, honors our cultures and tribal communities, and supplies the energy to power our future.

California Department of Fish and Game

The mission of the Department of Fish and Game is to manage California's diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources, and the habitats upon which they depend, for their ecological values and for their use and enjoyment by the public.

Volume III COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Klamath Facilities Removal Final EIS/EIR

State Clearinghouse # 2010062060



Contents

Volume III – Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report Comments and Responses

Chapter 10	Final EIS/EIR.....	10-1
10.1	Contents of the Final EIS/EIR.....	10-3
10.2	Public Involvement for the Klamath Facilities Removal EIS/EIR.....	10-3
10.2.1	Scoping	10-3
10.2.2	Release of the Draft EIS/EIR.....	10-4
10.2.3	Release of the Final EIS/EIR	10-5
10.3	Executive Summary	10-5
10.4	Preferred Alternative.....	10-6
10.5	Consultation and Coordination	10-6
10.6	Document Availability and Distribution.....	10-7
10.6.1	Document Availability.....	10-7
10.6.2	Distribution List.....	10-9
10.7	Next Steps	10-11
10.7.1	NEPA and CEQA Next Steps.....	10-11
10.7.2	KHSA.....	10-11
10.7.3	KBRA	10-11
Chapter 11	Comments and Responses	11-1
11.1	Summary of Comments Received and Responses to General Comments	11-1
11.2	Master Responses.....	11-44
11.3	Federal Agencies	11.3-1
11.4	State Agencies.....	11.4-1
11.5	Local Agencies.....	11.5-1
11.6	Indian Tribes	11.6-1
11.7	Advocacy Organizations.....	11.7-1
11.8	Special Interest Groups	11.8-1
11.9	Individuals	11.9-1
Chapter 12	References.....	12-1

Tables for Volume III

<i>Table</i>		<i>Page</i>
10-1	Libraries with Final EIS/EIR Available.....	10-7
10-2	Federal and State Agencies with Final EIS/EIR Available	10-8
10-3	Final EIS/EIR Distribution List	10-9
11-1	Comments on Draft EIS/EIR	11-2
11-2	Master Responses.....	11-44

Chapter 10

Final EIS/EIR

On September 22, 2011, the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), acting as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Lead Agency and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), acting as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Lead Agency, released the Klamath Facilities Removal Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIS/EIR) for public review and comment.

In compliance with NEPA, a Notice of Availability (NOA) was published by DOI's Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance in the Federal Register (Federal Register Vol. 76, No. 184, 58833) on Thursday September 22, 2011 and an associated NOA was published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in the Federal Register (Federal Register Vol. 76, No. 190, 60822) on Friday, September 30, 2011. A Notice of Completion (NOC) was also published in the State Clearinghouse (State Clearinghouse # 2010062060) on the same date, in accordance with CEQA.

The Lead Agencies conducted public involvement activities on the EIS/EIR during scoping and upon release of the Draft EIS/EIR. The scoping comment period and scoping meetings were held in June and July of 2010. Additionally the Lead Agencies held six public hearings during the comment period on the Draft EIS/EIR at the following locations in California and Oregon:

- Klamath County Fairgrounds, Klamath Falls, Oregon, October, 18, 2011;
- Chiloquin Community Center, Chiloquin, Oregon, October 19, 2011;
- Yreka Community Center, City of Yreka, California, October 20, 2011;
- Karuk Community Room, Orleans, California, October 25, 2011;
- Arcata Community Center, Arcata, California, October 26, 2011; and
- Yurok Tribal Administration Office, Klamath, California, October 27, 2011.

Written and verbal comments were accepted at meetings and written comments were accepted throughout the comment period. The comment period on the Draft EIS/EIR closed on December 30, 2011.

Since receipt of public comments, revision of the Draft EIS/EIR has been underway to produce this Klamath Facilities Removal Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (Final EIS/EIR). This Final EIS/EIR consists of three volumes: the revised Volume I, revised Volume II, and new Volume III. Volumes I and II of the Final EIS/EIR have been revised in response to the comments.

Volume III of the Final EIS/EIR contains responses to all comments received during the comment period (see Chapter 10, Chapter 11, and Chapter 12), as well as, all changes made to the public Draft EIS/EIR (see Appendix AB in Volume III).

During the process of addressing public comments, some notable content changes were made in the Final EIS/EIR from the prior Draft EIS/EIR. In this Final EIS/EIR, the Lead Agencies:

- Disclosed the Preferred Alternative as Alternative 2, Full Facilities Removal of Four Dams (Proposed Action) (see Executive Summary, ES.7.4, Section 2.5, and Section 5.9);
- Refined and more clearly articulated how stored sediment and suspended sediment volumes were calculated (see Section 2.4.3 “Sediment Weight and Volume in the Four Facilities and Erosion with Dam Removal”);
- More clearly identified the City of Yreka pipeline relocation discussion as being a programmatic level of analysis (see Section 2.4.3.9);
- Added a determination on critical habitat for eulachon with information from the recent listing (see Section 3.3.4.3);
- Expanded and refined information on flow modeling and flow requirements on the Klamath River (see Section 3.3.3.3.7);
- Expanded and refined the discussion in the Algae Section (see Section 3.4.4.3);
- Expanded the discussion on wetlands, riparian communities, and mitigation for possible effects to these resources (see Section 3.5.4.3);
- Expanded the discussion and added a determination on amphibians and reptiles (see Section 3.5.4.3);
- Expanded and refined the discussion on effects on groundwater from the on-project plan (see Section 3.7.4.3);
- Expanded discussion and added a determination on water rights assurances related to tribal water rights (see Section 3.8.4.3);
- Expanded discussion of the Tribal Trust for several of the federally recognized tribes (see Section 3.12);
- Expanded the Cultural Resources Section to more comprehensively address National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) compliance and more clearly articulated the mitigation measures for Cultural Resources (see Section 3.13.4.1);
- Refined the discussion on real estate effects (see Section 3.15.3.6); and
- Added a Scenic Quality mitigation measure SQ-1: Measures to Minimize Scenery Disturbances (See Section 3.19.4.4).

10.1 Contents of the Final EIS/EIR

The Klamath Facilities Removal Final EIS/EIR consists of:

- **Volume I EIS/EIR, as revised in response to comments;**
 - **Chapters 1 through 9**
- **Volume II EIS/EIR Appendices, as revised in response to comments;**
 - **Appendices A through U**
- **Volume III Comment Responses:**
 - **Chapter 10** – an overview of the Final EIS/EIR.
 - **Chapter 11** – responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR.
 - **Chapter 12** – references for Volume III
 - **Appendix AA** – copies of all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR.
 - **Appendix AB** – changes made to the public Draft EIS/EIR Volume I and Volume II

10.2 Public Involvement for the Klamath Facilities Removal EIS/EIR

A variety of public involvement activities were conducted for the Klamath Facilities Removal EIS/EIR and are described below.

10.2.1 Scoping

To provide notice of the intent to prepare an EIS/EIR, the DOI published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register (Vol. 75, No. 113, Monday June 14, 2010, 33634), as required by NEPA. The CDFG submitted a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on Monday June 21, 2010, to the State Clearinghouse (State Clearinghouse #2010062060) and sent copies of the NOP to affected agencies, according to CEQA requirements. Both notices invited the public to attend scoping meetings on Reclamation's Klamath Project and contained information on the location, date, and time of the scoping meetings.

Newspaper advertisements providing the dates and locations of scoping meetings were published in the following newspapers:

- Sacramento Bee (July 27 2010)
- Herald and News, Klamath Falls (June 23, 24, 25, and 27 and July 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9, 2010)
- Medford Mail Tribune (June 27 and July 4, 2010)
- Statesman Journal (June 27, 2010)
- Times-Standard (June 23 and 24, and July 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, and 14, 2010)

- Siskiyou Daily News (June 23, 24, and 25, and July 2, 6, and 7, 2010)
- Daily Triplicate (June 23 and 24, and July 4, 7, and 13, 2010)
- Mount Shasta News (June 23 and 30, and July 7, 2010)

The DOI and CDFG also issued a joint press release on June 14, 2010, notifying the public of the intent to develop an EIS/EIR and hold scoping meetings. A postcard containing information on the scoping meetings was mailed to over 5,000 individuals and entities on Reclamation's Klamath Project mailing list. Scoping meeting information was also posted on the Web site (www.klamathrestoration.gov).

In July 2010, the Lead Agencies held seven scoping meetings to seek public input for use in developing a full range of alternatives to the Proposed Action, including what issues and resources should be addressed in the EIS/EIR, the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Action, and what mitigation measures should be considered. The scoping meetings were held in the following locations in California and Oregon:

- Copco Community Center, Montague, California, July 7, 2010;
- Yreka Community Center, City of Yreka, California, July 7, 2010;
- Klamath County Fairgrounds, Klamath Falls, Oregon, July 8, 2010;
- Chiloquin Community Center, Chiloquin, Oregon, July 9, 2010;
- Chetco Activities Center, Brookings, Oregon, July 13, 2010;
- Arcata Community Center, Arcata, California, July 14, 2010; and
- Karuk Tribe Community Room, Orleans, California, July 15, 2010.

Verbal and written comments on the scope of the environmental document were accepted at the scoping meetings and written comment was accepted throughout the scoping comment period.

10.2.2 Release of the Draft EIS/EIR

The Draft EIS/EIR was released to the public for 100 days of review and comment on Thursday, September 22, 2011. As noted above, a NOA was filed by DOI's Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance in the Federal Register (Federal Register Vol. 76, No. 184, 58833) on Thursday September 22, 2011, and an associated NOA was filed by the USEPA in the Federal Register (Federal Register Vol. 76, No. 190, 60822) on Friday September 30, 2011. A Notice of Completion was also published in the State Clearinghouse (State Clearinghouse # 2010062060) on the same date, in accordance with CEQA.

Newspaper advertisements providing the dates and locations of public hearings on the Draft EIS/EIR were published in the following newspapers:

- Eureka Times Standard (September 21 and 24, 2011)
- Herald & News, Klamath Falls, OR (September 21 and 24, 2011)
- Medford Mail Tribune (September 21 and 24, 2011)
- North Coast Journal (September 21 and 24, 2011)

- Oregonian (September 21 and 24, 2011)
- Redding Record Searchlight (September 21 and 24, 2011)
- Sacramento Bee (September 21 and 24, 2011)
- Siskiyou Daily News (September 21 and 24, 2011)
- Statesman Journal, Salem, OR (September 21 and 24, 2011)
- Two Rivers Tribune (September 21 and 24, 2011)

The DOI and CDFG also issued a joint press release on September 22, 2011, notifying the public of the availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and the intent to hold public hearings on the Draft EIS/EIR. A postcard containing information on the public hearings was mailed to over 5,000 individuals and entities on Reclamation's Klamath Project mailing list. Public hearing information was also posted on Reclamation's Klamath Project Web site (www.klamathrestoration.gov).

During the comment period on the Draft EIS/EIR, the Lead Agencies held six public hearings in California and Oregon. Written and verbal comments were accepted at the public hearings and written comment was accepted throughout the comment period. After receiving numerous requests, the Lead Agencies extended the comment period to allow for additional review and comment. The comment period on the Draft EIS/EIR closed on December 30, 2011, and all comments received to that date have been included in this Final EIS/EIR.

Over 1,400 individual comment submittals were received on the Draft EIS/EIR, including written comments submitted during the comment period and verbal and written comments submitted at the public hearings. Comments were received from Federal, State, tribal, and local governments, private organizations, and members of the public. The comments were considered during the development of this Final EIS/EIR.

10.2.3 Release of the Final EIS/EIR

A Final EIS/EIR was released to the public for 30 days of review and comment. A NOA of the Final EIS/EIR was placed in the Federal Register according to NEPA requirements, and the California State Clearinghouse according to CEQA requirements.

10.3 Executive Summary

The Executive Summary of the Draft EIS/EIR has been revised based on comments. The revised Executive Summary provides an overview of the Klamath Facilities Removal EIS/EIR, including the purpose and need/project objectives, project description, regulatory requirements, environmental consequences/environmental impacts, and the proposed environmental commitments/mitigation measures. The revised Executive Summary is presented at the beginning of Volume I of this Final EIS/EIR.

10.4 Preferred Alternative

Both Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 include removal of the Four Facilities and implementation of KBRA, and both alternatives more fully meet the Purpose and Need (Sections ES.3 and 1.5.2.1). Some key benefits provided by implementation of Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 include (for a full discussion of the Alternatives, see Chapter 3):

- Largely eliminates in 2020 elevated late summer/fall water temperatures in and below the Hydroelectric Reach by removing the largest reservoirs
- Largely eliminates 2020 dissolved oxygen and pH problems produced in reservoirs in the Hydroelectric Reach and transported downstream
- Largely eliminates in 2020 algal toxins produced in the Hydroelectric Reach and transported downstream
- Anadromous fish would access low gradient historical habitat of critical importance to spawning and rearing under Copco 1 and Iron Gate Reservoirs
- Provides for natural recruitment of spawning gravel and river processes within and below the Hydroelectric Reach through dam removal
- Provides optimal efficiency beginning in 2020 of upstream and downstream salmonid migration through the Hydroelectric Reach by creating a free-flowing river
- Reduces concentration of myxospores associated with carcasses accumulating below hatchery facilities, thus reducing disease

Removal of the Four Facilities and implementation of KBRA are important components of a durable, long-term solution for local communities and tribes regarding the development, administration, allocation, and advancement of water and native fishery resources of the Klamath Basins. Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 provide a greater opportunity for expanding restoration of salmonids, which, over time would improve harvest opportunities of salmonids, and when compared to the other alternatives, resolve more societal hardships and conflicts that result from over-allocation of scarce natural resources.

Although Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 are similar, Alternative 2 would remove nearly all structures associated with the Four Facilities, while Alternative 3 would allow some structures to remain. By leaving no structures along the shore of the Klamath River, Alternative 2 leads to positive permanent changes in the human environment such as improvements to scenic quality, less long-term maintenance by land-management agencies, and is more protective of public safety. For these reasons Alternative 2 is the preferred alternative.

10.5. Consultation and Coordination

Chapter 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR (Volume I) provides a description of all consultation and coordination that occurred during development of the Klamath Facilities Removal EIS/EIR.

10.6 Document Availability and Distribution

This section describes where the Final EIS/EIR is available for viewing by the public, and a list of agencies and individuals who received a copy of the Final EIS/EIR or a notice of its availability.

10.6.1 Document Availability

This Final EIS/EIR was made available for public review for 30 days with the filing of the NOA of the Final EIS/EIR in December 2012 with the USEPA and the NOC of the Final EIS/EIR with the California State Clearinghouse.

Hard copies of this document are available to view at the libraries and Federal and State Agency offices in the Klamath Basin listed below. An electronic version of the document can be viewed on Reclamation's Klamath Project Web site:

<http://klamathrestoration.gov/>.

To request an electronic copy on compact disk of the Final EIS/EIR, please contact representatives of the Lead Agencies as follows:

Elizabeth Vasquez

Bureau of Reclamation

2800 Cottage Way

Sacramento, CA 95825

Email: klamathsd@usbr.gov

Fax: (916) 978-5055

Gordon Leppig

California Department of Fish and Game

619 Second Street

Eureka, CA 95501

Email: ksdcomments@dfg.ca.gov

Fax: (707) 441-2021

10.6.1.1 Libraries and Federal and State Agencies

Hard copies of the Final EIS/EIR are available for public viewing at the libraries and Federal and State Agencies as presented in Table 10-1 and Table 10-2.

Table 10-1. Libraries with Final EIS/EIR Available

State	County	Library	Address
Oregon	Klamath	Main Library	126 South 3 rd Street, Klamath Falls, OR 97601
		Chiloquin Branch Library	140 South 1 st Street, Chiloquin, OR 97264
		Keno Branch Library	15555 Hwy 66 Unit 8, Keno, OR 97627

Table 10-1. Libraries with Final EIS/EIR Available

State	County	Library	Address
California		Merrill Branch Library	365 Front Street, Merrill, OR 97633
		South Suburban Branch Library	3706 South 6 th Street, Klamath Falls, OR 97603
		Sprague River Branch Library	23402 Sprague River Hwy, Sprague River, OR 97639
		Bonanza Branch Library	31703 Hwy 70, Bonanza, OR 97623
	Jackson	Ashland Branch Library	410 Siskiyou Boulevard, Ashland, OR 97520
		Medford Branch Library	205 S. Central Avenue, Medford, OR 97501
	Siskiyou	City of Yreka Branch Library	719 4 th Street, City of Yreka, CA 96097
		Butte Valley Branch Library	800 West 3 rd Street, Dorris, CA 96023
		Etna Branch Library	130 Main Street, Etna, CA 96027
		Happy Camp Branch Library	143 Buckhorn Road, Happy Camp, CA 96039
		Montague Branch Library	230 South 13 th Street, Montague, CA 96064
		Mt. Shasta Branch Library	515 East Alma St., Mt. Shasta, CA 96067
		Tulelake Branch Library	451 Main St, Tulelake, CA 96134
		Fort Jones Branch Library	11960 East Street, PO Box 632, Fort Jones, CA 96032
		Dunsmuir Branch Library	5714 Dunsmuir Avenue, Dunsmuir, CA 96025
		Weed Branch Library	780 South Davis Avenue, Weed, CA 96094
		Scott Bar Branch Library	Post Office, Scott Bar, CA 96032
	Del Norte	Main Branch	190 Price Mall, Crescent City, CA 95531
	Humboldt	Kim Yerton Memorial Library	Intersection of Loop Road and Orchard Street, Hoopa, CA 95546
		Willow Creek Branch Library	Intersection of Hwy 299 and Hwy 96, Willow Creek, CA 95573
		Arcata Branch Library	500 7 th Street, Arcata, CA 95521
		Eureka Branch Library	1313 3 rd Street, Eureka, CA 95501

Table 10-2. Federal and State Agencies with Final EIS/EIR Available

	Agency	Address
Federal Agencies	Bureau of Indian Affairs	2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825
		911 NE 11th Avenue, Portland, OR 97232
	Bureau of Land Management	2795 Anderson Avenue, Bldg. #25, Klamath Falls, OR 97603
		1695 Heindon Road, Arcata, CA 95521-4573
	Bureau of Reclamation	2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825
		6600 Washburn Way, Klamath Falls OR 97603-9365
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	1936 California Avenue, Klamath Falls, Oregon 97601
		1655 Heindon Road, Arcata, CA 95521-5582
		4009 Hill Road, Tulelake, CA. 96134
		1829 S. Oregon Street, City of Yreka, CA 96037
U.S. Forest Service	1312 Fairlane Road, City of Yreka, CA. 96097	
	63822 Highway 96, Happy Camp, CA 96039	
State Agencies	California Department of Fish and Game	619 Second Street, Eureka, CA 95501
		601 Locust Street, Redding, CA 96001
		1625 South Main Street, City of Yreka, CA 96097

10.6.1.2 Web Site

An electronic version of this Final EIS/EIR is available on the project Web site:

<http://klamathrestoration.gov/>.

10.6.2 Distribution List

Elected officials and representatives, government agencies, private organizations, businesses, and individual members of the public have received a copy of this Final EIS/EIR or a notification of document availability. This section presents the distribution list of the Final EIS/EIR.

10.6.2.1 Elected Officials, Representatives and Government Agencies

Table 10-3 presents the elected officials, representatives and government agencies that have received a copy of this Final EIS/EIR or a notification of document availability.

Table 10-3. Final EIS/EIR Distribution List

Elected Officials and Representatives		
Federal	United States Senate	Barbara Boxer, CA
		Diane Feinstein, CA
		Jeff Merkley, OR
		Ron Wyden, OR
	House of Representatives	Michael Thompson, 1 st District, CA
		Walter Herger, 2 nd District, CA
		David Wu, 1 st District, OR
Greg Walden, 2 nd District, OR		
California	Governor	Jerry Brown
	Senate	Doug LaMalfa, 4 th District
		Ted Gaines, 1 st District
		Noreen Evans, 2 nd District
	Assembly	Wesley Chesbro, 1 st District
		Jim Neilson, 2 nd District
Oregon	Governor	John Kitzhaber
	Senate	Jeff Kruse, 1 st District
		Jason Atkinson, 2 nd District
		Alan Bates, 3 rd District
		Doug Whitsett, 28 th District
	House of Representatives	Wayne Krieger, 1 st District
		Wally Hicks, 3 rd District
		Peter Buckley, 5 th District
Bill Garrard, 56 th District		
Government Agencies		
Federal	Army Corps of Engineers	
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	
	Environmental Protection Agency	
	U.S. Forest Service	
	Klamath River Compact Commission	
Tribes	Hoopa Valley Tribe	
	Karuk Tribe	
	The Klamath Tribes	
	Quartz Valley Indian Community	
	Resighini Rancheria	

Table 10-3. Final EIS/EIR Distribution List

	Yurok Tribe	
	Shasta Indian Nation	
	Shasta Nation	
State	California	California Coastal Commission
		California Air Resources Board
		California Department of Boating and Waterways
		California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
		California Department of Toxic Substances Control
		California Department of Transportation
		California Department of Water Resources
		California Energy Commission
		California Native American Heritage Commission
		California Public Utilities Commission
		State Water Resources Control Board
		California State Lands Commission
		California State Office of Historic Preservation
		California Department of Parks and Recreation
		California Department of Conservation
		California Department of Food and Agriculture
	Oregon	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
		Oregon Water Resources Department
		Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
		Oregon Division of State Lands
County	California	Del Norte County
		Humboldt County
		Mendocino County
		Modoc County
		Siskiyou County
	Oregon	Curry County
		Jackson County
		Klamath County
City	California	Arcata
		Crescent City
		Eureka
		Montague
		Mount Shasta
		Weed
		City of Yreka
	Oregon	Ashland
		Brookings
		Klamath Falls
		Medford

10.6.2.2 Businesses, Organizations, and Individual Members of the Public

The Lead Agencies continue to update an extensive mailing list with over 5,000 businesses, organizations, property owners along the Klamath River, and members of the public. Those who have attended meetings, provided comments, or expressed an interest in the EIS/EIR have been added to the mailing list. All individuals on the mailing list have received either a copy of the Final EIS/EIR or notification of its availability. The mailing list will continue to be updated.

10.7 Next Steps

10.7.1 NEPA and CEQA Next Steps

This Final EIS/EIR has been released to the public for 30 days of review. Elected officials and representatives, government agencies, private organizations, businesses, and individual members of the public on the mailing list have received a copy of this document or a notification of document availability.

In compliance with NEPA, DOI must issue a Final EIS before making a determination on Klamath dam facilities removal. The Secretary of the Interior would consider the EIS/EIR when making this determination after a 30-day public review period for the Final EIS/EIR and when other requirements as described in the KHSA and KBRA are fulfilled. The Secretary's Determination would be on whether or not dam removal will advance restoration of the salmonid fisheries of the Klamath Basin and is in the public interest, which includes but is not limited to consideration of potential impacts on affected local communities and Indian Tribes. To read more about the Secretarial Determination process and the conditions on which an Affirmative Secretarial Determination, a determination where the Secretary finds that dam removal in accordance with KHSA would advance salmonid fisheries and be in the public interest, may be issued, see Section 1.3.1.3.

CDFG is responsible for certifying the EIR in accordance with CEQA's criteria.

10.7.2 KHSA

In the event of an Affirmative Secretarial Determination, the States of California and Oregon would consider the EIS/EIR when determining if they concur with the Secretary's Determination. The States of California and Oregon would have 60 days after an Affirmative Secretarial Determination to concur with that determination. To read more about the Secretarial Determination process and the conditions on which an Affirmative Secretarial Determination may be issued see Section 1.3.1.3.

10.7.3 KBRA

Under an Affirmative Determination by the Secretary of the Interior, the various plans contained in the KBRA, such as the Fisheries Management Plan, would be further developed. Following completion of the plans, each KBRA action would be evaluated individually to determine if additional environmental compliance, review and documentation would be required. If additional environmental review is required, the agency responsible for implementing the KBRA action would be responsible for the associated environmental review and compliance.

Chapter 11

Comments and Responses

This chapter presents responses to all comments received on the Klamath Facilities Removal Draft EIS/EIR, including all written comments received during the comment period and those submitted at public meetings.

Table 11-1 below lists the comment author's name, their affiliations, comment code and the page in which their comments and responses can be found. Comment documents are organized by affiliation type and then presented alphabetically by the last name of the comment author. Responses to duplicative comments were only provided on the original comment document. All duplicative comments are referred to in Table 11-1 and can be found in Appendix AA.

The original comment documents and public hearing transcripts received by the Lead Agencies on the Draft EIS/EIR are presented in this chapter with responses to each comment attached at the end of each individual comment document. The chapter is subdivided, similar to Table 11-1 by comment author affiliation with the comment documents in each subsection presented alphabetically by the last name of the comment author.

11.1 Summary of Comments Received and Responses to General Comments

The Klamath Facilities Removal Draft EIS/EIR was released on September 22, 2011, for public review and comment. All comments on the Draft EIS/EIR received by December 30, 2011, were given full consideration. All forms of written comments were accepted during the comment period, including emails, faxes, and letters. In addition, the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) conducted six public meetings in October 2011 which allowed the public the opportunity to give oral comment.

A total of 4,066 comments were received on the Draft EIS/EIR from Federal, State, and local agencies as well as individuals. 847 comments were submitted at the public meetings, and 3,219 comments were received during the comment period. Of these 4,066 comments received, 755 focused on the comment author's approval of dam removal and 511 focused on the comment author's disapproval of dam removal.

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
11.3 Federal Agencies			
Fujii, Laura	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9	FA_EM_1109_002	11.3-3
Manzanilla, Enrique	US Environmental Protection Agency	FA_LT_1230_005	11.3-5
Moore, Randy	US Forest Service	FA_LT_1221_004	11.3-30
Schoessler, Michael	US Department of the Interior, Office of Solicitor, Pacific North West Region	FA_EM_1017_001	11.3-34
Wright, Jeff	US Office of Energy Project, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FA_LT_1123_003	11.3-36
11.4 State Agencies			
Gonzalez, Marcelino	California Department of Transportation	CA_EM_1003_001	11.4-3
		CA_LT_1208_005	11.4-7
		CA_LT_1208_006	11.4-9
		CA_LT_1208_007 Duplicate of CA_LT_1208_006	AA- 28
		CA_LT_1208_008 Duplicate of CA_LT_1208_005	AA-29
Griffin, Dennis	Oregon Parks and Recreation Department	OA_LT_1130_002	11.4-11
Kuhlman, Catherine	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region	CA_LT_1230_010	11.4-14
		CA_LT_1230_011 Duplicate of CA_LT_1230_010	AA- 30
Osborne, Julie	Oregon Parks and Recreation Department	OA_LT_1205_003 Duplicate of OA_LT_1130_002	AA-39
Sanchez, Katy	Native American Heritage Commission	CA_LT_1003_002	11.4-28
		CA_LT_1208_004 Duplicate of CA_LT_1003_002	AA-40
Simon, Larry	California Coastal Commission	CA_LT_1230_008	11.4-31
		CA_LT_1230_013 Duplicate of CA_LT_1230_008	AA-41
Trgovcich, Caren	California State Water Resources Control Board	CA_LT_1130_003	11.4-35
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, High Desert Region (Various)	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, High Desert Region	OA_LT_1122_001	11.4-45
Waggoner, Michael	California Department of Water Resources	CA_LT_1230_009	11.4-60
		CA_LT_1229_012 Duplicate of CA_LT_1230_009	AA-44
Watts, Jennifer	California State Water Resources Control Board	CA_LT_0113_014	11.4-63
11.5 Local Agencies			
Armstrong, Maria	County of Siskiyou	CC_MC_1020_016	11.5-3
Bennett, Grace	County of Siskiyou, Board of Supervisors	CC_LT_1020_007	11.5-7
		CC_LT_1020_008	11.5-12
		CM_MC_1020_001	11.5-15
Cook, Jim	County of Siskiyou, Board of Supervisors	CC_LT_1019_001	11.5-21
		CC_MC_1020_004	11.5-34
Duffy, Jill	County of Humboldt, Board of Supervisors	CC_MC_1026_010	11.5-38
		CC_LT_1026_012 Duplicate of CC_MC_1026_010	AA-47

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Guarino, Thomas	County of Siskiyou, Office of County Council	CC_LT_1019_002	11.5-42
		CC_LT_1117_020	11.5-46
		CC_MC_1018_023	11.5-338
Kobseff, Michael	County of Siskiyou	CC_LT_1114_018	11.5-344
Lopey, Jon	County of Siskiyou	CC_MC_1020_003	11.5-356
		CC_LT_1019_014 Duplicate of CC_MC_1020_003	AA-50
		CC_LT_1019_015	11.5-361
Lovelace, Mark	County of Humboldt, Board of Supervisors	CC_LT_1208_009 Duplicate of CC_MC1117_021	AA-51
		CC_LT_1019_013	11.5-368
		CC_MC_1020_005	11.5-372
		CC_LT_1117_021	11.5-376
Mallory, Mike	County of Siskiyou	CC_LT_1020_006 Duplicate of CC_MC_1020_017	AA-55
		CC_MC_1020_017	11.5-381
		CM_LT_1118_002	11.5-385
McNeil, Rory	City of Yreka	CM_LT_1122_003 Duplicate of CM_LT_1118_002	AA-57
		CC_LT_1114_019	11.5-474
Oliver, Linda	Copco Lake Fire Protection District	CC_LT_1220_024	11.5-477
		CC_LT_1220_025	11.5-482
		CC_MC_1026_011	11.5-487
Seemann, Hank	County of Humboldt, Public Works Department	CC_MC_1026_011	11.5-487
Spellman, Darren	County of Calaveras	CC_EM_1121_022	11.5-490
11.6 Indian Tribes			
Belchik, Michael	Yurok Tribe	IT_MC_1027_052	11.6-3
		IT_MC_1026_062 Partial Duplicate of IT_MC_1027_052	11.6-9
		IT_WI_1113_079	11.6-12
Boomgarden, Donnabelle	Shasta Indian Nation	IT_WI_1113_079	11.6-12
Bruce-Hostler, Deborah	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_MF_1025_025	11.6-14
		IT_MC_1025_040 Duplicate of IT_EM_1117_083	AA-127
		IT_EM_1117_083	11.6-17
Buckskin, Marjorie	Yurok Tribe	IT_LT_1230_098	11.6-22
Case, Torina	The Klamath Tribes	IT_WI_1114_081	11.6-103
Chichizola, Regina	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_MC_1025_041	11.6-105
Chocktoot Jr, Perry	The Klamath Tribes	IT_FX_1221_091	11.6-110
Conrad, Florence	Karuk Tribe	IT_MC_1020_022	11.6-115
Cummings, Norma	The Klamath Tribe	IT_LT_1031_074	11.6-117
		IT_MC_1019_008	11.6-119
David, Taylor	The Klamath Tribes	IT_MC_1018_005	11.6-121
		IT_MC_1019_010	11.6-126
		IT_WI_1021_014	11.6-129
		IT_LT_1019_071 Duplicate of IT_MC_1019_010	AA-129
		IT_LT_1018_073 Duplicate of IT_MC_1018_005	AA-130
		IT_MC_1018_005	

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Difuntorum, Sami Jo	Shasta Indian Nation	IT_LT_1029_027	11.6-131
		IT_LT_1109_077	AA-132
		Duplicate of IT_LT_1029_027	
		IT_EM_1109_078	11.6-138
Dowd, Keshan	Resighini Rancheria	IT_LT_1125_088	AA-136
		Duplicate of IT_LT_1122_087	
Dowd, Rick	Resighini Rancheria, Tribal Council	IT_LT_1230_100	11.6-140
Dowd, Venola	Resighini Rancheria	IT_LT_1122_087	11.6-207
Dunlap, James	Yurok Tribe	IT_MC_1027_055	11.6-209
Dunsmoor, Larry	The Klamath Tribes	IT_LT_1019_070	11.6-212
		IT_MC_1018_002	11.6-214
		IT_MC_1019_009	11.6-217
Dyer, Jacquelyn	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_MF_1020_030	11.6-222
Fletcher, Troy	Yurok Tribe	IT_MC_1026_059	11.6-224
Flettcher, Pat	Shasta Indian Nation	IT_MC_1020_018	AA-137
		Duplicate of IT_LT_1020_029	
		IT_LT_1020_029	11.6-228
Foreman, Allen		IT_MC_1019_013	11.6-238
Gensaw, David		IT_MC_1027_045	11.6-242
Gensaw, Sammy		IT_MC_1027_050	11.6-245
Gentry, Don	The Klamath Tribes	IT_LT_1230_097	11.6-249
		IT_MC_1018_003	11.6-311
		IT_MC_1019_011	11.6-315
Gentry, Mary	The Klamath Tribes	IT_LT_1019_082	11.6-321
		IT_MC_1019_006	11.6-323
Goodwin, Bob	Karuk Tribe	IT_MC_1020_024	11.6-328
Goodwin, Jaclyn	Karuk Tribe	IT_MC_1020_020	11.6-333
Griffith, Ron	Karuk Tribe	IT_EM_1118_099	11.6-335
Hall, Betty	Shasta Indian Nation	IT_LT_1227_093	11.6-338
		IT_MC_1020_015	11.6-365
Hall, Roy	Shasta Indian Nation	IT_MC_1020_023	11.6-368
		IT_LT_1020_086	AA-140
		Duplicate of IT_MC_1020_023	
Higgins, Patrick	Resighini Rancheria	IT_MC_1026_065	11.6-372
		IT_MC_1025_039	11.6-378
		IT_MC_1027_054	11.6-386
		IT_LT_1027_103	11.6-393
Hillman		IT_MC_1025_038	11.6-401
Hillman, Erin	Karuk Tribe	IT_MF_1020_033	11.6-404
Hillman, Leaf	Karuk Tribe	IT_LT_1223_094	11.6-406
Horner, Charles & Tane	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_EM_1120_085	11.6-447
		IT_EM_1120_090	AA-142
		Duplicate of IT_EM_1120_085	
Hutt, Hayley	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_MC_1026_060	11.6-451
Jackson, Charles	Klamath Tribe	IT_MC_1019_007	11.6-455
		IT_WI_1027_026	11.6-460
Jackson, Robert		IT_MC_1027_057	11.6-462
Jordan, Daniel	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_MC_1026_066	11.6-465
Kelley, Sherrie	Quartz Valley Indian Reservation	IT_LT_1230_096	11.6-468

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Kelly, Janice	Resighini Rancheria	IT_MC_1027_047	11.6-476
		IT_LT_1027_102	AA-144
		Duplicate of IT_MC_1027_047	
Kelley, Jeff	The Modoc Nation	IT_LT_1012_001	11.6-479
Kinney, Javier	Yurok Tribe, Office of Self Governance	IT_MC_1027_048	11.6-493
Lake, Gary	Karuk Tribe	IT_MC_1020_019	11.6-497
Lewis, Kristi	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_MF_1020_032	11.6-502
Marston, Lester	Resighini Rancheria	IT_MC_1026_064	11.6-504
		IT_LT_1026_069	11.6-508
Masten, Leonard	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_LT_1118_084	11.6-525
		IT_LT_1125_089	AA-204
		Duplicate of IT_LT_1118_084	
Mattz, Ray	Yurok Tribe	IT_MC_1027_049	11.6-627
McAllister, Ashley	Karuk Tribe	IT_MF_1025_043	11.6-631
McAllister, Crispen	Karuk Tribe	IT_MF_1020_034	11.6-633
McNeal, Skyler	Karuk Tribe	IT_MF_1025_028	11.6-635
Mitchell, Jeff	The Klamath Tribes	IT_LT_1019_072	11.6-637
		IT_MC_1018_004	11.6-640
		IT_MC_1019_012	11.6-644
Mortenson, Sheila	Shasta Indian Nation	IT_WI_1113_080	11.6-649
Myers, Georgiana	Yurok Tribe	IT_MC_1027_053	11.6-651
Myers, Melissa	Yurok Tribe	IT_MF_1020_036	11.6-654
Nelson Jr, Byron	Hoopa Valley Tribe, Council	IT_LT_1026_068	11.6-656
Norris, Josh		IT_MC_1027_051	11.6-664
O' Rourke, Thomas	Yurok Tribe	IT_MC_1027_044	11.6-667
Oliver, Merk		IT_MC_1027_056	11.6-672
Orcutt, Mike	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_MC_1026_061	11.6-675
Redner, Barbara	Redwood Creek	IT_MC_1026_063	11.6-679
Reed, Ron	Karuk Tribe	IT_MC_1020_016	11.6-682
		IT_MC_1025_042	11.6-686
Rouvier, Helene	Karuk Tribe	IT_LT_1214_092	11.6-690
		IT_WI_1107_075	11.6-694
Schaefer, Sarah	Quartz Valley Indian Reservation	IT_MF_1102_058	11.6-696
Super, Florrine		IT_MC_1020_021	11.6-698
Super, Robert	Karuk Tribe	IT_WI_1108_076	11.6-700
Talley, Bari G.M.	Karuk Tribe	IT_WI_1229_095	11.6-702
Tripp, Sandi	Karuk Tribe	IT_MF_1020_037	11.6-704
Tso, Hunter	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_MF_1020_031	11.6-706
Tucker, Craig	Karuk Tribe	IT_MC_1020_017	11.6-708
Unidentified	Hoopa Valley Tribe	IT_LT_1026_067	11.6-712
Unidentified	Resighini Rancheria	IT_LT_0126_101	11.6-717
Watkins, Sushine	Resighini Rancheria, Business Council	IT_MC_1027_046	11.6-722
		IT_LT_1027_101	AA-210
		Duplicte of IT_MC_1027_046	
11.7- Advocacy Organizations			
Addington, Greg	Klamath Water Users Assoc.	AO_LT_1229_053	11.7-3
Baird, Mark	Siskiyou County Water Users Assoc.	AO_WI_1108_027	11.7-36
Beck, Diane	Redwood Chapter Sierra Club	AO_MC_1026_014	11.7-39
		AO_LT_1026_023	AA-213
		Duplicate of AO_MC_1026_014	

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Bergeron, Leo	Siskiyou County Water Users Assoc.	AO_LT_1118_034	11.7-44
		AO_LT_1208_042	AA-215
		Duplicate of AO_LT_1118_034	
		AO_LT_1222_048	11.7-50
		AO_LT_1230_067	AA-219
		Duplicate of AO_LT_1222_048	
Berol, Emelia	Northcoast Environmental Center	AO_MC_1026_021	11.7-53
Bitts, Dave	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermans Assoc.	AO_MC_1026_018	11.7-56
		AO_MF_1020_009	11.7-59
		AO_MC_1020_068	11.7-61
Bowen, Liz	Scott Valley Protect Our Water	AO_LT_1018_025	11.7-65
		AO_LT_0202_072	11.7-67
Brockbank, Dean	PacifiCorp Energy	AO_LT_1107_069	11.7-73
Brown, Josh	Environmental Protection Information Center	AO_MF_1122_036	11.7-76
Brucker, Petey	Salmon River Restoration Council	AO_WI_1230_062	11.7-78
Clark, Jim	Redwood Region Audubon Society	AO_WI_1117_031	11.7-81
		AO_LT_1230_061	11.7-89
		Partial Duplicate of AO_WI_1117_031	
DeVoe, John	Waterwatch	AO_LT_1229_059	11.7-97
		AO_LT_1229_065	11.7-125
		Duplicate of AO_LT_1228_059	
DuPont, Mark	Mid Klamath Watershed Council	AO_LT_1025_008	11.7-186
Ewart, Ron	National Association of Rural Landowners	AO_LT_1118_032	11.7-190
Garcia, Dawn	Altacal Audubon Society	AO_LT_1229_049	11.7-195
Gillespie, Don	The Friends of Del Norte	AO_LT_1208_041	11.7-200
		Partial Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	
Glass, Larry	Northcoast Environmental Center	AO_LT_1230_060	11.7-203
Graham, Gary	Environmental Protection Information Center	AO_LT_1026_022	11.7-211
Greacen, Scott	Friends of the Eel River	AO_MC_1026_016	11.7-213
Hannes	Onsite Energy, LP	AO_WI_0923_001	11.7-216
Harling, Will	Mid Klamath Watershed Council	AO_WI_1230_063	11.7-218
		Partial Duplicate of AO_LT_1230_057	
		AO_MC_1025_026	AA-257
		Duplicate of AO_WI_1230_063	
Heiken, Doug	Oregon Wild	AO_LT_1115_030	11.7-224
Helliwell, Vivian	Institute for Fisheries Resources	AO_MF_1025_006	11.7-233
		AO_MC_1026_017	11.7-235
		AO_LT_1026_024	AA-261
		Duplicate of AO_MC_1026_017	
Hemstreet, Tim	PacifiCorp Energy	AO_LT_1230_071	11.7-238
Hendrixson, Heather	The Nature Conservancy	AO_WI_1118_033	11.7-408
Hughes, Gary	Environmental Protection Information Center	AO_MC_1026_015	11.7-410
Hygdahl, Sarah	Salmon River Restoration Council	AO_MF_1020_012	11.7-413
Johnson, Brian	Trout Unlimited	AO_LT_1230_050	11.7-415
Katz Clark, Susan	Simplexity Health	AO_WI_1108_029	11.7-422
Kerns, Shirley	Klamath Bucket Brigade, Inc.	AO_MC_1018_004	11.7-424
Knight, Curtis	California Trout	AO_LT_1223_055	11.7-427
		Partial Duplicate of AO_LT_1229_054	

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Lawrence, Rebecca	Mid Klamath Watershed Council	AO MF 1025 007	11.7-436
Lilly, John	Keno Irrigation District	AO LT 1118 070	11.7-438
Mallams, Tom	Klamath Off-Project Water Users Assoc.	AO LT 1120 035	11.7-444
		AO LT 1120 044 Duplicate of AO LT 1120 035	AA-262
Mclsaac, D.O.	Pacific Fishery Management Council	AO LT 1213 045	11.7-463
		AO LT 1218 046 Duplicate of AO LT 1213 045	AA-271
Mihailovich, Bart	Spokane Riverkeeper	AO LT 1118 043	11.7-467
Minasian, Meith, Soares, Sexton, & Cooper, LLP.	Siskiyou County Water Users Assoc.	AO LT 1121 039	11.7-470
Nielson, Dan	Klamath Bucket Brigade, Inc.	AO LT 1208 040	11.7-492
Ogan, Chet	Redwood Region Audubon Society	AO MC 1026 019	11.7-498
Orahoske, Andrew	Environmental Protection Information Center	AO EM 1230 051	11.7-500
		AO LT 1227 047 Partial Duplicate of GP WI 1110 480	11.7-524
Pennington, Nathaniel	Salmon River Restoration Council	AO MF 1020 011	11.7-527
Rice, Jack	California Farm Bureau Federation	AO LT 1230 064	11.7-529
Richard, George & Mackey, Megan	Ecotrust	AO LT 1229 056	11.7-546
Ringo, Paul	Sabine Riverkeeper	AO EM 1124 037	11.7-553
Rothert, Steve	American Rivers	AO LT 1229 054	11.7-556
		AO LT 1229 066 Duplicate of AO LT 1229 054	AA-274
Ryan, Lynn	Ancient Forest International	AO MF 1025 013	11.7-566
		AO MC 1026 020	11.7-568
		AO LT 1128 058 Partial Duplicate of GP LT 1128 939	11.7-571
Scott, David	Sierra Club	AO LT 1230 052	11.7-573
Sheehan, Linda	Earth Law Center	AO WI 1108 028	11.7-582
Spain, Glen	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermans Assoc.	AO LT 1020 010	11.7-584
		AO LT 1228 038	11.7-588
Sully, John	Rogue Group Sierra Club	AO LT 1024 005	11.7-634
Terence, Erica	Klamath Riverkeeper	AO LT 1230 057	11.7-645
Wright, Gary	Klamath Water Users Assoc.	AO LT 1019 002	11.7-660
		AO MC 1018 003 Duplicate of AO LT 1019 002	AA-283
11.8 Special Interest Groups			
Bits, Dave	Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Association	SG MC 1020 003	11.8-3
Cliff, Fred	Oregon Backcountry Hunters and Anglers	SG EM 1219 006	11.8-7
		SG LT 1222 007 Duplicate of SG EM 1219 006	AA-287
Hammerstad, Charles	Flycaster, Inc. of San Jose	SG WI 1107 004	11.8-9
O'Keefe, Thomas	American Whitewater	SG LT 1226 008	11.8-11
		SG LT 1228 009 Duplicate of SG LT 1226 008	AA-288
Rockwell, Mark	Federation of Fly Fishers, Northern California Council	SG EM 1024 002	11.8-37

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Scantlebury, Mark	Lower Columbia Canoe Club	SG_WI_0923_001	11.8-39
Ward, John and Anita	Rogue Flyfishers	SG_EM_1230_010	11.8-41
		SG_EM_1230_011	AA-311
		Duplicate of SG_EM_1230_010	
Zigelhofer, Ron	Trout Unlimited, El Dorado	SG_WI_1111_005	11.8-44
11.9- Individuals			
Adams, Bill	General Public	GP_MC_1018_150	11.9-3
		GP_LT_1018_279	AA-314
		Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_150	
Adams, Michael	General Public	GP_MC_1020_198	11.9-6
Adams, William	One Stop Auto Wreckers	GP_MF_1019_101	11.9-8
Ajari, Bruce	General Public	GP_WI_1112_580	11.9-10
Aklestad, Arnold	General Public	GP_EM_1122_1055	11.9-12
Albers, Karen	General Public	GP_EM_1128_934	11.9-14
		GP_EM_1128_1045	AA-316
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1128_934	
Algieri, Robert	General Public	GP_WI_1112_585	11.9-17
Allen, Andrew	Rogue Crescent City Harbor	GP_MF_1114_707	11.9-19
Allen, Chris	Stillwater Development	GP_WI_1112_608	AA-317
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Allen, David	General Public	GP_WI_1107_383	11.9-21
Allen, Frances	General Public	GP_WI_1103_364	11.9-23
Almond, George and Fay	General Public	GP_LT_1118_797	11.9-25
		GP_LT_1208_982	AA-318
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1118_797	
Amble, Diane	General Public	GP_EM_1116_734	AA-319
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_729	
Anderson, Clifford	General Public	GP_LT_1221_1181	11.9-27
		GP_LT_1221_1225	AA-320
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1221_1181	
Anderson, Robin	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1158	AA-321
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	
Anderson, Susan	General Public	GP_WI_1102_370	11.9-29
		GP_WI_1117_735	11.9-31
Andre Grauman, Jan	General Public	GP_WI_1101_292	11.9-33
Andrus, Harold	General Public	GP_WI_1123_909	11.9-35
Archibald, Robert and Joan	General Public	GP_EM_1120_822	11.9-37
		Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	
		GP_EM_1120_1025	AA-322
Arneson, JoAnn	General Public	Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_822	
		GP_EM_1121_842	11.9-39
		GP_EM_1121_1068	AA-323
Arnold, Thomas	General Public	Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_842	
		GP_WI_1111_598	AA-324
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Arwood, David	General Public	GP_WI_1108_393	11.9-41
Aschernbrenner, Kindra	General Public	GP_WI_1130_949 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_480	AA-325
Ayers, Bill	General Public	GP_EM_1026_250	11.9-43
Ayres, Katherine	General Public	GP_LT_1229_1209	11.9-45
Bacigalupi, Debbie	General Public	GP_MC_1020_213	11.9-49
		GP_LT_1230_1221	11.9-53
		GP_LT_1230_1232 Duplicate of GP_LT_1230_1221	AA-326
Bacigalupi, Donna	General Public	GP_MC_1020_229	11.9-95
Bacigalupi, Jerry	General Public	GP_LT_1230_1220	11.9-99
		GP_LT_1230_1226 Duplicate of GP_LT_1230_1220	AA-361
Backland, Stanley	General Public	GP_WI_1111_516 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-369
Bacon, Bill	General Public	GP_MC_1018_129	11.9-116
Bacon, Julie	General Public	GP_WI_1226_1169	11.9-118
Baetscher, Diana	General Public	GP_EM_1021_108	11.9-120
Baillio, Austin	General Public	GP_EM_1128_1042	11.9-122
Bak, Peter	General Public	GP_WI_1114_665 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-370
Baker-de Kater, Rachel	General Public	GP_EM_1123_912	11.9-125
Baldwin, Gloria	General Public	GP_WI_1229_1189	11.9-127
Balko, Janette	General Public	GP_WI_1103_366 Duplicate of GP_WI_1103_364	AA-371
Baradrusha, Cellra	General Public	GP_LT_1109_448 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-372
Baramontas, Tim	General Public	GP_LT_1109_438 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-373
Barclay, Susan	General Public	GP_EM_1107_386	11.9-129
Barnes, Cloyce	General Public	GP_LT_1024_257	11.9-131
Barnes, Earl	General Public	GP_MC_1020_195	11.9-133
Barnes, Paul	General Public	GP_EM_1119_776	11.9-136
		GP_EM_1118_1148 Duplicate of GP_EM_1119_776	AA-374
Barrett, Jerry	General Public	GP_MC_1018_142	11.9-138
		GP_MF_1019_092	11.9-143
Bashr, Abul	General Public	GP_LT_1109_442 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-375
Baucom, Elizabeth	General Public	GP_EM_1120_825	11.9-146
Baudeau, Sylvea	General Public	GP_LT_1208_1006 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-376
Bayhn, Tony	General Public	GP_LT_1109_445 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-378
Beardsmore, Loy	General Public	GP_MC_1020_238	11.9-148

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Beaver, Ben	General Public	GP_MC_1025_302	11.9-152
Bechtel, Danny	General Public	GP_WI_1112_573	11.9-155
Becker, Stacy	General Public	GP_EM_1116_689	11.9-157
Beckerdite, Debbie	General Public	GP_EM_1126_904	11.9-159
		GP_EM_1126_1048 Duplicate of GP_WI_1116_715	AA-379
Beem, Randy and Sharon	General Public	GP_EM_1212_1204	11.9-161
		GP_WI_1116_715	11.9-163
		GP_EM_1116_1126	AA-380
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1116_715	
Bell, Larry	General Public	GP_MC_1020_225	11.9-165
Bellett, Jim	General Public	GP_MC_1018_160	11.9-170
Bennett, Anna	General Public	GP_WI_1108_400	11.9-174
Berggreen, John	General Public	GP_EM_1114_658	11.9-176
Bernard, Lucy	General Public	GP_EM_1114_652	11.9-178
Bettelheim, Paul	General Public	GP_WI_1114_655	11.9-180
Beuris, Dee	General Public	GP_LT_1109_468	AA-381
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Bingham, Sierra	General Public	GP_EM_1128_917	11.9-182
Birdsall, Laurie	General Public	GP_WI_1110_482	11.9-184
Bithell, Marianne	General Public	GP_WI_1108_397	11.9-186
Blackwell, Doug	General Public	GP_EM_1019_073	11.9-188
Blanchard, David	General Public	GP_MC_1018_173	11.9-190
		GP_MF_1019_097	11.9-193
Blume, Mark	General Public	GP_WI_1219_1098	11.9-195
Bodnar, Richard	General Public	GP_EM_1114_639	11.9-197
Bogenreif, Sarah	General Public	GP_LT_1121_867	11.9-199
Bohling, Dale	General Public	GP_EM_1119_1111	11.9-203
Boise-Cossart, Beverly	General Public	GP_WI_1217_1082	11.9-205
Bolender, Aimee	General Public	GP_MF_1110_650	11.9-207
Bollok, Steve	General Public	GP_EM_1110_475	11.9-209
Bond, Lea	General Public	GP_WI_1111_551	11.9-211
Botzler, Sally	General Public	GP_EM_1209_1008	11.9-213
Bourdon, Richard	General Public	GP_WI_1201_952	11.9-215
Bowen, Liz	General Public	GP_MC_1020_222	11.9-217
Bozarth, Tami	General Public	GP_EM_1123_907	11.9-221
		GP_EM_1123_1049	AA-382
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1123_907	
Breitenfelder, Chris	General Public	GP_EM_1020_076	11.9-223
Brennan, John	Hammond Forest	GP_LT_1021_182	11.9-225
		GP_WI_1020_075	11.9-227
Brimlow, John and Barbara	General Public	GP_WI_1202_958	11.9-229
Brinkley, John	General Public	GP_WI_1107_380	11.9-231
Brinton	General Public	GP_MC_1026_368	11.9-233
		GP_EM_1221_1110	AA-383
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1121_867	
		GP_EM_1221_1222	11.9-236
Brown, Bill	General Public	GP_LT_1019_084	11.9-239
Brown, Chris	General Public	GP_EM_1121_850	11.9-243
		Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Brown, Christopher	General Public	GP_EM_1121_1064 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-246
Brown, Pastor Rob	General Public	GP_LT_1208_980	11.9-249
Buck, Kim	General Public	GP_EM_1121_857	11.9-251
Buris, Earl	General Public	GP_LT_1109_421 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-385
Burney, James	Klamath Ranch Resort	GP_LT_1128_938 Partial Duplicate of GP_MC_1020_224	11.9-253
		GP_MC_1018_130	11.9-290
		GP_LT_1018_375 Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_130	AA-386
		GP_MC_1020_224	11.9-295
		GP_WI_1001_016	11.9-299
Burns, Tom	General Public	GP_EM_0923_004	11.9-301
Burres, Erick	General Public	GP_WI_1114_633 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-388
Buskirk, Katrina	General Public	GP_EM_1115_677	11.9-304
Cabot, Mariane	General Public	GP_LT_1123_927	11.9-306
		GP_LT_1208_997 Duplicate of GP_LT_1123_927	AA-389
Caler, Judi	General Public	GP_EM_1121_861 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-391
		GP_EM_1121_1060 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-393
Campbell, Dorothy	General Public	GP_EM_1102_301	11.9-309
Campbell, Jane	General Public	GP_LT_1019_085	11.9-311
Campbell, Jane, Tara and Miranda	General Public	GP_WI_1110_415 Duplicate of GP_LT_1019_085	AA-395
Cantrell, Marvin	General Public	GP_MC_1018_137	11.9-316
Cardiff, Darrell	General Public	GP_MF_1025_328	11.9-319
		GP_MF_1026_327	11.9-321
		GP_MF_1026_373	11.9-323
Carlson, Elin	General Public	GP_EM_1121_847	11.9-325
		GP_LT_1122_888 Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_847	AA-399
		GP_LT_1208_1001 Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_847	AA-400
		GP_EM_1121_1067 Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_847	AA-401
Carpenter, Jim	General Public	GP_MC_1018_120	11.9-327
Carpenter, Karen	General Public	GP_WI_1230_1194	11.9-331
Carpenter, Ken	General Public	GP_WI_1112_619 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-403

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Carrick, Matt	General Public	GP_EM_1122_871	11.9-334
		GP_EM_1122_1057 Duplicate of GP_EM_1122_873	AA-404
Carroll, Joan	General Public	GP_EM_1122_873	11.9-336
		GP_EM_1122_1056 Duplicate of GP_EM_1122_873	AA-405
Carter, Patsy	General Public	GP_EM_1118_772	11.9-338
Casale, Carl	General Public	GP_WI_1112_575	11.9-340
Case, William	General Public	GP_MF_1019_050	11.9-342
Cederwall, Mark	General Public	GP_WI_1118_783	AA-406
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Chan, Martin	General Public	GP_WI_1108_408	11.9-344
Chandler, Janna	Simplexity Health	GP_WI_1105_361	11.9-346
Chandler, Tom	General Public	GP_WI_1111_521	11.9-348
Chapman, Jason	General Public	GP_MC_1018_111	11.9-350
Charles	General Public	GP_WI_1212_1085	11.9-352
		GP_EM_1219_1101 Duplicate of GP_WI_1212_1085	AA-407
Chesney, Joe	General Public	GP_EM_1005_019	11.9-364
Cheyne, Hank	General Public	GP_LT_1019_065	11.9-371
		GP_MC_1018_156 Duplicate of GP_LT_1019_065	AA-418
Chichizule, Regina	General Public	GP_MF_1025_305	11.9-374
Chouinard, Claire	General Public	GP_WI_1111_540	AA-420
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
		GP_WI_1217_1092	AA-421
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1216_1044	
		GP_EM_1220_1104	AA-422
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1216_1044	
Chouinard, Fletcher	General Public	GP_WI_1216_1080	11.9-376
Clanin, Thomas	General Public	GP_MC_1020_192	11.9-378
Clark, Jim	General Public	GP_WI_1224_1175	11.9-381
		Partial Duplicate of AO_WI_1117_031	
Clark, Mathew	General Public	GP_EM_1213_1033	11.9-385
Clarridge, Jan	General Public	GP_WI_1110_490	11.9-387
		GP_WI_1116_727	AA-423
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Clegg, Ted	General Public	GP_LT_1019_079	11.9-389
		GP_MC_1018_151	AA-424
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1019_079	
Clemens, Terry and Loretta	General Public	GP_WI_0926_007	11.9-392
Coapman, Amy	General Public	GP_WI_1107_382	11.9-394
Collins, Bill	General Public	GP_WI_1123_906	11.9-396
Collins, Harvey	General Public	GP_WI_1220_1105	11.9-398

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Colman, Daniel	General Public	GP_WI_1114_668 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-426
Combs, Cindy	General Public	GP_LT_1019_086	11.9-403
Cone, Jerry	General Public	GP_MC_1020_201 Duplicate of GP_LT_1020_272	AA-427
Connick, Tom	General Public	GP_LT_1208_1012	11.9-408
Cooper, Eileen	General Public	GP_MC_1027_311	11.9-436
Cooper, June	General Public	GP_EM_1121_839	11.9-438
Cordonnier, Justin	General Public	GP_WI_1113_632 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-429
Cornforth, Jerry	General Public	GP_WI_1113_625	11.9-440
Cornish, Kevin	General Public	GP_WI_1111_548	11.9-442
Corrigan, Douglas	General Public	GP_EM_1120_1017	11.9-444
Corselli, Ronald	General Public	GP_LT_1123_928 GP_LT_1208_1003 Duplicate of GP_LT_1123_928	11.9-446 AA-430
Corvin, Brian	General Public	GP_LT_1109_452 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-431
Cotter, Jason	General Public	GP_MF_1019_058	11.9-448
Cozales, Evelyn	General Public	GP_LT_1109_450 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-432
Cozzalio, Rex	General Public	GP_MC_1020_215 GP_LT_1020_270 GP_LT_1122_880 Duplicate of GP_MC_1020_215	11.9-450 11.9-454 AA-433
Crane, Kathryn	General Public	GP_WI_1114_648	11.9-456
Crawford, Mark and Sherry	General Public	GP_EM_1020_078	11.9-458
Crebbin, Mike	General Public	GP_MC_1020_212	11.9-461
Creely, Elizabeth	General Public	GP_WI_0922_003	11.9-464
Criss, Brandon	General Public	GP_MC_1020_221 GP_LT_1018_350 Duplicate of GP_MC_1020_221	11.9-466 AA-434
Crosby, Peter	General Public	GP_WI_1111_570	11.9-470
Cross, Shane	General Public	GP_EM_1212_1032	11.9-472
Culbertson, Shelly	General Public	GP_WI_1219_1096 Duplicate of GP_WI_1216_1044	AA-435
Cummings, Norma	General Public	GP_MF_1025_306	11.9-474
Cunningham, Mary	General Public	GP_WI_1003_017	11.9-476
Cziglenyi, Ildiko	General Public	GP_WI_1114_666 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-436
Dana, Dorothy	General Public	GP_LT_1208_1009	11.9-478
Dana, Mark	General Public	GP_EM_1230_1214 GP_WI_1230_1215 Duplicate of GP_EM_1230_1214	11.9-483 AA-437
Daniel	General Public	GP_WI_1111_539	11.9-492
Darin	General Public	GP_WI_1107_389	11.9-494

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Davey, John	General Public	GP_WI_1111_520	11.9-496
David, Aaron	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1164	11.9-498
Davis, G.	General Public	GP_MC_1020_231	11.9-500
Davis, Mark	General Public	GP_WI_1112_584	11.9-505
Davis, Robert	General Public	GP_MC_1020_219	11.9-507
Davis, Robert B.	General Public	GP_EM_1230_1205	11.9-512
		GP_EM_1230_1207	11.9-514
		GP_EM_1230_1218	11.9-516
Davis, Robert E.	General Public	GP_LT_1128_936	11.9-521
		GP_LT_1208_994	AA-440
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1128_936	
Davis, Sandra	General Public	GP_MC_1020_209	11.9-531
Dawson, Mike	General Public	GP_MC_1018_135	11.9-537
Dealey, David S.	General Public	GP_MF_1122_896	11.9-539
Defoe, David	General Public	GP_LT_1122_885	11.9-543
Deluca, Tom	General Public	GP_WI_1111_554	11.9-545
Dencer, Ken	General Public	GP_MC_1018_126	11.9-547
Dencer, Patricia	General Public	GP_EM_1031_261	11.9-549
		GP_MC_1018_127	11.9-551
		GP_LT_1018_043	11.9-554
Dennis, Diane	General Public	GP_WI_1018_035	11.9-558
Denton, John	General Public	GP_WI_1011_026	11.9-560
Derosé, Lani	General Public	GP_MF_1029_260	11.9-562
Deutsch, Sierra	General Public	GP_WI_1229_1190	11.9-564
Devin	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1157	AA-447
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	
deVries, Gus	General Public	GP_WI_1114_674	11.9-566
deVries, H.	General Public	GP_MF_1114_681	11.9-568
Di Stefano, Jacqueline	General Public	GP_LT_1208_979	11.9-570
Difuntorum, Sami Jo	General Public	GP_EM_1029_252	11.9-572
		GP_WI_1111_571	11.9-574
Dina	General Public	GP_WI_1115_686	11.9-576
Dinda	General Public	GP_WI_1116_709	11.9-578
Dittner, Gearldine	General Public	GP_LT_1020_536	AA-448
		Duplicate of GP_MC_1020_232	
		GP_MC_1020_232	11.9-580
Diver, Sibyl	General Public	GP_EM_1121_866	11.9-584
Doherty, Mike	General Public	GP_EM_1118_770	11.9-586
		GP_LT_1122_894	AA-449
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_770	
		GP_LT_1128_922	11.9-589
		Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	
		GP_LT_1208_981	AA-450
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_770	
		GP_LT_1208_1004	AA-451
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_770	
		GP_EM_1118_1143	AA-452
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_770	
Donohue, Karen	General Public	GP_WI_1114_641	11.9-591

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Dordon, Nick	General Public	GP_LT_1122_893	11.9-593
		GP_LT_1208_985	AA-454
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1122_893	
Dorsey, Dan	General Public	GP_EM_1118_760	11.9-595
Dotson, David	General Public	GP_MC_1018_163	11.9-597
Dotta, Tom	General Public	GP_EM_1106_247	11.9-599
Dowling, Beverly	General Public	GP_LT_1230_1228	11.9-601
Drekmeier, Peter	General Public	GP_EM_1216_1065	11.9-603
Drennon, Craig and Nancy	General Public	GP_EM_0929_014	11.9-605
DuBois, Jeffry	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1166	11.9-607
Duerr, Carolyn	General Public	GP_MC_1020_230	11.9-609
Duerr, Herbert	General Public	GP_LT_1208_984	11.9-612
		GP_LT_1122_891	11.9-614
		GP_LT_1020_274	11.9-616
Duerr, Herbert and Carolyn	General Public	GP_LT_1122_890	11.9-620
		Partial Duplicate of GP_LT_1020_274	
		GP_LT_1208_987	AA-455
Dunklin, Thomas	General Public	Duplicate of GP_LT_1122_890	
		GP_MF_1025_242	11.9-623
Dunn, Susan	General Public	GP_MC_1026_322	11.9-625
		GP_WI_1116_690	11.9-628
DuPont, Mark	Mid Klamath Watershed Council	GP_MC_1025_300	11.9-630
Dysart, Ralph	General Public	GP_WI_1112_618	AA-457
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Eastlick, Carl	General Public	GP_EM_1122_872	11.9-635
Ebert, Linda	General Public	GP_MC_1020_206	11.9-641
Ebert, Carl and Linda	General Public	GP_LT_1018_346	AA-458
		Duplicate of GP_MC_1020_206	
Edward J.	General Public	GP_LT_1123_937	11.9-645
Edwards, Benjamin	General Public	GP_WI_1111_532	AA-461
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Edward Griffman, Ronald	General Public	GP_EM_1118_1144	11.9-647
Ehr, Allen	General Public	GP_EM_1116_1124	11.9-649
		GP_EM_1220_1103	11.9-651
Elerck, Nancy	General Public	GP_LT_1208_992	AA-462
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1121_867	
Engle, E.T.	General Public	GP_WI_1114_636	11.9-653
		GP_WI_1114_637	AA-464
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1114_636	
Ereshan, Lynda	General Public	GP_WI_1220_1102	AA-465
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1216_1044	
Ericson, Gail	General Public	GP_MC_1026_321	11.9-655
Estrella, Jose	General Public	GP_LT_1109_460	AA-466
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Etgen, Benjamin	General Public	GP_EM_1117_733	AA-467
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1115_685	

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Evans, Caye	General Public	GP_LT_1109_455 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-468
Evans, Stephen M.	General Public	GP_WI_1110_479	11.9-658
Evans Rhodenbaugh, Pamela	General Public	GP_EM_1121_864	11.9-660
		GP_EM_1121_1059 Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_864	AA-469
Exter, Robert	General Public	GP_EM_1120_832	11.9-662
		GP_EM_1120_1029 Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_832	AA-470
Fagerskog, Trevor	General Public	GP_WI_1111_508 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-471
Fajardo, Leslee	General Public	GP_LT_1109_459 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-472
Farrell, Devin	General Public	GP_WI_1111_534 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-473
Fay, John	Cal Trout & Trout Unlimited	GP_WI_1114_660	11.9-665
Ferguson, Frances	General Public	GP_LT_1106_396	11.9-667
Ferguson, Jim	General Public	GP_EM_1113_1084 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-474
Ferguson, John	General Public	GP_LT_1109_440 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-475
Ferguson, Patrick	General Public	GP_WI_1112_613 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-476
Fernandez, Nancy	General Public	GP_EM_1120_1155 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-477
Fernandez, Ron	General Public	GP_EM_1126_903	11.9-670
		GP_EM_1126_1051 Duplicate of GP_EM_1126_903	AA-478
Fernandez - Volking, Sara	General Public	GP_LT_1109_425 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-479
Ferroggiaro, Suzanne	General Public	GP_EM_1115_683	11.9-672
Fheyr, Ly	General Public	GP_LT_1109_443 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-480
Fiel, John and Gaylee	General Public	GP_LT_1125_924 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-674
		GP_LT_1208_986 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-481
Figone, Julianne L.	General Public	GP_LT_1128_921	11.9-677
		GP_LT_1208_995 Duplicate of GP_LT_1128_921	AA-483

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Filtina, Don and Dennessa	General Public	GP_LT_1125_932 Partial Duplicate of GP_LT_1121_867	11.9-679
Finch, Che	General Public	GP_WI_1229_1187	11.9-682
Fine, Joel	General Public	GP_EM_1120_817 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-684
Finses, James	General Public	GP_LT_1025_258	11.9-686
Fischer, Kris	General Public	GP_MC_1018_153	11.9-688
Fisher, Konrad	General Public	GP_WI_1110_416 GP_MC_1025_290	11.9-690 11.9-692
Fisher, Shirley	General Public	GP_LT_1208_1174	11.9-696
Fisher, Stephen	General Public	GP_MC_1020_200 GP_LT_1020_273 Duplicate of GP_MC_1020_200	11.9-706 AA-484
Fitzpatrick, Jan	General Public	GP_WI_1103_365 Duplicate of GP_WI_1103_364	AA-485
Flackus, R.	General Public	GP_MF_1019_056	11.9-711
Fletcher, Kelly	General Public	GP_EM_1118_782 GP_EM_1119_1150 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_782	11.9-714 AA-486
Foley, James	General Public	GP_MC_1020_194	11.9-716
Ford, Julie	General Public	GP_WI_1112_583	11.9-719
Foster, John	General Public	GP_WI_1111_542	11.9-721
Foster, Terry & Norton, Jeffrey	General Public	GP_EM_0928_010	11.9-723
Fox, Del	General Public	GP_WI_1013_030	11.9-726
Fratus, Karla	General Public	GP_EM_1104_351	11.9-728
Frazee, Cary	General Public	GP_WI_1112_578 GP_WI_1128_920	11.9-730 11.9-732
Freedlund, Ali	General Public	GP_MC_1026_318 GP_WI_1116_720	11.9-734 11.9-737
Freeman, Liz	General Public	GP_EM_1117_730	11.9-739
Frick, Jim	Century 21 Harris and Taylor	GP_EM_1116_711 GP_EM_1116_1127 Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_711 GP_EM_1212_1203	11.9-741 AA-487 11.9-743
Frye, Marion	General Public	GP_EM_1130_947	11.9-745
Fulton, Bob	General Public	GP_EM_1119_778	11.9-747
Fyler, Tom	General Public	GP_EM_1112_576 GP_EM_1111_621	11.9-749 11.9-751
Gabriel, Lincoln	General Public	GP_MC_1018_114	11.9-761
Gabrielli, Chris	General Public	GP_WI_1018_042	11.9-764
Galusha, Frank	General Public	GP_EM_1106_395	11.9-766
Garvey, Lydia	General Public	GP_WI_1118_791 Partial Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480 GP_WI_1210_1015	11.9-773 11.9-775
Gass, Heather	General Public	GP_EM_1104_356	11.9-777
Gelineau, Glenn	General Public	GP_EM_1104_362	11.9-779
Gierak, Dr. Richard A.	General Public	GP_EM_1227_1210 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1021_107	11.9-781

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
		GP_EM_1021_107	11.9-803
		GP_MC_1020_189	11.9-829
		GP_EM_1102_371	11.9-834
		GP_LT_1128_943 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1021_107 & GP_MC_1120_189	11.9-859
Giese, Mark	General Public	GP_WI_1111_529 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-488
		GP_EM_1111_530 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-489
Glaser, Dean	General Public	GP_EM_1117_752	11.9-871
Glass, Larry	General Public	GP_WI_1115_679 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-490
		GP_EM_1115_682 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-491
Glenn	General Public	GP_WI_1107_377	11.9-873
Gliatto, Louise	General Public	GP_MC_1020_223	11.9-875
		GP_LT_1018_349 Duplicate of GP_MC_1020_223	AA-492
		GP_EM_1114_634	11.9-878
Godbey, Mark	General Public	GP_MF_1019_057	11.9-881
Goeller, Steve	General Public	GP_EM_1116_712	11.9-883
		GP_LT_1122_887	11.9-886
		GP_LT_1208_993 Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_712	AA-493
		GP_LT_1230_1223 Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_712	AA-495
		GP_EM_1104_358	11.9-889
Golding, Janette	General Public	GP_EM_1104_358	11.9-889
Goldstein, Michael	General Public	GP_LT_1109_427 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-498
		GP_WI_1204_962	11.9-891
Gorcott, Matt	General Public	GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-893
Graves, Kay	General Public	GP_EM_1117_738	11.9-902
		GP_EM_1117_1136 Duplicate of GP_EM_1117_738	AA-499
		GP_LT_1118_795 Duplicate of GP_EM_1117_738	AA-500
		GP_LT_1208_988 Duplicate of GP_EM_1117_738	AA-501
		GP_WI_1108_401	11.9-904
Grayson, Dennis	General Public	GP_WI_1108_401	11.9-904
Green, Benjamin	General Public	GP_WI_1112_617 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-502
		GP_WI_1018_038	11.9-906
Green, Olivia	General Public	GP_WI_1018_038	11.9-906
Gresdel, Linda	General Public	GP_EM_1018_040	11.9-908

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
		GP_EM_1102_1118	11.9-910
Griffin, Christine	General Public	GP_WI_1108_402	11.9-912
Grobert, Matthew	General Public	GP_WI_1112_603 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-503
Gunn Phillips, Bea	General Public	GP_EM_1122_874 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-914
		GP_LT_1208_989 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-916
Gutierrez, Freddy	General Public	GP_EM_1214_1038	11.9-919
Hadzicki, Carol	General Public	GP_EM_1127_900	11.9-921
		GP_EM_1127_1046 Duplicate of GP_EM_1127_900	AA-504
Hall, James	General Public	GP_WI_1012_028	11.9-923
Hall, Sue	General Public	GP_LT_1017_033	11.9-925
Hall, William	General Public	GP_WI_1205_969	11.9-927
Halbert, Tyson	General Public	GP_WI_1114_673 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-505
Hammons, Kevin	General Public	GP_MC_1020_237	11.9-929
Hann, Eric	General Public	GP_WI_1117_739 Duplicate of GP_WI_1116_717	AA-506
Hansard, Holly	General Public	GP_MC_1020_235	11.9-932
Hanson, John	General Public	GP_WI_0925_005	11.9-936
Harling, Adrienne	General Public	GP_MC_1025_303	11.9-938
Harreld, Chuck	General Public	GP_MC_1018_128	11.9-941
Harris, Dean	General Public	GP_LT_1122_881	11.9-945
		GP_MC_1020_188	11.9-950
		GP_MF_1018_347	11.9-954
Harrison, Norma	General Public	GP_WI_1110_487	11.9-956
		GP_EM_1118_774	11.9-958
Hart, Susan	General Public	GP_EM_1117_754	11.9-960
		GP_EM_1117_1138 Duplicate of GP_EM_1117_754	AA-507
Hatcher, Jo	General Public	GP_EM_1118_786	11.9-963
Hatton, Chris	General Public	GP_MC_1025_291	11.9-965
Haupt, Ray A.	General Public	GP_EM_1118_775	11.9-969
Hayden, Natanya	General Public	GP_MF_1019_074	11.9-973
Haynes, Brenda	General Public	GP_EM_1117_756	11.9-975
Haynes, Marcella	General Public	GP_LT_1227_1179 Duplicate of GP_LT_1118_792	AA-509
Head, Julia	General Public	GP_WI_1229_1184	11.9-977
Heinemann, Paul & Starr	General Public	GP_EM_1120_810	11.9-979
		GP_EM_1120_1135 Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_810	AA-510
Heiney, Wilma	General Public	GP_MC_1018_155	11.9-981
		GP_MF_1019_100	11.9-984
Henry, P.	General Public	GP_WI_1107_379	11.9-986
Henry, William	General Public	GP_WI_1111_560	11.9-989
Herman, Bev	General Public	GP_EM_1118_763	11.9-991

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
		GP_EM_1118_1142 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_763	AA-511
Hernikl, John	General Public	GP_WI_1202_956 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-512
Herrera, Kathy	General Public	GP_WI_0926_006	11.9-993
Hilden, Brian	General Public	GP_WI_1102_310	11.9-995
Hill, Darcy	General Public	GP_WI_1108_406	11.9-997
Hill, Tricia	General Public	GP_MC_1018_162	11.9-1001
Hilliard, Raymond	General Public	GP_WI_1114_653	11.9-1004
Hillman, Annelia	General Public	GP_MC_1020_197	11.9-1006
		GP_MC_1025_295	11.9-1008
Hillman, Chook-Chook	General Public	GP_MC_1025_296	11.9-1010
Hilton, Bonnie	General Public	GP_WI_1109_407	11.9-1014
Hines, Brian	General Public	GP_WI_1112_604 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-513
Hinz, Tom	General Public	GP_WI_1110_488	11.9-1016
Hirsch, William	General Public	GP_WI_1110_476	11.9-1018
Hobbs, David	General Public	GP_WI_1111_593 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-514
Hollenbach, Suzy	General Public	GP_EM_1120_823	11.9-1020
		GP_EM_1120_1024 Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_823	AA-515
Holtrop, Eric	General Public	GP_EM_1031_263	11.9-1022
Holtrop, John	General Public	GP_EM_1103_363	11.9-1024
		GP_EM_1103_1117 Duplicate of GP_EM_1103_363	AA-516
Honey, James	General Public	GP_MC_1018_167	11.9-1026
Hope, Dana	General Public	GP_WI_1117_737 Duplicate of GP_WI_1116_717	AA-517
		GP_EM_1117_1083 Partial Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	11.9-1030
Horne, Gary	General Public	GP_EM_1117_1139	11.9-1032
Horvath, Kyle	General Public	GP_MF_1026_340	11.9-1034
Houston, Harvey	General Public	GP_LT_1019_080	11.9-1036
		GP_MC_1018_143	11.9-1039
		GP_LT_1121_878 Duplicate of GP_LT_1019_080	AA-518
		GP_LT_1128_940 Duplicate of GP_LT_1019_080	AA-520
Hoyt, Werner	General Public	GP_LT_1230_1216	11.9-1044
Hoyu-Nielsen, Suerd	General Public	GP_MF_1019_095	11.9-1065
Huber, William	General Public	GP_EM_1101_282	11.9-1067
Huffaker, Marlane	General Public	GP_LT_1123_930	11.9-1070
		GP_LT_1208_1000 Duplicate of GP_LT_1123_930	AA-521

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Hughes, Bart	General Public	GP_WI_1112_615 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-522
Hughes, Karin	General Public	GP_MC_1018_148	11.9-1072
		GP_LT_1018_278 Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_148	AA-523
Hugo, Donald	General Public	GP_MC_1020_214	11.9-1075
Hull, Danny	General Public	GP_LT_1019_066	11.9-1078
		GP_MC_1018_133	11.9-1081
		GP_MC_1019_177 Partial Duplicate of GP_LT_1019_066	11.9-1085
		GP_LT_1120_844 Partial Duplicate of GP_LT_1019_066	11.9-1090
		GP_LT_1121_877 Duplicate of GP_LT_1019_066	AA-525
		GP_LT_1120_1094 Duplicate of GP_LT_1120_844	AA-527
Hunt, Tanya	General Public	GP_WI_1118_768 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-531
Hurlimann, Andrew	General Public	GP_LT_1020_283	11.9-1095
Hutchison, Vic	General Public	GP_WI_1113_646	11.9-1097
Hyde, Becky	General Public	GP_MC_1018_132	11.9-1099
		GP_MC_1019_181	11.9-1102
Jackman, Jarred	General Public	GP_WI_1005_020	11.9-1104
Jan	General Public	GP_WI_1128_916	11.9-1106
Jaques, John	General Public	GP_WI_1111_553	11.9-1108
Jasfield, Carol	General Public	GP_LT_1109_458 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-532
Jasfield, Clarence	General Public	GP_LT_1109_419 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-533
Jefcoat, Dennis	General Public	GP_MF_1019_102	11.9-1110
		GP_MC_1018_149	11.9-1112
		GP_LT_1101_307	11.9-1117
		GP_MC_1019_178	11.9-1120
Jennings, Craig	General Public	GP_WI_1217_1091 Duplicate of GP_WI_1216_1044	AA-534
Jerry	General Public	GP_WI_1111_526	11.9-1127
Jessen, Stephen	General Public	GP_WI_1110_480	11.9-1129
Jewett, John	General Public	GP_WI_1111_503	11.9-1131
John	General Public	GP_WI_1018_036	11.9-1133
Johnson, Ara	General Public	GP_WI_1111_501	11.9-1135
Johnson, Dale	General Public	GP_EM_1117_749	11.9-1137
Johnson, Dennis	General Public	GP_WI_1116_691	11.9-1140

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Johnson, Mark	General Public	GP_EM_1116_692	11.9-1142
		GP_EM_1212_1021	11.9-1148
		GP_EM_1116_1120	AA-535
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_692	
Johnson, Richard	General Public	GP_EM_1118_784	11.9-1152
		GP_EM_1119_1149	AA-537
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_784	
Johnson, Robert	General Public	GP_WI_1110_491	11.9-1154
Johnson, Rodney	General Public	GP_LT_1020_256	11.9-1156
Johnston, Holly	General Public	GP_WI_1114_670	11.9-1160
Jones, Rosslyn	General Public	GP_EM_1116_719	11.9-1162
		GP_EM_1116_1125	AA-538
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_719	
Jorerst, R. Scott	General Public	GP_LT_1109_457	AA-539
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Jose	General Public	GP_WI_1229_1197	11.9-1164
Joy, Marla	General Public	GP_WI_1108_403	11.9-1166
Kalm, Denise	General Public	GP_LT_1109_462	AA-531
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Kalt, Jennifer	General Public	GP_MC_1026_323	11.9-1168
		GP_MF_1025_241	11.9-1170
Kandra, Steve	General Public	GP_MF_1019_105	11.9-1172
		GP_MC_1018_157	11.9-1174
		GP_LT_1018_343	AA-541
		Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_157	
Karaba, Kelly	General Public	GP_LT_1026_342	11.9-1177
		GP_WI_1118_773	11.9-1179
Karina	General Public	GP_WI_1118_789	11.9-1182
Karrs, David	General Public	GP_WI_1114_638	AA-543
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Kato, Carol	General Public	GP_WI_1120_809	11.9-1184
Kauzlarich, Steve	General Public	GP_LT_1109_444	AA-544
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Kegler, Lori	General Public	GP_WI_1214_1095	AA-545
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	
Keisacker, Michael	General Public	GP_EM_1121_862	11.9-1186
		GP_EM_1121_1061	AA-546
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_862	
Kelleher, Edward	General Public	GP_WI_1111_591	AA-547
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Kellett, Michael	General Public	GP_LT_1109_471	AA-548
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_4181	
Kelly, John	General Public	GP_LT_1109_456	AA-549
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Kemp, Leslie	General Public	GP_EM_1111_504	11.9-1188
Kennedy, Shelly	General Public	GP_WI_1107_381	11.9-1190
Kennedy, William	General Public	GP_MC_1018_140	11.9-1192
Kent, Bart	General Public	GP_MC_1020_185	11.9-1195
		GP_MF_1020_284	11.9-1199
		GP_WI_1006_021	11.9-1200
Kessler, Greg	General Public	GP_WI_1204_964 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-550
Kiefer, Marc	General Public	GP_WI_1202_957	11.9-1202
King, Bob	General Public	GP_MC_1018_122	11.9-1204
King, Mike	General Public	GP_MC_1018_124	11.9-1208
		GP_WI_1121_856	11.9-1211
		GP_WI_1230_1206	11.9-1213
King-Clegg, Lynda	General Public	GP_FX_0928_011	11.9-1215
		GP_LT_1018_049	11.9-1217
		GP_MC_1018_139 Partial Duplicate of GP_LT_1018_049	11.9-1221
		GP_MF_1019_090	11.9-1224
		GP_MF_1230_1230	11.9-1226
Kinker, Judith	General Public	GP_EM_1120_1020 Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_814	AA-551
		GP_EM_1120_814	11.9-1228
Kivela, Leo	General Public	GP_LT_1005_018	11.9-1230
Klein, Stephanie	General Public	GP_WI_1121_835 Duplicate of GP_WI_1116_717	AA-552
Kleppe, Cora Jean	General Public	GP_EM_1121_841 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-553
Knox, Bob	General Public	GP_EM_1122_875 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-554
		GP_EM_1122_1054 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-556
Koene, John	General Public	GP_WI_1112_577	11.9-1239
Kohr, C.	General Public	GP_WI_1110_481 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-558
		GP_WI_1214_1039 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-559
Koke, Nancy	General Public	GP_MC_1026_320	11.9-1241
Korcek, Doug	General Public	GP_EM_1121_843	11.9-1243
Koshy, Stephen	General Public	GP_LT_1012_029	11.9-1248
		GP_LT_1118_794	11.9-1250
		GP_LT_1221_1109	11.9-1255
		GP_LT_1230_1213 Duplicate of GP_LT_1221_1109	AA-560

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Kost, Rod	General Public	GP_LT_1019_067	11.9-1273
		GP_MC_1018_138	11.9-1276
		GP_LT_1122_879	AA-566
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1019_067	
Kress, Larry	General Public	GP_WI_1114_657 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-567
Kristal	General Public	GP_WI_1120_820	11.9-1279
Krizo, Jacqui	General Public	GP_LT_1230_1208	11.9-1281
		GP_WI_1230_1217	AA-568
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1230_1208	
Krohn, Bruce	General Public	GP_WI_1111_557	11.9-1288
Kuhn, Kevin	General Public	GP_WI_1111_600	AA-572
		Duplicate of GP_1111_503	
Lagasse, Brennan	General Public	GP_WI_1111_594	AA-573
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	
Lange, Wendy	General Public	GP_WI_1117_743	11.9-1290
Langley, Mary	General Public	GP_WI_1214_1037	11.9-1292
Lanning, Michael	General Public	GP_WI_1112_609	AA-574
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Lapke, Joe	General Public	GP_EM_1217_1089	11.9-1294
Larimer, John	General Public	GP_EM_1118_785	11.9-1296
		GP_EM_1204_963	11.9-1298
Laursen, Richard	General Public	GP_EM_1120_815	11.9-1301
		GP_EM_1120_1074	AA-575
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_815	
Lefeber, Jim	General Public	GP_WI_1230_1193	11.9-1303
Leiteke, Stewart & Maureen	General Public	GP_MF_1019_059	11.9-1305
Leitzke, Stweart	General Public	GP_MC_1018_118	11.9-1308
Lester, Gail	General Public	GP_WI_1127_902	11.9-1310
Lewandowski, Edward	General Public	GP_LT_1120_806	11.9-1312
		GP_LT_1123_933	AA-576
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1120_806	
		GP_LT_1208_999	AA-578
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1120_806	
		GP_LT_1120_1153	AA-580
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1120_806	
Lewis, Frances	General Public	GP_EM_1121_1071	AA-582
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	
Lieb, Louise	General Public	GP_WI_1111_502 Partial Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	11.9-1316
Lindler, Danielle	General Public	GP_MC_1020_211	11.9-1318

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Lindstedt, Paul A.	General Public	GP_EM_1117_740	11.9-1323
		GP_EM_1117_1133 Duplicate of GP_EM_1117_740	AA-583
Linthicum, Dennis	General Public	GP_MC_1018_119	11.9-1325
Linville, Mike	General Public	GP_WI_1117_758	11.9-1328
Lipmanson, Donald	General Public	GP_WI_1118_764	11.9-1331
Lipscomb, David	General Public	GP_WI_1202_959	AA-584
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Lolmaugh, Julie	General Public	GP_WI_1111_509	AA-585
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Long, Kristine	General Public	GP_WI_1112_610	AA-586
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	
Long, Linda	General Public	GP_MC_1018_154	11.9-1333
		GP_LT_1018_280	AA-587
		Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_154	
Loper, Laura	General Public	GP_WI_1111_523	11.9-1337
Lorence, Pamela	General Public	GP_LT_1109_469	AA-589
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Lippold, Jim	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1159	AA-590
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	
Lufs, Michael	General Public	GP_MF_1019_089	11.9-1339
		GP_MC_1018_141	11.9-1341
Lynn, Trevor	General Public	GP_WI_1104_360	11.9-1347
Mackintosh, Don	General Public	GP_LT_1128_942	11.9-1349
		GP_MC_1020_218	11.9-1352
Madgic, Bob	General Public	GP_EM_1121_838	11.9-1355
Mackintosh, Judy	General Public	GP_LT_1114_699	11.9-1357
Mahony, Lynne	General Public	GP_WI_1111_620	11.9-1365
Malki, Joseph	General Public	GP_WI_1114_654	AA-591
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	
Mallams, Beverly	General Public	GP_MC_1018_170	11.9-1367
		GP_MF_1019_099	11.9-1370
Mallams, Kantica	General Public	GP_MC_1018_168	11.9-1372
		GP_MF_1019_103	11.9-1375
Mallams, Savannah	General Public	GP_MF_1019_104	11.9-1377
		GP_MC_1018_159	11.9-1379
Mallams, Tom	General Public	GP_MC_1018_125	11.9-1382
		GP_MC_1020_236	11.9-1385
		GP_MF_1019_087	11.9-1389
Mallvor, David	General Public	GP_MF_1019_055	11.9-1391
Malmberg, Norman	General Public	GP_MF_1020_286	11.9-1393
Manhart, Stefan	General Public	GP_EM_1230_1196	11.9-1395
March, Sara	General Public	GP_WI_1111_524	11.9-1397
Mareja, Christopher	General Public	GP_LT_1109_433	AA-592
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Marlatt, Ed	General Public	GP_WI_1114_642	AA-593
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Marquez, Kate	General Public	GP_EM_1019_046	11.9-1399
Marshall, Richard	General Public	GP_MC_1020_208	11.9-1401
		GP_LT_1122_883 Duplicate of GP_MC_1020_208	AA-594
		GP_LT_1208_990	11.9-1405
Marshall, Tim	General Public	GP_WI_1112_579	11.9-1414
Martien, Jerry	General Public	GP_MC_1026_319	11.9-1416
		GP_LT_1026_326 Duplicate of GP_MC_1026_319	AA-596
		GP_LT_1208_991 Duplicate of GP_MC_1026_319	AA-597
Martin, Lazaro	General Public	GP_EM_1121_865 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-1419
Martin, Les	General Public	GP_MF_1019_060	11.9-1421
		GP_MF_1019_061	11.9-1423
		GP_LT_1019_064	11.9-1425
Martin, Pat	General Public	GP_LT_1118_796 Partial Duplicate of GP_LT_1117_751	11.9-1429
Martin, Rosada	General Public	GP_WI_1215_1041	11.9-1431
Martti, Christ	General Public	GP_LT_1109_463 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-599
Mason, Ramona	General Public	GP_WI_1229_1188	11.9-1433
Massie, Tracy	General Public	GP_WI_1113_627 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-600
Mathis, JoAnn & Harold	General Public	GP_EM_1119_779	11.9-1435
		GP_EM_1119_780	11.9-1437
		GP_EM_1119_1146 Duplicate of GP_EM_1119_779	AA-601
Matt	Stoecker Ecological	GP_WI_1216_1044	11.9-1439
Mattenberger, Sue	General Public	GP_EM_1112_581	11.9-1441
Matthew	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1115 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-602
May, Richard	General Public	GP_WI_1114_667	11.9-1443
May, Theresa	General Public	GP_EM_1117_1079	11.9-1445
McAuliffe, Ambrose	General Public	GP_MC_1018_171	11.9-1516
McBaine, Marsha	General Public	GP_EM_1031_262	11.9-1520
McCamant, John	General Public	GP_WI_1111_552	11.9-1522
McCann-Sayles, Alan	General Public	GP_WI_1118_761	11.9-1524
McCann-Sayles, Daniel	General Public	GP_WI_1208_978	11.9-1526
McClelland, Jonathan	General Public	GP_WI_1118_769	11.9-1528
McConnel, Tom	General Public	GP_WI_1121_845	11.9-1530
McCovey, B	General Public	GP_MC_1025_297	11.9-1532
McCovey, Beavi	General Public	GP_MC_1020_227	11.9-1536
McCovey, Kathleen	General Public	GP_EM_1209_1014	11.9-1539

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
McCovey, Mavis	General Public	GP_MC_1025_289	11.9-1541
		GP_LT_1227_1180	11.9-1544
		GP_LT_1230_1224	AA-603
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1227_1180	
McCovey, Shaunna	General Public	GP_WI_1006_023	11.9-1552
McCoy, Pauley	General Public	GP_WI_1111_547	11.9-1556
McCullough, David	General Public	GP_LT_1114_697	11.9-1558
McCullough, Rosslynne	General Public	GP_EM_1120_816	11.9-1562
McDonald, Don Scott	General Public	GP_WI_1111_505	11.9-1564
McDonald, Meg	General Public	GP_EM_0922_001	11.9-1566
		GP_WI_0922_002	AA-609
		Duplicate of GP_EM_0922_001	
McEwan, Robert	General Public	GP_WI_1111_555	11.9-1569
		GP_WI_1201_953	AA-611
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_555	
McFall, Harold	General Public	GP_MC_1020_226	11.9-1571
McFarland, Stu	General Public	GP_WI_1112_602	AA-612
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
McGilvray, Elizabeth	General Public	GP_MC_1018_147	11.9-1575
McGinn, Dano	General Public	GP_WI_1229_1192	11.9-1577
McGuire, Sue	General Public	GP_EM_1118_787	11.9-1579
		GP_EM_1119_1151	AA-613
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_787	
McKinney, Melvin	General Public	GP_LT_1125_946	11.9-1583
McLaughlin, Michael	General Public	GP_WI_1220_1106	11.9-1585
McMillan, Cliff	General Public	GP_WI_1018_044	11.9-1587
		GP_EM_1018_045	AA-614
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1018_044	
McQuillen, Jim	General Public	GP_MF_1218_1100	11.9-1591
McRoberts, Julie	General Public	GP_LT_1117_751	11.9-1593
McTavish, Anne	General Public	GP_WI_1112_616	AA-616
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
McTear, Jeff	General Public	GP_WI_1108_399	11.9-1596
McVay, James	General Public	GP_LT_1024_254	11.9-1598
		GP_LT_1108_405	AA-617
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1024_254	
		GP_LT_1208_1173	AA-619
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1024_254	
Meamber, Don	General Public	GP_EM_1022_183	11.9-1601
		GP_MC_1020_234	11.9-1608
Menke, John	General Public	GP_MC_1020_203	11.9-1611
Mercado, Marisa	General Public	GP_WI_1113_645	11.9-1617
Merill, Cherye	General Public	GP_MF_1019_052	11.9-1619
Merz, Karolyn	General Public	GP_WI_1111_500	11.9-1621
Meyer, Jon	General Public	GP_WI_1111_537	11.9-1623
Meyers, Betty	General Public	GP_WI_1016_032	11.9-1625
Miho	General Public	GP_WI_1116_705	11.9-1627
Mike	General Public	GP_WI_1111_569	11.9-1629

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Mike	General Public	GP_EM_1118_1145 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-621
Millard, James	General Public	GP_WI_1228_1186	11.9-1631
Miller, Jennifer	General Public	GP_WI_1229_1183	11.9-1633
Miller, Krista	General Public	GP_WI_1006_022	11.9-1635
Mitchell, Constance	General Public	GP_EM_1120_1026	11.9-1637
Mitchell, Jason	General Public	GP_WI_1111_549	11.9-1639
Mitchell, Jeff	General Public	GP_MF_1019_093	11.9-1641
Mittelstaedt, Don	General Public	GP_WI_1201_954	11.9-1643
Moffatt, Alden	General Public	GP_WI_1011_027	11.9-1645
Mogerley, Carl	General Public	GP_WI_1113_629 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-624
Moir, Jim	General Public	GP_WI_1126_905	11.9-1647
Molamphy, Michael	General Public	GP_WI_1224_1168	11.9-1649
Molinari, Jim	General Public	GP_WI_1111_545	11.9-1651
Moniz, Bill	General Public	GP_EM_1127_901 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-625
		GP_EM_1123_1050 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-627
Monkerud, Carol Hamilton	General Public	GP_EM_1116_721	11.9-1653
Morris, Jim	General Public	GP_MF_1128_935	11.9-1655
Morse, Susan	General Public	GP_LT_1109_426	AA-629
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Moschetti, Michele	General Public	GP_WI_1116_725	11.9-1657
Moser, Becky	General Public	GP_WI_1115_685	11.9-1659
Mosler, Larry	General Public	GP_EM_1120_807	11.9-1661
Mueller, Rex	General Public	GP_WI_1205_961	11.9-1663
Mulholland, Scott	General Public	GP_WI_1115_675	AA-630
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Muniz, Sotero	General Public	GP_EM_1123_911	11.9-1666
Munro, Ross	General Public	GP_WI_1112_607	AA-631
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Munsen, Donna	General Public	GP_EM_1123_910	11.9-1668
		GP_EM_1123_1052	AA-632
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1123_910	
Murdock, Lois	General Public	GP_LT_1109_439	AA-633
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Murphy, Joanne	General Public	GP_MF_1019_053	11.9-1670
Murphy, P.D.	General Public	GP_EM_1116_1132	11.9-1672
		GP_EM_1116_731	11.9-1674
Murphy, Ronald	General Public	GP_MF_1019_051	11.9-1676
Myers, Daunce	General Public	GP_LT_1109_465	AA-634
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Myers, Howard	General Public	GP_EM_1120_804	11.9-1678
		GP_EM_1120_1152 Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_804	AA-635
		GP_EM_1212_1199	11.9-1680
		GP_MF_1020_202	11.9-1682
Myers, Melissa Star	General Public	GP_MC_1018_164	11.9-1684
Nash, Caroline	General Public	GP_MF_1019_091	11.9-1689
Nathan, Shirley	General Public	GP_EM_1121_831	11.9-1691
		GP_EM_1120_1030 Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_831	AA-636
		GP_EM_1120_1076 Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_831	AA-637
		GP_LT_1125_931 Partial Duplicate of GP_LT_1118_751	11.9-1693
Naylor, T	General Public	GP_LT_1118_751	11.9-1693
		GP_EM_1123_913	11.9-1695
		GP_EM_1123_1053 Duplicate of GP_EM_1123_913	AA-638
Nazara, Joel	General Public	GP_EM_1107_385	11.9-1697
Neander, Wendy	General Public	GP_MC_1026_367	11.9-1699
Nelson, Denver	General Public	GP_EM_1026_249	11.9-1702
Neumann, Rachel	General Public	GP_EM_1027_246	11.9-1704
Neumann, Yeshi	General Public	GP_WI_1111_563	11.9-1706
Ng, Douglas	General Public	GP_WI_0927_009	11.9-1708
Nichols, Dani	General Public	GP_WI_1115_676	11.9-1710
Nichols, Karen	General Public	GP_MC_1018_145	11.9-1712
Nicholson, Roger	General Public	GP_WI_1114_643	AA-639
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Nicholson, Tom	General Public	GP_EM_1116_729	11.9-1715
		GP_EM_1116_1130 Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_729	AA-640
		GP_EM_1116_729	
Nippe, Andree	General Public	GP_WI_1121_853	11.9-1719
		GP_EM_1121_854 Duplicate of GP_WI_1121_853	AA-642
		GP_EM_1121_855 Duplicate of GP_WI_1121_853	AA-643
		GP_EM_1121_1063 Duplicate of GP_WI_1121_853	AA-644
		GP_WI_1112_588	11.9-1721
		GP_WI_1121_852	11.9-1723
Noel	General Public	GP_EM_1121_829	11.9-1725
Noel, Cynthia	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1116 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-645
Norma	General Public	GP_LT_1109_464 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-646
Nuchols, Emily	General Public		
Nulligan, Nancy	General Public		

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
O'Connell, Edward and Rita	General Public	GP_LT_1122_895 Duplicate of GP_LT_1121_867	AA-647
Oakes, Kirk	General Public	GP_MC_1019_175	11.9-1727
Oakley, Dale	General Public	GP_EM_1120_818	11.9-1730
		GP_EM_1120_1019 Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_818	AA-649
Oehlert, Elizabeth	General Public	GP_EM_1119_777	11.9-1732
		GP_LT_1123_929 Duplicate of GP_EM_1119_777	AA-650
		GP_LT_1208_996 Duplicate of GP_EM_1119_777	AA-651
		GP_EM_1118_1147 Duplicate of GP_EM_1119_777	AA-652
Ogan, Chet	General Public	GP_MF_1025_240	11.9-1734
		GP_MF_1026_329	11.9-1736
Ohanian, Laura	General Public	GP_WI_1112_586	11.9-1738
Ohman, Gordon	General Public	GP_LT_1116_708	11.9-1740
Ojera, Stephen	General Public	GP_LT_1109_436 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-653
Oldfather, Felicia	General Public	GP_MC_1026_317	11.9-1742
Oliver, Ken	General Public	GP_WI_1117_736	11.9-1745
Olson, Dick	General Public	GP_EM_1212_1031	11.9-1747
Olson, Jon	General Public	GP_EM_1115_684	11.9-1749
Ore, Elaine	General Public	GP_LT_1114_698 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-654
Ormsby, Jon	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1160 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-655
Orosz, James	General Public	GP_WI_1112_612 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-656
Ortega, Jennifer	General Public	GP_WI_1116_724	11.9-1751
Osborne, Dennis	General Public	GP_WI_1209_1013 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-657
Ottoman, James	General Public	GP_LT_1017_034 Duplicate of GP_LT_1018_082	AA-658
		GP_LT_1018_082	11.9-1753
Ottoman, Jim	General Public	GP_MC_1018_113	11.9-1755
Owen, Dan	General Public	GP_EM_1119_1112	11.9-1760
Oxley, David	General Public	GP_EM_1121_1072	11.9-1762
Oyarzo, LaVerne	General Public	GP_EM_1122_898	11.9-1764
Pace, Felice	General Public	GP_MC_1027_312	11.9-1766
Paine, Howard	General Public	GP_LT_1024_255	11.9-1771
Pandozzi, John	General Public	GP_MF_1019_063	11.9-1775
Paoluccio, Joseph	General Public	GP_WI_1111_568	11.9-1778
Park, Noel	General Public	GP_EM_1209_1007	11.9-1780

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Parks, Jim	General Public	GP_WI_1113_626 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-659
Parkhurst, Dennis	General Public	GP_EM_1112_572	11.9-1782
Parrett, Steven	General Public	GP_WI_1018_039	11.9-1784
Parson, Scott	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1114 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-660
Pascoe, Carol	General Public	GP_EM_1120_884	11.9-1786
Pat	General Public	GP_LT_1109_434 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-661
Patterson, Jesse	General Public	GP_MF_1019_069	11.9-1789
Patty, Nancy	General Public	GP_EM_1120_1023	11.9-1791
Paul, Helen	General Public	GP_EM_1018_041	11.9-1793
Paul, Mark	General Public	GP_WI_1116_717	11.9-1795
Paull, Ben	General Public	GP_WI_1111_531	11.9-1797
Paxton, Ken	General Public	GP_EM_1104_355 GP_LT_1208_983 Duplicate of GP_LT_1122_892 GP_LT_1122_892	11.9-1799 AA-662 11.9-1801
Payne, Frank	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1163	11.9-1803
Pearce, Russ	General Public	GP_WI_1203_966	11.9-1805
Pearson, Rhiana	General Public	GP_EM_1121_837 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_836	11.9-1807
Penfield, Ralph	General Public	GP_WI_1111_497	11.9-1809
Penn, Susan	General Public	GP_EM_1121_848 GP_EM_1121_1066 Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_848	11.9-1811 AA-663
Penso, Gail	General Public	GP_WI_1205_968	11.9-1813
Perricelli, Claire	General Public	GP_LT_1206_1172 GP_MC_1026_316 GP_MF_1026_325 Duplicate of GP_MC_1026_316	11.9-1815 11.9-1818 AA-664
Perry, Fran	General Public	GP_WI_1120_828	11.9-1820
Perry, Meredith	General Public	GP_LT_1118_798	11.9-1822
Peters, Norlyn	General Public	GP_WI_1118_762	11.9-1825
Peterson, Jo	General Public	GP_MF_1117_750	11.9-1827
Peterson, Mevanwie	General Public	GP_WI_1201_951	11.9-1829
Petes, Bob	General Public	GP_EM_1121_840 GP_EM_1121_1069 Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_840	11.9-1831 AA-665
Petes, Robert	General Public	GP_WI_1114_659	11.9-1833
Peugh, Ken	General Public	GP_MF_1025_243 GP_MC_1025_304	11.9-1835 11.9-1837
Phelps, Pam	General Public	GP_EM_1121_858	11.9-1840
Phelps, Tom and Pam	General Public	GP_EM_1121_1062 Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_858	AA-666
Phillips, Corley	General Public	GP_WI_1113_630 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-667

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Phillips, Robert	General Public	GP_WI_1218_1088	11.9-1842
Pierce, Dianne	General Public	GP_EM_1121_836	11.9-1844
Pierce, Donald	General Public	GP_WI_1113_631 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-668
Pisani, William	General Public	GP_EM_1121_1073	11.9-1846
Pitre, Helen	General Public	GP_WI_1111_499	11.9-1848
Plank, Gareth	General Public	GP_MC_1020_233	11.9-1850
Pohlman, Ralph	General Public	GP_WI_1112_582	11.9-1854
Potter, Dave & Kirsten	General Public	GP_EM_1020_077	11.9-1856
Powell, Anna	General Public	GP_MF_1020_288	11.9-1858
Powell, Brett	General Public	GP_WI_1111_595 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-669
Pozzi Demuth, Lyn	General Public	GP_LT_1123_926	11.9-1860
		GP_LT_1208_998 Duplicate of GP_LT_1123_926	AA-670
Pratum, Tom	General Public	GP_LT_1223_1171	11.9-1862
Preston, Dawn	General Public	GP_LT_1109_422 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-671
Price, Tony	General Public	GP_WI_1111_565	11.9-1864
Pryor, Geoff	General Public	GP_WI_1114_662	11.9-1866
Quincy, Craig	General Public	GP_WI_1112_606 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-672
Quinlan, Jeremy	General Public	GP_WI_1223_1167	11.9-1868
Quinn, Kevin	General Public	GP_MC_1018_146	11.9-1870
Rabe, Andrea	General Public	GP_MC_1018_117	11.9-1874
Radieeve, Gina	General Public	GP_WI_1110_484 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-673
Rae, James	General Public	GP_MC_1020_196	11.9-1878
Ramage, Kelsey	General Public	GP_WI_1107_392	11.9-1881
Rapalyea, Stephen	General Public	GP_WI_1015_031 Duplicate of GP_EM_1015_266	AA-674
		GP_MC_1018_116	11.9-1883
		GP_EM_1015_266	11.9-1890
Rapoza, Terry	General Public	GP_EM_1116_701	11.9-1894
		GP_EM_1117_744	11.9-1896
		GP_EM_1116_1122 Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_701	AA-675
		GP_EM_1117_1134 Duplicate of GP_EM_1117_744	AA-676
Ratcliff, Phillip	General Public	GP_WI_1118_771 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-677
Ratliff, Marillyn	General Public	GP_EM_1120_824	11.9-1898
		GP_EM_1120_1070 Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_824	AA-678
Rea, James	General Public	GP_LT_1020_267	11.9-1900
Reagan, Pamela	General Public	GP_WI_1111_556	11.9-1902

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Recchia, Dick	General Public	GP_WI_1111_511 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-679
Reedy, Gary	General Public	GP_WI_1227_1170	11.9-1904
Reid, Daniel	General Public	GP_WI_1204_976	11.9-1906
Reid, Javan & Alexandra	General Public	GP_WI_1206_972	11.9-1908
Reid, Lynn	General Public	GP_WI_1213_1034	11.9-1910
Reschke, Wener	General Public	GP_MC_1018_158	11.9-1912
Reuter, Cecelia	General Public	GP_EM_1116_694	11.9-1918
Reynolds, Chrissie	General Public	GP_MC_1020_204	11.9-1920
Reynolds, Sarge	General Public	GP_EM_1116_706	11.9-1925
		GP_EM_1116_1129 Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_706	AA-680
		GP_EM_1212_1201	11.9-1927
Rhea, Ina	General Public	GP_EM_1121_834	11.9-1929
Rhode, Robert	General Public	GP_WI_1109_414	11.9-1931
Rickard, Lee	General Public	GP_MC_1020_199	11.9-1933
		GP_MF_1020_271	11.9-1936
Rickard, Tom	General Public	GP_MC_1020_191	11.9-1938
		GP_EM_1117_753	11.9-1942
Ritchie, Thomas	General Public	GP_WI_1111_566	11.9-1945
Riter, Kristen	General Public	GP_MC_1020_228	11.9-1947
		GP_LT_1020_268	11.9-1951
		GP_LT_1230_1218	11.9-1953
		GP_LT_1230_1219 Duplicate of GP_LT_1230_1218	AA-681
Riter, Steve	General Public	GP_LT_1230_1211	11.9-2003
Robbi, Marc	General Public	GP_MC_1025_298	11.9-2016
Robinson, Bruce	General Public	GP_LT_1229_1212	11.9-2020
		GP_LT_1230_1229 Duplicate of GP_LT_1229_1212	AA-707
Robo, Jason	General Public	GP_WI_1116_714	11.9-2024
Rodriquez, Greg	General Public	GP_EM_1121_851	11.9-2026
Roe, Jim	General Public	GP_EM_1123_908	11.9-2028
Ron	General Public	GP_WI_1116_700	11.9-2030
Root, Barbara	General Public	GP_WI_1116_728 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-709
Roseberry, Garrett	General Public	GP_MF_1019_062	11.9-2032
Roseman, James C	General Public	GP_WI_1109_412	11.9-2034
Rossini, Gene	General Public	GP_MC_1020_216	11.9-2036
Rummel, Travis	General Public	GP_WI_1217_1093 Duplicate of GP_WI_1216_1044	AA-710
Russell, Kerry	General Public	GP_EM_1118_801 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-2039
Russell, Wendy	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1161 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-711

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Ryan, Bill	General Public	GP_EM_1111_533 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-712
		GP_EM_1111_1119 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-713
Ryan, Lynn	General Public	GP_MF_1025_239	11.9-2043
		GP_EM_1128_939	11.9-2045
Ryan, Wayne	General Public	GP_LT_1109_472 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-714
Salo, Steven	General Public	GP_WI_1116_687	11.9-2048
Sandigo, Henry	General Public	GP_WI_1111_622	11.9-2050
Sands, Duane	General Public	GP_EM_1117_1140	11.9-2052
Sandusky, Ken	Salmon Liberation Organization	GP_WI_1227_1178	11.9-2054
SanFilippo, Steve	General Public	GP_MF_1102_315	11.9-2056
SanFilippo, Teresa	General Public	GP_MF_1102_314	11.9-2058
Sang Lee Chung, Hyo	General Public	GP_EM_1216_1086	11.9-2060
Sargent, Christine	General Public	GP_EM_1109_413	11.9-2064
Santori Cash, Nancy	General Public	GP_LT_1011_025	11.9-2066
Sargent, Nadine	General Public	GP_LT_1110_473	11.9-2069
Savage, William	General Public	GP_WI_1120_812 Partial Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	11.9-2071
Sawaske, Spencer	General Public	GP_WI_1111_550	11.9-2073
Saxon, Joshua	General Public	GP_MC_1025_299	11.9-2075
		GP_LT_1122_886	11.9-2078
Scalas, Belinda	General Public	GP_MC_1018_131	11.9-2080
		GP_LT_1018_277 Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_131	AA-715
Scharff, Mark	General Public	GP_EM_1117_741	11.9-2083
Schell, Barbara	General Public	GP_EM_1120_811	11.9-2085
		GP_EM_1120_1018 Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_811	AA-717
Scher, Sarah	General Public	GP_WI_1117_742	11.9-2087
Schillo, Noah	General Public	GP_WI_1111_599 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-718
Schmidt, Eric	General Public	GP_MF_1128_945	11.9-2089
Schmidt, Hermalee	General Public	GP_WI_1027_747 Duplicate of GP_WI_1027_247	AA-719
		GP_WI_1027_247	11.9-2094
Schoener, Jen	General Public	GP_WI_1217_1081	11.9-2096
Scholey, Monica	General Public	GP_WI_1111_623 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-720
Scott, Cameron	General Public	GP_MF_1019_071	11.9-2098
Scott, John	General Public	GP_EM_1118_765 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_729	11.9-2100
Seeger, Galena	General Public	GP_WI_1116_713	11.9-2102
Sees, Larry & Joan	General Public	GP_WI_0930_015	11.9-2104
Selbach, Willian & Jean	General Public	GP_EM_1106_388	11.9-2106
Sharpe, Charles	General Public	GP_WI_1107_391	11.9-2108

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Shaw, Chris	General Public	GP_MF_1019_054	11.9-2110
		GP_MF_1019_094	11.9-2112
		GP_MC_1018_110	11.9-2114
Shere, Lindsey	General Public	GP_EM_1111_546	11.9-2116
Sherman, Lauryn	General Public	GP_EM_1110_477	11.9-2118
		GP_WI_1110_478	AA-721
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1110_477	
Shetler, Richard & Cherie	General Public	GP_EM_1104_352	11.9-2120
Shoemaker, Bruce	General Public	GP_EM_1111_495	11.9-2122
Shum, Michael	General Public	GP_WI_1207_974	11.9-2124
Sicular, Daniel	General Public	GP_WI_1111_519	AA-728
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Siegel, T.	General Public	GP_LT_1109_441	AA-729
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Siegfried, Rick	General Public	GP_WI_1110_496	AA-730
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	
Sill, Majorie	General Public	GP_WI_1111_543	11.9-2126
Sills, Linda	General Public	GP_EM_1128_1043	11.9-2128
		GP_EM_1128_914	11.9-2130
Silver, Dan	General Public	GP_WI_1111_510	AA-725
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Silver, Don	General Public	GP_EM_1128_919	11.9-2132
Simmons, Cheryl Denise	General Public	GP_EM_1128_899	11.9-2134
		GP_EM_1128_1047	AA-726
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1128_899	
Simon, Daniel	General Public	GP_MC_1020_217	11.9-2136
		GP_LT_1116_722	11.9-2140
		GP_WI_1116_726	AA-727
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1116_722	
Simpson, Ruth	General Public	GP_EM_1105_387	11.9-2145
Simpson, Suzanne	General Public	GP_WI_1116_710	11.9-2147
Sims, Ray	General Public	GP_LT_1220_1231	11.9-2149
Singer, Harry	General Public	GP_WI_1111_513	AA-731
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Siodmak, Lynne	General Public	GP_WI_1219_1099	11.9-2153
Sizemore, Helen	General Public	GP_WI_1107_390	11.9-2155
Sjoberg, Craig	General Public	GP_EM_1107_384	11.9-2157
Skinner, Scott	General Public	GP_EM_1119_1152	11.9-2159
Skiptis, Greg	General Public	GP_EM_1116_704	11.9-2161
Slocum, Janice	General Public	GP_LT_1109_431	AA-732
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Smith, A	General Public	GP_WI_1019_048	11.9-2163
Smith, Das	General Public	GP_WI_1202_960	11.9-2165
Smith, Donald	General Public	GP_WI_1110_485	11.9-2167
Smith, James	General Public	GP_WI_1114_635	11.9-2169

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Smith, Josette	General Public	GP_EM_1120_803	11.9-2171
Smith, Latimer	General Public	GP_WI_1130_948	11.9-2173
Smith, Maudie	General Public	GP_MF_1019_068	11.9-2175
		GP_MF_1019_096	11.9-2177
		GP_MC_1018_172	11.9-2179
Smith, Phyllis	General Public	GP_LT_1202_970	11.9-2181
		GP_LT_1208_1005 Duplicate of GP_LT_1202_970	AA-733
Smith, Robert L.	General Public	GP_EM_1116_1128	11.9-2187
		GP_EM_1212_1202	11.9-2189
Smith, Suzanne	General Public	GP_EM_1021_098	11.9-2191
Smithson, Julie Kay	General Public	GP_EM_1115_680	11.9-2193
Snook, Joseph	General Public	GP_EM_1117_746	11.9-2197
Sohn, Robert	General Public	GP_EM_1120_827	AA-735
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	
		GP_EM_1120_1027 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-738
Solis, Alberto	General Public	GP_WI_1111_538	11.9-2199
Solway, Sean	General Public	GP_WI_1111_506	AA-741
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Southard, Glenda	General Public	GP_MC_1020_207	11.9-2201
		GP_LT_1128_944 Duplicate of GP_MC_1020_207	AA-742
Sowerwine, Jennifer	General Public	GP_EM_1026_248	11.9-2208
Spain, Glen	General Public	GP_MF_1019_088	11.9-2214
		GP_MC_1020_187	11.9-2216
Spotts, Richard	General Public	GP_EM_1117_732	AA-743
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1116_717	
Spott, Richard & Cindy	General Public	GP_WI_1112_574	11.9-2220
Sproull, Janice	General Public	GP_WI_1111_562	11.9-2222
Staats, Jenny	General Public	GP_MC_1025_293	11.9-2224
Stahl, Wayne	General Public	GP_EM_1128_915	11.9-2228
Staunton, Marshall	General Public	GP_MC_1018_169	11.9-2230
Steen, George	General Public	GP_WI_1121_863	11.9-2233
Steffan, Fred	General Public	GP_WI_1111_512	AA-744
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Steitz, Jim	General Public	GP_EM_1114_640	11.9-2236
Stephen, Edward	General Public	GP_WI_1220_1108	11.9-2238
Steward, Stephen & Karen	General Public	GP_WI_1118_788	11.9-2240
Stewart, David	General Public	GP_EM_1120_808	11.9-2242
		GP_EM_1120_1156 Duplicate of GP_EM_1120_808	AA-745
Stewart, John	General Public	GP_WI_1110_494	11.9-2244
Still, Nita	General Public	GP_LT_1105_398	11.9-2246
Stine, Jan	General Public	GP_LT_1109_451	AA-746
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Stoddard, Amy	General Public	GP_WI_1111_596 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-747
Stoecker, Matt	General Public	GP_WI_1111_517 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-748
Stokes, John	General Public	GP_WI_1128_918	11.9-2252
Stone, Mary	General Public	GP_WI_0926_008	11.9-2254
Strange, Joshua	General Public	GP_MC_1027_313	11.9-2256
Strickland, Garrett	General Public	GP_WI_1111_518	11.9-2259
Sturgess, Mark	General Public	GP_WI_1202_955 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-749
Styerh, Paul	General Public	GP_LT_1109_467 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-750
Sudderth, Gerald	General Public	GP_EM_1120_826	11.9-2261
Sullivan, Dan	General Public	GP_WI_1220_1107	11.9-2263
Sullivan, Robert	General Public	GP_WI_1114_671 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-751
Sullivan Murphy, Mary	General Public	GP_LT_1104_359	11.9-2265
		GP_LT_1108_404 Duplicate of GP_LT_1104_359	AA-752
Sultz, LaVerne	General Public	GP_WI_1111_564	11.9-2267
Sunstein, Sara	General Public	GP_EM_1214_1036 Partial Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	11.9-2269
Sutherland, Forrest	General Public	GP_MF_1024_253	11.9-2271
Swank, Roberta	General Public	GP_EM_1120_821 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-2273
		GP_EM_1120_1022 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-753
		GP_EM_1229_1182 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-755
Swanson, Barbara	General Public	GP_WI_1103_369	11.9-2276
Sweizey, Lauren, Paul Sr., and Paul Jr.	General Public	GP_LT_1230_1227	11.9-2278
Swihart, Tim	General Public	GP_WI_1113_614 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-756
Swinney, O' Rourke & Linda	General Public	GP_WI_1116_688	11.9-2280
Sylvesto, R.J.	General Public	GP_LT_1109_418	11.9-2282
		GP_LT_1109_461 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-757
Szymanski, Ron	General Public	GP_WI_1120_813 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-758
Tallerico, Frank	General Public	GP_MC_1020_186	11.9-2284

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Tash, Debra	General Public	GP_EM_1104_353	11.9-2287
		GP_EM_1104_376	AA-759
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1104_353	
		GP_EM_1121_830	11.9-2289
		GP_EM_1213_1035	AA-760
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1104_353	
Taylor, Ben	General Public	GP_EM_1120_1075	AA-761
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1121_830	
Taylor, David	General Public	GP_WI_1111_528	11.9-2291
Taylor, Ross	General Public	GP_LT_1109_447	AA-762
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Tejeda, Richard	General Public	GP_WI_1110_417	11.9-2293
Tenbrink, Victoria	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1165	11.9-2295
Terence, Erica	General Public	GP_MF_1019_072	11.9-2297
		GP_MC_1019_174	11.9-2299
		GP_MF_1019_264	11.9-2304
Terence, Susan	General Public	GP_MC_1020_220	11.9-2307
		GP_MC_1026_324	11.9-2310
Terry	General Public	GP_MC_1025_294	11.9-2314
		GP_EM_1116_693	11.9-2316
		GP_EM_1116_1121	11.9-2318
Theys, Robert	General Public	GP_EM_1118_790	11.9-2320
Thomas, Brian	General Public	GP_WI_1111_589	AA-763
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Thomas, Keith	General Public	GP_WI_1112_605	AA-764
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Thomas, Kurt	General Public	GP_LT_1109_449	AA-765
		Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
Thomas, Pete	General Public	GP_WI_1018_037	11.9-2322
Thompson, Deanna	General Public	GP_WI_1111_559	11.9-2324
		GP_LT_1109_454	AA-766
Thompson, Ronald	General Public	Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	
		GP_WI_1205_967	11.9-2326
Thorndike, Greg	General Public	GP_WI_1111_525	11.9-2328
Thyme, Lenny	General Public	GP_EM_1116_702	11.9-2330
		GP_EM_1116_1123	AA-767
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_702	
Tidwell, Stephanie	General Public	GP_MF_1019_106	11.9-2334
		GP_MC_1020_205	AA-769
		Duplicate of GP_MF_1019_344	
		GP_MF_1019_344	11.9-2336
Tom, Keith	General Public	GP_WI_1228_1185	11.9-2339
Tonero, Jeff	General Public	GP_WI_1112_601	AA-771
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Topham, Virginia	General Public	GP_MC_1018_109	11.9-2341
		GP_MC_1018_112	11.9-2343

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Tores, Sarah	General Public	GP_MF_1020_285	11.9-2347
Toretta, Tom	General Public	GP_WI_1117_757	11.9-2349
Tozzini, Leslie	General Public	GP_EM_1121_833 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-2351
Tozzini, Leslie	General Public	GP_EM_1120_1028 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-772
Tozzini, Leslie & Doug	General Public	GP_EM_1104_357	11.9-2354
Trabucco, Joan & Dan	General Public	GP_EM_1116_703	11.9-2357
		GP_EM_1116_1131 Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_703	AA-774
Trout, Jack	General Public	GP_MC_1020_193	11.9-2359
Troutman, M.	General Public	GP_LT_1110_474	11.9-2364
Tucker, Craig	General Public	GP_LT_1018_341	11.9-2369
Tucker, Scott	General Public	GP_WI_1111_514 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-775
Turner, Zachary	General Public	GP_WI_1117_755	11.9-2372
Unidentified	General Public	GP_EM_1103_372	11.9-2374
Unidentified	General Public	GP_EM_1117_1078	11.9-2376
Unidentified	General Public	GP_EM_1117_745	11.9-2378
Unidentified	General Public	GP_EM_1117_748	11.9-2380
Unidentified	General Public	GP_EM_1120_805 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-2382
Unidentified	General Public	GP_EM_1121_1058	11.9-2384
Unidentified	General Public	GP_EM_1121_859 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-2386
Unidentified	General Public	GP_EM_1204_977	11.9-2388
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1018_276 Duplicate of AO_LT_1120_035	AA-776
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1019_081	11.9-2390
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1020_269	11.9-2393
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1020_272	11.9-2395
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1020_275	11.9-2399
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1025_244	11.9-2401
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1025_251	11.9-2405
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1110_649	11.9-2410
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1118_792	11.9-2412
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1128_941	11.9-2414
Unidentified	General Public	GP_MF_1019_345	11.9-2417
Unidentified	General Public	GP_MF_1114_696	11.9-2420
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1019_047	11.9-2422
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1108_394	11.9-2424
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1108_409	11.9-2426
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1109_410	11.9-2428
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1109_423 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-784
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1109_424 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-785

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1109_428 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-786
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1109_430 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-787
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1109_435 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-788
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1109_437 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-789
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1109_446 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-790
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1109_453 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-791
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1109_470 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-792
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1110_483 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-793
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1110_486	11.9-2430
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1110_489	11.9-2432
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1110_493 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-794
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1111_498 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-795
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1111_515 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-796
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1111_541	11.9-2434
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1111_558	11.9-2436
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1111_567	11.9-2438
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1112_587	11.9-2440
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1111_590 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-797
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1113_644	11.9-2442
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1110_651 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-798
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1114_656 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-799
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1114_669	11.9-2444
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1114_672 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-800
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1116_718	11.9-2446
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1118_793 Duplicate of GP_LT_1118_792	AA-801

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1119_799	11.9-2448
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1121_868 Duplicate of GP_LT_1121_867	AA-802
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1121_869 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-804
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1128_923 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-805
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1125_925 Duplicate of GP_LT_1118_792	AA-807
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1128_947	11.9-2463
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1204_965	11.9-2465
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1206_971	11.9-2467
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1208_1010 Duplicate of GP_LT_1121_867	AA-808
Unidentified	General Public	GP_LT_1208_1011 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-810
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1217_1090 Duplicate of GP_WI_1216_1044	AA-811
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1113 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-812
Unidentified	General Public	GP_WI_1230_1195	11.9-2469
Unidentified	General Public	GP_EM_1120_1200 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-813
Unidentified	General Public	GP_EM_1204_975	11.9-2471
Urhammer, Stacey	General Public	GP_WI_1110_492 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-814
Valens, Marc	General Public	GP_MC_1018_134	11.9-2474
Valens, Mark	General Public	GP_MC-1019_180	11.9-2477
VanHoose, Stephanie	General Public	GP_WI_1219_1097	11.9-2480
Various	General Public	GP_LT_1121_870	11.9-2482
Vaughn, Charles	General Public	GP_WI_1227_1176 Duplicate of GP_WI_1224_1175	AA-815
Vaughn, William	General Public	GP_WI_1116_716	11.9-2504
Vaught, Cheryl	General Public	GP_LT_1109_420 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-818
Vaught, Jerry	General Public	GP_LT_1109_466 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-819
Vibrans, Amy	General Public	GP_WI_1206_973	11.9-2506
Vieira, Edwin	General Public	GP_MF_1019_070	11.9-2508
Virginia	General Public	GP_EM_1117_1137	11.9-2510
Vitale, Anne	General Public	GP_WI_1111_507	11.9-2512
Vogel, Robert	General Public	GP_WI_1116_723	11.9-2514

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
Voss, Jessica	General Public	GP_WI_1222_1162 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-820
		GP_WI_1222_1177 Duplicate of GP_WI_1110_480	AA-821
W. Kivela, Lee	General Public	GP_MF_1025_259	11.9-2516
Walent, Anne	General Public	GP_MC_1020_184	11.9-2518
Walker, Don	General Public	GP_WI_1122_897	11.9-2521
Walker, Ryan	General Public	GP_WI_1229_1198	11.9-2523
Wallace, Laurie	General Public	GP_EM_1104_354	11.9-2526
Walter, Kathleen	General Public	GP_MC_1019_179	11.9-2528
Walter, Matt	General Public	GP_MC_1018_166	11.9-2531
		GP_MC_1019_176	11.9-2535
Ward, Anita	General Public	GP_MF_1229_1191	11.9-2542
Warner, George	General Public	GP_MC_1018_152	11.9-2544
		GP_LT_1031_265 Partial Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_152	11.9-2549
Warren	General Public	GP_WI_1114_663 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-822
		GP_WI_1114_664 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-823
Warren, Carol	General Public	GP_LT_1019_083 Partial Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_136	11.9-2552
		GP_MC_1018_136	11.9-2554
Water, Randy	General Public	GP_WI_1201_950	11.9-2559
Watson, Roger	General Public	GP_WI_1112_611	AA-824
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Wayne, Donald	General Public	GP_WI_1111_597	AA-825
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Wearing, Tom	General Public	GP_WI_1028_245	11.9-2561
Webb, Edward	General Public	GP_LT_1101_309	11.9-2563
Webb, James	General Public	GP_WI_1111_592	AA-826
		Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	
Weil, James	General Public	GP_WI_1118_781	11.9-2565
Wenger, Patrick	General Public	GP_WI_1118_766	11.9-2567
		GP_EM_1118_767 Duplicate of GP_WI_1118_766	AA-827
Westwoldt, Edwin	General Public	GP_LT_1118_802	AA-829
		Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	
Wetter, Tom	General Public	GP_MC_1020_210	11.9-2569
Whelan, Mark	General Public	GP_WI_1111_561	11.9-2573
White, Mary	General Public	GP_MC_1018_144	11.9-2575

Table 11-1. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

Name	Affiliation	Comment Code	Page Number
White, Mike	General Public	GP_WI_1118_759 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1116_729	11.9-2577
		GP_EM_1118_1141 Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	AA-831
Whitsett, Doug	General Public	GP_MC_1018_121	11.9-2579
		GP_MC_1020_190	11.9-2583
		GP_LT_1018_348	11.9-2587
Whitsett	General Public	GP_LT_1018_374 Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_123	AA-832
		GP_MC_1018_123	11.9-2591
Whitsett, Gail	General Public	GP_LT_1121_876 Duplicate of GP_MC_1018_123	AA-835
		GP_WI_1114_661	11.9-2599
Whittemore, Thomas	General Public	GP_WI_1114_647	AA-837
Widrig, Tom	General Public	Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	11.9-2601
Wiest, Mark	General Public	GP_EM_1121_846	AA-838
Williams, Juanita	General Public	GP_LT_1109_432 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	AA-839
		GP_WI_1111_535 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	AA-840
Wilson, L.	General Public	GP_LT_1109_429 Duplicate of GP_LT_1109_418	11.9-2603
Wineteer, James	General Public	GP_EM_1116_695	11.9-2605
Winkler, Paul	General Public	GP_WI_1111_527	11.9-2607
Wolfsohn, Kathi	General Public	GP_EM_1121_849	11.9-2610
Wood, Shirley	General Public	GP_EM_1121_860 Partial Duplicate of GP_EM_1118_800	11.9-2613
		GP_WI_1210_1016	11.9-2615
Woodward, Hope	General Public	GP_MC_1018_161	11.9-2618
Woodwick, Jeff	General Public	GP_LT_1011_024	AA-841
Worker, Dale & Delores	General Public	GP_LT_1101_308 Duplicate of GP_LT_1011_024	AA-842
		GP_WI_1111_624 Duplicate of GP_WI_1111_503	11.9-2621
Wrisley, Gregg	General Public	GP_MF_1020_287	11.9-2623
Wyett, Marjorie	General Public	GP_WI_1111_522	11.9-2625
Wyro, John	General Public	GP_WI_1111_544	11.9-2627
Yandell, George	General Public	GP_WI_0928_012	11.9-2629
Yee, Erin	General Public	GP_WI_1218_1087	11.9-2631
Yost, John	General Public	GP_EM_1116_1077	11.9-2633
Young, Denise	General Public	GP_WI_1113_628	11.9-2635
Young, Gerald	General Public	GP_WI_1107_378	11.9-2637
Zaitlin, J.A.	General Public	GP_EM_1109_411	11.9-2639
Zipperli, D and C	General Public	GP_WI_1215_1040	
Zoe	General Public		

11.2 Master Responses

In some cases responses to comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR include a reference to a Master Response. These Master Responses are presented below in Table 11-2. Each Master Response has a specific code and descriptive title that are referenced in the responses to comments.

Table 11-2. Master Responses	
ALG-2	<p>Harmful Cyanobacteria (blue-green algae)</p> <p>Cyanobacteria (blue-green algae) blooms and their related toxins are a national and worldwide concern. Some blue-green algae, including <i>Microcystis aeruginosa</i>, produce cyanotoxins that can cause irritation, sickness, or in extreme cases, death to exposed organisms, including humans (World Health Organization [WHO] 1999). WHO has developed guidelines for safe use of recreational waters, including cyanobacteria (cell density and toxin level) criteria to protect humans against harmful cyanobacteria and toxin exposures (http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/bathing/srwe1/en/index.html). US EPA's National Center for Environmental Assessment has prepared draft toxicological reviews of several cyanobacteria toxins, and many States have developed public health protective thresholds or criteria to address the various cyanobacteria and their related toxins.</p> <p>Oregon has public health criteria for issuing and lifting public health advisories due to cyanobacteria blooms. Each summer numerous water bodies in Oregon are closed; and in recent years, several dog deaths have occurred due to cyanotoxin exposures (http://public.health.oregon.gov/HealthyEnvironments/Recreation/HarmfulAlgaeBlooms/Pages/Blue-GreenAlgaeAdvisories.aspx). California has prepared a draft toxicological summary and suggested action levels for six cyanotoxins; peer review comments are currently being addressed, and responses to comments are expected to be completed by January 2012 (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/peer_review/peer_review_cyanotoxins.shtml). California currently has draft guidance including thresholds for cyanobacteria bloom posting/ advisories and public notification (see Draft Voluntary Statewide Guidance for Blue-Green Algae Blooms – July 2010, http://www.cdph.ca.gov/healthinfo/vironhealth/water/Pages/Bluegreenalgae.aspx). The Hoopa Valley Tribe has also adopted public health guidelines for recreational exposures that are similar to the WHO values. Table 3.2-10 in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.2.2.3 (p.3.2-45) presents a summary of the water quality guidance, criteria, and targets for toxigenic blue-green algae and algal toxins relevant to the Area of Analysis.</p> <p>As detailed in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.7 (pages 3.2-29 to 3.2-30), Section 3.4.3.4 (pages 3.4-6 to 3.4-7), and (Appendix) C.6.1.4 (pages C-56 to C-59), the Klamath River's Copco and Iron Gate Reservoirs, and downstream river reaches annually experience blooms significantly exceeding WHO and CA Draft Voluntary Statewide Guidance for both cell densities and toxin thresholds during summer months, resulting in posting of public health advisories.</p>
ALT-1	<p>Programmatic Analysis of City of Yreka Pipeline Relocation</p> <p>The Lead Agencies recognize that less detail is available for the City of Yreka pipeline relocation than for other elements of the Proposed Action and Alternative 3; therefore, the Final EIS/EIR indicates that this analysis is at a programmatic level (See Section 2.4.3.9).</p> <p>In the event of a positive Secretarial Determination, the Dam Removal Entity (DRE) would perform additional studies in cooperation with the City of Yreka to optimize the water supply pipeline modification designs. The feasibility-level studies performed for the Detailed Plan for Facilities Removal (Reclamation 2012b)(Detailed Plan) included a new pipe bridge near the existing reservoir crossing, but also considered a pipeline realignment across the existing roadway bridge just upstream. Burial of the new pipeline beneath the river channel would require underwater construction and bedrock excavation, and was considered less economical, but would be technically feasible. Final design and construction for the new river crossing would be considered a project expense. Future operation and maintenance of the pipeline would remain the responsibility of the City of Yreka.</p> <p>More detailed information on the pipeline design is presented in the reports titled Klamath Dam Removal Overview Report for the Secretary of the Interior, An Assessment of Science and Technical Information (Department of the Interior [DOI], 2012c), and, Detailed Plan for Dam Removal – Klamath</p>

	<p>River Dams (Reclamation, 2012b), available to the public at the following Web site: http://klamathrestoration.gov/</p>
ALT-2	<p>Elimination of Alternative 10 - Fish Bypass: Bogus Creek Bypass and Alternative 11 - Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing from Detailed Study</p> <p>The Draft EIS/EIR considers Alternatives 10 (Fish Bypass: Bogus Creek Bypass) and 11 (Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Routing) in Section 2.3 and Appendix A, the Final Alternatives Report. While these alternatives were considered, they were not moved forward to the EIS/EIR for additional analysis because they did not meet any of the NEPA purpose and need or the CEQA objectives. The comment suggests that Alternative 11 should be the environmentally preferable/superior alternative; however, the comment does not include evidence that Alternative 11 would be a feasible fish passage method for the Klamath Hydroelectric Reach. In contrast, CDFG conducted a preliminary analysis of the Hart Bypass (updated as Alternative 10 – Bogus Creek Bypass) proposal, and concluded it would not provide an effective alternative for passage of adult salmon and steelhead populations for the upper Klamath River. (Alternatives Report, sec. 4.2.10., p. 4-10, referring to CDFG, Technical Memo, February 26, 2009). CDFG concluded that behavioral traits of anadromous fish would prevent them from using the Hart Bypass/Bogus Creek Bypass rather than the Klamath River due to their lack of familiarity with these creeks. In addition, successful implementation of this alternative would require the fish to change their migratory behavior as they would need to swim downstream as part of their upstream migration (Alternatives Report, sec. 4.2.10, p. 4-10.). Although the Draft EIS/EIR concluded that Alternative 11 – Alternative Tunnel Route addressed some of Alternative 10's deficiencies by providing a multidirectional migration corridor, fish would still be unlikely to choose this new migration route rather than the mainstem of the Klamath River (Alternatives Report, sec. 4.2.11, p. 4.10.).</p> <p>Additionally, the Lead Agencies received independent reviews of Alternatives 10 and 11 which confirmed the Lead Agencies' conclusion that the two fish bypass methods are unlikely to be used by adult anadromous fish or outgoing smolts. These reviews (Mefford 2011 and White 2011) conclude that Alternatives 10 and 11 do not comport with known salmonid migratory behavior and do not include provisions for outmigrating juvenile salmonids. Mr. Mefford states that Alternative 11, the tunnel alternative, provides no ecological benefit for the river and, to a degree, further degrades the ecology of the Klamath River within this reach by diverting water. He goes on to say that, while the tunnel option must be considered very high risk, dam removal has a high likelihood of reestablishing the ecological benefits of the river lost by the construction of the dams. Alternatives 10 and 11 would not provide a simple alternative for passage of salmon and steelhead populations past the lower four dams in the Klamath River.</p>
ALT-3	<p>Elimination of Alternative 13 - Federal Takeover of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project from Detailed Study</p> <p>Section 2.3 and Appendix A of the Draft EIS/EIR include Alternative 13 - Federal Takeover of the Project. Under this alternative, the Federal Government would take control of the dams under the authority of the Federal Power Act. The intent of the Federal Takeover Alternative would be to fast track the removal of the Four Facilities (similar to the intent of the commenter). However, analysis of this alternative found that the Federal requirements for action (including environmental compliance, Congressional approval and funding, California approval and funding, Oregon approval, development of dam removal plans consistent with the Federal Principals and Guidelines on Water Resources on Water and Land Related Resources Implementation Studies, hiring and indemnifying a DRE and their contractors, completion of Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act compliance including the necessary biological assessments, 401 and 404 permits, transfer of dam ownership under normal processes, and development of mitigation) would take a long time and not substantially expedite the timeframe included in the Proposed Action.</p> <p>Other ongoing dam decommissioning projects in the region including the Elwha River Restoration Project and the Condit Dam Removal Project, both of which are smaller in total scope than removal of the four Klamath Hydroelectric Facility Dams, have required similar time frames from initial agreement to remove the dam to actual decommissioning. In the case of the Elwha River Restoration Project, the Federal government purchased the dams from the owner Fort James Corporation in 2000 and dam removal was not initiated until 2011 (American Rivers 2011). In the case of the Condit Dam Removal Project, agreement between the owner PacifiCorp and 22 other parties on dam removal was reached in 1999 with the commencement of dam removal, following 12 years of studies, permit filings and stakeholder negotiations, beginning in 2011 (PacifiCorp 2011). As demonstrated by these smaller dam decommissioning projects, including the Elwha River Restoration Project where the Federal Government took ownership of the dams, the expedited removal of the dams would not likely be possible and therefore was not included in the alternatives analyzed in more detail in the EIS/EIR.</p>

	<p>American Rivers. 2011. Elwha River Restoration. Available online from http://www.americanrivers.org/our-work/restoring-rivers/dams/projects/elwha-river-background.html. Accessed on December 6, 2011.</p> <p>PacifiCorp. 2011. Condit Overview. Available online from http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Hydro/Condit_Overview.pdf. Accessed on December 6, 2011.</p>
ALT-4	<p>Elimination of Alternative 8 - Dam Removal Without KBRA from Detailed Study</p> <p>This master response addresses comments that suggest the Lead Agencies should analyze the effects of dam removal without implementation of the KBRA.</p> <p>NEPA and its implementing regulations only require the following with respect to the number of alternatives that must be considered by an agency: 1) the agency must consider “appropriate” alternatives to recommended courses of action, 42 USC § 4332(2)(E); 2) an EIS must “[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” and must explain why it has eliminated an alternative from detailed study, 40 CFR § 1502.14(a) (2000) (emphasis added); 3) the agency must consider a “no action” alternative, id. § 1502.14(d); and 4) the agency must designate a “preferred” alternative, id. § 1502.14(e). The statutory and regulatory requirements dictate that an agency must consider “appropriate” and “reasonable” alternatives; the requirements do not enumerate the minimum number of alternatives that an agency must consider.</p> <p>Similarly, under CEQA, “[t]here is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(a).) Accordingly, the CEQA Lead Agency’s discussion of alternatives should: 1) focus on alternatives that are “capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(b)), 2) include alternatives that could feasibly obtain most of the project’s objectives (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(c), 3) briefly explain the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed as well as those that were considered but rejected (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(c)), 4) evaluate a “No Action/No Project” alternative (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(e)(1)), and 5) identify an “environmentally superior” alternative. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(e)(2).)</p> <p>In short, NEPA and CEQA both require the Lead Agencies to analyze a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. (40 CFR sec. 1502.14; 43 CFR sec. 46.420(b); Pub. Resources Code sec. 21002; CEQA Guidelines sec. 15126.6(a).) The Draft EIS/EIR describes the Lead Agencies’ process for developing a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives, including an initial list of 18 preliminary alternatives. (Draft EIS/EIR, pp. 2-2 through 2-7; Appendix A, Alternatives Report (hereinafter “Alternatives Report”).) Through the process described in the Draft EIS/EIR, the Lead Agencies narrowed the range of 18 potential alternatives to the 5 that were fully analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR. (Ibid.)</p> <p>Alternative 8 - Dam Removal without KBRA</p> <p>Alternative 8, dam removal without implementation of the KBRA, is included in the preliminary list of 18 potential alternatives, but it is ultimately not fully analyzed in the EIS/EIR.</p> <p>The question before the Lead Agencies is whether analysis of dam removal without KBRA (Alternative 8) must be fully evaluated in order to ensure that the EIS/EIR contains analysis of reasonable alternatives consistent with NEPA and CEQA as described above, or whether Alternative 8 can be documented in the EIS/EIR as an alternative that has been eliminated from detailed study with a brief discussion of the reasons for its elimination. The Lead Agencies have carefully considered this question and have concluded that inclusion of Alternative 8 is not necessary to ensure full analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives for a number of reasons. DOI observes that CEQ’s guidance implementing NEPA clearly establishes that what constitutes a reasonable range of alternatives depends on the nature of the proposal and the facts in each case (40 CFR § 1502.14(a); 46 FR 18,026 (March 23, 1981)). Among the primary reasons for the Lead Agencies’ conclusion that evaluating dam removal in the absence of the KBRA is not reasonable is the fact that the KHSRA in conjunction with KBRA settles a FERC relicensing proceeding. (KHSRA § 7.7) In addition, all of the settling parties, except PacifiCorp and the United States, are also parties to the KBRA, and those parties executed the two agreements simultaneously, agreed to implement the two agreements in a coordinated fashion, and have agreed that dam removal pursuant to the KHSRA should be a condition precedent to the accomplishment of certain proposed actions provided in the KBRA. For example, and as explained in further detail below, the KBRA parties have agreed that removal of the hydroelectric facilities through</p>

<p>the KHSA is a necessary precondition related to assurances and relinquishment of water right claims found in the KBRA. Consequently, it is unreasonable to evaluate dam removal as described in KHSA without the KBRA being a connected action as defined in 40 CFR Part 1508.25(a)1.</p> <p>Under NEPA, what constitutes a reasonable, feasible alternative is usually determined according to the purpose and need for the Proposed Action. Similarly, the determination under CEQA considers the project's objectives, whether the alternative is feasible, and if the alternative is capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. Accordingly, the Lead Agencies explained in the Alternatives Report, "the alternatives that will move forward for more detailed analysis in the EIS/EIR are those that best meet the NEPA purpose and need and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, are feasible, and represent a range of reasonable alternatives." (Alternatives Report, sec. 2.4, p. 2-5.)</p> <p>The Lead Agencies decided not to fully analyze an alternative that involves dam removal without implementation of the KBRA because such an alternative fails to meet the NEPA purpose and need and most of the CEQA objectives. (Alternatives Report, sec. 4.2.8, p. 4-8.) As described in Chapter 1 of the EIS/EIR, the purpose of the Proposed Action is "to achieve a free flowing river condition and full volitional fish passage as well as other goals expressed in the KHSA and KBRA"; the need for the Proposed Action is "to advance restoration of the salmonid fisheries in the Klamath Basin consistent with the KHSA and the connected KBRA." An alternative that considered dam removal in the absence of the KBRA's programs and proposed actions would not meet this purpose and need, because it would include no further actions beyond dam removal to advance the restoration of salmonids.</p> <p>Furthermore, as explained above and described more fully below, the KHSA and KBRA are intended to be implemented together. Therefore, an alternative that analyzes dam removal without the KBRA would be contrary to the intent of the KBRA which is evidenced by section 8.2.2 of the KBRA: "[t]he parties shall implement this Agreement and the Hydroelectric Settlement in a coordinated and Timely manner . . . recognizing that such performance is necessary to assure the bargained-for benefits."</p> <p>Additionally, because the KHSA and KBRA involve a series of compromises and commitments that are intended to resolve long standing disputes concerning natural resources in the Klamath Basin, multiple provisions in the agreements preclude either agreement from being fully implemented without the other. As a result, it is infeasible to fully implement the KHSA and remove the dams without also implementing the KBRA.</p> <p>For example, removal of the hydroelectric facilities is a necessary precondition related to assurances and relinquishment of claims found in the KBRA. Specifically, the Klamath Tribes, Yurok Tribe, and Karuk Tribe will not relinquish certain claims related to water unless the hydroelectric facilities are removed. (KBRA §§ 15.3.5.C, 15.3.6.B, 15.3.7.B.) Removal of the hydroelectric facilities is also a necessary condition for certain tribal and Klamath Project Water Users assurances related to water, fish, and tribal trust resources to become permanent and unconditional. (KBRA §§ 15.3.2.A, 15.3.2.C, 15.3.3.A, 15.3.6.A, 15.3.7.A.) Moreover, the KBRA's water diversion limitations for the Klamath Reclamation Project also depend on dam removal. (KBRA, §§ 15.1.1, 15.1.2.C, 15.3.1.A.iv, 15.3.4.A.v, and Appendix E-1.)</p> <p>Additionally, if the dams are removed pursuant to the KHSA, eligible PacifiCorp customers would receive credits on their bills via funding from the KBRA. (KHSA, § 5.2.2; KBRA, § 17.4.4.A.) Another interconnected compromise relieves PacifiCorp from any liability associated with removing the hydroelectric facilities. (KHSA §§ 2.1.1.E.1., 8.11.2.B.)</p> <p>Oregon's and California's fish reintroduction programs rely, in part, on removal of the hydroelectric facilities. (KBRA § 11.2.1.A, 11.4.2.) Other agency actions initiated by an Affirmative Secretarial Determination include: USFWS commencing an environmental analysis related to reconnecting land to Agency Lake and BLM commencing an environmental analysis related to reconnecting Wood River Wetland to Agency Lake. (KBRA §§ 18.2.2.C., 18.2.3.)</p> <p>Also, signatories to the KHSA agreed to support legislation that would implement the KBRA and vice versa. (KHSA § 2.1.1.A.; KBRA § 3.1.1.B.i.)</p> <p>Finally, dam removal alternatives under the FERC process were already considered by those entities with jurisdiction under the Federal Power Act. FERC's Final Environmental Impact Statement for</p>
--

	<p>Relicensing of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project No. 2082-027 issued in November 16, 2007 evaluates dam removal alternatives without additional measures to restore and sustain native fisheries or to establish reliable long-term water and power supplies. Alternative 8 would largely duplicate alternatives already considered in the FERC process. KHSa 3.2.1 (i) directs the Secretary to “use existing studies and other appropriate data including those in the FERC record for this project”. This FERC analysis is part of the administrative record for this EIS/EIR and forms the starting point for the Lead Agencies’ analysis of the No Action Alternative and the four action alternatives. So though the Secretary of the Interior has no authority to execute any of the FERC alternatives and they do not meet the current NEPA purpose and need, nor most of the CEQA objectives, nor avoid or substantially lessen the Proposed Action’s effects, the public discussion and analysis in the FERC record and related EIS do underpin the analysis in the current EIS/EIR and would inform the decisionmakers.</p>
ALT-7	<p>Elimination of KBRA without KHSa Including Alternatives 16 – Dredge Upper Klamath Lake and Alternative 18 - Partition of Upper Klamath Lake from Detailed Study</p> <p>This master response addresses comments that suggest the Lead Agencies should analyze the effects of dam removal without implementation of the KBRA.</p> <p>NEPA and its implementing regulations only require the following with respect to the number of alternatives that must be considered by an agency: 1) the agency must consider “appropriate” alternatives to recommended courses of action, 42 USC § 4332(2)(E); 2) an EIS must “[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” and must explain why it has eliminated an alternative from detailed study, 40 CFR § 1502.14(a) (2000) (emphasis added); 3) the agency must consider a “no action” alternative, id. § 1502.14(d); and 4) the agency must designate a “preferred” alternative, id. § 1502.14(e). The statutory and regulatory requirements dictate that an agency must consider “appropriate” and “reasonable” alternatives; the requirements do not enumerate the minimum number of alternatives that an agency must consider.</p> <p>Similarly, under CEQA, “[t]here is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(a).) Accordingly, the CEQA Lead Agency’s discussion of alternatives should: 1) focus on alternatives that are “capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(b)), 2) include alternatives that could feasibly obtain most of the project’s objectives (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(c), 3) briefly explain the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed as well as those that were considered but rejected (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(c)), 4) evaluate a “No Action/No Project” alternative (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(e)(1)), and 5) identify an “environmentally superior” alternative. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(e)(2).)</p> <p>In short, NEPA and CEQA both require the Lead Agencies to analyze a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. (40 CFR sec. 1502.14; 43 CFR sec. 46.420(b); Pub. Resources Code sec. 21002; CEQA Guidelines sec. 15126.6(a).) The Draft EIS/EIR describes the Lead Agencies’ process for developing a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives, including an initial list of 18 preliminary alternatives. (Draft EIS/EIR, pp. 2-2 through 2-7; Appendix A, Alternatives Report (hereinafter “Alternatives Report”).) Through the process described in the Draft EIS/EIR, the Lead Agencies narrowed the range of 18 potential alternatives to the 5 that were fully analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR. (Ibid.)</p> <p>KHSa</p> <p>The KHSa is a settlement agreement in which the dam owner (PacifiCorp) and other parties agreed to study and analyze whether the removal of four dams in PacifiCorp’s project, Iron Gate, J.C. Boyle, Copco 1 and Copco 2 Dams on the Klamath River, may be decommissioned and removed. Under this agreement, removal would only be contemplated if certain preconditions were met including that the Secretary of the Interior must determine, after further study, that dam removal is in the public interest (including but not limited to potential impacts of dam removal on affected local communities and tribes) and would advance the restoration of salmonid fisheries in the Klamath Basin. The KHSa lays out the process for additional studies, environmental review, and a determination by the Secretary of the Interior. The KHSa includes provisions for the interim operation, transfer, decommissioning, and removal of the dams.</p> <p>In the event of an Affirmative Determination by the Secretary of the Interior, the States of California and Oregon are each to provide their own notice as to whether they concur with the Secretary’s determination. In their concurrence, each State shall consider, in its discretion and independent judgment, whether: 1) significant impacts identified in its environmental review can be avoided or</p>

	<p>mitigated as provided under State law, and 2) whether removal of the four dams would be completed within a certain cost cap.</p> <p>KBRA</p> <p>As a result of the Klamath Basin issues surrounding the limited availability of water to support agricultural, tribal, environmental, and fishery needs in many years, the United States; the States of California and Oregon; the Klamath, Karuk, and Yurok Tribes; Klamath Project Water Users; and other Klamath Basin stakeholders (collectively the Parties) negotiated the KBRA to resolve the water conflicts among the many users, restore stressed fisheries, and identify reliable power supplies. The KBRA is intended to result in effective and durable solutions. The goals of the KBRA are to (1) restore and sustain natural fish production and provide for full participation in ocean and river harvest opportunities of fish species throughout the Klamath Basin; (2) establish reliable water and power supplies which sustain agricultural uses, communities, and NWRs; and (3) contribute to the public welfare and the sustainability of all Klamath Basin communities. The Parties view these agreements as an important part of the resolution of long-standing, complex, and difficult-to-resolve concerns over resources in the Klamath Basin.</p> <p>The KBRA is analyzed as a connected action to the KHSA. NEPA defines connected actions as those actions that are closely related or cannot or will not proceed unless other actions are taken previously or simultaneously (40 CFR 1508.25(a)(1)(ii)). Some actions or component elements of the KBRA are independent obligations and thus have independent utility from the KHSA, but the implementation of several significant elements of the KBRA package would be different, if the determination under the KHSA is not to pursue full dam removal (see Table 1-1). Recognizing that implementation of many elements of the KBRA is unknown and not reasonably foreseeable at this time, the connected action analysis is being undertaken at a programmatic level. The KBRA analysis in this EIS/EIR is programmatic, as described in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. A program-level document is appropriate when a project consists of a series of smaller projects or phases that may be implemented separately. Under the programmatic EIR approach, future projects or phases may require additional, project-specific environmental analysis including an evaluation of compliance with Federal laws such as the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act. Consequently, appropriate NEPA compliance would be completed for the separate KBRA components in the future. The KBRA does not supersede existing laws or regulations and does not exempt any actions from compliance with ESA or CESA. Project level actions and decisions will continue to be made in compliance with existing laws and regulations.</p> <p>KBRA Implementation without the KHSA</p> <p>Restoration similar to the KBRA without the KHSA is included in the preliminary list of 18 potential alternatives through inclusion of Alternatives 16 and 18, but these alternatives are ultimately not fully analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR.</p> <p>The intent of Alternative 16 would be to improve water quality in the Klamath Basin by dredging and removing phosphorous-rich sediments from Upper Klamath Lake. The dredging could also increase the storage capacity of Upper Klamath Lake, offering the potential to increase supplies and reduce the competition for limited water supplies among the irrigators, wildlife refuges, and environmental needs downstream from the lake. Similarly the concept behind Alternative 18 is to create an “inner lake” in Upper Klamath Lake by constructing a new levee in the middle of the existing lake (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 2.3; Appendix A: Figure 3-11). The new reservoir would capture excess winter and spring runoff, and be fed throughout the summer by natural springs. Alternatives 16 and 18 are similar to the KBRA because many of the programs contemplated in the KBRA focus on improving water quality in the upper basin and increasing water storage. However, unlike the Proposed Action which includes the KBRA as a connected action, implementation of alternatives 16 and 18 would not result in a free-flowing river, provide for volitional fish passage, would not advance the restoration of salmonids, would not provide certainty regarding water supplies for Reclamation Project irrigators, would not provide certainty of power supplies for KBRA participants, and would be an alternative or a component to the connected action of KBRA.</p> <p>For the purposes of NEPA, the question before DOI is whether analysis of Alternatives 16 and 18 must be fully evaluated in order to ensure that the EIS contains analysis of reasonable alternatives consistent with 40 CFR § 1502.14, or whether Alternatives 16 and 18 can be documented in the EIS as alternatives that have been eliminated from detailed study with a brief discussion of the reasons for their elimination. DOI has carefully considered this question and has concluded that a number of</p>
--	--

	<p>factors contribute to the conclusion that inclusion of Alternatives 16 and 18 is not necessary to ensure full analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives. CEQ's guidance implementing NEPA clearly establishes that what constitutes a reasonable range of alternatives depends on the nature of the proposal and the facts in each case. (40 CFR § 1502.14(a); 46 FR 18,026 (March 23, 1981))</p> <p>Regarding suggestions that the Lead Agencies should analyze the effects of the KBRA without dam removal, it is important to keep in mind that the KBRA represents a negotiated agreement to undertake more than 30 actions in the Klamath Basin. As the Draft EIS/EIR explains, the KBRA is a "basinwide approach to addressing the current resources challenges. . . . Some KBRA actions are expressly preconditioned by and therefore hinge upon dam removal, and an affirmative Secretarial Determination. Some KBRA actions are Federal but are not expressly linked to dam removal, and some actions are completely between private parties." (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 2.4.3.9, p. 2-36) Therefore, the KBRA does not contemplate a single action, but rather many actions that would be undertaken by various governmental and private entities, at different times and depending on different circumstances. Given this structure of the KBRA, to the extent that enough information was available, the Lead Agencies conducted a programmatic environmental analysis of portions of the KBRA's direct and cumulative effects. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 3.1.1.6, p. 3.1-3, sec. 4-1 et. seq, p. 4-1.) This means that this EIS/EIR, for purposes of NEPA, does not make decisions about implementing any specific program, plan, commitment, or activity under the KBRA if dams are not removed. Federal decisions on specific measures in the KBRA, including any necessary environmental review, will be made in a separate process. This EIS/EIR will be used to make a decision relative only to dam removal. In doing so, NEPA requires DOI to properly scope the alternative and impacts analysis. It is also worth noting that California's decision concerning the Proposed Action will be limited to whether it concurs or not with an affirmative Secretarial Determination. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 1.3.1.3, p. 1-20 [describing the Secretarial Determination process and any concurrence by California and Oregon].) As a result, concurrence by California would not include approval of any individual KBRA component. Prior to any future implementation of additional KBRA components, where required, the Lead Agencies would undertake environmental analysis pursuant to NEPA and/or CEQA. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 2.4.3.9, p. 2-37)</p> <p>The Lead Agencies did not analyze the effects of full implementation of the KBRA without dam removal because, as explained in master response [insert master response number] concerning dam removal without implementation of KBRA, the KHSA and KBRA are interconnected agreements. Therefore pursuant to the terms of the agreement full implementation of the KBRA would not occur without dam removal. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 2.4.3.9, p.2-37; see also Table 1-1, p. 1-26 & Table 2-15, p. 2-40.)</p> <p>On the other hand, even if the parties had never negotiated and agreed upon the KBRA, certain components contemplated in the KBRA would still exist. For example, the Williamson River Delta Project, Agency Lake and Barnes Ranches Project, Fish Habitat Restoration, and Climate Change Assessment exist or could be implemented despite the KBRA. These KBRA components either do not have a Federal nexus or are not subject to environmental review, and they are either already ongoing or could be implemented absent dam removal. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 2.4.3.9, p.2-37) Despite the fact that the KBRA and dam removal are not necessary for the survival of these KBRA components, they were nonetheless included in the KBRA because they could receive additional funding and could be expanded or accelerated through the KBRA, and the parties determined that the components were necessary to ensure the comprehensive resolution of the Basin's water conflicts. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 2.4.2, p. 2-14; sec. 2.4.3.9, p. 2-37.) Because these KBRA components already exist or could be implemented without dam removal, they are analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR in Alternative 1: No Action/No Project. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 2.4.2, p. 2-13-14.)</p> <p>However, the Lead Agencies still view the various KBRA provisions as a "whole program." (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 2.4.3.9, p.2-37.) This is because the KBRA's various components are intended to be implemented "in a manner that seeks to attain synergy and optimize benefits through a coordinated, holistic approach to restoration and water management." (Ibid.) And because, as discussed above, the implementation of several significant KBRA components are related to dam removal, implementing only the KBRA components that are unrelated to dam removal would not yield the same benefits to the Basin as full implementation of the KBRA. Therefore, full implementation of the KBRA is not included in the analysis of Alternative 1: No Action/No Project, nor is there a separate alternative that analyzes implementation of the KBRA without dam removal.</p>
ALT-8	<p>Inclusion of Alternatives Solely Based on Cost</p> <p>The purpose of the NEPA and CEQA environmental review process is to disclose to decision makers</p>

	<p>and the public the significant environmental effects of a Proposed Action or project and the manner in which those significant effects can be avoided or minimized (40 CFR Section 1502.1; Pub. Resources Code, sec. 21002). While NEPA requires a discussion of the potential socioeconomic impacts of the proposed project, neither NEPA nor CEQA (CEQA Guidelines section 15131) require an analysis of the costs of constructing, operating, or maintaining a proposed project. Therefore, it is beyond the scope of this EIS/EIR to analyze the costs of implementing the proposed project or to examine an alternative solely because it may cost less than the proposed project.</p> <p>However, cost would be considered by the Secretary of the Interior when making the Determination on whether or not the Proposed Action is in the public interest. More detailed information on the costs of implementing the proposed project are presented in the reports titled Klamath Dam Removal Overview Report for the Secretary of the Interior, An Assessment of Science and Technical Information (DOI, 2012c), and, Detailed Plan for Dam Removal – Klamath River Dams (Reclamation, 2012b), available to the public at the following Web site: http://klamathrestoration.gov/.</p>
ALT-9	<p>Appendix A of the Draft EIS/EIR includes a wide range of alternatives representing diverse viewpoints and needs based on internal and public scoping. The alternatives that moved forward for more detailed analysis in this EIS/EIR are those that best meet the NEPA purpose and need and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, are feasible, and represent a range of reasonable alternatives (see Appendix A for more information). The NEPA purpose and need and CEQA objectives are broader than only addressing modification or increased hatchery production of native fish (see Section 1.4.2 on page 1-29 of the Draft EIS/EIR). An alternative that looked at only modifying or increased hatchery production of native fish would not be able to accomplish the purpose and need/objectives. These alternatives would not restore a free-flowing river, achieve full volitional fish passage, establish reliable water and power supplies, contribute to public welfare and sustainability of communities, or be consistent with the goals and objectives of the KHSa and KBRA.</p> <p>Additionally, the effect of hatchery fish on populations of wild (natural) salmonids in the Klamath basin is not well understood but is likely negative (NRC 2004, page 303). Increasing evidence indicates hatchery salmon have lower fitness in natural environments than wild fish (Araki et al. 2008). Based on several studies, hatchery steelhead have exceptionally low fitness compared with wild steelhead (Dunne et al. 2011, page 56). The Snake River basin provides information on supplementation hatcheries and captive broodstock programs (www.fws.gov/snakecomplan/). Their hatchery programs have been useful in preventing extinction but not for rebuilding natural populations because habitat and survival issues have not been improved in basins where this approach is taken. (Goodman et al. 2011, Response to Independent Peer Review Comments, page 18).</p> <p>Expert Panels (Goodman et al. 2011, Dunne et al. 2011) convened to assess fisheries in the Klamath Basin concluded that full implementation of the KBRA would increase probability of successfully restoring coho, Chinook, and steelhead runs. The Chinook Expert Panel does not advise long-term hatchery supplementation if the objective is self-maintained, ecologically adapted, runs of spring Chinook salmon (Goodman et al. 2011, page 26). Finally, the Chinook Expert Panel concluded with certainty that if the four dams are not removed, the Klamath Chinook salmon may continue to decline (page 69 of Appendix C of the July 20, 2011 Addendum to the Chinook Expert Panel report).</p> <p>Modifying hatchery operations may have merit if combined with a comprehensive restoration strategy. As described in more detail in Master Response AQU-32, modification of hatchery operation and use of a conservation hatchery for fish reintroduction are addressed in the KHSa and KBRA and analyzed at a programmatic level in Alternatives 2 and 3.</p>
AQU – 1	<p>Sediment amounts and effects to fish</p> <p>(A.) There is estimated 13.1 million cubic yards of sediment deposited behind the facilities proposed for removal (p. 3.11-11 of EIS/EIR). By 2020, the volume is projected to increase to 15 million cubic yards. This sediment is approximately 85 percent silt and clays that are unconsolidated and have low cohesive strengths. Moving water would erode these sediments quickly as the reservoir is drawn down from January 1, 2020 to March 15, 2020. Because the sediment is fine, most of this sediment would be carried in suspension all the way to the ocean and not deposit in the channel downstream from Iron Gate Dam. More details of the sediment movement can be found in Section 3.11 of the EIS/EIR. It is expected that approximately 36 to 57 percent of this material would be eroded within the first year from the reservoir areas and washed downstream (Reclamation 2012d). The range in the volume eroded is primarily driven by whether river flows are high or low during the reservoir draw down. The river channel under the present-day reservoirs would erode to the pre-dam bed elevations and not likely beyond that because the natural sediment balance in the river would be restored.</p>

	<p>(B.) There would be two major effects to aquatic organisms as the result the release of the stored fine reservoir sediment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase in suspended sediment concentrations. 2. Increase in the fine sediment within the bed material of the river. <p>The estimated concentrations downstream from the dam resulting from dam removal are given in Section 3.2 and 3.3 of the EIS/EIR. The sediment concentrations resulting from dam removal are expected to be significantly above background levels below the dams only for the first year following dam removal. There are three reasons why concentrations would not be elevated in subsequent years:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most of the sediment that is erodible would erode during the drawdown process. 2. There is an aggressive revegetation plan for the reservoir areas. The entire reservoir area would be covered in mulch and seeded with grasses in the upland areas and woody species adjacent to the river (p. 3.5-43 to 3.5-45 of EIS/EIR). 3. Physical testing showed that the reservoir sediment becomes much less erodible once it dries out (Reclamation 2012d). The sediment is expected to dry out the first summer following dam removal at which point, resistance to erosion increases dramatically (p. 3.11-23 of EIS/EIR). <p>(C.) The effects to aquatic organisms due to increases in suspended sediment concentration are expected to be significant the first year following dam removal and the effects are detailed in Section 3.3.4.3 and Appendix E of EIS/EIR. Regarding the effects of the increase in the fine sediment in the river bed material, the physical impacts are described in Section 3.3.4.3 and on p. 3.11-21. Appendix F of EIS/EIR addresses effects to fish as the result of bed material changes resulting from dam removal. The EIS/EIR states that there are significant impacts expected the first year after dam removal, but the long-term benefits to aquatic organisms outweigh the short-term impacts. The EIS/EIR also includes several mitigation measures to reduce impacts to coho salmon and other salmonids in Section 3.3.4.4.</p>
AQU – 2	<p>Sediment Dredging</p> <p>(A.) The impacts of dam removal if sediment dredging were performed prior to removal were analyzed in Appendix F, Section F.9. The engineering analysis and costs of dredging are referenced in a memo dated August 30, 2011 from Dennis Lynch of the US Geological Survey (USGS) and it is available on http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies. Dredging of reservoir sediment was deemed infeasible for the following reasons (1) dredging is relatively ineffective because it only removes 43 percent of the erodible sediment at best, (2) it would only provide a marginal benefit to fish, (3) sediment disposal would have a large environmental impact on terrestrial resources and possibly on cultural resources, and (4) it comes with a high cost of about \$165 million in 2020 dollars. The analysis conducted by the Lead Agencies could find no other feasible mitigation opportunities for sediment removal. The Lead Agencies did identify a number of mitigation measures to address the impacts of sediment release on aquatic species (see Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.4).</p> <p>(B.) All applicable Federal, tribal, State, and local statutes and regulations would be followed under the Proposed Action. However, some questions remain over the ultimate applicability of California and local regulations depending on the selection of the Dam Removal Entity (DRE) (responsible for dam deconstruction) or Hydropower Licensee (responsible for taking over the dams and operations). Section 6.1 of the EIS/EIR lists all applicable statutes and regulations. The required permits would not be obtained until a positive determination on the Proposed Action.</p>
AQU – 3	<p>Coho Native Status not Critical to NEPA or CEQA</p> <p>As a threshold legal matter, the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) both require the Lead Agencies to respond to comments on significant environmental issues related to the Draft EIS/EIR. Even if one assumes that the comment author is accurate and that coho salmon are not native to the Klamath River, there is no evidence that reintroduction/introduction of coho to the Klamath River would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, neither NEPA nor CEQA compel any further response. Nevertheless, the Lead Agencies provide the following evidence concerning coho's native range as part of their good faith effort at full disclosure.</p>
AQU – 4	<p>Coho are Native</p> <p>(A.) Credible scientific information describes the native North American range of coho salmon as extending from Alaskan coastal waters to the central California coast (Evermann and Clark 1931; Shapovalov and Taft 1954; Fry 1973; Moyle 1976; Sandercock 1991). This description is widely accepted by fishery biologists and ichthyologists. Brown and Moyle (1991) found records of the historic</p>

	<p>occurrence of coho salmon in 52 streams from the Smith River near the Oregon border to the Big Sur River on the central Coast. The largest concentration of wild coho occurs in the Eel River watershed (Brown and Moyle 1991), located just south of the Klamath Basin. The National Research Council (NRC) (2004a; 2008) lists coho salmon as a native species which occurred throughout the Klamath River and its tributaries at least up to the Oregon border. Hamilton et. al (2005) reports coho salmon in the Klamath were historically distributed upstream at least to the vicinity of Spencer Creek. Historical distributions of anadromous fish in the Klamath River are described in the EIS in Chapter 3.3, Section 3.3.3.1.</p> <p>(B.) Written historical documentation regarding coho salmon in the Klamath River is scarce prior to the early 1900's due, in part, to the apparent difficulty in recognizing there were different species of salmon inhabiting the rivers of the area (California Fish and Game Commission [CFGF] 1913; Snyder 1931). Snyder (1931) reported that coho salmon were said to migrate to the headwaters of the Klamath to spawn, but that most people were unable to distinguish them. Further, it was his opinion that there was little interest in coho salmon in general because Chinook salmon are so much larger and more abundant. Although available written information on the historical occurrence of coho salmon in the Klamath River is sparse, it is important to note that no sources specifically exclude the Klamath, Scott and Shasta Rivers from the described range of coho.</p> <p>(C.) Snyder (1931) reported that coho salmon in the Klamath River occur in large numbers. Early egg take records from the Klamathon egg station located near the historic town of Klamathon (approx. river mile 183) first operated in 1910, document over 2.1 million coho eggs were collected that year (CFGF 1913). To account for that number of eggs, a minimum of 880 female coho would have been captured (CDFG 2002). Larger numbers of coho salmon eggs were reported taken at the Klamath station between 1913 and 1916 (CFGF 1913; Cobb 1931; Fortune 1966). Based on egg take records at the Klamathon station beginning in 1910, Cobb (1931) concluded coho salmon upstream migration encompassed areas upriver from where Iron Gate and Copco I Dams now reside. In 2006 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) proceedings, Administrative Law Judge Honorable Parlen L. McKenna concluded that anadromous fish (including coho salmon) migrated past the present site of Iron Gate Dam based on historical records and tribal accounts (Finding of Fact 2A-3, p 12 of 87).</p> <p>(D.) The earliest record of coho salmon stocking in the Klamath Basin was of a plant made in 1895 in the Trinity River and in Supply Creek, tributary to the Trinity River (U.S. Commission on Fish and Fisheries 1895). Supply Creek is located approximately 12 miles above the Trinity River's confluence with the Klamath River and is over 160 river miles from Iron Gate Dam. This planting was deemed necessary because all the adult salmon were being taken at the cannery at the mouth of the Klamath River (U.S. Commission on Fish and Fisheries 1895). This was the only known plant of coho salmon in the Klamath Basin prior to 1911 when construction of Copco I began (Cobb 1931). Coho fry resulting from the 1910 Klamathon egg collection were reared at the Sisson (Mt Shasta) Fish Hatchery and planted back into the Klamath River as well as into the Sacramento River (CFGF 1913). This was the first effort by the State of California to increase the runs of coho salmon (CFGF 1913). Additional coho salmon plants to the Klamath River using eggs from coho captured at the Klamathon station occurred between 1912 and 1941. These fish were reared and released from the US Bureau of Fisheries' Hornbrook Hatchery on the Klamath River or, in later years, the Fall Creek Hatchery.</p> <p>(E.) Following completion of Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) in 1966, and Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) in 1963 adult coho returns were typically less than 500 and 1,000 fish, respectively. Efforts to increase returns to IGH and TRH started when coho stocks from outside the basin were imported beginning in 1964 and which continued until 1970 (CDFG 1994). Since coho salmon were well documented in the Klamath prior to the construction of the hatcheries, the intent of these out-of-basin transfers was to supplement already existing, albeit dwindling, natural coho populations.</p> <p>(F.) Substantial coho populations were documented in the upper Klamath River in 1910 as evidenced by the egg collections which began at the Klamathon racks that year. Although it cannot be determined with absolute certainty that the 1895 stocking did not result in a portion of the runs observed later at the Klamathon station and in the Shasta River, this single stocking in the Trinity River was likely too small and in the wrong area to have had much chance of establishing a new, self-reproducing population in the upper Klamath River and tributaries.</p> <p>(G.) The fact that the Klamath River and tributaries: 1) are contiguous with documented historical coho rivers and streams both north and south of the Klamath River; 2) contain no natural barriers that would</p>
--	--

	<p>prevent their migration into the upper reaches and tributaries such as the Scott and Shasta rivers; 3) have physical attributes that would have produced suitable coho habitat in the past (e.g. gradient, morphology, and, in some cases like the Shasta River, spring sources that provide perennial flow); and 4) still contain suitable coho salmon habitat, is additional evidence that native coho salmon inhabited the Klamath River and its tributaries prior to any stocking.</p>
AQU – 5	<p>Will Benefit all Salmonids</p> <p>Removal of the Klamath River Dams as proposed in Alternatives 2 (the Proposed Action) and 3 is intended to benefit all salmonid species. Section 3.3.4.3 of the EIS/EIR addresses the likely impacts of each alternative on aquatic habitat and various fish species. Additionally, Expert Panels were convened specifically to address the effect of dam removal on fish and aquatic habitats. Expert Panel Reports are addressed in the EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3 Effects Determinations, Alternative 2 (and 3), Aquatic Resources Effects, Species Specific Impacts for coho, steelhead and Chinook salmon respectively.</p>
AQU – 6	<p>Expert Panel Coho, Steelhead and Chinook</p> <p>(A.) Under the Secretarial Determination process, the Expert Panel (Dunne et al., 2011) on coho and steelhead concluded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Conditions would likely continue to be detrimental to coho, the difference between the Proposed Action and Current Conditions is expected to be small, especially in the short term (0-10 years after dam removal). • Larger (moderate) responses are possible under the Proposed Action if the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) is fully and effectively implemented and mortality caused by the pathogen <i>C. shasta</i> is reduced. (Dunne et al., 2011, p. ii.) • Short-term effects of dam removal on sediment transport would be injurious to upstream migrating coho and steelhead, but longer-term prospects of dam removal with KBRA is an increase and expansion in spawning and rearing habitat – for steelhead probably considerably, and for coho probably slightly (Dunne et al., 2011, Section 3.1, p. 18). • The Proposed Action could result in increased spatial distribution and numbers of steelhead, and in the long term (decades), increased numbers relative to those under Current Conditions. If the Proposed Action is implemented ineffectively, there may be no detectable response of steelhead. If the Proposed Action is implemented effectively, and the other related actions occur [e.g., Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)], then the response of steelhead may be broader spatial distribution and increased numbers of individuals within the Klamath system. (Dunne et al., 2011, p. ii). <p>(B.) Under the Secretarial Determination process, the Expert Panel (Goodman et al., 2011) on Chinook salmon concluded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proposed Action appears to be a major step forward in conserving target fish populations in the Klamath Basin. The Expert Panel predicted that, based on the information provided to them, it was possible that the Proposed Action would provide a substantial increase in the abundance of naturally spawned Klamath River Chinook salmon above that expected under existing conditions in the reach between Iron Gate Dam and Keno Dam (Goodman, et al., 2011, p. i). While the Panel agreed that there was also evidence for dramatic increases in abundance associated with the Proposed Action upstream of Keno Dam, they cautioned that achieving substantial gains in Chinook salmon abundance and distribution in the Klamath Basin is contingent upon successfully resolving key factors that would continue to affect population, such as water quality, disease, and instream flows. • While noting uncertainties based on existing data, the prospects for the Proposed Action to provide a substantial positive effect for spring Chinook salmon is more remote than for fall-run Chinook salmon. The primary concern of the panel was that low abundance and productivity (return per spawner) of spring Chinook salmon would limit recolonization of habitats upstream of Iron Gate Dam. However, this concern would be addressed in that the KBRA includes a reintroduction component to establish populations in the new habitats. KBRA implementation would reintroduce spring-run Chinook salmon upstream of Upper Klamath Lake in Phase 1. The adaptive management approach to reintroduction would include spring-run and fall-run Chinook salmon (Hooton and Smith 2008). Even without supplementation, it is likely that spring-run Chinook salmon recolonization would occur as it did following barrier removal at Landsburg Dam in Washington (Kiffney et al. 2009). • In response to comments provided on the Chinook Expert Panel Report, the Expert Panel stated: “There is much certainty that if the four dams are not removed, the Klamath Chinook salmon will continue to decline.” (p. 69 of Appendix C of the July 20, 2011 Addendum to the Chinook Expert Panel report).

AQU – 7	<p>Expert Panel Uncertainty and Likelihood of Success</p> <p>The Expert Panel reports acknowledge that there is a degree of uncertainty in their findings and that future events primarily related to implementation of the KBRA agreements could influence predicted outcomes; the Panels did not conclusively state there is little likelihood of success. Both the Chinook and the coho and steelhead Expert Panels noted that full implementation of the KBRA and dam removal would increase probability of successfully restoring Chinook, coho, and steelhead runs.</p> <p>In addition to quantitative modeling results in this regard (Hendrix 2011), FERC (2007), Hetrick et al. (2009), and Hamilton et al. (2011) concluded in synthesizing available information that increased habitat access following dam removal would result in an increase in the abundance of Chinook salmon population in the Klamath River Watershed.</p>
AQU – 8	<p>Climate Change, Fisheries, Predator Control, Reintroduction</p> <p>Climate change is addressed in EIS/EIR, Chapter 3.10 and in Part IV, Section 19.4 of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA).</p> <p>Implementation of the KBRA is part of Alternatives 2 and 3. The Chinook Expert Panel concluded that the Proposed Action offers greater potential than the current conditions for Chinook salmon to tolerate climate change and changes in marine survival (Goodman et al. 2011).</p> <p>While the Proposed Action and Alternatives affect commercial and recreational fishing, management of fishing regulations is beyond the scope of this document. Appendix A, Final Alternatives Report, from the EIS/EIR describes the alternatives considered during development of the document. Alternative 17, Predator Control, considered the possibility of controlling seal, sea lion, and cormorant populations at the mouth of the Klamath River as an alternative to dam removal. This alternative did not move forward for more detailed analysis in the EIS/EIR because it would not meet the NEPA purpose and need or most of the CEQA objectives.</p> <p>A Fisheries Reintroduction Plan is part of Alternatives 2 and 3 under the KBRA (EIS/EIR Section 2.4.3.9, p. 2-44). Section 11 of the KBRA describes the process for development of the Fisheries Reintroduction and Management Plan. The KBRA anticipates that anadromous salmonids would voluntarily colonize available habitats downstream from Upper Klamath Lake following dam removal in both California and Oregon. Therefore, no active intervention or movement of fish would be immediately proposed into the Klamath River or tributary streams below Upper Klamath Lake unless monitoring efforts reveal that re-colonization is not occurring or is occurring too slowly, at which time the fishery managers may pursue active reintroduction strategies. An active reintroduction program is anticipated to colonize habitats upstream of Upper Klamath Lake under KBRA.</p>
AQU – 9	<p>Minimum Flows for Fish</p> <p>Table 3.3-4 of the EIS does present the minimum flows below Iron Gate Dam and lake elevations for Upper Klamath Lake from the 2010 Biological Opinion. As described in Section 3.3.4.3 of the EIS, the Proposed Action, which includes implementation of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA), would result in flows more favorable to all life stages of salmonids, and would provide suitable habitat for resident riverine species, anadromous fish and lamprey in hydroelectric reach from the upstream end of J. C. Boyle Reservoir to Iron Gate Dam. In the Lower Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam, over the long term, the Proposed Action would alter the hydrograph so that the duration, timing, and magnitude of flows would be more similar to the unregulated conditions under which the native fish community evolved (Hetrick et al. 2009).</p> <p>The Proposed Action would have a beneficial effect on essential fish habitat (efh) for chinook and coho salmon in the long term. The fact that coho and chinook salmon historically occupied the hydroelectric reach and the Lower Klamath is also evidence that restoring flows to mimic historic patterns would be sufficient for maintenance and recovery of fish populations.</p> <p>Minimum flows for fish are also expected to be a result of future Biological Opinions by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries Service) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), pursuant to Section 7, of the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). NOAA Fisheries Service issued a biological opinion to Reclamation requiring releases from Reclamation's Klamath Project to produce specified rates of flow for the Klamath River downstream from Iron Gate Dam, based on the habitat needs of coho salmon (NOAA Fisheries Service 2010, EIS/EIR Section 2.4.2, p. 2-17). Implementation of the NOAA Fisheries Service 2010 Biological Opinion mandatory flows are a reasonably foreseeable future action associated with Reclamation's Klamath Project (EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.1, p. 3.2-35). Target flow rates in the Klamath River</p>

	<p>downstream from Iron Gate Dam vary by month, and are dependent in part on the amount of water entering Upper Klamath Lake. Reclamation and PacifiCorp are required to meet these flow requirements. PacifiCorp currently coordinates with Reclamation to meet ramp rates in the NOAA Fisheries biological opinion on Reclamation's Klamath Project (EIS/EIR Section 2.4.2, p. 2-17).</p>
AQU – 11	<p>NOAA BO, ESA and KBRA Water Management</p> <p>(A.) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service Biological Opinion (BO) for the operation of the Klamath Project by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) through 2018 provides for a range of flow releases downstream from Iron Gate Dam which are linked to hydrologic conditions in the upper basin and inflow to Upper Klamath Lake (NOAA Fisheries Service 2010). In the BO, NOAA Fisheries Service concluded that the operation of Reclamation's Klamath Project as proposed would likely jeopardize the continued existence of Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast (SONCC) Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) coho salmon and would likely destroy or adversely modify its designated critical habitat. NOAA Fisheries Service developed a reasonable and prudent alternative (RPA) for flow releases to the Klamath River downstream from Iron Gate Dam to avoid the likelihood that Reclamation's Klamath Project would jeopardize the continued existence of SONCC ESU coho salmon or result in the destruction or adverse modification of its critical habitat. The RPA flows include two elements. The purpose of the first element is to increase fall and winter flow variability (September 1 through March 1) to mimic hydrologic responses that would naturally occur in the river downstream from Iron Gate Dam. 18,600 acre-feet of water is set aside to provide for increased fall and winter flow variability. The release of this volume of water is managed by the flow variability team as described in the BO. The second element increases spring flows during average and wetter hydrological conditions to provide better habitat conditions for juvenile coho salmon in the middle and upper reaches of the river. The RPA flow requirements are presented in Table 18 (p. 177) of the BO. Flow requirements vary based on month and hydrological conditions (Table 18).</p> <p>(B.) Regardless of the outcome of the Secretarial Determination, future Federal actions influencing mainstem Klamath River flows would be subject to interagency consultations under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to insure flow releases are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the SONCC ESU of coho salmon or result in the destruction or adverse modification of its designated critical habitat.</p> <p>(C.) The KBRA includes a Water Resources Program (Part IV.) that describes several water conservation and management actions that are intended to benefit both anadromous salmonids and endangered sucker populations. A copy of the KBRA is available on the klamathrestoration.gov web page and can be downloaded through this link:</p> <p>http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/Klamath-Agreements/Klamath-Basin-Restoration-Agreement-2-18-10signed.pdf</p> <p>(D.) A cornerstone of the KBRA is the agreement to limit diversions to Reclamation's Klamath Project in exchange for certain assurances among the parties in the Oregon water rights adjudication process and with respect to the exercise of certain tribal water rights. A description of the Programmatic Measures under KBRA is also provided in Section 2.4.3.9 of the EIS/EIR. Among other things, the Water Resources Program of the KBRA requires development of a plan for Reclamation's Klamath Project to align water supply and demand in order to meet the diversion limits (see KBRA Section 15.2). Before implementation of this plan, the KBRA provides for consultation under Section 7 of the ESA to consider the effects on listed species and designated critical habitat, including the SONCC ESU of coho salmon and its critical habitat, that would result from implementation of the plan and diversion limits (see KBRA Section 22.1.2).</p> <p>(E.) Appendix D-2 of the KBRA provides for establishment of a Technical Advisory Team (TAT) whose purpose is to inform the implementation of the KBRA as it relates to the management of environmental water and aquatic resources. To determine whether to store water at any particular time, the parties would need to understand the real-time water budget of the basin. Implementation of real-time water management would occur through installation of tools such as water flow monitoring gauges and snowpack gauges. This would provide managers with the ability to mimic natural flow variability in near real time. Given this flexibility in how environmental water would be managed under the KBRA in real time in response to existing environmental and hydrologic conditions, and the future development of a plan for implementation of diversion limits and future consultation described above, it is difficult at this time to predict how that water would be managed into the future under the KBRA and the effects</p>

<p>on listed species. However, for purposes of modeling effects of the Proposed Action here, the hydrology modeling presented in (2012d), and referenced in the EIS/EIR, uses an assumed parameter based on changes to the current hydrology as an outcome of certain actions that are anticipated to take place under the KBRA using the limited information that is currently available.</p> <p>(F.) Reclamation (2012d) conducted an analysis comparing river flows under the No Action Alternative (BO flows) and the Proposed Action (Alternative 2) which includes KBRA type flow releases over a fifty year time period. Results of this modeling analysis indicate that the average monthly flows at Iron Gate Dam are generally similar between these two alternatives. The exceptions to this are the months of October to December, where the average flows are about 200 to 400 cfs less under Proposed Action than under the No Action Alternative, and in April, where the flows are about 300 cfs higher under the Dam Removal Alternative than under the No Action Alternative. During February and March the modeled KBRA simulated flows at the 90% exceedance are less than the 2010 BO flow simulation in February, are greater in March, and are similar in April. The KBRA simulations are very similar to Hardy Phase II flows (slightly lower or higher) from May through September. For the KBRA flow simulation (Reclamation 2012d, Appendix E) minimum base flows equal to the Ecological Base Flow (EBF) levels recommended by Hardy et al. (2006a) were incorporated into the Dam Removal Alternative hydrologic simulation for the periods from March through June, and from August through September to insure adequate protection of anadromous fish during dry water years.</p> <p>(G.) The annual flow at Keno Dam is generally similar between the two alternatives except for the few driest years on record. In these dry years, the agricultural supply is significantly reduced under the No Action Alternative, whereas the agricultural supply is much less severely impacted under the Dam Removal Alternative; therefore, more flow is released to the Klamath River under the No Action Alternative than under the Dam Removal Alternative. At Iron Gate Dam from July through November, the flows are commonly around 800 cfs under the Dam Removal Alternative during these extremely dry years whereas the flows are more commonly between 1000 and 1300 cfs under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>(H.) The anticipated future changes to the system that would occur under the KHSA and KBRA led Hardy (2008) to conclude that future flow releases as described in the KBRA was a logical extension of the Hardy Phase 2 Flow recommendations, balancing multiple needs, including those of anadromous salmonids. Improved water quality and water temperature conditions, restoration of sediment transport processes, potential reductions in disease, restored access to thermal refugia and instream habitats upstream are all factors that led Hardy (2008) to conclude “that the threshold flow at which significant concerns over thermal and disease factors will drop well below 1000 cfs to something on the order of 700 to 800 cfs.” Consistent with these findings the Federal Team incorporated minimum base flows of 800 cfs into the KBRA flow simulations during the period from October through February (Reclamation 2012d, Appendix E). Base flows of 800 cfs would provide greater than 75 percent of the currently available Chinook salmon spawning habitat from the R-Ranch study site downstream to the Brown Bear study site in every year (Appendix I, Hardy et al. 2006a) and flow levels of this magnitude would be adequate allow adult coho salmon to migrate freely upstream. However, under real time flow management that is envisioned by the KBRA incorporation of variable flows during the spawning season would increase spawning habitat above what would be provided under the current static flow condition.</p> <p>(I.) Reclamation (2012d) also found that the 50 percent exceedance flows (normal years) under the Dam Removal Alternative are about 5 to 15 percent greater for the months of April and June to August and about 15 to 20 percent less for the months of October to December. The 90 percent exceedance flows (dry years) are similar for the two alternatives from March to September, but for the months of October to February, the No Action Alternative 90 percent exceedance flows are about 20 to 30 percent larger (290 to 360 cfs larger).</p> <p>(J.) In the Effects Determinations Section (3.3.4.3), the EIS/EIR states:</p> <p>“Over the long term, the Proposed Action would alter the hydrograph so that the duration, timing, and magnitude of flows would be more similar to the unregulated conditions under which the native fish community evolved (Hetrick et al. 2009). While mean annual flows would not substantially change from existing flows due to the lack of active reservoir storage (Stillwater Sciences 2009b; Reclamation 2012d), flow variability would increase.”</p>

	<p>The Proposed Action would establish a flow regime that more closely mimics natural conditions in the Lower Klamath River. Dam removal would also cause water temperatures to become warmer earlier in the spring and early summer and cooler earlier in the late summer and fall, and to have diurnal variations more in sync with historical migration and spawning periods (Hamilton et al. 2011). These changes would result in water temperature more favorable for salmonids in the mainstem.</p>
AQU – 13	<p>Ocean Conditions Ocean conditions do play a large factor in anadromous salmonid survival and productivity, as do several others factors, such as the condition of out-migrating juvenile salmonids (smolts) and freshwater habitat. Lawson (1993) used a conceptual model of declining freshwater habitat quality and cyclic ocean conditions to show that freshwater habitat is most critical during periods of depressed ocean survival, and shows how improving ocean conditions can mask declines in habitat quality. Pacific salmon have evolved their metapopulation structures over millennia to deal with variations in ocean conditions. Although mechanisms are not absolutely clear, the physical template provided by naturally functioning watersheds (freshwater environment) is the ultimate source of “climate insurance” necessary for wild salmon populations to persist.</p>
AQU – 14	<p>Expert Panel Resident Fish The Expert Panel on resident fish (Buchanan et al., 2011a) concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proposed Action provides greater promise for preventing extinction of the shortnose sucker and Lost River sucker and for increasing overall population abundance and productivity. The key benefits of the Proposed Action to these species stem from major habitat improvement activities in the Upper Klamath Lake and its tributaries that support these fishes (Buchanan 2011a, p. 76). • The Proposed Action is expected to increase redband trout populations in all areas. Proposed habitat improvements, including water quality and quantity and riparian corridor improvements and protection, are anticipated to increase trout productivity in headwater and lower tributary areas of the Upper Klamath Lake basin (Buchanan et al. 2011a, p. 77). • However, the level of improvement is uncertain in part because details of most activities have not been described. Recreational fishing opportunities would be expected to increase in proportion to the increase in trout abundance in all areas (Buchanan et al. 2011a, p. 77). • Following dam removal, the abundance of redband/rainbow trout in the free-flowing reach between Keno Dam and Iron Gate Dam could increase significantly. The amount of habitat with free flowing waters would increase by 43 mi (69.2 km) following dam removal but the quality of this habitat for supporting each life stage of redband/rainbow trout has not been carefully evaluated because 22-23 mi (35.4-37.0 km) of habitat remains under the reservoirs (Cunanan 2009); approximately 4 mi (6.4 km) of habitat has been adversely affected by the dewatered (100 cfs) flows in the bypass reach; and 17 mi (27.4 km) of habitat has been adversely affected by the daily fluctuating flows in the peaking reach (Adm. Law Judge Orders 2006). Existing trout and colonizing anadromous steelhead are expected to co-exist, as they do in other watersheds, although there may be shifts in abundance related to competition for space and food. An increase in abundance for redband/rainbow trout in the project reach could provide significantly more recreational fishing opportunities than the current trophy trout fisheries (Buchanan et al. 2011a, p. 76). • The Proposed Action provides promise for preventing extinction of Bull Trout and for increasing overall population abundance and distribution (Buchanan et al. 2011a).
AQU – 15	<p>Expert Panel for Lamprey The assessment of the Expert Panel (Close et al., 2010, p. 24-25) on lamprey was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dam removal and KBRA could eventually increase Pacific lamprey carrying capacity in the Klamath Basin by a maximum of 14 percent (based on an analysis of mainstem habitat), and potentially more if the Upper Klamath Basin is accessible and contains suitable habitat. Adult Pacific lamprey would be expected to recolonize newly accessible habitat following dam removal, but in the absence of active reintroduction measures, recolonization could take decades.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the release of sediment from dam removal result in short-term mortality of lamprey downstream from Iron Gate Dam, the Panel expects that larval lamprey from tributaries would recolonize this habitat during normal downstream movements. Pacific lamprey larval rearing capacity downstream from Iron Gate Dam would likely increase for a short time after dam removal because of fine sediment released from dam removal. This habitat would decrease over time, but likely remain higher than under current conditions because sediment transport would no longer be interrupted by the presence of the dams and reservoirs. Under dam removal and KBRA, Pacific lamprey harvest rates would be expected to eventually increase by 1 to 10 percent downstream from Iron Gate Dam.
AQU – 16	<p>Benefits to Coho</p> <p>Removal of the Four Facilities would allow coho salmon access to at least 76 miles of additional habitat (EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3). The reservoir drawdowns would allow tributaries and springs such as Fall, Shovel, and Spencer Creeks and Big Springs to flow directly into the mainstem Klamath River, creating patches of cooler water that could be used as temperature refugia by fish. Access to the cooler waters associated with spring inputs in the Hydroelectric Reach would benefit coho salmon rearing in the mainstem (Hamilton et al. 2011 cited in EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3). Access to this habitat would increase the availability of spawning sites, result in additional food resources, and provide access to areas of better water quality. Removal of the Four Facilities would result in lower water temperatures during the fall months and would provide slightly warmer water temperatures in the spring. However, water temperatures in the spring would provide favorable conditions for rearing salmonids for a longer period time than occurs under the No Action Alternative and natural fluctuations in daily temperatures would also provide some additional thermal refuge for salmonids during the evening and early morning hours in summer. Dam removal would increase dissolved oxygen concentrations, and eliminate reservoir habitat that creates the conditions necessary for the growth of blue green algae and other phytoplankton. These changes would be beneficial for coho salmon critical habitat (EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.9-92).</p>
AQU – 17	<p>Expert Panel Second Line of Analysis, Not the only line of Evidence</p> <p>The Expert Panel Reports are a valuable part of the science review for the Secretarial Determination and they identified several challenges to restoration of fishery resources as addressed in the EIS/EIR. Additionally, they are an important part of the diverse and extensive scientific record for the Klamath Basin. One purpose of an EIS/EIR is to systematically identify a proposed project's environmental effects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which would avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects. Another purpose of an EIS/EIR is to disclose this information to the public and decision makers. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service convened the Panels to review, evaluate, synthesize and provide scientific assessments regarding the likely trajectories of fish populations with and without implementation of the KBRA and KHSA. The Panels provided valuable independent reviews in addition to the various studies, reports and scientific information considered in the science review process EIS/EIR analyses. Having the Expert Panel reports as a second line of analysis, which is largely consistent with the findings in the Technical Management Team reports, provides increased confidence in the science process and the findings relative to fish and fisheries. However, the EIS/EIR relied not only on the Expert Panel Reports, but on a broader record.</p>
AQU – 18	<p>Fate of Iron Gate Hatchery under Alternatives</p> <p>Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) was built solely to mitigate for the loss of 16 miles of spawning and rearing habitat between Copco 2 Dam and Iron Gate Dam (IGD) resulting from the construction of IGD. IGH was completed in 1966. A US Supreme Court decision established hatchery production goals for Chinook and coho salmon as well as steelhead. These production goals require IGH to annually release 4.9 million smolt and 1.08 million yearling Chinook salmon, 75,000 yearling coho salmon and 200,000 yearling steelhead trout. Although PacifiCorp currently provides 100 percent of the funding for hatchery's operations, it is operated by the California Department of Fish and Game. In contrast, the restoration of fish passage for anadromous fish to historical habitat under Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 would provide for additional fish production from at least 420 miles (675.92 km) of currently inaccessible habitat.</p> <p>Future management of the IGH is considered a part of the KHSA. Under the No Action / No Project Alternative (Alternative 1), IGH would continue to operate at current levels of production to meet mitigation requirements and PacifiCorp would continue to fund 100% of operational costs. Under Alternatives 2 and 3 (dam removal alternatives), removal of IGD would require the elimination of the water supply pipe from the penstock intake structure to the fish hatchery and the fish handling facilities at the base of the dam, but IGH would remain in place. Within six months of an Affirmative Determination by the Secretary of the Interior, PacifiCorp would propose a post IGD Mitigation</p>

	<p>Hatchery Plan that would ensure hatchery mitigation goals are met for eight years following dam removal (Interim Measure [IM] 19 of the KHSR). Under IM 20 of the KHSR, PacifiCorp would also be required to provide funding to IGH or “other hatcheries necessary” to meet current mitigation requirements for eight years after dam removal. Hatchery goals would focus on Chinook salmon production, with consideration for steelhead trout and coho salmon, and may be adjusted downward from current mitigation requirements by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries Service), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in consultation with other Klamath River fish managers, in response to monitoring trends.</p> <p>After eight years, continued hatchery operations would depend largely on: 1) realized and projected benefits of restored access to additional habitat above the current location of IGD; 2) the success of habitat restoration efforts through the KBRA; and, 3) the reintroduction program identified in the KBRA. Due to this uncertainty, CDFG, in consultation with NOAA Fisheries Service, USFWS, and other Klamath River fish managers would evaluate the need to continue hatchery operations to support the upper basin salmon reintroduction program or convert the purpose to conservation and/or production. Funding for continued hatchery operations would need to be identified.</p> <p>Under Alternative 4 (fish passage at 4 dams), PacifiCorp would continue to fund hatchery operations necessary to meet mitigation requirements. Under Alternative 5 (IGD and Copco 1 Dam removal and fish passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2), PacifiCorp would continue to fund operating IGH to meet current mitigation requirements until IGD is removed, after which time the disposition of the hatchery would be determined by the CDFG in consultation with NOAA Fisheries Service, the USFWS and other Klamath River fish managers, in response to fish population monitoring trends. Funding for continued hatchery operations would need to be identified.</p>
AQU – 19	<p>Chinook Expert Panel Proposed Action Better Than No Action</p> <p>The Chinook Expert Panel assessment indicated that dams out plus KBRA implementation (Alternative 2 or 3) offers greater potential than the Current Conditions in improving conditions for water quality (Goodman et al. 2011; page 9), disease, (Goodman et al. 2011; page 12), recolonization (Goodman et al. 2011; page 14), increased harvest and escapement (Goodman et al. 2011; page 16), predation (Goodman et al. 2011; page 17), and tolerating climate change and changes in marine survival (Goodman et al. 2011; page 19).</p>
AQU – 20	<p>Bedload Sediment and Fish Habitat</p> <p>The reservoirs created by the dams have trapped most of the fine sediment (silt and clay sized material) and all of the coarse sediment (sands, gravels, and cobbles) entering them since their construction. In the Klamath River, the fine sediment travels almost exclusively as suspended load, meaning that it does not interact with the bed material. The gravels and cobbles travel almost exclusively as bed load, meaning that they travel in contact with the bed. Sand travels as a mixture of suspended and bed load depending upon the flow rate and size of the sand particle. For example, coarse sand (greater than 0.5 mm) will travel as primarily bed load for flows less than 7,000 cfs, but travel as primarily as suspended load for higher flows (Stillwater, 2004).</p> <p>Bed load movement is vital to create and maintain functional aquatic habitat. Coarse sediment, in the form of sand, gravels, cobbles and boulders is naturally delivered to and transported in undammed streams and rivers. Natural sediment pulses that result from heavy rainfall and snowmelt events are incorporated by stream and river processes into spawning beds, gravel bars, side channels, pools, riffles and floodplains that provide habitat and support food chains of aquatic species. These periodic inputs of coarse sediments are necessary for the long-term maintenance of aquatic habitats.</p> <p>The interception of these coarse sediments by the dams has caused the bed material in both riffle and pool sections downstream from the dams to be less mobile than it would be under natural conditions. The reach where the mobility of gravels and cobbles is reduced by the presence of the dams extends from Copco I Reservoir to Cottonwood Creek (Reclamation, 2012d). The reach in which mobility of sand is affected is considerably longer because sand can travel as suspended load at the higher flows and be transported over larger distances.</p> <p>After dam removal, sediment supply would be restored to the Klamath River and the natural cycles of erosion and deposition that occur would be restored. The gravel and cobble material in the reach from Copco I Reservoir to Cottonwood Creek is expected to be substantially more mobile after dam removal because the average bed material size would reduce. Therefore, the flows required to mobilize the bed material would be reduced and there would be more years in which bed mobilization occurs. There would also be substantially more sand, silt, and clay transported in the Klamath River from Copco I</p>

	<p>Reservoir to a distance beyond the Shasta River. Downstream from Cottonwood Creek this also means that the bed is expected to be overall more mobile due to the transport of sand.</p> <p>There would be short-term negative impacts from the release of the stored sediment but this is a temporary negative impact compared against long-term improvements. There is estimated to be 13.15 million cubic yards of sediment deposited behind the facilities proposed for removal (p. 3.11-11 of EIS). By the year of removal (2020), the volume is projected to increase to approximately 15 million cubic yards. The reservoir sediment is approximately 85 percent silt and clays that are unconsolidated and have low cohesive strengths when they remain wet. The moving water would erode these sediments quickly as the reservoir is drawn down from January 1, 2020, to March 15, 2020. It is expected that approximately 36 to 57 percent of this material would be eroded within the first year from the reservoir areas and washed downstream. The range in the volume is primarily driven by whether river flows are high or low during the reservoir draw down. The river channel under the present-day reservoirs would erode to the pre-dam bed elevations and not substantially beyond that because the natural sediment balance in the river would be restored. Most of the fine sediment that is eroded would be carried in suspension all the way to the ocean and not deposit in the channel downstream from the dam. The remaining 15% which is a mixtures of sand and gravel would be metered out more slowly.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the sediment conditions downstream from Iron Gate Dam is found in: Reclamation (2012d). "Hydrology, Hydraulics and Sediment Transport Studies for the Secretary's Determination on Klamath River Dam Removal and Basin Restoration," Technical Report No. SRH-2011-02. Prepared for Mid-Pacific Region, US Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, CO. It is available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies. Also, more details of the sediment movement can be found in Section 3.11 of the EIS. Appendix E of EIS address effects to fish related to the rise in suspended sediment concentrations. Appendix F of EIS addresses effects to fish as the result of bed material changes resulting from the release of sediment.</p>
AQU-21	<p>NRC Dam Removal Help Coho</p> <p>The National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Science reviewed causes of decline and strategies for recovery of endangered and threatened fishes of the Klamath Basin. Coho salmon are the only threatened or endangered salmon species in the Klamath Basin. The NRC concluded "removal of Iron Gate Dam ... could open new habitat, especially by making available tributaries that are now completely blocked to coho" (NRC, 2004, page 310). The NRC also recommended a systematic evaluation of all dams and diversions in the Klamath Basin for their effects on anadromous fishes; those with strong adverse effects should be investigated further for modification or removal (NRC, 2004, page 302). The EIS/EIR considers the impacts of, and alternatives for removal of hydroelectric dams on the Klamath as recommended by the NRC.</p>
AQU-22	<p>Expert Panel Considered in Entirety</p> <p>The Expert Panel Reports were considered in their entirety in the EIS/EIR. These reports are addressed in the EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3 Effects Determinations, Alternative 2 (and 3), Aquatic Resources Effects, Species Specific Impacts for coho, steelhead and Chinook salmon respectively.</p>
AQU-23	<p>Evaluation of Dam Removal and Restoration and Anadromy (EDRRA) Model</p> <p>Hendrix (2011) developed a Chinook salmon model which has been referred to as the Evaluation of Dam Removal and Restoration and Anadromy (EDRRA) Chinook salmon life cycle production model. In the development of the model, Hendrix analyzed a time series of spawner and recruitment data from 1979 to 2000 in the Lower Klamath Basin (STT 2005) and used the results of this analysis to forecast future productivity of Chinook salmon in the Lower Klamath River Basin. Therefore, results of the EDRRA model implicitly incorporate varying ocean and freshwater conditions that influenced survival Chinook salmon historically. As described in Section 3.3 of the EIS/EIR, results of the model indicate that there is a substantial uncertainty in Chinook salmon stock recruitment dynamics, resulting in uncertain escapement and harvest abundance forecasts. Despite this uncertainty, modeling results indicate that the Proposed Action would result in higher abundances of Chinook salmon relative to the No Action Alternative. The median numbers of adult spawners that return to the Klamath Basin are predicted to be higher with the Proposed Action than under existing conditions. Harvest is also predicted to be greater with the Proposed Action, and the probability of low escapement leading to fishery closures was less under the Proposed Action. Finally, model simulations predicted that there is approximately a 75 percent probability that there would be higher escapement with the Proposed Action, and approximately a 70 percent probability of higher annual harvest.</p>
AQU-24	<p>Chinook Climate Change and Marine Survival</p> <p>The Proposed Action [Alternatives 2 and 3] offers greater potential than the Current Conditions for Chinook salmon to tolerate climate change and changes in marine survival (Goodman et al. 2011; p. 9).</p>

AQU-25	<p>Habitat Upstream of Iron Gate Dam</p> <p>Removing the dams would restore historical access to at least 49 tributaries upstream of Iron Gate Dam providing for at least 420 miles (675.92 km) of additional habitat for anadromous fish (U.S. Department of the Interior [DOI] 2007), including groundwater-fed areas resistant to water temperature increases caused by changes in climate (Hamilton et al. 2011). In addition, the mainstem downstream from Iron Gate Dam would reflect natural temperature regimes (Hamilton et al. 2011).</p> <p>An additional 22.4 miles (36.04 km) of riverine and riparian habitat (currently under reservoirs) would restore riverine nutrient cycling and aeration processes provided by a natural channel. These improvements resulting from the Proposed Action would likely moderate the anticipated stream temperature increases resulting from climate change (EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3, p. 3.3-87).</p> <p>A successful anadromous fish restoration program has the potential to increase fish production by allowing anadromous fish to use historical production areas within and upstream of the project and would restore access to important thermal refugia, most notably in the J.C. Boyle bypassed reach and in tributaries upstream of Upper Klamath Lake. Restoration of anadromous fish upstream of Iron Gate Dam could restore Tribal and recreational fisheries over a very large geographical area and could contribute to recovery of the SONCC coho salmon ESU (FERC Final EIS, Section 3.3.3.2.5, page 3-318).</p>
AQU-26	<p>Increased Abundance for Harvest and Tribes</p> <p>The Proposed Action would restore a more natural Klamath River flow regime and improve and expand spawning and rearing habitat for salmon on the Klamath River, which would benefit salmon populations. Commercial and traditional cultural uses of salmon would benefit as a result. Commercial fishing landings would increase because of increased salmon abundance, which would increase fishing revenues (EIS/EIR Section 3.15.4.2). Increased salmon populations would attract more ocean recreational fishing effort, which would increase spending in the regional economy. (Bureau of Reclamation [Reclamation] 2012c, [NOAA Fisheries Service] 2012, cited in EIS/EIR Section 3.15.4.2). Dam removal would increase fish harvest for subsistence, cultural practices and commercial uses and provide economically beneficial opportunities for Indian Tribes residing on the Klamath River (EIS/EIR Section 3.15.4.2). These conditions are likely to result in increased opportunities and revenue for guides.</p>
AQU-27	<p>Disease</p> <p>Factors that can lead to high infection rates include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical habitat components that support the invertebrate host species (pools, eddies, sediment, mats of filamentous green algae [periphyton]) • Microhabitats with low velocity and unnaturally stable flows • Close proximity to spawning areas • Water temperatures higher than 15°C <p>To varying degrees, each of the alternatives would have different effects on fish disease and parasites because each alternative had varying effects on the variables that favor development of fish disease (EIS/EIR 3.3.4.3). Of the action alternatives, dam removal would likely do the most to reduce disease due to the parasites <i>C. shasta</i> and <i>P.minibicornis</i>. Removal of the Four Facilities would minimize static flows, immobile substrate, seasonally warm water temperatures, and planktonic food sources that are favorable for polychaetes and for <i>C. shasta</i> and <i>P. minibicornis</i> (Hetrick et al. 2009).</p> <p>Fish passage would also remove a major barrier to fish migration and reduce the concentration of carcasses that presently occurs downstream from the dam and contribute to disease. Greater dispersal of salmon spawners and thus their carcasses would reduce their proximity to dense populations of polychaetes. FERC's analysis (FERC 2007) concluded that restoring access to reaches above Iron Gate Dam for anadromous fish would allow adult fall-run Chinook salmon to distribute over a greater length of the river, reducing crowding and the concentration of disease pathogens that currently occur in the reach between Iron Gate Dam and the Shasta River (EIS/EIR 3.3.4.3).</p> <p>FERC (2007) concluded that restoring natural sediment transport processes would likely contribute to the scour of attached algae downstream from the current site of Iron Gate Dam, and deposited gravel and sand would provide a less favorable substrate for attached algae because of its greater mobility during high flow events than the existing armored substrate. The reduction in attached algae would provide less habitat for the polychaete intermediate host of <i>C. shasta</i> and <i>P. minibicornis</i>, which should reduce the infection rate of juvenile salmonids downstream from Iron Gate Dam (FERC 2007).</p>

AQU-28	<p>FERC Conclusions for Disease</p> <p>The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (2007) concluded that Klamath Hydroelectric Project has likely contributed to conditions that foster disease losses in the Lower Klamath River by (1) increasing the density of spawning adult fall Chinook salmon downstream from Iron Gate Dam; (2) promoting the development of attached algae beds that provide favorable habitat for the polychaete alternate host for <i>C. shasta</i> and <i>P. minibicornis</i>; and (3) contributing to water quality conditions that increase the stress level of juvenile and adult migrants and increase their susceptibility to disease. The water quality conditions that may increase stress levels include: (1) increased water temperatures in the late summer and fall; (2) swings in DO, pH, and ammonia levels associated with algal blooms in project reservoirs; and (3) effects of exposure to elevated levels of microcystin produced from <i>Microcystis</i> blooms in project reservoirs, which may also result in direct mortality.</p> <p>The EIS/EIR considered the FERC discussion that it is possible that the Hydroelectric Project may also reduce fish stress during the spring by delaying the increase in water temperature to stressful levels during the start of the smolt outmigration period Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 2007; p. 3-309).</p> <p>However, Bartholow et al. suggests that earlier warming of the river system may trigger juvenile salmonids to outmigrate earlier (Bartholow et al. 2005). Similarly, FERC concluded that more rapid cooling of river temperatures in the fall with the project dams removed may also allow fall Chinook salmon to spawn earlier in the fall. This, in turn, would likely result in earlier emergence and growth, and encourage earlier emigration (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 2007, p 3-314). This is consistent with findings that accumulated temperature units are more important predictors of migration of juvenile Chinook salmon than flow or photoperiod (Sykes et al. 2009). A predicted earlier outmigration in response to elevated water temperatures in the spring is also supported by a vast body of literature relating to increased growth rates and thermal response of emigrating salmonids (Hoar 1988). If so, this would mean many emigrants would avoid unsuitably warm water temperatures that are presently reached in late spring to midsummer in most years. Under the dam removal scenarios, these emigrants would thus minimize exposure to disease.</p> <p>Under a scenario of potential dam removal, it is likely that a greater diversity of salmon life histories would evolve, with some of those types more likely to avoid parasite exposure by migrating earlier or over wintering in tributaries and migrating in the fall (Bartholomew and Foott 2010; page 40).</p>
AQU-30	<p>BRT Current Status of Chinook fisheries</p> <p>New information has become available that describes the current status of the Chinook salmon populations in the Klamath River Basin. In response to a petition to list Chinook salmon in the Upper Klamath and Trinity River (UKTR) Evolutionarily Significant Unit, the National Marine Fisheries Service formed a Biological Review Team to review the biological status of the species to determine if listing under the Endangered Species Act is warranted. The results of the review indicate that recent spawner abundance estimates of both fall- run and spring-run Chinook salmon returning to spawn in natural areas are generally low compared to historical estimates of abundance; however, the majority of populations have not declined in spawner abundance over the past 30 years (i.e., from the late 1970s and early 1980s to 2010) except for the Scott and Shasta rivers where there have been modest declines (Williams et al 2011). In addition, Williams <i>et al.</i> (2011) found that hatchery returns did not track escapement to natural spawning areas and they concluded that there has been little change in the abundance levels, trends in abundance, or population growth rates since the review conducted by Myers <i>et al.</i> (1998). The Biological Review Team also noted that the recent abundance levels of some populations are low, especially in the context of historical abundance estimates. This was most evident with respect to two of the three spring-run population units that were evaluated (Salmon River and South Fork Trinity River). Although current levels of abundance are generally low compared with historical estimates of abundance, the current abundance levels do not constitute a major risk in terms of ESU extinction.</p>
AQU-31	<p>Thermal Lag and Diel Temperatures</p> <p>Removal of the dams as described under Alternatives 2 and 3 would restore a natural thermal regime to the Klamath River immediately downstream from Iron Gate Dam. The effects of the elimination of the thermal lag caused by the two largest reservoirs on aquatic species are discussed in Section 3.3.4.3 of the EIS/EIR. Water temperatures would be restored to a more natural pattern (See Section 3.2.4.3.2.1) which would be in sync with historical migration and spawning periods for anadromous salmonids, warming earlier in the spring, and cooling earlier in the fall compared to existing conditions (Stillwater Sciences 2009b; Hetrick et al. 2009; Hamilton et al. 2011). Water temperatures in the spring would provide favorable conditions for rearing salmonids for a longer period time than occurs under the</p>

	<p>No Action Alternative and natural fluctuations in daily temperatures would also provide some additional thermal refuge for salmonids during the evening and early morning hours in summer. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (2007) states that the increase in average and maximum daily temperatures may be compensated for by lower temperatures at night, which NRC (2004) concludes may allow rearing fish to move out of temperature refugia to forage, allowing growth to occur even when ambient temperatures are above optimal.</p> <p>Overall the Proposed Action would reduce minimum daily temperatures below those under existing conditions during the summer when water temperatures are warm. Salmonids in the Klamath River have been observed to migrate between thermal refugia during times of the day when cooler water temperatures exist (Belchik 2003). Dunsmoor and Huntington (2006) suggest that lower nighttime and early morning temperatures with dam removal would allow fish to leave thermal refugia in the Klamath River to forage and thereby allow more effective use of the available refugia habitat. This would benefit salmonids by allowing them to make feeding excursions when confined to refugia during the warmer times of the day.</p>
AQU-32	<p>Iron Gate Hatchery Alternative 1, 2, 3 and a Conservation Hatchery</p> <p>Future management of the IGH is considered a part of the KHSa. Under the No Action / No Project Alternative (Alternative 1), IGH would continue to operate at current levels of production to meet mitigation requirements and PC would continue to fund 100% of operational costs. Under Alternatives 2 and 3 (dam removal alternatives), removal of IGD would require the elimination of the water supply pipe from the penstock intake structure to the fish hatchery and the fish handling facilities at the base of the dam, but IGH would remain in place. Within 6 months of an Affirmative Determination by the Secretary of the Interior, PC would propose a post IGD Mitigation Hatchery Plan that would ensure hatchery mitigation goals are met for eight years following dam removal (Interim Measure [IM] 19 of the KHSa). Under IM 20 of the KHSa, PC would also be required to provide funding to IGH or “other hatcheries necessary” to meet current mitigation requirements for eight years after dam removal. Hatchery goals would focus on Chinook salmon production, with consideration for steelhead trout and coho salmon, and may be adjusted downward from current mitigation requirements by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries Service), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in consultation with other Klamath River fish managers, in response to monitoring trends.</p> <p>After eight years, continued hatchery operations would depend largely on: 1) realized and projected benefits of restored access to additional habitat above the current location of IGD; 2) the success of habitat restoration efforts through the KBRA; and, 3) the reintroduction program identified in the KBRA. Due to this uncertainty, CDFG, in consultation with NOAA Fisheries Service, USFWS, and other Klamath River fish managers would evaluate the need to continue hatchery operations to support the upper basin salmon reintroduction program or convert the purpose to conservation and/or production. Funding for continued hatchery operations would need to be identified.</p> <p>In addition to the Interim Measures under the KHSa described above, the KBRA also provides for development of a conservation hatchery (Section 11.4.4 Conservation Hatchery) to assist in reintroduction efforts if the need is identified in the Fisheries Reintroduction Plan. Iron Gate Hatchery, Fall Creek Hatchery, or another facility could serve to meet this purpose provided it satisfies the requirements to operate as a conservation hatchery. The development of guidelines for the use of the conservation hatchery would be outlined in the Phase I Fisheries Reintroduction and Management Plan and would support the establishment of naturally producing anadromous salmonid populations in the Klamath Basin following implementation of the KHSa (EIS/EIR 3.3-140).</p>
AQU-33	<p>ESA Compliance</p> <p>There are a number of sections of the KBRA that clarify that Federal agencies must comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and other legal requirements, including the Endangered Species Act (ESA), when implementing the KBRA (see, for example, KBRA sections 2.1, 2.2, and 7.4.3). Section 22.5 of the KBRA specifically clarifies that the KBRA does not supercede NOAA Fisheries Service and USFWS’ obligations under the ESA and related regulations. Section 22.5 of the KBRA provides, “By entering into this Agreement, NOAA Fisheries Service and USFWS are not prejudging the outcome of any process under the ESA and NOAA Fisheries Service and USFWS implementing regulations, and NOAA Fisheries Service and USFWS expressly reserve the right to make determinations and take actions as necessary to meet the requirements of the ESA and implementing regulations.” In addition, the KBRA specifically describes processes that are available and would be used by parties to comply with requirements under the ESA (see, for example, KBRA sections 22.1 and 22.2).</p>

	Regardless of the outcome of the Secretarial Determination, future Federal actions influencing coho salmon or their critical habitat would be subject to interagency consultations under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to insure those actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the SONCC ESU of coho salmon or result in the destruction or adverse modification of its designated critical habitat.
AQU-34	<p>Trap and Haul/Keno Dam Water Quality</p> <p>(A.) Trap and haul has been proposed to transport migrating adult fish upstream of the Keno Impoundment when certain adverse water conditions exist. Trap and haul around Keno Impoundment is seen as a temporary solution, for a single fish stock (fall Chinook adults) and would only be done seasonally when water quality cannot meet certain criteria (U.S. Department of the Interior [DOI] 2007/NOAA Fisheries Service 2007 – modified fishway prescriptions). These conditions occur during the period July-October.</p> <p>In some years it may not be necessary. In the long run, implementation of KBRA and TMDLs may eliminate the need for trap and haul around the Keno Impoundment, or sooner if engineering solutions to the low summer dissolved oxygen in the Keno Impoundment can be identified and implemented.</p> <p>(B.) Trap and haul around the four dams would bypass 58 miles of important salmonid main stem and tributary habitat and cold water refugia (Administrative Law Judge 2006).</p>
COST-1	<p>Cost Estimate</p> <p>The cost of dam removal in 2020 was estimated at approximately \$292 million, with a range between \$238 million and \$493 million, as reported in the Detailed Plan Report posted with the draft EIS/EIR, for the Proposed Action. The Draft EIS/EIR (page ES-12) indicates that "KHSAs sets a cost cap of \$450 million in 2020 dollars for removal of the Four Facilities. Of this, an amount not to exceed \$200 million in 2020 dollars would come from additional charges to PacifiCorp ratepayers residing in California and Oregon, and up to \$250 million in 2020 dollars would come from the sale of bonds in California or other means deemed appropriate financing mechanisms to cover removal costs in excess of the rate-payer contributions. The United States government would not be responsible for the costs of facilities removal." The KBRA is a connected action with an estimated cost of under \$1 billion in 2011 dollars, which will require Federal funding.</p>
COST-2 (fish passage alternativ e)	<p>Cost of FERC Relicensing</p> <p>The Draft EIS/EIR (ES.2.2.2) indicates "The economic reality of implementing fishways and meeting CWA 401 Certification at the Four Facilities combined with the prospect of annual loss of revenue, and the protection of prudent and reasonable utility rates for its customers....resulted in PacifiCorp signing the KHSAs." One would conclude from this that PacifiCorp believed that dam removal would be cheaper than the modifications necessary to retain the dams.</p>
COST-3 (power rates)	<p>Cost of Power Surcharge</p> <p>The charge on PacifiCorp power bills was approved by the Oregon Public Utilities Commission. Page 3.15-63 of the Draft EIS/EIR describes the 2 percent surcharge added by PacifiCorp to customer rates in California and Oregon to cover costs of dam removal. The Web site http://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2011ords/11-174.pdf contains a copy of the Final Order 11-174 approving the PacifiCorp rate increases. Funds collected through this charge would be used to fund a portion of the proposed Klamath River Dam removal or the cost of relicensing and are being applied to rate payers in both States. California bond funds would be used to pay for the remainder of the dam removal costs. Rate increases for utility customers are controlled by the PUCs to prevent price gouging and sudden harmful increases in power costs. Rate increases for PacifiCorp customers in the Klamath Basin would rise even if the dams are retained in order to cover upgrade and maintenance costs of the four facilities.</p>
CUL-1	<p>Shasta Nation Participation</p> <p>The Shasta were included in the NEPA and NHPA Section 106 processes for this study. Information regarding ceremonial sites and burial grounds within the Shasta aboriginal territory was obtained through ethnographic reports, cultural resources reports, and consultations. The Shasta people are identified and their aboriginal territory is considered in 3.13 Cultural and Historic Resources of the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, Shasta people would be included in the additional consultations under NHPA Section 106 for each mitigation measure. Letters initiating NHPA Section 106 consultation were sent to the Shasta Indian Nation and Shasta Nation Chairperson on October 19, 2010 with a second letter sent on June 23, 2011. Ethnographic information received from the Shasta Indian Nation in January 2011</p>

	was incorporated into the Draft EIS/EIR as well as during a meeting with the Shasta Nation on March 16, 2012 has been incorporated in the EIS/EIR.
CUL-2	<p>Federal Recognition</p> <p>The Shasta Nation is not currently recognized by the Federal Government as a sovereign entity and therefore has no federally recognized trust resources that the Federal Government is required to protect/conserv. The current process for Federal recognition, found in 25 C.F.R. 83, is a rigorous process requiring the petitioning tribe to satisfy seven mandatory criteria, including historical and continuous American Indian identity in a distinct community. Each of the criteria demands exceptional anthropological, historical, and genealogical research and presentation of evidence.</p>
GEN-1	<p>Comment Included as Part of the Record</p> <p>A response to this comment is not required under CEQA or NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (CEQA Guidelines, section 15088; NEPA Regulations 40 CFR Part 1503.4). Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA/CEQA process. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.</p>
GEN-2	<p>Some People Support Dam Removal and Others Oppose Dam Removal</p> <p>The Secretary of the Interior acknowledges that there are many people who support dam removal and there are many who maintain that the dams should stay in place. There are a range of reasonable alternatives presented in the EIS/EIR; 18 alternatives are presented in the EIS/EIR, five of which are examined in detail using the best available science. There are positive and negative aspects for each of these alternatives. The potential effect of each alternative is discussed in the EIS/EIR and will be fully considered by the Secretary, along with public input and peer reviewed science before making a final determination.</p>
GEN- 3	<p>Best Available Information</p> <p>The Lead Agencies have used their best efforts to identify and disclose as much relevant information as possible in the EIS/EIR based on the review of the best available information at the time of the issuance of the Notice of Intent, as well as new information developed to support the Secretarial Determination process. Under CEQA, the Lead Agency is not required to conduct every test or perform all research, studies, or experimentation at the commenter's request (Pub. Resources Code, section 21091(d)(2)(B), CEQA Guidelines sec. 15151 and 15204). The Lead Agencies implemented various processes to ensure that only high quality and objective science will contribute to the Secretarial Determination, including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new Federal scientific studies used followed Federal guidance requirements on peer review and scientific integrity, including the procedures adopted by the Departments of the Interior and Commerce (DOI and DOC) in response to the 2004 Office of Management and Budget Bulletin on Peer Review, the Presidential Memorandum on Scientific Integrity dated March 9, 2009 (which was incorporated into Appendix J of the KHSAs), the Office of Science and Technology Policy 2010 guidance memorandum on scientific integrity, the 2011 DOI Memorandum on Science Integrity (for DOI agencies), and as well as internal procedures used by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), United States Geological Survey (USGS), Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and National Oceanic and Atmospheric (NOAA) Fisheries Service. • Any new Federal scientific studies or reports were developed by a Program Manager, who was supported by a Technical Management Team, which included nine sub-teams covering various disciplines (Engineering, Geomorphology, and Constructability; Environmental Compliance; Biological; Water Quality; Tribal/Cultural; Real Estate; Recreation; and Communications). The quality and objectivity of these products and reports all benefited from the expertise of sub-team members representing multiple Federal agencies. • During the period of project design and execution of new Federal studies, the public and stakeholders were briefed at frequent intervals via public meetings. Public input from these meetings closed data gaps, refined study approaches, and provided additional studies or data to incorporate into the analyses. This involvement of the public improved the quality and the breadth of the science, and ensured that the final reports addressed questions and concerns raised by the public, Indian tribes, and local agencies (e.g. counties).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When warranted, new studies were undertaken to fill data gaps and to better inform the Secretarial Determination. Some example new studies included: (1) reservoir sediment drilling and diver inspections of the dam foundations prior to preparing a feasibility engineering plan for dam removal; (2) hydrologic modeling to predict drawdown and transport of reservoir bottom sediments downstream; (3) chemical analysis of sediments and fish tissues to assess the effects of these suspended sediments on humans and biota if they were transported downstream or exposed as new land surfaces; (4) a model of the expected response of Chinook salmon to the Proposed Action; (5) economic analysis of the effects to various sectors on implementing the agreements, locally, regionally and nationally and on Indian Tribes, among many other studies. • All scientific reports produced by the Technical Management Team (TMT) were reviewed by independent subject matter experts (outside of the Klamath Secretarial Determination process) in accordance with the policies of the agency producing the report. Peer reviews were undertaken to ensure that the reported results were reliable, objective, accurate and scientifically sound. • In some cases, an existing report important for the Secretarial Determination process had not previously been peer reviewed. Prior to use in contributing to the Secretarial Determination, these previously unreviewed reports were assigned to an independent contractor to obtain one or more critique(s) by subject matter experts to verify their reliability, objectivity, accuracy and to verify their scientific veracity. • An independent contractor convened four Expert Panels to evaluate and make findings regarding the likely trajectory of fish populations under both the Proposed Action and the No Action alternatives. The majority of panel members were not from Federal agencies, but were from universities or consulting firms. The four panels evaluated: resident native fish (trout and suckers), lamprey, coho salmon and steelhead, and Chinook salmon. These panels provided an independent evaluation of the information that was available at the time of their deliberations in preparation of their reports. These independent analyses were largely consistent with the findings in the Technical Management Team reports, which provided increased confidence in the science process and the findings relative to fish and fisheries. <p>One of the goals of scientific analysis is to develop new information and to increase the certainty of conclusions (i.e. reduce scientific uncertainty). Using best available information, however, cannot remove all scientific uncertainty from a decision. No amount of investigating, hypothesis testing, modeling, or peer reviewing would ensure perfect knowledge about how the Klamath River ecosystem would respond to future large changes/actions (e.g. alternatives 2 through 5) or even 50 years of “no action” (e.g. alternative 1). Scientific uncertainty is inherent in any analysis of present and future conditions, particularly in a system as complex as the Klamath Basin.</p> <p>It is important to understand what is meant by the term scientific “uncertainty” because it has a very different meaning than the meaning more commonly used by the public outside the realm of science; this difference in word usage often leads to serious misunderstandings when science results are communicated. Science and engineering use the word “uncertainty” to define how well something is known, not whether it is known. Because nothing measured, estimated, modeled, or predicted can be known with perfect accuracy and certainty, scientists seek to describe the statistical variability of a number, a range of possibilities, and/or the relative level of confidence in a conclusion. By defining uncertainty, scientists seek to clarify the strength and accuracy of a conclusion. This definition of scientific uncertainty should not be confused with the more common definition of uncertainty (outside the realm of science and engineering), which typically conveys that something is completely unknown, that a result is unreliable, or that the state of knowledge is confused.</p> <p>In some cases, scientific uncertainty is quantifiable and is often described as the estimated amount an observed, calculated, or modeled value may differ from the true value. For example, a study may show that we have 98 percent confidence that the true value would fall within a defined range of values. This defined range of values is referred to as the 98 percent confidence interval. For estimating the potential cost of removal of the Four Facilities, engineers were able to determine a most probable cost, as well as the 98 percent confidence interval around the most probable cost, in order to define the range of possible removal costs.</p>
--	--

	<p>In other cases how well something is known cannot be quantified and uncertainty is often described in relative terms, such as predicting how an ecosystem (e.g. Klamath River) may respond to a potential action (e.g. dam removal). Based on the best available information and analyses, scientists convey the likelihood of these predictions with descriptions such as “highly likely”, “probable”, or other caveats intended to disclose the level of certainty in a conclusion. For example, predicting the potential benefits of dam removal on juvenile salmon disease in the Klamath Basin cannot be known with perfect accuracy, but most fishery biologists believe removal of the Four Facilities would decrease the infection rates. A lack of certainty of the exact response of the ecosystem does not preclude a conclusion that juvenile salmon disease would likely decrease. This conclusion is based on studies of other river systems, investigations of salmon disease in the Klamath River, and knowledge of the specific factors contributing to salmon disease and how these factors would change if dams were removed.</p> <p>In order to provide a sound foundation for a Secretarial Determination on removal of the Four Facilities, multiple strategies were used to weigh the validity of hypotheses, reach scientific conclusions, and decrease scientific uncertainty around those conclusions. These strategies included: (1) developing new studies, that test multiple hypotheses, in order to fill critical information gaps; (2) developing numerical models (when gathering empirical data is not possible) to predict the probable ecosystem response; (3) repeating investigations on critical topics to ensure past results are reproducible; (4) obtaining independent expert opinions on important topics; and (5) drawing conclusions based on the weight of evidence and multiple lines of evidence.</p> <p>Using multiple lines of evidence refers to a process when conclusions are not drawn from a single study but from two or more studies that have different approaches. For example, the conclusion that dam removal and KBRA implementation could increase Chinook production in the Klamath Basin was based on a recent synthesis of previous study findings (Hamilton et. al. 2011), two new independent modeling studies (Hendrix 2011; Lindley and Davis, 2011), a Chinook Expert Panel report (Goodman et al. 2011), among others. Although the authors of each of these four peer-reviewed reports used different approaches and assumptions, as well as presented different levels of confidence in quantifying their conclusions and scientific uncertainty, they all concluded that Chinook salmon would increase in number relative to the “no action alternative” of leaving dams in place and not implementing KBRA. Considering several diverse lines of evidence decreased scientific uncertainty and strengthened this overarching conclusion.</p> <p>In some situations, where studies present conflicting results, the “weight of evidence” for a conclusion considers the quantity of evidence supporting that conclusion as well as when and how studies were done; generally weight is given to more recent studies and studies done with more scientific rigor (e.g. peer review). When there is a significant amount of conflicting information, a conclusion is often expressed with a higher degree of uncertainty.</p>
GEN-7	<p>Unsubstantiated Information</p> <p>The information the comment author has provided in support of assertions made in the comment is not known to the authors of this Final EIS/EIR and could not be found through library database queries, internet research and research in the Lead Agencies data archives. The EIS/EIR did however rely on the best available science in support of the analysis that the comment is directed and absent any additional information to substantiate this comment, no response is required.</p>
GEN-9	<p>Beneficial Effects</p> <p>The impact determinations for beneficial effects are consistent with CEQA and NEPA terminology. CEQA and NEPA do not identify between different scales or magnitudes of beneficial effects. No changes have been made to the statements.</p>
GEN-13	<p>Range of Alternatives Considered</p> <p>Both NEPA and CEQA include provisions that the draft environmental review analyze a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the purpose and need/project objectives, and are potentially feasible (40 CFR § 1502.14; 43 CFR § 46.420(b); Pub. Resources Code, sec. 21002; CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a), (c), (f)). Alternatives should be limited to ones that avoid or substantially lessen the Proposed Action’s significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.6(a), (c), (f), sec. 15204(a); Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.3). The Lead Agencies are not required to consider all conceivable alternatives to the Proposed Action. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21091(d)(2)(B); CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a); sec. 15204(a). Nor are the Lead Agencies required to analyze an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(f)(3). The Lead Agencies developed a list of 18 preliminary alternatives that were screened down to five. These five alternatives were analyzed in the</p>

	<p>Draft EIS/EIR because they best meet the NEPA purpose and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, and are potentially feasible (Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.3). (A full description of the alternatives and the rationale for screening the alternatives is presented in Appendix A, the Alternatives Formulation Report).</p>
GEN-16	<p>Public Involvement</p> <p>The Lead Agencies have provided many opportunities for public involvement throughout the environmental review process and have met or exceeded the public involvement requirements of NEPA and CEQA. For additional information on public involvement see Chapter 7.</p> <p>Seven public scoping meetings were held in July 2010 in California and Oregon to help determine the range of alternatives, the environmental effects, and the mitigation measures to be considered in an environmental document. Verbal and written comments on the scope of the environmental document were accepted at these meetings. The Department of the Interior (DOI) published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register (Vol. 75, No. 133, Monday June 14, 2010), as required by NEPA. California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) submitted a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on Monday June 21, 2010 with the State Clearinghouse (State Clearinghouse #2010062060) and also sent copies of the NOP to affected agencies, according to CEQA requirements. Both notices contained information on the location, date, and time of the scoping meetings. Newspaper advertisements providing the dates and locations of scoping meetings were published in the following newspapers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sacramento Bee (July 27 2010) • Herald and News, Klamath Falls (June 23, 24, 25 & 27 and July 4, 6, 7, 8 & 9, 2010) • Medford Mail Tribune (June 27 and July 4, 2010) • Statesman Journal (June 27, 2010) • Times-Standard (June 23 & 24, and July 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, & 14, 2010) • Siskiyou Daily News (June 23, 24 & 25, and July 2, 6 & 7, 2010) • Daily Triplicate (June 23 & 24, and July 4, 7, & 13, 2010) • Mount Shasta News (June 23 & 30, and July 7, 2010) <p>The DOI and DFG issued a joint press release on June 14, 2010, notifying the public of the intent to develop an EIS/EIR and hold scoping meetings. A postcard containing information on the scoping meetings was mailed to over 5,000 individuals and entities on the project mailing list. Scoping meeting information was also posted on the project Web site (www.KlamathRestoration.gov).</p> <p>The Lead Agencies held six public hearings on the Draft EIS/EIR in October 2011 in California and Oregon that were open to the public. At these meetings, verbal and written comments on the Draft EIS/EIR were accepted. To publicize these meetings, the Lead Agencies issued a press release to the project mailing list, posted notices in local area newspapers, and posted the public hearing dates and locations on the project Web site (www.KlamathRestoration.gov). Additionally, on Thursday September 22, 2011, DOI published a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Public Hearings for Klamath Facilities Removal (FR Vol. 76, No. 184, 58833). This notice provided information on how to submit comments on the Draft EIS/EIR and listed the dates and locations of six public hearings that were open to the public and were held to solicit comments on the Draft EIS/EIR. DFG submitted a Notice of Completion to the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2010062060) on the same date. Newspaper advertisements providing the dates and locations of the hearings were published in the following newspapers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eureka Times Standard (September 21 & 24, 2011) • Herald & News, Klamath Falls, OR (September 21 & 24, 2011) • Medford Mail Tribune (September 21 & 24, 2011) • North Coast Journal (September 21 & 24, 2011) • Oregonian (September 21 & 24, 2011) • Redding Record Searchlight (September 21 & 24, 2011) • Sacramento Bee (September 21 & 24, 2011) • Siskiyou Daily News (September 21 & 24, 2011) • Statesman Journal, Salem, OR (September 21 & 24, 2011) <p>Two Rivers Tribune (September 21 & 24, 2011)</p>
GEN-20	<p>PacifiCorp Private Ownership of Hydroelectric Facilities</p> <p>The Four Facilities are private property owned and operated by a private utility company, PacifiCorp Energy (PacifiCorp). The Four Facilities are not owned by the general public, the residents of Siskiyou County, Siskiyou County itself, or the States of Oregon or California. PacifiCorp and other signatory</p>

	<p>parties willingly negotiated and entered into the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSa) to establish a process for potential removal of these facilities. Becoming a party to the KHSa was a PacifiCorp business decision, which they determined was in the best interest of PacifiCorp stockholders and their approximately 1.7 million customers across six Western States.</p> <p>Both Oregon Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and the California PUC have determined that the cost to PacifiCorp customers would be less under a decommissioning scenario than a relicensing scenario (EIS/EIR Section 3.15.4.2).</p>
GEN-21	<p>Access to Water for Fire Suppression</p> <p>As described on Page 3.18-18 of the Draft EIS/EIR, helicopters equipped with normal firefighting equipment will still be able to obtain water from the Klamath River once the dams are removed. Minimal depth for helicopter buckets is 18 inches. Fire trucks responding to fires in the area would be able to refill from the river using recreational and construction access roads.</p>
GEN-22	<p>Willingness-to-pay Survey</p> <p>CEQA requires a response to significant environmental issues raised (CEQA Guidelines, section 15088). This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue, and therefore no response is required. However, in an effort to provide additional information the Lead Agencies respond as follows: The commenter is referring to a "total economic value" study conducted in order to estimate the total economic value (which includes both use and nonuse values) associated with the Agreements. The study design and the survey used to collect the data for this analysis were approved by the Office of Management Budget (OMB) on July 11, 2011, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act. The results of the analysis were not included in the impact analyses for the Draft EIS/EIR, but are displayed in the SDOR in the section discussing the results from the National Economic Development Analysis (this analysis is posted on klamathrestoration.gov). Additional information on the survey itself can be found by accessing http://www.reginfo.gov/ using OMB Control Number 1090-0010.</p>
GEN-23	<p>Agenda 21</p> <p>This Draft EIS/EIR has been developed in accordance with the requirements of NEPA and CEQA to analyze the potential impacts to the environment from the removal of the four PacifiCorp dams on the Klamath River as contemplated in the KHSa and from the implementation of the KBRA. Together, these two agreements attempt to resolve long-standing conflicts in the Klamath River Basin. Some of the conflicts and issues these agreements attempt to resolve are enumerated on Draft EIS/EIR Pages ES-1 and ES-8-9. The activities leading to the development of the KHSa and the KBRA are discussed on Pages ES-7-13.</p> <p>Agenda 21 is an action plan of the United Nations seeking to promote sustainable development. It was an outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992. Agenda 21 can be found on the internet at http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/.</p> <p>Both the KHSa and KBRA were negotiated and signed by a diverse array of over 40 parties with an interest in resolving Klamath Basin issues. The goal of the KHSa is found on page 3 or the agreement and the goals of the KBRA are found on page 4 of that agreement. Neither the United Nations nor any of its programs or committees took part in the negotiation of these agreements; provided guidance, consultation, input, or review of the agreements; or are signatories to these agreements. The United Nations Agenda 21 is not mentioned in either agreement. See Klamathrestoration.gov for the KHSa and KBRA.</p>
GEN-24	<p>Noise Levels</p> <p>CEQA does not require Lead Agencies to collect data on existing noise levels. Rather, using the estimated ambient noise levels for rural residential areas published by the USEPA (1974) is an acceptable method for estimating the ambient background noise levels in the existing environment. The analysis relied on published values for rural residential areas; urban noise levels were not considered in this evaluation (see p. 3.23-3).</p> <p>Impacts associated with construction or demolition activities are summarized in Section 3.23.4.3. Table 3.23-6 summarizes the estimated noise levels at the closest residential receptors and the increase noise levels caused by the Proposed Action. As explained on p. 3.23-3, J.C. Boyle Dam is not included on this table because no residential areas are within a mile of the dam.</p>
Gen-27	<p>Interplay between Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) and KBRA</p> <p>The objectives of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) and the KBRA are interdependent, given the hydraulic and biological linkage between the two river basins. Further, we acknowledge that the Federal Government's trust responsibility to the affected Tribes must be fulfilled by our efforts in</p>

	<p>both basins. The Record of Decision for the Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration was executed in December 2000, establishing the current TRRP as a component of the Central Valley Project. The KBRA recognizes the interdependence and therefore shares many of the same goals as the TRRP, including express provisions that the two programs do not adversely affect one another. For example, Section 2.2.12 of the KBRA states:</p> <p><i>"The Parties intend that this Agreement not adversely affect the Trinity River Restoration Program, and further intend that the Trinity River Restoration Program not adversely affect this Agreement."</i></p> <p>From a scientific perspective, the habitat restoration and monitoring actions in the KBRA and the TRRP are viewed as complimentary, even having cumulative beneficial effects rather than being competitive or exclusionary processes. Below the confluence, Trinity River Basin and Klamath Basin fish must coexist, so improved biological conditions in the Klamath system would be of overall benefit to fish populations of the Trinity. Conversely, improvements to fish habitat conditions, associated fish populations, and improved knowledge of biological conditions in the Trinity system will be of overall benefit to Klamath fish populations.</p> <p>The parties to the TRRP and the KBRA are committed to transparency, adaptive management, real-time reporting, and the production of annual (and in the case KBRA, decadal) reports which will facilitate the sharing of information and coordination between the two programs. The TRRP partners have for years made their data and restoration efforts available to the public via the TRRP Web site and other means.</p> <p>The goals of the TRRP and the KBRA are closely aligned in program plans and intended benefits to fisheries throughout the basin; water and power users in the Upper Basin; counties; Indian tribes; and basin communities. Both programs include extensive habitat restoration, and improvements to water flow and quality. The interconnectedness of the two programs in their implementation evidence a commitment to continued support in the common restoration effort of the Klamath River. From a biological perspective, the TRRP and KBRA are closely aligned and the two programs would complement one another.</p>
GEN-29	<p>River Drying Up</p> <p>The Lead Agencies are aware that under historical conditions, prior to the development of the Klamath Irrigation Project, there were rare occasions when strong southerly winds at Upper Klamath Lake created seiches that greatly reduced flows at Link River. Estimates of the unimpaired or natural flow in the Klamath River have been developed by Reclamation (2005) and Hardy et al. (2006a). Reclamation (2005) estimated that in critically dry water years, for the months of August and September, mean monthly flows at Keno Dam(90 percent exceedence) would be 520 cfs and 560 cfs, respectively. Review of historical flow data at Keno Dam (USGS Gage # 11519500) for water years from 1905 through 1913 show that the lowest mean daily flow recorded never fell below 755 cfs.</p> <p>Following the construction of Copco 1 Dam in 1918, hydroelectric peaking operations reduced the mean daily flows in the Klamath River near Fall Creek (USGS Gage# 11512500) to levels below 100 cfs on 50 occasions between water years 1931 and 1937. Instantaneous flow levels may have been lower. Thus, hydropower peaking between 1918 and the construction of Iron Gate Dam to re-regulate flows in 1962 likely explain reports of the lower river "running dry". Under the Proposed Action a more natural hydrograph and elimination of peaking means these extreme low flows would not occur.</p> <p>Upper Klamath Lake holds 83 percent of the total storage capacity of the reservoirs on the Klamath River (FERC 2007) and approximately 98 percent of active storage. Link Dam controls Upper Klamath Lake and would remain under all alternatives. Associated reservoirs for J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams contain 14 percent of the total storage capacity and only 2 percent of the active storage on the river.</p> <p>The purpose for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project facilities is power generation, and although the operation of these facilities can alter flow patterns (power peaking) with in this reach, the operation of these facilities does not create additional storage of water that could be used to supplement flows in the river downstream. The total amount of active storage available within the four hydroelectric reservoirs is only 11,749 acre-feet and release of this pool would eliminate the ability of these projects to generate hydropower. The presence of the reservoirs actually reduces the annual volume of water that would otherwise flow downstream because of evaporative losses related to the large surface area created by the impoundments. Removal of the hydroelectric project reservoirs would result in a slight increase in flow as the evaporative losses would be reduced. Evaporation from the surface of the</p>

	<p>reservoirs is currently about 11,000 acre-feet/year and after dam removal the evapotranspiration in the same reaches is expected to be approximately 4,800 acre-feet/year, resulting in a gain in flow to the Klamath River of approximately 6,200 acre-feet/year (Reclamation 2012d). The presence of the lower four dams on the Klamath River actually decreases the amount of flow that would otherwise be available to anadromous fish.</p>
GEN-30	<p>Power Generation As described in Section 3.18: Public Health and Safety, Utilities and Public Services, Solid Waste, Power, four of the seven power generating facilities of the KHP would be removed. As shown in Table 3.18-4, the Klamath Hydroelectric Project has a total average annual electric output of 716,800 Megawatt hours (MWh), while the Four Facilities under consideration have an annual average output of 686,000 MWh. The EIS/EIR acknowledges that the loss of renewable power generated at the four facilities would increase greenhouse gas emissions (Section 3.10), and decrease property tax revenues (Section 3.15.3.6).</p>
GHG-1	<p>Green Power Each type of power generation has its own typical set of environmental impacts. For instance, there are air quality concerns for coal and biomass generation, avian collisions for wind, visual and habitat disruption for solar, and disruption of fish migration and populations for hydroelectric generation. The Lead Agencies acknowledge these and the effects of associated facilities, such as transmission lines. The EIS/EIR analyzes the environmental impacts of replacement power in Sections 3.10, Global Climate Change. The EIS/EIR uses a conservative approach in predicting the power resource mix under dam removal alternatives and their associated effects by assuming a mix similar to the current portfolio. A more precise estimation of future energy projects would be speculative at this time. These include a change in the annual flow pattern of the river (the hydrograph), lower dissolved oxygen levels, and the algae that blooms in the reservoirs and produces toxic microcystin, all of which create impacts to native fisheries and other aquatic wildlife (Section 3.2, Water Quality, p. 14). The Final EIS/EIR acknowledges that the loss of renewable power generated at the four facilities would increase greenhouse gas emissions in Section 3.10. In addition, the California Energy Commission does not recognize hydroelectric facilities that produce over 30MW as “renewable energy” based on the environmental impacts caused by the dams (CEC, 2011).</p> <p>However the loss in renewable power production is expected to be offset by California requirements on power retailers that 33% of their power portfolio be provided from renewable power sources by 2020, which would increase the amount of renewable power generated and used in the State compared to current levels (California Renewable Portfolio Standards, (http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Renewables/overview.htm). Oregon enacted a similar standard in 2007, asking the three largest power retailers in the State, which includes PacifiCorp, to provide 20% of their power from renewable sources by 2020 (http://www.oregon.gov/ENERGY/RENEW/RPS_Summary.shtml).</p> <p>While there could be a short-term increase in criteria pollutant emissions, these emissions would diminish as additional sources of renewable power are brought online as described. Additionally, it is not possible to pinpoint the exact location at which temporary increased emissions could occur and it is not possible to determine if a localized impact could occur. Unlike GHG emissions that have regional and global implications for increased emissions, criteria pollutant emissions contribute to localized impacts.</p> <p>Carbon sequestration could occur from many restoration activities that would occur following the removal of the dams. The benefits were not quantified, but the EIS does not state that restoration activities would definitely cause a net reduction in carbon emissions. Rather, it states that restoration activities “could” cause a net reduction in carbon depending on the size and types of plants that are used.</p> <p>Cumulative effects of future energy projects not yet proposed or under development would be overly broad speculation and is therefore not analyzed in the EIS/EIR.</p>
GHG-2	<p>Rate Increases Rates for PacifiCorp customers in the Klamath Basin are anticipated to rise even if the dams are retained. Any rate increase would be used to fund a portion of the Proposed Action, if approved, or the cost of relicensing, if it is not approved. Federal funds and California bond funds would be used to pay for the remainder of the costs associated with the Proposed Action. The current increased charge on PacifiCorp power bills was approved by the Oregon Public Utilities Commission, and the rate increases are being applied to rate payers in both Oregon and California. Rate increases for utility customers are controlled by the public utility commissions to prevent price gouging and sudden harmful</p>

	<p>increases in power costs. Both Oregon PUC and the California PUC have determined that the cost to PacifiCorp customers would be less under a decommissioning scenario than a relicensing scenario.</p> <p>According to the Oregon PUC hearings on the cost increases associated with the KHSA, PacifiCorp claimed that relicensing would cost their customers in excess of \$400 million in capital costs and \$60 million in operations and maintenance costs over a 40 year license term (Oregon PUC Order No. 10-364, http://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2010ords/10-364.pdf). The cost of decommissioning has been capped at \$450 million under the KHSA, and customer contributions have been capped at \$200 million with up to \$184 million coming from Oregon customers and up to \$16 million from California customers. The annual collection from PacifiCorp may not exceed two percent of their annual revenue, and must be collected as a specified amount per kilowatt-hour billed to customers. The State of California is obligated to provide the remaining \$250 million through the issuance of a bond or some other means (Oregon PUC Order No. 10-364, http://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2010ords/10-364.pdf).</p> <p>California's PUC (CPUC) also determined that the KHSA would provide more certainty to PacifiCorp customers in terms of cost than a relicensing scenario, as the KHSA mandates specific cost caps to the Utility's customers. Without the KHSA, the CPUC finds that PacifiCorp's ratepayers would be subject to "an uncertain amount of cost in addressing what to do with PacifiCorp's Klamath assets" (CPUC Final Decision to Authorize a Surcharge to Recover the Costs of Removing the Klamath Assets, http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/FINAL_DECISION/134812-03.htm).</p>
GHG-3	<p>Replacement Power</p> <p>Replacement power for reduced generation at any of the Klamath facilities would be provided by PacifiCorp. The interconnected characteristics of the power grid enable power to be transmitted thousands of miles. Power generated at the Four Facilities may be used for local demand or it may be used to meet demands in other communities. Likewise, power generated by PacifiCorp and other generators in other communities may be used in southern Oregon and northern California. There is already enough excess generating capacity in the Northwest region to meet the demand in PacifiCorp's Klamath Service Area if the dams are removed (North American Electric Reliability Corporation 2010). In their 2011 Integrated Resource Plan, PacifiCorp projected that their service area, as a whole, would experience a "summer peak resource deficit" of 326 MW beginning in 2011. This means that more power is needed in the region to meet peak summertime demand. PacifiCorp's Strategic Plan has identified the continuing need for new power sources and increased transmission capacity in the Klamath service area regardless of the outcome of the proposed decommissioning (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.18 p. 13-14). New sources of power, demand side management, and power purchases would be needed to meet the increasing demand in PacifiCorp's service area in the near future, and is unrelated to the proposed project. The Klamath hydropower facilities provide important "load balancing" functions as they are able to provide power during short-term peaks in demand. However, the Klamath hydropower facilities cannot generate sustained, heavy load power production, demand for which is forecasted to increase over the next decade (2011 IRP). Energy forecasts over the study period (2010-2018) showed the Northwest region having an energy surplus at the beginning of the 2010 and declining but sufficient to meet the needs of the project region through 2018 (WECC 2009).</p> <p>PacifiCorp outlined the necessary system improvements and power purchases in their 2011 Integrated Resource Plan to meet this deficit. These improvements and purchases would allow PacifiCorp to meet the expected load across their service area. Please see Volume I, Section 3.18, p.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more in-depth discussion of power issues related to the removal of the Four Facilities. Additionally, PacifiCorp has already begun upgrading their transmission capacity through its Energy Gateway project (http://www.pacificorp.com/energygateway). There have been few improvements in transmission capacity over the last 20 years, despite population growth and increased demand. The planned improvements to the transmission systems, as well as additions to generating capacity, are targeted to be online by 2018, prior to the removal of the Four Facilities as outlined in the Proposed Action.</p>
GHG-4	<p>GHG Emissions Estimate</p> <p>The GHG analysis was completed to estimate a conservative (worst-case) estimate of emissions. The calculations reflect the Lead Agencies' current estimate regarding the amount of electricity needed in the future. While it is possible that less electricity could be required if energy efficiency improvements continue, the analysis was performed to estimate emissions based on the current energy predictions for the area.</p>

GRO-1	<p>Groundwater Use</p> <p>Section 3.7.4.3 presents an analysis of the impacts of the Proposed Action on groundwater levels and the corresponding impact to legal wells adjacent to the reservoirs. As described under Alternative 2, groundwater levels in existing wells adjacent to the reservoirs could decline in response to the drop in surface water elevation when the reservoirs are removed. This impact was determined to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure GW-1. Mitigation measure GW-1, discussed in Section 3.7.4.4, would deepen or replace any well affected by the project. As described in Section 3.7.4.4 pre-construction survey would need to be conducted at the well to establish conditions prior to a dam being removed so that any impacts can be identified.</p>
HYDG-1	<p>Flood Protection</p> <p>As discussed in section 3.6.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams are not designed or operated as flood control facilities, although they do provide some incidental flood protection during flood events. Specifically, Table 3.6-9 shows peak flood flows and indicates that the 100-yr flood is attenuated less than 7 percent by Iron Gate and Copco 1 Dams under the No Action/No Project Alternative, with J.C. Boyle and Copco 2 providing negligible flood attenuation. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 3.6.4.3, p. 3.6-30.). Under the Proposed Action, the facilities would not be in place to provide this temporary reduction in flow and depending on the time of year, there would be a minor increase in the 100-yr flood elevations as the result of dam removal from Iron Gate Dam located at River Mile 190 to Humbug Creek located at RM 172. The peak flow would also occur a few hours sooner after the dams are removed. Ultimately, during high flow periods, the existing flood control capacity of the four dams would do little to reduce flood damage. Therefore, there would be little change to flood control capacity after the four dams are removed. Nevertheless, modeling by DOI indicated the 100 year flood plain could change with facilities removal. Less than six residences and other structures (e.g. garages) that are not currently within the 100-year flood plain could be included in a new 100-year flood plain after facilities removal. However, the Lead Agencies cannot conclusively determine where the 100-year flood plain would be after facilities removal because the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is responsible for determining these boundaries. Mitigation measures H1 and H2 would reduce the effects of any change in the flood plain to a less than significant level.</p>
HYDG-2	<p>Drought Plan</p> <p>The Drought Plan was not complete at the time that the Lead Agencies conducted their analyses. As discussed in Section 2.4.3.10 of the Final EIS/EIR, the KBRA elements (including the Drought Plan) are incorporated at a programmatic level of detail in this EIS/EIR. As stated in this section, "Federal decisions on specific measures in the KBRA, including any necessary additional environmental review, will be made in a separate process."</p> <p>While the Drought Plan was not yet available, the hydrologic modeling required some assumptions regarding dry year flows. As stated in the footnote in Section 2.4.3, "Minimum flows may change in the future. Hydrologic modeling assumed that the Drought Plan would include a minimum flow of 800 cfs (Reclamation 2012d). The final Drought Plan or future ESA actions could change the minimum flows; however, these assumptions reflect the best available information at the time of the modeling."</p>
HYDG-3	<p>Minimum Flows in the Klamath River</p> <p>As discussed in footnote 3 on page 3.8-19, "Minimum flows may change in the future. Hydrologic modeling assumed that the Drought Plan would include a minimum flow of 800 cfs (Reclamation 2012d). The final Drought Plan or future ESA actions could change the minimum flows; however, these assumptions reflect the best available information at the time of the modeling." Future minimum flow rates would be governed by future biological opinions rather than existing biological opinions, and the exact contents are currently uncertain.</p>
HYDP-1	<p>Reservoir Water Rights</p> <p>The Four Facilities are owned and operated by PacifiCorp. The associated water rights owned by PacifiCorp are for power generation, to refill regulatory storage space in Iron Gate Reservoir, 98 cubic feet per second for fish propagation facilities and fish culture, and 5,475 acre-feet for irrigation of 43 acres and stock watering of 200 animals from April 1 through October 31. The only loss to farming/ranching due to removal of the Four Facilities would be the 5,475 acre-feet for irrigation.</p>
HYDP-2	<p>Power Production at the Four Facilities</p> <p>The Four Facilities were constructed by and are owned, operated, and maintained by PacifiCorp, a private utility company. The Klamath Basin is on the regional electrical grid, meaning that power supply and demand are shared throughout the region. Homes and businesses located close to the generation do not necessarily receive their power from that location, depending on the load at a given time. Therefore, removal of the dams would not affect electricity availability of homes or businesses in the area. Further, removal of the dams would not significantly change electrical rates. Pages 3.18-23 and</p>

	<p>3.18-24 of the Draft EIS/EIR describe how power from the dams would be replaced. Page 3.15-63 of the Draft EIS/EIR describes the potential changes in energy rates for PacifiCorp customers with dam removal.</p>
KBRA-4	<p>Proposed Legislation</p> <p>These comments would appear to be on a proposed bill that may not accurately reflect the KBRA rather than on the EIS/EIR analysis of the KBRA. The KBRA does not supersede existing laws or regulations and does not exempt any actions from compliance with applicable laws including NEPA, CEQA, ESA, or CESA. As plans and programs are developed under the KBRA, they would be made in compliance with existing laws and regulations including opportunities for public review and comment.</p>
KBRA-5	<p>KBRA and the Klamath Tribes</p> <p>Pursuant to a series of court decisions in <i>United States v. Adair</i>, the Klamath Tribes are entitled to a water right to fulfill the Tribes' treaty fishing, hunting, and gathering rights with a priority date of time immemorial. The courts also recognized a tribal water right for agrarian purposes, with a reservation date (1864) priority. The Tribes' water rights are being quantified in Oregon's Klamath Basin Adjudication and recent decisions by the Administrative Law Judge in the adjudication have been supportive of the application filed by the United States as trustee for the Tribes. Under the KBRA, the Tribes will not exercise their senior water rights in a manner inconsistent with the KBRA as long as its provisions, including limitations on use by water users as well as other provisions, are maintained. The KBRA also provides that the Tribes will receive funds for the purchase of a portion of their ancestral homeland that was lost as a result of termination decades ago as part of the agreement regarding the Tribes, with a senior water right, agreeing to not place a call on the use of water by irrigation interests. Such arrangements amongst the KBRA parties involving senior water rights holders are consistent with how other water rights settlements throughout the west have been developed and implemented</p>
KHSA-1	<p>Negotiations of KHSA and KBRA</p> <p>The Klamath Basin has experienced one of most contentious water fights in the United States. Communities in the Basin have experience water cut offs, fish die offs, and disagreements over the relicensing of the four PacifiCorp dams. A number of organizations in the Basin had been talking for years in different forums to explore ways to resolve these issues.</p> <p>The Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and Klamath Basin Reclamation Agreement (KBRA) were not negotiated in secret and an assertion of secrecy is unfounded. The existence of these negotiations was well publicized during the negotiation process. Numerous local and regional decision makers and governments were actively involved in these negotiations for over three years. The elected decisionmaking bodies of Klamath Settlement Group members, such as county boards of supervisors, were well aware of these on-going negotiations and conducted occasional informational updates on the progress of negotiations for their boards. Siskiyou County, California; Klamath County, Oregon; Klamath Off-Project Water Users; and the Klamath Water Users Association, and the States of California and Oregon, for example, all had active and engaged representatives at these negotiations to speak for their respective agencies' interests. Numerous other local stakeholder groups were also represented during these negotiations. While ultimately not every member of the Klamath Settlement Group signed the agreements, many were nonetheless actively and openly involved in their creation right up to the completion of these agreements.</p> <p>The Klamath Settlement Group, which negotiated the KBRA and negotiated with PacifiCorp to create the KHSA, released a press release and an opinion-editorial on July 23, 2007. The beginning of this opinion-editorial states: "Since 2005 a diverse group of 26 stakeholders, referred to as the Klamath Settlement Group, have been engaged in the difficult task of developing a consensus-based solution for long standing disputes in the Klamath Basin. We want to report on the progress we are making." This opinion-editorial was signed by, among others, Siskiyou County, California; Klamath County, Oregon; Klamath Off-Project Water Users; and the Klamath Water Users Association (Klamath Settlement Group 2007) and is available at www.klamathcouncil.org.</p> <p>In January 2008, the Klamath Settlement Group released Draft 11 of the KBRA to the public for public comment. This draft was posted on the Klamath Settlement Group Web site and is currently available at www.klamathcouncil.org.</p> <p>Public comments were considered by the Klamath Settlement Group and there were public hearings on the KBRA Draft 11 document by several public governmental agency bodies involved in the negotiations as well as informational public presentations on the KBRA by various Parties in several forums, including a lengthy Klamath Falls public forum on the KBRA that ran on local public access TV</p>

	<p>broadcasts in Klamath Falls once a week for several months. A May 6, 2009, working draft of the KBRA that included changes in response to some of the prior public comments was posted on the Klamath Settlement Group Web site and is currently available at www.klamathcouncil.org.</p> <p>The framework "Agreement in Principle" developed between PacifiCorp and the States of California and Oregon with Federal participation, which was ultimately the basis of the KHSA, was also publicly released shortly after its signing in late November, 2008. The "Agreement in Principle" itself was filed by PacifiCorp in the FERC record under Docket No. P-2080-000 on November 24, 2008, as Document Accession No. 20081124-5160(California, Oregon, U.S. Department of the Interior, and PacifiCorp (CA, OR, DOI, PacifiCorp) 2008). That document was shortly afterwards also made available on various Internet web sites, including being posted on the Department of the Interior and the Klamath Settlement Group Web sites and is currently available at www.klamathcouncil.org.</p> <p>FERC staff and PacifiCorp also sponsored and held two widely advertised public meetings, on January 29, 2009, in the City of Yreka, to inform the public about the "Agreement in Principle" and how it related to the existing FERC relicensing process and ongoing negotiations. The PowerPoint presentation from that meeting was also shortly afterwards posted on the "Klamath Basin Crisis" Web site, and is still available from: http://www.klamathbasincrisis.org/Poweranddamstoc/nodams/toc.htm.</p> <p>Those two meetings were well attended by the public as well as elected officials from Siskiyou County and elsewhere. These two meetings were also publicly noticed by FERC as Docket No. P-2082-027 Document Accession No. 20081224-3024 (December 24, 2008), and advertised in the local press. Automated email notice of all FERC filings in these dockets is sent to all interveners and all interested parties who have requested such notice from FERC.</p> <p>The parties to the negotiation released a draft of the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement for public review in September 2009. All these drafts were accompanied by a press release and were posted on the neutral facilitator's Web site; they are currently available at www.klamathcouncil.org.</p> <p>In January 2010, the Klamath Settlement Group released another draft of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement for public review. This 2010 Summary of the Draft states: "Klamath River Basin stakeholders have developed a Public Review Draft of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement." "For over three years the Klamath Settlement Group, representing over 30 organizations has been working to develop a comprehensive solution for the Klamath Basin. All parties agreed to public release of the agreement to inform the public and, where appropriate, to enable public review before each organization in the group makes a final decision on whether to sign it."</p> <p>This Summary Report was signed by, among others, Siskiyou County, California; Klamath County, Oregon; Klamath Off-Project Water Users Association; and the Upper Klamath Water Users Association (Klamath Settlement Group 2010) and is available at www.klamathcouncil.org.</p> <p>The Klamath Settlement Group agreed to undertake these negotiations under a confidentiality agreement because they felt it was the most effective way to candidly exchange views, reach agreement and develop durable solutions to numerous sensitive and complex issues. The KHSA and KBRA are examples of negotiations designed to resolve longstanding legal battles over the use of water resources in the Klamath Basin. Parties commonly enter into confidentiality agreements to negotiate privately for a period of time to resolve long-standing disputes that have been or are in active litigation. This is what occurred in the negotiations over PacifiCorp's Klamath Hydroelectric Project, which led to the KHSA as well as the related KBRA. The KHSA and KBRA negotiation process is described in Gosnell and Kelly (2010). PacifiCorp, tribes, environmental, fishing and agriculture interests, as well as State and local governments, used these meetings to negotiate agreements to avoid current and future litigation and resolve decades-old natural resource problems. The Federal Government often times has a vested interest in resolving such disputes and related litigation and in these cases seeks confidentiality as well. But the fact that such negotiations were ongoing was made well known throughout most of the process, as were the names and contact information for most of the participant organizations.</p>
KHSA-2	<p>Dam Removal Entity</p> <p>The Dam Removal Entity (DRE) refers to an entity designated by the Secretary of the Interior that would be responsible for dam removal activities, if an Affirmative Determination is made. (KHSA, Section 7) As part of an Affirmative Determination, the Secretary of the Interior would designate the entity that would serve as the DRE. The DRE would develop a Definite Plan for Facilities Removal</p>

	<p>which would include all the information necessary to implement the Detailed Plan as well as the additional elements listed in KHSA Section 7.2.1.A. The Secretary must consult with the Signatories to the KHSA prior to designating a non-Federal DRE and receive concurrence from the States with that selection. The Secretary may designate the Department of the Interior to be the DRE.</p> <p>The DRE would have the legal, technical, and financial capacities described in Section 7.1. of the KHSA, including:</p> <p>A. Accept and expend non-Federal funds as provided in Section 4.2.4 of the KHSA;</p> <p>B. Seek and obtain necessary permits and other authorizations to implement Facilities Removal;</p> <p>C. Enter into appropriate contracts;</p> <p>D. Accept transfer of title to the Facilities for the express purpose of Facilities Removal;</p> <p>E. Perform, directly or by oversight, Facilities Removal;</p> <p>F. Prevent, mitigate, and respond to damages the DRE causes during the course of Facilities Removal, and, consistent with Applicable Law, respond to and defend associated liability claims against the DRE, including costs thereof and any judgments or awards resulting therefrom;</p> <p>G. Carry appropriate insurance or bonding or be appropriately self-insured to respond to liability and damages claims against the DRE associated with Facilities Removal; and</p> <p>H. Perform such other tasks as are reasonable and necessary for Facilities Removal, within the authority granted by the Authorizing Legislation or other Applicable Law.</p>
LAND - 1	<p>Land Use Significance Criteria</p> <p>(A) Section 3.14.4.2 Significance Criteria describes the criteria by which potential changes in land use would be considered significant. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (B) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. • (C) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or Exclusive Farm Zone land as defined by the Oregon Revised Statutes, Chapter 308, to non-agricultural use. • (D) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. • (E) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g)). • (F) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. • (G) Involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. <p>(E) Section 3.14.4.3 Effects Determination by Alternative analyzes the effects of the Proposed Action to each of the criteria listed in Section 3.14.4.2 and provides a conclusion as to whether or not there would be an effect.</p>
LAND-2	<p>Transfer of Ownership</p> <p>As discussed on p. 3.14-1 and 3.14-7 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 7.6.4A of the KHSA states, "it is the intent of the Parties that ownership of PacifiCorp lands associated with the Klamath Hydroelectric Project and/or included within the FERC Project boundary, identified as parcel B in Exhibit 3 shall be transferred to the State of Oregon or the State of California, as applicable, or to a designated third party transferee, before Facilities Removal is commenced. It is also the intent of the Parties that transferred lands shall thereafter be managed for public interest purposed such as fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement, public education, and public recreational access." The States of California and Oregon have indicated they would accept transfer and ownership of the parcel B lands, which include the land that is now under the reservoirs. Future management of the Parcel B lands in California would then become the responsibility of California Department of Fish & Game (CDFG), while Parcel B lands in Oregon would become the responsibility of the Oregon Department of Fish and</p>

Klamath Facilities Removal
Final EIS/EIR

	Wildlife (ODFW). The reservoir lands that are not part of Parcel B are owned either by the Federal or State government and this ownership is not expected to change. (Draft EIS/EIR sec. 3.14.3.1, pp. 3.14-13 - 3.14-14).
LAND-3	Restoration of Parcel B Lands The States have no detailed plans at present, but indicate that the Parcel B lands, including the approximately 2,000 acres of inundated lands which would be restored per the Reservoir Restoration Plan, and would be managed for public interest purposes such as fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement, public education, and public recreational access as stated in Section 7.6.4 of the KHSA.
LAND-4	River Access Following Dam Removal In California, private landowners with lands adjacent to Copco 1 and Iron Gate Dam would have access to the river from any public access points. In accordance with mitigation measure REC-1, the DRE would prepare a plan to develop new river access points along the newly formed channel. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 3.20.4.4, p. 3.20-62.) This plan would be developed in consultation with stakeholder groups. Also, CDFG anticipates that upon transfer of Parcel B lands, CDFG would seek to designate them as a State wildlife area and promulgate area regulations under Sections 550 and 551 of Title 14 California Code of Regulations before the California Fish and Game Commission. It would be anticipated that CDFG would initiate the preparation of a management plan which would include community participation to identify specific locations for developed public access, allowable uses, the need for area closed zones, management activities, etc. It is likely that the DRE's planning efforts would be coordinated with any planning effort by CDFG. Little would change in Oregon as there are no private lands with reservoir access adjacent to J.C. Boyle Reservoir.
N/CP-2	Coordination Neither the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) nor the implementing regulations, promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508, require the kind of coordination alleged by the comment author. Section 101 of NEPA (42 U.S.C. §4331) lays out the overall goals of the statute. Directives for working with State and local governments which have jurisdictional authority pertain to Cooperating Agencies. See 40 CFR § 1501.6. Each of the Counties that would be affected by possible dam removal, or any of the other analyzed alternatives were invited to be a Cooperating Agency. Humboldt County and Klamath County accepted that invitation, and have been involved in the development and review of the document. The DOI has worked with local officials of the counties who did not become Cooperating Agencies consistently, including the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors to discuss the alternatives and the contents of the document. However, there is no legal requirement for the Department to cease its planning activities or to resolve all inconsistencies between Federal and local plans.
N/CP-5	Use of "would" and "could" The Lead Agencies use the words "would" or "could" when describing proposed alternatives and their environmental effects because the alternatives are only "proposed"; they have not yet been approved for implementation. The effects of any alternative would not occur unless the alternative is approved and implemented. The Lead Agencies cannot legally approve and implement any of the alternatives until the environmental review process is complete (40 CFR § 1506.1, CEQA Guidelines section 15092).
N/CP-8	Structure and Readability of the EIS/EIR We have given great effort to present information in a logical, orderly, and understandable way. Through the scoping process, over 560 comments were received from the public. These comments helped identify the significant issues to be analyzed in detail in the EIS/EIR. In turn, the scope, depth, and complexity of the project analysis call for a substantial amount of information in the EIS/EIR. To help make the EIS/EIR more readable, the Executive Summary allows readers a more concise overview. Further, in-depth reports and resource analysis were included as appendices to lessen the volume of the EIS/EIR and appropriately support findings.
N/CP-12	Comment Period The comment period was re-opened. All written comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and all verbal comments received during the public meetings and by December 30, 2011 will be fully considered and addressed.

N/CP-13	<p>KBRA is Analyzed as a Connected Action</p> <p>(A) As described on pages 2-36 and 2-37 in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the NEPA Lead Agency, the Department of the Interior, is analyzing the KBRA as a connected action. NEPA defines connected actions as those actions that are closely related or cannot or will not proceed unless other actions are taken previously or simultaneously (40 CFR 1508.25(a)(1)(ii)). Some actions or component elements of the KBRA are independent obligations and thus have independent utility from the KHSA, but the implementation of several significant elements of the KBRA package would be different, if the determination under the KHSA is not to pursue full dam removal. Recognizing that implementation of many elements of the KBRA are unknown and not reasonably foreseeable at this time, the connected action analysis is being undertaken at a programmatic level. Consequently, appropriate NEPA compliance would be completed for the KBRA in the future.</p> <p>(B) For purposes of CEQA, relevant parts of the KBRA analysis are programmatic, as described in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. This decision was made because many of its component elements have not been specified to a degree where the associated impacts would be reasonably foreseeable for purposes of this environmental analysis. The parties recognize that future project-specific analysis may be required for various components of the KBRA as they become more clearly defined and if an affirmative public approval is identified. A program-level document is appropriate when a project consists of a series of smaller projects or phases that may be implemented separately. Under the programmatic EIR approach, future projects or phases may require additional, project-specific environmental analysis.</p>
N/CP-16	<p>Purpose and Need/Project Objectives</p> <p>(A) As described under NEPA regulations Section 1502.13, the Purpose and Need “shall briefly specify the purpose and need to which the agency is responding.” Under CEQA, the project description must include a statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15124(b).) “The statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project” (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15124(b)).</p> <p>(B) The NEPA purpose and need and CEQA project objectives were developed to reflect the underlying needs, goals and objectives of the Federal and State action agencies. These agencies have the responsibility to define the Purpose and Need/Project Objectives—consistent with their statutory authorities. We recognize that the Purpose and Need/Project Objectives has a necessarily narrow focus on the action for which the Lead Agencies must make a decision. The Lead Agencies cannot artificially expand the Purpose and Need/Project Objectives or authorities.</p>
N/CP-18	<p>Process to Select Alternatives for Detailed Analysis</p> <p>(A) Both NEPA and CEQA include provisions that the draft environmental review analyze a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the purpose and need/project objections, and are potentially feasible (40 CFR § 1502.14; 43 CFR § 46.420(b); Pub. Resources Code, sec. 21002; CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a), (c), (f).). Alternatives should be limited to ones that avoid or substantially lessen the Proposed Action’s significant environmental effects. (CEQA Guidelines secs. 15126.6(a), (c), (f), sec. 15204(a); Draft EIS/EIR, section 2.3.) The Lead Agencies are not required to consider all conceivable alternatives to the Proposed Action. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21091(d)(2)(B); CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(a); sec. 15204(a).) Nor are the Lead Agencies required to analyze an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(f)(3).)</p> <p>(B) The Lead Agencies developed a list of 18 preliminary alternatives that were screened down to five. The Lead Agencies fully analyzed the five alternatives in the Draft EIS/EIR because they best meet the NEPA purpose and CEQA objectives, minimize negative effects, and are potentially feasible (Draft EIS/EIR, section 2.3). (A full description of the alternatives and the rationale for screening the alternatives is presented in Appendix A, the Alternatives Formulation Report).</p> <p>(C) In Appendix A of the Draft EIS/EIR, several alternatives were considered that would not involve implementation of the KHSA and KBRA, including Alternative 9, Trap and Haul Fish, Alternative 10, Fish Bypass: Bogus Creek Bypass, and Alternative 11, Fish Bypass: Alternative Tunnel Route. These alternatives were eliminated from further consideration because they did not meet the purpose and need/objectives. For additional information on alternatives considered but eliminated, see Appendix A, Alternatives Formulation Report in the EIS/EIR.</p>
N/CP-20	<p>Response to Public Comment</p> <p>(A) Public involvement is a key part of the environmental review process and provides numerous opportunities for public input. All written comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and all verbal</p>

	<p>comments received during the public meetings on the Draft EIS/EIR (within the specified comment period), by law, become part of the record and must be presented in the Final EIS/EIR. The Lead Agencies must respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues related to the Draft EIS/EIR. In the Final EIS/EIR, the Lead Agencies must respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues related to the Draft EIS/EIR.</p> <p>(B) If comments are received that request specific changes to the content or conclusions presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, the Lead Agencies will incorporate those changes and present the revised text as part of the Final EIS/EIR, or they will provide an explanation as to why they believe the comment does not warrant any changes to the document.</p>
N/CP-21	<p>Ongoing Fish Habitat Restoration Projects</p> <p>The No Action/No Project Alternative includes the ongoing fish habitat restoration projects and they are analyzed under that alternative. The actions that would be increased in magnitude and accelerated with implementation of KBRA (e.g. those elements that are identified in Appendix C-2 – anything with funding shown in C-2 is not an ongoing activity) are part of the Proposed Action and are analyzed programmatically because the details are not yet known. Please see Chapter 2 of the EIS/EIR for additional information on the KBRA elements analyzed as part of the No Action/No Project Alternative and the Proposed Action.</p>
N/CP-22	<p>How KBRA Was Analyzed</p> <p>The KBRA analysis in this EIS/EIR is programmatic, as described in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. A program-level document is appropriate when a project consists of a series of smaller projects or phases that may be implemented separately. Under the programmatic EIR approach, future projects or phases may require additional, project-specific environmental analysis including an evaluation of compliance with Federal laws such as the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act. Consequently, appropriate environmental compliance will be completed for the separate KBRA components in the future.</p> <p>Page 2-36 through 2-61 describe the KBRA actions that are analyzed in the EIS/EIR as connected actions at a programmatic level. Resource areas in Chapter 3 that would be affected by the KBRA provide an analysis of effects as part of the Proposed Action analysis. Mitigation is described for all KBRA impacts determined to be significant.</p> <p>Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR contains the cumulative effects analysis. This chapter includes a cumulative effects analysis of the KBRA as a separate subheading under each resource area. As noted on Page 4-28, the KBRA is analyzed at a programmatic level of detail in the cumulative effects analysis because the specific locations, timeframes, and construction methods for KBRA actions are not yet known. Where adequate information on KBRA actions is available, general cumulative effects are discussed. Where information is not sufficient for a detailed cumulative effects analysis, or there is a high level of uncertainty as to what actions would occur and how they would affect resources, this is noted in the text and no attempt at speculation is made. As noted throughout this document, dam removal as contemplated in the KHSA and full implementation of the KBRA are expected to require additional environmental analysis under CEQA and/or NEPA.</p>
N/CP-26	<p>KHSA and KBRA Settlement Parties</p> <p>(A) As described in Chapter 1 of the EIS/EIR, the KHSA and KBRA are negotiated agreements and reflect the cooperative effort by more than 40 parties in the basin, representing different interest groups. The agreements were negotiated and written to be executed together. Representatives of Federal agencies, the States of California and Oregon, Indian Tribes, counties, farmers, and conservation and fishing groups agreed to the comprehensive solutions presented in the KHSA and KBRA.</p> <p>(B) As a result of the Klamath Basin issues surrounding the limited availability of water to support agricultural, tribal, environmental, and fishery needs in many years, the United States¹; the States of California and Oregon; the Klamath, Karuk, and Yurok Tribes; Klamath Project Water Users; and other Klamath Basin stakeholders (collectively the Parties) negotiated the KBRA to resolve the water conflicts among the many users, restore stressed fisheries, and identify reliable power supplies. The KBRA is intended to result in effective and durable solutions. The goals of the KBRA are to (1) restore and sustain natural fish production and provide for full participation in ocean and river harvest</p>

¹ Agencies involved in KBRA negotiations include: NOAA Fisheries Service, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Department of the Interior (including, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, and Fish and Wildlife Service).

	<p>opportunities of fish species throughout the Klamath Basin; (2) establish more reliable water and power supplies which sustain agricultural uses, communities, and NWRs; and (3) contribute to the public welfare and the sustainability of all Klamath Basin communities. The Parties view these agreements as an important part of the resolution of long-standing, complex, and difficult-to-resolve concerns over resources in the Klamath Basin.</p>
RE-1	<p>Real Estate Evaluation Report</p> <p>(A) The Dam Removal Real Estate Evaluation Report and its supplement were completed by Bender-Rosenthal, Inc. The primary author met all of the requirements of the Appraisal Institute for Professional Appraisers and Bender-Rosenthal complied with the Uniform Standards for Professional Appraisal Practice in its study methodology. The report complies with the “Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions” (Bender-Rosenthal 2011; Bender-Rosenthal 2012).</p> <p>(B) The report and its supplement were not intended as an analysis of specific impacts to any given parcel or property but rather were intended as a look, in the aggregate, of the potential impact of the real estate land values in the communities surrounding Copco and Iron Gate Reservoirs. It is not an appraisal or valuation of any specific property or properties in the communities.</p> <p>(C) Appraisal theory attributes premiums to the overall price of a property such as reservoir frontage or views to the lot and not the improvements. Since the change in property value is being attributed to the value of the lot following the loss of the reservoirs the value of the improvements was not considered.</p> <p>(D) The scope of work did not place restrictions on the certified appraisers concerning determination of what characterized lake influence for properties near or in the general vicinity of the reservoirs. The parcel list was generated by Bender-Rosenthal using Land Vision mapping software wherein parcels thought to have the potential for impact were tagged (Bender-Rosenthal 2011). These parcels were then cross referenced with data from the Siskiyou County Assessor’s office. The list of Potentially Impacted Parcels was determined to be those parcels potentially impacted by the proposed dam removal.</p> <p>(E) The Dam Removal Real Estate Evaluation Report and the supplement analyzed the effect of dam and reservoir removal on property values in order to measure the financial impact their removal would have on surrounding real estate. This was accomplished by comparing the difference in estimated market values of parcels with a reservoir view to a similar parcel without a reservoir view and parcels with reservoir frontage to similar parcels with a river view. Based on property values in 2008, 668 parcels were determined to be impacted by dam removal. The conclusion of the report was that there would be a \$2,666,094 decrease in the value of these impacted parcels following dam removal in 2008 (this translates into a 29.6% decrease in value) (Bender-Rosenthal 2011). In order to be responsive to public comments, the Report was expanded to include the same analysis for 2004 and 2006. The conclusion of the additional analysis is that there would be a decrease of \$2,232,418 in value for 2004 (32.9% decrease). For 2006, the decrease in aggregate value would be \$2,496,664 representing a 29.7% decrease (Bender-Rosenthal 2011).</p> <p>(F) A literature review conducted of studies done on the impacts to property values with the removal of other dams showed that property values are dictated, in large part, by local circumstances and economic trends (Bender-Rosenthal 2012). Predicting the direct impact of dam removal does not yield consistent results. One study did focus on the effects of lot size and proximity to the Klamath River, Copco I and Iron Gate Reservoirs. This study identified a positive and significant effect on residential property values for lake proximity or lake view. There was not a sufficient sample size to estimate the effect on property values for proximity to the Klamath River. In response to comments, further research was done on different situations where changes in land use impacted the value of adjacent or nearby properties. This review included studies on wildfire and wildfire risk. These did not provide any information pertinent to the effects on property values with dam removal. The risk of wildfire is a risk not only to the existing vegetation for the area, but also a risk to property. Most of the wildfire studies focus on this risk and the perception of that risk. This is not the situation with the Proposed Action of dam removal and reservoir drawdown.</p>
RE-2	<p>Changes in Property Values</p> <p>(A) Section 3.15 of the EIS/EIR concludes that, in the short term, property values would be adversely affected by changing parcels from a reservoir view to a river view and eliminating access to a reservoir. It is also clear that dam removal would affect property values over the long-term. However, the net value of these changes is difficult to forecast. The same section also recognizes that, in the long-term,</p>

	<p>land values of parcels downstream from Iron Gate Dam with river views could increase because of restoration of the river, including improved water quality and more robust anadromous fish runs. Further it states that it is difficult to evaluate the magnitude of the net changes under the Proposed Action in the long term.</p> <p>(B) As stated in the Real Estate Evaluation Report real estate agents in the area have opined that the current value declines in the Iron Gate and Copco Reservoir neighborhoods are in large part due to the current market conditions affecting real estate everywhere, but many who have current listings also make the assertion there has been buyer resistance due to the unknowns associated with the proposed dam removals (Bender-Rosenthal 2011 on page 18). Historically, it has not been a strong real estate market and sales have been slow due to remoteness of the location, the lack of good building sites, and affordable utility connections (Bender-Rosenthal 2011 on page 20). Due to the timing of the proposed dam removal and the declining market conditions it is difficult to separate the two issues; however, there is no strong evidence that the majority of decline in the real estate values of the neighborhood in the past several years is attributable to the proposed dam removal (Bender-Rosenthal 2011 on page 20).</p>
RE-3	<p>Landowner Compensation</p> <p>(A) While the Draft EIS/EIR acknowledges there could be adverse effects to property values around Copco 1 and Iron Gate Reservoirs (section 3.15 page 64), at this time there are no provisions in the KHSA or KBRA to compensate landowners for any loss of property value resulting from removal of the dams and associated reservoirs.</p> <p>(B) Until the Secretary of the Interior makes a decision on dam removal and the State of California concurs we will not know whether or not your property would be negatively impacted. Only if it is determined that your property is negatively impacted and there is authority given to compensate you for any loss would an appraisal be performed.</p> <p>(C) NEPA requires that an EIS disclose impacts associated with each alternative to inform the decisionmaking process, which this Draft EIS/EIR has done. NEPA also requires that mitigation measures must be discussed in an EIS, but it is the discretion of the Lead Agency what measures are adopted. No mitigation has been proposed.</p>
RE-4	<p>Takings</p> <p>The Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and Cal. Const., art. I, section 19 forbids the government from taking private property for public use without just compensation. While takings may occur through a variety of government actions, the threshold question is whether the property owner has a valid and legal right to compensation. Each analysis is fact specific, and the Lead Agencies would go through that factual determination if dam removal occurs.</p>
RE-5	<p>Reservoir Area Management Plan</p> <p>(A) Section 7.0 of the Detailed Plan for Dam Removal (Reclamation 2012b) describes plans for the revegetation and restoration of formerly inundated lands that would be undertaken with the goal of establishing sustainable riparian and native wetland and upland habitats on the newly exposed reservoir sediment.</p> <p>(B) Appendix B. Sub-group Goals for Managing the Reservoir Areas of the Reservoir Area Management Plan for the Secretary's Determination on Klamath River Dam Removal and Basin Restoration, Technical Report No. SRH-2011-19 details the construction period, short-term, mid-term, and long-term goals for restoration of the former reservoirs. Restoration was developed in part to minimize the effects of draining the reservoirs on the adjacent private property owners.</p>
RE-6	<p>Disposition of Parcel B Lands</p> <p>(A) As discussed in EIS/EIR, Section 3.14, KHSA Section 7.6.4A states, "it is the intent of the Parties that ownership of PacifiCorp lands associated with the Klamath Hydroelectric Project and/or included within the FERC Project boundary, identified as parcel B in Exhibit 3 shall be transferred to the State of Oregon or the State of California, as applicable, or to a designated third party transferee, before Facilities Removal is commenced. It is also the intent of the Parties that transferred lands shall thereafter be managed for public interest purposes such as fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement, public education, and public recreational access."</p> <p>(B) The KHSA (Section 7.6.4) specifies that the lands currently inundated by the reservoirs would be transferred to the respective State (Oregon or California) or a designated third party before facility</p>

	<p>removal. The lands would then be managed for public interest purposes such as fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement, public education, and public recreational access.</p> <p>(C) The States of California and Oregon have indicated they would accept transfer and ownership of the Parcel B lands, which include the land that is now under the reservoirs. Future management of the Parcel B lands in California would then become the responsibility of CDFG, while Parcel B lands in Oregon would become the responsibility of the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. The reservoir lands that are not part of Parcel B are owned either by the Federal or State government and this ownership is not expected to change. (Draft EIS/EIR sec. 3.14.3.1, pp. 3.14-13 - 3.14-14.)</p> <p>(D) In California, private landowners with lands adjacent to Copco 1 and Iron Gate Dam would have access to the river from any public access points. In accordance with mitigation measure REC-1, the DRE would prepare a plan to develop new river access points along the newly formed channel. (Draft EIS/EIR, sec. 3.20.4.4, p. 3.20-62.) This plan would be developed in consultation with stakeholder groups.</p> <p>(E) CDFG anticipates that upon transfer of Parcel B lands, CDFG would seek to designate them as a State wildlife area and promulgate area regulations under Sections 550 and 551 of Title 14 California Code of Regulations before the California Fish and Game Commission. It would be anticipated that CDFG would initiate the preparation of a management plan which would include community participation to identify specific locations for developed public access, allowable uses, the need for area closed zones, management activities, etc. It is expected that the DRE's planning efforts would be coordinated with any planning effort by CDFG. Little would change in Oregon as there are no private lands with reservoir access adjacent to J.C. Boyle Reservoir.</p>
REC-1	<p>Regional Recreation Resources Additional text was added to analyze recreational trade-offs following dam removal and specifically how the regional resources summarized in Table 3.20-4 could substitute for the loss of the subject reservoirs. The data presented in Table 3.20-4 comes from PacifiCorp 2004 and presents the main recreational information for each lake/reservoir in the region.</p>
REC-2	<p>Recreational Use at Restored River The restored river would offer fishing, boating, and other water contact sports. In addition, there are at least 11 comparable lakes and reservoirs in the region that have similarly low to moderate visitor use levels as compared to the Klamath Hydroelectric Project reservoirs. These regional lakes and reservoirs provide equivalent open water and flat-water recreation opportunities including developed campsites and boat launches. These regional resources could compensate, in part, for the loss of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project reservoirs and recreational facilities; although, it is unknown to what degree regional lakes and reservoirs would be used by recreationalists who currently favor the Klamath Hydroelectric Project reservoirs.</p>
REC-3	<p>Mitigation Measure REC-1 Mitigation Measure REC-1 – At least 1 year before starting dam removal activities, the Dam Removal Entity (DRE) would prepare a plan to develop new recreational facilities and river access points along the newly formed river channel between J.C. Boyle Reservoir and Iron Gate Dam. The mitigation measure was clarified to explain that the purpose of the plan is to mitigate for recreational facilities that would be removed during dam removal. The intent is to provide resources and infrastructure which would support similar levels albeit different types of use. The plan would be developed in consultation with appropriate State and Federal agencies (e.g., BLM and CDFG) and stakeholder groups, and would include an implementation schedule for construction of recreational facilities and river access areas. Mitigation Measure REC-1 is described on p. 3.20-62 of the Draft EIS/EIR.</p>
REC-4	<p>Non Commercial Use at Hell's Corner At this point, it is too speculative to conclude that lower flows albeit more consistent would accommodate more non-commercial use on Hell's Corner. The Lead Agencies have however in response to comments completed additional flow modeling (Appendix R) and the Final EIS (Figure 3.20-16 and Table 3.20-6) has been updated to include flows from both 1000-3500 cfs and from 1300-3500 cfs to reflect opportunities and changes for outfitted and general whitewater recreation on Hell's Corner. The conclusions presented in the EIS/EIR present conservative benefits in order to not overstate benefits that are not fully known at this time.</p>
REC-6	<p>Chanel Flows Following Dam Removal Text was inserted as a footnote into the impact analysis for Alternative 2 to explain that flows following dam removal were not modeled for areas of the newly formed free-flowing river channel.</p>

	<p>Added text reads:</p> <p>Flows following dam removal were not modeled for areas currently inundated by reservoirs. No records exist of the condition of the inundated areas and whether free-flowing conditions would be possible following dam removal, or if there are barriers to flow in this area. With details of the condition of these areas lacking, it is too speculative to analyze specific impacts of dam removal on whitewater boating and fishing in areas currently inundated by reservoirs. It is however likely that fishing and whitewater boating will occur in the exposed and restored river channel.</p>
REC-7	<p>Keno Reach Access</p> <p>Change has been made. The following text was added (p. 3.20-41):</p> <p>Existing difficult access to the Keno Reach, including a flat water paddle above J.C. Boyle Dam, may limit recreational use of this area. Dam removal would likely increase the current through the area that is currently J.C. Boyle reservoir and improve access to the exit of the Keno Reach and may benefit whitewater boating and fishing opportunities in this area.</p>
REC-8	<p>Flat Water Fishing</p> <p>With the removal of the four PacifiCorp dams there would be a complete loss of flat water fishing at the reservoirs. Long-term improvements in water quality, changes in river flows to a more natural regime and restored access to hundreds of miles of habitat above Iron Gate Dam for anadromous fish are however anticipated to increase the abundance and extent of in-river recreational fishing opportunities. Over time, this increase could provide a different, but comparable, recreational fishing opportunity.</p>
REC-9	<p>Whitewater Recreation on Hells Corner Reach</p> <p>Based on comments additional flow modeling has been completed (Appendix R) and the Final EIS (Figure 3.30-16 and Table 3.20-6) has been updated to include flows from both 1000-3500 cfs and from 1300-3500 cfs to reflect opportunities and changes for outfitted and general whitewater recreation on Hell's Corner.</p>
TERR-1	<p>Terrestrial Benefits of Restoring Salmon Passage</p> <p>A paragraph has been added to the text describing the benefit to terrestrial wildlife and habitat of restoring passage for salmon. Salmon would provide nutrient-rich food for terrestrial species, including bald eagles, osprey, and many other species of birds and mammals. These consumers would subsequently deposit these marine-derived nutrients into terrestrial habitats, increasing productivity of riparian vegetation and benefiting terrestrial ecosystems as a whole.</p>
TERR-2	<p>Reservoir Habitat</p> <p>Section 3.5 of the EIS/EIR provides an evaluation of the loss of the open water/reservoir habitat on birds and other wildlife (see Section 3.5 "Long-term Habitat Loss and/or Modification"). Based on the evaluation, while unavoidable impacts on wildlife, particularly waterfowl and other waterbirds, from the permanent loss of reservoir habitat would occur under the Proposed Action, these impacts would be less than significant. Some species would be able to utilize newly created and restored wetland and riparian habitat along the Klamath River where the reservoirs are currently located. Many waterfowl and waterbird species currently utilizing the reservoirs would be able to utilize numerous other expansive wetland and open water habitats in the area, particularly at Upper Klamath Lake, and the Lower Klamath, Tule Lake, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges.</p>
TERR-3	<p>Invasive Species Control</p> <p>Restoration of reservoir areas following dam removal would be conducted in accordance with the Reservoir Area Management Plan (reference Department of the Interior, Reclamation 2012b), which is part of the Detailed Plan and cited in the EIS/EIR. Reed canary grass is listed in the Plan among the invasive species to be removed and controlled at the reservoirs. The Reservoir Area Management Plan provides specific details on how invasive species would be controlled following reservoir drawdown, along with specific performance standards.</p>
TERR-4	<p>Terrestrial Resource Mitigation</p> <p>Based on the evaluation in Section 3.5 of the EIS/EIR, impacts on terrestrial wildlife and habitat would generally be less than significant with the incorporation of specific elements during construction to avoid or reduce impacts. In instances where impacts are potentially significant, mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts to less than significant. The Proposed Action and resulting recovery of healthy salmonid populations would provide positive benefits for many terrestrial wildlife species in the Klamath Basin.</p>
TERR-5	<p>Incidental Take Permit</p> <p>Implementation of the Proposed Action may result in the incidental take of State and federally listed species and this take, including areas of impact, is described in EIS/EIR Sections 3.3 (Aquatic Resources) and 3.5 (Terrestrial Resources).</p>

	<p>EIS/EIR Chapter 6, Table 6-2, p. 6-5, provides the regulatory requirements of the State of California. Table 6-2 lists the Relevant Permits and Processes that removal of The Four Facilities would be subject. Table 6-2 includes Fish and Game Code Section 2080.1 consistency determination and Section 2081 Incidental Take Permit.</p> <p>It should be noted, that if there is an Affirmative Determination and the Secretary of the Interior also designates a Federal dam removal entity, then implementation of the Proposed Action would be a Federal project and thus not subject to California Endangered Species Act (CESA). In this case, no Incidental Take Permit or consistency determination would be issued by the State of California.</p> <p>If California were to issue an Incidental Take Permit or consistency determination for the Proposed Action in the future, then during that future permitting process, CDFG would likely require further analysis of the Proposed Action's areas of impact, take mechanisms, take avoidance approaches, and full mitigation strategies in order to ensure consistency with CESA.</p>
TTA-1	<p>Federal Trust Responsibility and the KBRA</p> <p>Several comments assert that the KBRA or its authorizing legislation, if enacted, would result in the “termination,” unilateral subordination, or relinquishment of tribal water and fishing rights in the Klamath River or would “terminate” the Federal trust responsibility over such rights. These comments, made on behalf of the Hoopa Valley Tribe or other Indian tribes in California, reference in particular KBRA Section 15.3.9 and Appendix E-1 as the basis of these assertions.</p> <p>As previously explained to the Hoopa Valley Tribe (see letters of September 10, 2009 from Solicitor Hillary Tompkins to Hoopa Chairman Leonard Masten and December 3, 2010 from Deputy Solicitor Pilar Thomas to Hoopa attorney Tom Schlosser) in the context of related stipulations filed as part of the State of Oregon’s adjudication of water rights in Oregon, nothing in the KBRA or its related actions waives, releases, or terminates water rights or fishing rights in the Klamath River system in California of any Indian tribe. Likewise, nothing in the KBRA affects the ability of the United States or any Indian tribe to determine and quantify tribal water rights in California. (KBRA Sections 2.2.11, 14.2, 15.3.2.C) Thus, nothing in these documents affects or “terminates” the United States’ ability to protect these tribal rights in California.</p> <p>KBRA Section 15.3 and related provisions do provide certain assurances related to Reclamation’s Klamath Project operations in Oregon and directly tie into claims filed as part of the water rights adjudication in Oregon. As referenced in these sections, the only tribal water rights at issue in the Oregon adjudication involve claims filed by the United States and the Klamath Tribes, and these claims--to Upper Klamath Lake (Case 286) and to the Klamath River from the Lake to the Oregon border (Case 282) -- would then be limited in their capacity to call on certain water rights as specified in the KBRA in relation to Reclamation’s Klamath Project.</p> <p>Conversely, neither the United States nor any Indian tribe filed claims in Oregon based on tribal rights that originate in California, and the Oregon adjudication has no jurisdiction to determine or affect tribal water or fishing rights in California. Thus, no provision of the KBRA waives or releases water, fishing, or other rights in California held by the United States or any Indian tribe. Sections 2.2.11, 14.2, 15.3.2.C explain this position explicitly.</p> <p>The main provision of concern--Section 15.3.9, the KBRA “no-call” provision--does affect the ability of the United States or other parties to alter Reclamation’s Klamath Project water budget in the future if the KBRA were implemented and certain conditions met. But that section does not affect the determination of any tribal rights in California nor does it affect the ability of non-parties to the KBRA in California to challenge or limit any other water right in Oregon in an appropriate forum. Moreover, even in the absence of the KBRA, the Oregon adjudication will ultimately determine both claims related to Reclamation’s Klamath Project operations as well as claims filed by the United States and the Klamath Tribes for Upper Klamath Lake and the Klamath River in Oregon. Thus, with or without the KBRA, the United States would not have unfettered discretion to alter Reclamation’s Klamath Project operations in the future.</p> <p>Ultimately, the United States, other basin tribes, and most other interested parties believe the KBRA and KHSA are based on sound science and provide the best opportunity to restore the Klamath Basin and its fishery. These agreements promote basin fisheries through the following actions: dam removal, Project diversion limitations, increase in the size of Klamath Lake, habitat restoration activities throughout the basin, continued ESA protections, a drought plan affecting the Project and the Upper</p>

	<p>Klamath Basin, water acquisitions (both permanent and during an interim period before the agreements are fully implemented), fish and water quality monitoring studies, and other actions to protect and restore the basin fishery. The Department has also committed to identify other potential mitigation tools, including additional releases from Trinity Reservoir, as necessary to protect Trinity River-based fishery resources as well (KBRA Section 2.2.12) Overall, restoration would be consistent with any trust obligation due all basin tribes, including those who currently oppose the KBRA and its authorizing legislation. Conversely, litigation or adjudication of these and other issues entails significant risks and costs, takes years if not decades to resolve, and ultimately does not provide the opportunity, both in programs and appropriations, that the KBRA and related activities will if enacted. In fact, the Oregon adjudication began in the mid-1970s and has yet to complete the first of three phases. Thus, this agreement offers enormous opportunities as well as certainty to the basin's interests</p>
TTA-2	<p>Clarification of the Tribal Trust No Action</p> <p>The evaluation of the No Action/No Project in Section 3.12 for each tribe has been clarified with the following statement 'Therefore continued operation under the No Action/No Project Alternative in the short and long-term would result in no change from existing adverse conditions.' Though these conditions have been on-going for many years prior to the Notice of Intent for this EIS/EIR, this clarification has been made to acknowledge the current adverse conditions to Tribes and their trust resources and assets.</p>
TTA-3	<p>Federal Trust Responsibilities and Fisheries</p> <p>The Federal government has a trust responsibility to ensure that all federally recognized tribes in the Klamath Basin with a federally recognized right to harvest Klamath River fall Chinook salmon are able to exercise that right. A federally reserved fishing right is not one of ownership in particular fish, but a right to an opportunity to obtain possession of a portion of the resource, which can best be expressed by either the numbers of fish taken or an allocation of the harvestable resource. See <i>United States v. Washington</i>, 520 F.2d 676, 687 (9th Cir. 1975), cert. denied, 423 U.S. 1086 (1976); see also <i>Puget Sound Gillnetters Ass'n v. U.S. Dist. Ct.</i>, 573 F.2d 1123, 1129 n.6 (9th Cir. 1978), vacated and remanded, <i>Washington v. Washington State Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel Ass'n</i>, 443 U.S. 658 (1979) (vacating judgments of Ninth Circuit and State Supreme Court and remanding for further proceedings not inconsistent with the U.S. Supreme Court's opinion). This trust responsibility includes ensuring that timing of water release, water quality, water quantity, and habitat are managed in a way that provides fall Chinook salmon with river conditions that produce a viable in-river Tribal fishery (subsistence, ceremonial, and commercial).</p> <p>Salmon know no jurisdictional or political boundaries. They are hatched in rivers and tributaries, then emigrate downstream to the ocean, and spend the majority of their life freely feeding and growing in vast areas of the open ocean. Upon reaching adulthood, generally three or four years of age, they return to the river of origin and migrate upstream to spawn and die. In the Klamath River, for Harvest Rate Management purposes, Trinity and Klamath salmon are all considered Klamath stocks. (Klamath Salmon: Understanding Allocation Ronnie M. Pierce February 1998 Funding Provided by the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force United States Fish and Wildlife Service) (Cooperative Agreement # I4-48-11333-98-G002)</p> <p>Although the Hoopa Valley Tribe harvest salmon after they enter the Trinity River, these salmon have passed through 43 miles of the Klamath River and have been affected by conditions in the Klamath River. Many salmon caught by the Yurok Tribe are fish that would have returned to spawn in the Trinity River if they had not been caught in the Klamath River.</p> <p>In October of 1993, the Department of the Interior's Solicitor issued a Memorandum (M-36979) concluding that:</p> <p>"I conclude that when the United States set aside what are today the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Reservations, it reserved for the Indians of the reservations a federally protected right to the fishery resource sufficient to support a moderate standard of living. I also conclude, however, that the entitlement of the Yurok and Hoopa Valley Tribes is limited to the moderate living standard or 50% of the harvest of Klamath-Trinity basin salmon, whichever is less. Given the current depressed condition of the Klamath River basin fishery, and absent any agreement among the parties to the contrary, the Tribes are entitled to 50% of the harvest."</p> <p>The Solicitor reached these conclusions based on the following:</p> <p>Since prehistoric times, the fishery resources of the Klamath and Trinity Rivers have been a mainstay of the life and culture of the Indians residing there. See <i>Mattz v. Arnett</i>, 412 U.S. 481, 487, (1973) ;</p>

	<p>Blake v. Arnett, 663 F.2d 906, 909 (9th Cir. 1981). One estimate is that prior to settlement along the coast by non-Indians, the Indians in the Klamath River drainage "consumed in excess of 2 million pounds . . . of salmon annually from runs estimated to have exceeded 500,000 fish." U.S. Department of the Interior, Environmental Impact Statement - Indian Fishing Regulations 2 (Hoopa Valley Reservation, California) (April 1985) ..</p> <p>The Indians' heavy dependence on the salmon fishery for their livelihood has been well- documented. "The salmon fishery permitted the [Klamath-Trinity basin] tribes to develop a quality of life which is considered high among native populations." AITS</p> <p>The salmon resource was the primary dietary staple of the tribes, and was the center of their subsistence economy. As the court noted in Blake v. Arnett, 663 F.2d at 909, the fishery was "not much less necessary to the existence of the Indians than the atmosphere they breathed" (quoting United States v. Winans, 198 U.S. 371, 381 (1905)).</p> <p>The fact that the Yurok Tribe catches more fish than the Hoopa Valley Tribe does not equate to the Yurok Tribe having a greater interest in the Klamath Basin fishery. The Hoopa Valley Tribe depends upon their fishery for subsistence and ceremonial purposes in much the same way as the Yurok Tribe. Trinity River fish must pass through the main stem of the Klamath River before entering the Trinity River and are affected by Klamath River conditions as evidenced by the large portion of "Trinity River" fish killed in the 2002 fish kill on the Klamath River. The Hoopa Valley Tribe has just as much stake or just as much to lose if the Klamath River becomes so degraded that anadromous fish cannot survive in its waters.</p>
TTA-4	<p>1988 Hoopa-Yurok Settlement Act</p> <p>The 1988 Hoopa-Yurok Settlement Act authorized the Resighini Rancheria (along with others) to merge its lands and membership with the Yurok Reservation if a majority of the Rancheria's adult members voted in favor of such merger. 25 U.S.C. sec. 1300i-10(b). The Resighini Rancheria members did not exercise this option, the Rancheria remains a separate sovereign tribal government, and the Tribe and its lands were not extinguished through merger with the Yurok Reservation as would have occurred had its members exercised the merger option under the 1988 Act. Fishing, water, or other rights associated with the Resighini Rancheria have not been conclusively determined. [Solicitor's Opinion M-36979 October 4, 1993]</p>
TTA-5	<p>Presentation of Effects</p> <p>In the Environmental Consequences sections of Chapter 3 for each resource category, each discrete component of analysis includes three distinct parts: an italicized statement which provides the focus of the analysis, the analysis, and then a concluding statement that describes findings and may indicate whether the identified impacts are considered significant. The introduction and conclusion statements are paired.</p> <p>The statement quoted by the comment author includes the word 'could' because this italicized sentence identifies the potential for an impact. The paired statement to this introductory statement uses 'would' to definitively describe the conclusions drawn in that analysis.</p>
TTA-7	<p>Tribal Involvement in Future Discussions of Water Management</p> <p>Non-signatory Tribes can influence the KBRA implementation as a part of the public input at the Klamath Basin Coordinating Council (KBCC) meetings. [KBCC is the governing entity.]</p> <p>DOI would still have to consult on a Government-to-Government basis with all Tribes that have an interest in fish and water. So, there still would be tribal – Federal discussion regarding how water management and fish issues should be handled outside of the KBRA.</p> <p>Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) chartered Advisory Committees would be formed under terms of the KBRA. The General Services Administration would have authority to approve these charters as well as the Balanced Committee Plan that must be submitted with the FACA charter. The Secretary would take steps to ensure that the myriad points of view from the Basin are represented and have an opportunity to be heard, when the appropriate time to charter those committees arrives.</p>
WQ-1	<p>Sediment Deposits Behind the Dams and Potential Contaminants</p> <p>(A.) There is an estimated 13.1 million cubic yards of sediment deposited behind the facilities proposed for removal (p. 3.11-11 of the Draft EIS/EIR). Under the Proposed Action, the dams would be removed in 2020 and the volume is projected to increase to 15 million cubic yards by that date. It is expected that approximately 36 to 57% of this material would be eroded within the first year from the reservoir</p>

	<p>areas and washed downstream (Reclamation 2012d). The range in the volume is primarily driven by whether river flows are high or low during the reservoir draw down.</p> <p>This sediment is approximately 85% silt and clays (fine sediment) that are unconsolidated and have low cohesive strengths. The moving water would erode these sediments quickly as the reservoir is drawn down from January 1, 2020 to March 15, 2020. Because the sediment is fine, most of this sediment would be carried in suspension all the way to the Pacific Ocean and not deposit in the channel downstream from the dam. More details of the sediment movement can be found in Section 3.11 of the Draft EIS/EIR.</p> <p>(B.) There has been extensive physical and chemical testing of the sediment. Two separate studies have collected over 80 drill cores from reservoir sediments in two separate studies. These have been tested for engineering properties and chemical composition. Section 3.2.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR describes the water quality impacts associated with Dam Removal. In particular, p. 3.2-121 to 3.2-125 summarizes some of the major results of the chemical testing performed for the study and p. 3.2-149 to 3.2-161 summarizes all of the water quality impacts considered in the Draft EIS/EIR and the level of significance of these impacts. Appendix C details the water quality impacts of dam removal and Section C.7 contains a detailed contaminant assessment. CDM published a report titled “<i>Screening-Level Evaluation of Contaminants in Sediments from Three Reservoirs and the Estuary of the Klamath River, 2009-2011</i>” (CDM 2011b) regarding the potential for adverse ecological or human health effects from chemical contamination in Klamath Reservoir sediments. It is available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.</p> <p>(C.) The CDM (2011b) report concluded that the Klamath Reservoir sediments contain no chemicals at levels that would preclude their release into downstream or marine environments.</p> <p>(D.) As part of the Klamath Dam Removal Secretarial Determination studies, evaluations were performed to investigate the potential environmental and human health impacts of contaminants associated with the sediment deposits (including deposits in Copco 1 Reservoir). Results of these evaluations are presented in <i>Screening-Level Evaluation of Contaminants in Sediments from Three Reservoirs and the Estuary of the Klamath River, 2009-2011</i> (CDM 2011b). The results are summarized Section 3.2 and Appendix C of the Draft EIS/EIR in sub-sections with the title “Inorganic and Organic Contaminants”. Existing Conditions are summarized on pages 3.2-31 to 3.2-33. Environmental Effects Determination Methods are summarized on pages 3.2-41 to 3.2-42, while the Significance Criteria are summarized on pages 3.2-46 to 3.2-47.</p> <p>(E.) Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.8 Inorganic and Organic Contaminants (pages 3.2-30 to 3.2-33) and Section (Appendix) C.7 (pages C-63 to C-72) present existing information on sediment contaminants in the Project reservoirs and the Klamath River Estuary. The existing information is summarized from multiple studies, including a recent study carried out under the Secretarial Determination process entitled “<i>Screening-Level Evaluation of Contaminants in Sediments from Three Reservoirs and the Estuary of the Klamath River, 2009-2011</i>” (CDM 2011b).</p> <p>(F.) Sediments bioassays indicated a small amount of toxicity to benthic insects and amphipod, but only in sediments from J.C. Boyle Reservoir (CDM 2011b). Elutriate samples representing the water that results when sediments are re-suspended did exceed freshwater quality criteria and human health criteria for some chemicals (i.e., ammonia [reservoirs only], chromium, phosphorus, copper, chloride [Estuary only], lead, total PCBs, mercury, aluminum, nickel, zinc [J.C. Boyle only] and arsenic); however, the expected dilution and mixing that would occur during reservoir drawdown is likely to be sufficient such that the minimum relevant criteria would be met and these chemicals would not be problematic (CDM 2011b). Elutriate bioassay results indicate the estimated dilution factor of about 48- to 66- fold that might occur would be sufficient to eliminate rainbow trout toxicity, and is likely to be high enough to be protective of other fish species that may be more sensitive than rainbow trout (CDM 2011b).</p> <p>(G.) As discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2.7 Inorganic and Organic Contaminants, under the Proposed Action, the short-term (< 2 years following dam removal) and long-term (2–50 years following dam removal) effects of sediment release, transit, and potential downstream river-bank deposition on humans and aquatic species (freshwater and marine) due to low-level exposure to</p>
--	--

	sediment-associated inorganic and organic contaminants in the lower Klamath River would be a less-than-significant impact (see pgs 3.2-121 to 3.2-125).
WQ-2	<p>Chromium VI / Heavy Metals in Sediments Deposited Behind the Dams</p> <p>In both the 2009-2011 study and a prior 2004-2005 study by Shannon and Wilson, Inc. (2006), heavy metals were analyzed in reservoir sediments and did not exceed guidelines that would prevent their release downstream during and after dam removal. Total chromium was included in the set of analyzed metals. While it was detected in reservoir sediments, total chromium did not exceed the primary marine or freshwater sediment screening levels (i.e., Pacific Northwest Sediment Evaluation Framework sediment screening levels ["PNW SEF SL1-MS" or "SL1-FWS"], see CDM [2011b]) except in two samples from the Klamath River Estuary. Elutriate samples representing the water that results when sediments are resuspended did exceed freshwater quality criteria and human health criteria for some chemicals (i.e., ammonia [reservoirs only], chromium, phosphorus, copper, chloride [Estuary only], lead, total PCBs, mercury, aluminum, nickel, arsenic, zinc [J.C. Boyle only]); however, the expected dilution and mixing that would occur during reservoir drawdown is likely to be sufficient such that the minimum relevant criteria would be met and these chemicals would not be problematic.</p>
WQ-4	<p>Hydroelectric Project Impacts to Water Quality & Anticipated KHSA/KBRA Improvements</p> <p>(A.) A summary of existing poor water quality in the Upper Klamath Basin is described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.1 Existing Conditions (pages 3.2-19 to 3.2-33). Additional details are provided in Appendix C (pages C-1 to C-86).</p> <p>(B.) The presence and operation of the Four Facilities affect many aspects of water quality in the Klamath River, including slower transport of water downstream, interception and retention of sediment, organic matter, nutrients, and other constituents that would otherwise be transported downstream, and alteration of seasonal water temperatures when compared to free-flowing stream reaches. Existing data and numeric models described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2 (pages 3.2-76 to 3.2-125) indicate that dam removal would improve water quality in the Hydroelectric Reach and the Klamath River downstream from Iron Gate Dam by decreasing late summer/early fall water temperatures, increasing seasonal dissolved oxygen concentrations, decreasing seasonal pH levels*, and decreasing or eliminating high seasonal chlorophyll-a and algal toxin concentrations (see also Table 3.2-14, pages 3.2-149 to 3.2-161).</p> <p>*Summer time increases in pH levels and daily variability could occur in the Klamath River immediately downstream from Iron Gate Dam due to periphyton colonization. These increases would be less-than-significant.</p> <p>(C.) Water quality improvements in Upper Klamath Basin, including the Keno Impoundment, are critically important to water quality further downstream in the Klamath River. As described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.1 No Action Alternative (pages 3.2-47 to 3.2-76), full attainment of the Oregon and California TMDLs would eventually be beneficial for algal-derived suspended material, nutrients, dissolved oxygen, pH and algal toxins/ chlorophyll-a in the Hydroelectric Reach; however, it could require decades to achieve and is highly dependent on improvements in Upper Klamath Lake and the Keno Impoundment. As described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2.10 KBRA (pages 3.3-125 to 3.2-132), resource management actions implemented under KBRA as part of the Proposed Action would accelerate long-term improvements in water quality, including those anticipated under the TMDLs.</p> <p>(D.) Additional detail on the interaction of the TMDLs and the Alternatives is provided by the Water Quality SubTeam (2011) (also referred to as the Water Quality SubGroup), as cited in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.5, page 3.3-241. This document, entitled "Assessment of Long Term Water Quality Changes for the Klamath River Basin Resulting from KHSA, KBRA, and TMDL and NPS Reduction Programs" can be found at http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies.</p>
WQ-5	<p>Upper Basin Geology and Land Use Implications for Water Quality</p> <p>As stated in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.1 Existing Conditions (Water Quality) (see in particular page 3.2-19), the Upper Klamath Basin possesses soils that are naturally high in phosphorus. Human activities in the upper basin, including wetland draining, agriculture, ranching, logging, and water diversions have altered seasonal stream flows and water temperatures, increased concentrations of nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) and suspended sediment in watercourses, and degraded other water quality parameters such as pH and dissolved oxygen. Regarding nutrients in particular, research published in peer reviewed journals demonstrates that although levels of naturally occurring phosphorus are elevated in Upper Klamath Lake, historical land use activities in the Upper Klamath Basin resulted in increased nutrient loading to the lake, subsequent changes in its trophic status, and</p>

	associated degradation of water quality (Bradbury et al. 2004, Coleman et al. 2004, Eilers et al. 2004) (see Draft EIS/EIR [Appendix] Section C.3, page 3-20).
WQ-6	<p>Periphyton Growth and Fish Disease</p> <p>It is not anticipated that periphyton growth in the river downstream from Iron Gate Dam would be substantially affected by dam removal. As discussed in Section 3.4.4.3 (pages 3.4-16 to 3.4-17), while some conditions under the Proposed Action may enhance periphyton growth in the Hydroelectric Reach and in the Klamath River downstream from Iron Gate Dam (i.e., re-exposed riverine habitat in the Hydroelectric Reach and increased nutrient transport in both reaches), conditions may counteract this response in the river downstream from Iron Gate Dam (i.e., increased uptake of nutrients by periphyton establishment in the Hydroelectric Reach, increased frequency and intensity of river bed scouring events, decreasing nutrient concentrations due to TMDL implementation and KBRA nutrient reduction programs). Overall, it is likely that increases in periphyton growth downstream from Iron Gate Dam would be less than significant. Further, the analysis conducted for the Draft EIS/EIR indicates that the Proposed Action would be expected to reduce overall impacts on salmonids from fish disease. As described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.3.4.3 (pages 3.3-88 to 3.3-89), dam removal would be likely to reduce overall habitat quality for the polychaete host by reducing the planktonic food source provided by the reservoirs and restoring seasonal flow patterns and sediment dynamics that reduce the stability of the host's favored habitats (i.e., periphyton mats), particularly downstream from Iron Gate Dam (see also AQU-27).</p>
WQ-10	<p>Permitting Sediment Release</p> <p>Both the State Water Resources Control Board and the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board issue permits with conditions and requirements that support and prevent harm of beneficial uses. Any permit issued would require conditions to ensure the protection of beneficial uses. If there is an Affirmative Determination such that dams would be removed, the State or Regional Water Board may need to issue a permit before any construction activities could proceed. In considering that permit and the conditions that might be included in that permit, the State or Regional Water Board would need to balance the potential immediate impact of dam removal (e.g., sediment discharge) against the potential long-term benefits to water quality and beneficial uses.</p> <p>In order to certify the J.C. Boyle Dam removal under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, the Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) must conclude that the project would comply with Oregon's current water quality standards. Based on a review and input from a local advisory committee, neighboring States, and USEPA, ODEQ recommends adoption of a new Klamath-specific restoration rule that requires them to include a specified time schedule for allowable water quality exceedances as part of the 401 certification process (see Section 3.C. in Kirk [2011]). The rule also requires that ODEQ justify the special circumstances under which the rule is applicable by making the following findings: dam removal and its associated water quality impacts would be of limited duration; dam removal and related restoration activities would provide a net ecological benefit; dam removal would be performed in a manner minimizing, to the maximum extent practicable, adverse impacts to water quality, threatened and endangered species, and beneficial uses of the Klamath River; and dam removal, by the end of a specified time schedule, is not expected to cause an exceedance of a water quality standard set forth in this Division. The objectives, legal foundation, and requirements of the ODEQ proposed rule are consistent with those proposed by the California North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p>
WQ-11	<p>Comparisons With Rogue River and Downstream Sediment Effects</p> <p>(A.) The impacts of dam removal on downstream river reaches vary depending on the individual characteristics of the project. The impacts can be significantly different between projects based upon composition of the reservoir sediment and characteristics of the river. Particle size analyses of the sediments deposited behind Gold Ray Dam indicate that the sediments were dominated by coarse materials (gravel and sand) (HDR 2009), which can deposit downstream once the dam is removed. Deposition of coarse materials downstream from Gold Ray Dam was expected and may have temporarily caused negative effects to the downstream habitat. However, high flows would redistribute these sediments in a natural way and incorporate them into the river system as they would with naturally supplied sediments. There are no significant long-term negative biological impacts associated with the coarse sediments.</p> <p>Particle size analyses of the sediments deposited behind J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, and Iron Gate Dams indicate that the Klamath River sediment deposits are made up of 85% fine particles (silt and clay) (see Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.11.3.4, pages 3.11-9 to 3.11-11). As described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.11.4.3 (pages 3.11-20 to 3.11-22), sediment transport modeling conducted for the Klamath River</p>

	<p>indicates that fine sediments released during drawdown and dam removal would primarily remain in suspension and be transported to the ocean (Reclamation 2012d, Stillwater Sciences 2008). There would be some settling of fine material within slow velocity areas such as vegetated eddies and deep pools. This material may eventually be flushed out during high flows, but some fine material may become vegetated and become incorporated into the existing stream bed, banks, and floodplain surfaces.</p> <p>The remaining 15% of the sediment material currently in the reservoirs is primarily sand with some gravel and cobble. This material would be metered out more slowly and its fate would be dependent upon the type of flows that occur during dam removal and immediately after. A detailed assessment of the sediment movement is found in Reclamation (2012d). If dam removal occurs during a dry or normal year, then the bed downstream from Iron Gate Dam would have a high sand content. It is expected that it would take one wet year to flush the sand through the reaches downstream from Iron Gate Dam and return the river bed to natural levels of sand.</p> <p>The relatively greater amount of silt and clay behind the Klamath River dams as compared to the (previous) Gold Ray Dam is an important distinction between the two projects and suggests that the downstream impacts would be different.</p> <p>(B.) Short-term impacts, such as sediment deposition in downstream reaches or elevated suspended sediment concentrations in the river, are expected in almost all dam removal projects. For the Klamath River, elevated suspended sediment concentrations are expected to occur in the river downstream from the dams for weeks to months following reservoir drawdown (Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2.2, pages 3.2-84 to 3.2-93). The elevated concentrations would be a significant impact on biota in the river.</p> <p>However, there are anticipated long-term benefits of dam removal, including increased habitat access for migrating aquatic species and improved water quality. There would also be long-term benefits caused by the resupply of sediment to the reaches downstream from Iron Gate Dam after dam removal. The natural cycles of erosion and deposition that occurred before would be restored. The gravel and cobble material in the reach from Copco I Reservoir to Cottonwood Creek is expected to be substantially more mobile after dam removal because the average bed material size would reduce. Therefore, the flows required to mobilize the bed material would be reduced and there would be more years in which bed mobilization occurs. There would also be substantially more sand, silt, and clay transported in the Klamath River from Copco I Reservoir to a distance beyond the Shasta River confluence.</p>
WQ-15	<p>Klamath Dams Do Not Supply Cool Summertime Water to Downstream River Reaches</p> <p>Existing data and numeric models described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2 (pages 3.2-76 to 3.2-125) indicate that the Project dams increase late summer/early fall water temperatures in the Klamath River downstream from Iron Gate Dam. Thus, in general the dams are not acting to cool summertime water that is transported downstream from Upper Klamath Lake. This is due to the fact that powerhouse withdrawals for Copco 1 and Iron Gate Dams are primarily from the epilimnion (surface waters) (see Appendix C, page C-3) which are heated by ambient air temperatures. Unlike Shasta Dam (Sacramento River), Lost Creek Dam (Rogue River), or other deep reservoirs that support downstream tailwater fisheries by release of cool water from low level outlets, the location of Klamath dam outlets cannot be adjusted to access large volumes of cool water in the bottom of the reservoirs (hypolimnion). This is because hypolimnetic waters in the Project reservoirs are of limited volume and poor water quality. Further, since Keno Dam, J.C. Boyle, and Copco 2 impoundments lack a hypolimnion altogether, there are no controllable actions that can be taken to cool summertime water released from these facilities (FERC 2007, page 3-142).</p>
WQ-16	<p>Upper Klamath Basin Historically Productive but Land Use Exacerbates Problem</p> <p>Upper Klamath Lake and portions of the Klamath River have historically been known to be productive and at times eutrophic water bodies (see studies cited in the EIS/EIR including Bradbury et al. [2004] and Eilers et al. [2001]*). Findings presented in the EIS/EIR are consistent with this understanding. Recent land use disturbances and changes in hydrology have led to hypereutrophic conditions in Upper Klamath Lake that frequently violate water quality standards and place designated beneficial uses in the Klamath River at risk.</p> <p>*Colman et al. (2004) was not cited in the Draft EIS/EIR and has been added to the Final EIS/EIR.</p>

WQ-19	<p>Water Temperature Models and General Predictions</p> <p>Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.1.1. (page 3.2-36) and Appendix D.1 (pages D-1 to D-8) provide a detailed review of the numeric models developed to analyze the effects of each project alternative on Klamath River water temperatures. The models used in the analysis are capable of providing water temperatures for multiple locations between Link River Dam and the Klamath River Estuary on a daily basis. Model output for the Proposed Action is described in Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.4.3.2.1 (pages 3.2-76 to 3.2-83). While model output indicates that, compared to existing conditions, there are times and locations where water temperatures would be warmer if the dams were removed (i.e., summer/fall in J.C. Boyle bypass reach, springtime in Hydropower Reach and downstream from Iron Gate Dam), there are also times and locations where water temperatures would become cooler in the absence of the dams (i.e., summer/fall in J.C. Boyle peaking reach, Hydropower Reach, and downstream from Iron Gate Dam). In general, the removal of the Hydroelectric Facilities would result in a more natural water temperature pattern in the Klamath River.</p>
WQ-20	<p>Replaced with WQ-1 D and text on algaecides and copper removed from master response because only applicable to two comment responses.</p>
WQ-22	<p>TMDLs and the No Action/No Project Alternative (and Alternative 4)</p> <p>The implementation of the TMDLs is included throughout the water quality analysis, including the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4. Within the period of analysis (i.e., 50 years) reasonably foreseeable actions associated with water quality are anticipated to be the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing restoration activities in the Klamath Basin (see Section 2.4.2). • Implementation of TMDLs for Oregon and California (see Section 3.2.2.4) • National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service 2010 Biological Opinion mandatory flows (see Section 2.3.1). • California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) Code Section 5937 instream flow mandate for tributaries to the mainstem Klamath River • Climate change (see Section 3.10.3.1). <p>Therefore, under the No Action/No Project Alternative, elements of ongoing restoration projects, TMDLs, and programs mandating stream flows that would affect future water quality are identified for a specific reach and/or water quality parameter and included as part of the analysis narrative in a qualitative or, if possible, a quantitative manner. Further TMDL implementation is discussed throughout the No Action/No Project Alternative analysis and would also be applicable to Alternative 4.</p>
WQ-23	<p>Dam Removal Water Quality Effects on Terrestrial Species</p> <p>The Proposed Action and the other dam removal alternatives would result in multiple water quality improvements downstream from Iron Gate Dam (See Master Response WQ-4). The Lead Agencies have not identified documented evidence of detrimental effects that existing water quality impairments have had on most native terrestrial species, including species of birds, amphibians, and reptiles. PacifiCorp (2004a) did identify that habitat degradation and poor water quality are likely reasons why Oregon spotted frog does not occur in the study area. The EIS/EIR was revised to provide an analysis of short-term impacts on amphibians and reptiles from suspended sediments following dam removal, based primarily on information found in Stillwater Sciences (2009). The EIS/EIR does not analyze how anticipated long-term water quality improvements from the Proposed Action and the other dam removal alternatives would affect terrestrial species. However, it is anticipated that long-term water quality improvements in the Lower Klamath Basin from the Proposed Action could result in positive or neutral ecological effects for most species.</p>
WQ-27	<p>Nutrient Retention With Dams, Nutrient Release Without Dams, and Periphyton</p> <p>As described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.2.3.4 (pages 3.2-24 to 3.2-26) and (Appendix) Section C.3 (pages C-19 to C-34), on an annual basis the reservoirs at the Four Facilities intercept and retain phosphorus and nitrogen; however, on a seasonal basis, including late summer and fall, the reservoirs are a source for nutrients downstream, which fuels periphyton (i.e., attached algae) growth in the river. As detailed in Section 3.2.4.3.2.3 (see pages 3.2-100 to 3.2-104) and in Section 4.4.1 Water Quality (Cumulative Effects) (pages 4-45 to 4-47), under the Proposed Action nitrogen and phosphorus would no longer be trapped by the dams. This would result in very small annual increases in total phosphorus and relatively larger annual increases in total nitrogen in the Klamath River immediately downstream from Iron Gate Dam. For much of the year (i.e. the non-growing seasons of winter and spring) these increases would have minimal effect on algal growth. During the growing season, nutrients would be available for algal uptake; however, the anticipated increases in nutrients would diminish with distance downstream due to retention by algae and tributary dilution. Additional regulation of periphyton growth is expected from increased frequency and intensity of river bed scouring events. Therefore, despite the overall increase in nutrients under the Proposed Action, it is not anticipated that productivity (i.e.,</p>

	<p>periphyton growth) in the river downstream from Iron Gate Dam would substantially increase, and as such, dissolved oxygen and pH (which are important to fish health) would be minimally affected. Therefore, the increase in nutrients under the Proposed Action would be a less-than-significant effect.</p>
WQ-32	<p>Expert Panel Discussion of Increased Water Temperature Variation Downstream Under the Proposed Action</p> <p>As part of the discussion of increased temperature variation under the Proposed Action, the Expert Panel (Dunne et al. 2011) notes that the highest temperatures experienced by fish may increase, but also notes on pages 31-32 that, "...if the fish use cooler hours of the night for migrating in the mainstem from one thermal refuge to the next, the cooler cold hours and cooler cold days (during the warm season) under the Proposed Action could benefit the fish. Cooler fluctuating temperatures can also allow time for repair of proteins damaged by thermal stress, allowing persistence through periods of high maximum daily temperatures (Schrank 2003)." In other words, fish are able to take advantage of daily temperature fluctuations such that temporary maximum temperatures that are stressful can be offset by temporary minimum temperatures that are more beneficial. These fluctuations are more natural than constant temperatures such as in waters released from the reservoirs, and fish may therefore be better adapted for these conditions. The Expert Panel reports did acknowledge that there is a degree of uncertainty in their findings and that future events primarily related to implementation of the KBRA agreements could influence predicted outcomes. Both panels noted that full implementation of the KBRA would increase probability of successfully restoring coho, Chinook, and steelhead runs.</p> <p>Finally, the Chinook Expert Panel (Goodman et al. 2011) concluded with certainty that if the four dams are not removed, the Klamath Chinook salmon would continue to decline (page 69 of Appendix C of the July 20, 2011 Addendum to the Chinook Expert Panel report [Goodman et al. 2011]) (see also AQU-6 B).</p>
WQ-39	<p>Foreseeable Restoration Measures</p> <p>Recall that collectively, the "Regulatory Restoration Measures" referred to by the commenter include a) the PacifiCorp Habitat Conservation Plan; (b) the National Marine Fisheries Service 2010 Biological Opinion; (c) the CDFG Code Section 5927 in-stream flow mandate for tributaries to the mainstem Klamath River; and (d) the mitigation and monitoring plan for the 2007 FERC EIS.</p> <p>The PacifiCorp Habitat Conservation Plan generally describes existing operations with inclusion of several Interim Measures; these are included in the No Action/No Project Alternative (see Section 2.4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR). The NOAA Fisheries Service biological opinion and the CDFG Section 5937 instream flow mandate are also included in the No Action/No Project Alternative as existing regulations that affect flows. They are not explicitly detailed in Section 2.4.2, but they are included in the hydrologic and hydraulic modeling efforts. The CDFG Code Section 5927 is not included in the No Action/No Project as this code is not relevant to dam removal or water management in Klamath River watershed.</p> <p>The mitigation and monitoring plan for the 2007 FERC EIS is not included in the No Action/No Project Alternative. The mitigation and monitoring plan describes mitigation measures identified in the EIS associated with the FERC Proposed Action and how to monitor those measures. These measures are not included in the No Action/No Project Alternative because FERC did not issue a license to implement FERC EIS/EIRs Proposed Action. Alternative 4 is similar to the Proposed Action from the FERC EIS; however, the Lead Agencies completed an independent analysis of this alternative and identified appropriate mitigation within this EIS/EIR rather than simply incorporating the provisional mitigation and monitoring plan from the 2007 FERC EIS.</p>
WQ-43	<p>Handling of Uncertainty in the Water Quality Analysis, Including TMDLs</p> <p>Uncertainty is inherent to any analysis of future conditions, particularly in a system as complex as the Klamath Basin. The EIS/EIR has been prepared according to requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Accordingly, assessments of the effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives on future water quality and algae conditions in the Klamath River involve comparison to both existing conditions (CEQA) and future conditions (NEPA). Future conditions include "reasonably foreseeable actions" that are independent of FERC licensing and are expected to occur during the 50-yr period of analysis (2012 to 2061). With respect to water quality in the Klamath Basin, reasonably foreseeable actions include implementation of TMDLs for Oregon and California (see full list of reasonably foreseeable actions associated with water quality in Section 3.2.4.1, page 3.2-25). Uncertainty is inherently associated with each of the reasonably foreseeable actions, including TMDL implementation, and does not eliminate the requirement to include these actions in the analyses. The same is true for KBRA implementation, which, as a connected action, is analyzed at a program-level. Uncertainty regarding TMDL and KBRA</p>

	<p>implementation is appropriately called out in statements throughout the Draft EIS/EIR (such as the ones cited in the comment). Effects determination statements for the No Action/No Project Alternative in Section 3.2 Water Quality and Section 3.4 Algae include an explicit acknowledgement that full attainment of the Oregon and California TMDLs would improve water quality but the implementation mechanisms and timing are unknown. The comment does not provide specific examples of how the uncertainty regarding TMDL water quality improvements would affect decisions related to the effects of the alternatives. Further, the general assertion of uncertainty associated with respect to TMDL implementation made by the comment does not provide finer resolution than the statements already made in the EIS/EIR.</p>
WQ-51	<p>Short-term and Long-Term Water Quality Impacts from Dam Removal</p> <p>Anticipated significant water quality impacts from the Proposed Action include short-term and long-term increased summer/fall water temperatures in the J.C. Boyle bypass reach due to the elimination of hydropower peaking flows; short-term and long-term increases in spring time water temperatures in the Hydroelectric Reach and from Iron Gate Dam to the Salmon River due to removal of the reservoirs; short-term increases in suspended material in the Hydroelectric Reach and Klamath River downstream from Iron Gate Dam (including the Klamath River Estuary) due to release of sediment deposits behind the dams; and, short-term increases in oxygen demand (Immediate Oxygen Demand [IOD] and Biological Oxygen Demand [BOD]) and reductions in dissolved oxygen in the Hydroelectric Reach and the Klamath River from Iron Gate Dam to Clear Creek due to release of sediment deposits behind the dams (see also Table 3.2-14, pages 3.2-149 to 3.2-161). There are numerous less-than-significant short-term and long-term water quality impacts anticipated under the Proposed Action, which are also detailed in the aforementioned section and summarized in Table 3.2-14. As described in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 2 and Section 3.2.5 Mitigation Measures (page 3.2-147), the timing of reservoir drawdown under the Proposed Action was optimally developed to minimize short-term environmental effects (i.e., high suspended sediments, low dissolved oxygen). Short-term construction-related water quality impacts (i.e., increased suspended sediments and inorganic and organic contaminants from hazardous materials associated with construction equipment) would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of deconstruction and/or construction-related Best Management Practices (BMPs). These BMPs are described in Appendix B of the EIS/EIR.</p>
WSR-1	<p>Wild & Scenic River Eligibility</p> <p>The reach from the Oregon-California border to the backwater of Copco Reservoir (RM 204) has been found eligible and suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS) with a scenic classification in the Final Eligibility and Suitability Report for the Upper Klamath Wild and Scenic River Study (BLM April 2, 1990). It is beyond the scope of this EIS/EIR process to address additional reaches for designation under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (NWSRA). In addition there are three instances when Federal agencies assess eligibility for additional reaches: 1) at the request of Congress through specific authorized studies; 2) through their respective agency inventory and planning processes; or 3) during NPS evaluation of a Section 2(a)(ii) application by a State. River areas identified through the inventory phase are evaluated for their free-flowing condition and must possess at least one Outstanding Remarkable Value (ORV). There are then two mechanisms that can be used to designate additional reaches of the Klamath River to the NWSRS. 1) Congress would be required to pass specific legislation or 2) Section 2(a)(ii) of the NWSRA which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to include a river already protected by a State river protection program in the National System upon the request of that State's governor.</p>
WSWR-1	<p>Effects to Agricultural Water Supply</p> <p>(A) The main water bodies that store water for agricultural in the Klamath Basin are Upper Klamath Lake, a natural lake now controlled by Link River Dam; the Lost River; and the Klamath River from the Keno Impoundment. Upper Klamath Lake holds 83 percent of the total storage capacity of the reservoirs on the Klamath River (FERC 2007) and approximately 98 percent of active storage (Greimann 2011). Neither Link River nor Keno Dams are being considered for removal. As a result, the removal of the Four Facilities would not negatively affect the water supply for Reclamation's Klamath Project.</p> <p>(B) In the Lower Klamath Basin, some agricultural diversion of water occurs for farming and ranching from tributaries such as the Shasta, Scott, Salmon, and Trinity Rivers. However, the Four Facilities are located on the main stem Klamath River; therefore, these diversions of water from tributaries would not be affected by removal of the Four Facilities.</p> <p>(C) Associated reservoirs for J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams contain 14 percent of the total storage capacity and 2 percent of the active storage on the Klamath River. These dams were designed for short-term water storage and for water to be released at specific times and volumes for</p>

	<p>power purposes. The Four Facilities are owned and operated by PacifiCorp. The associated water rights owned by PacifiCorp are for power generation, to refill regulatory storage space in Iron Gate Reservoir, 98 cubic foot per second for fish propagation facilities and fish culture, and 5,475 acre-feet for irrigation of 43 acres and stock watering of 200 animals from April 1 through October 31. As of December 2010, the only potential loss to farming/ranching due to removal of the Four Facilities would be the 5,475 acre-feet of irrigation water currently assigned to PacifiCorp. Water rights information is found in the DEIR in Section 3.8. Pages 3.8-5 through 3.8-12 specifically discuss the current water rights in the Klamath Basin.</p> <p>(D) Two State filings in Siskiyou County were identified which could be developed into diversions from the Mainstem Klamath. Applications were submitted in 1956 by the State Water Resources Control Board to preserve water for future use and development. The SWRCB holds this water in trust for the people of California. Any development of this water would need to be consistent with a coordinated plan such as the State's Water Plan or a County General Plan. Parties who seek to develop water supply projects may petition the SWRCB to assign all or part of the State-filed applications to them. Both applications are for the use of 60,000 acre-feet from the Klamath River with a point of diversion from the current location of Iron Gate Dam. One stated use is for power and one has the stated uses of domestic, municipal, recreational, fish culture, fish and wildlife protection and /or enhancement, industrial and irrigation. (e-wrims 5-17-2012). Since 1956, no diversion infrastructure has been installed nor planned for construction involving these water rights applications. None of the alternatives considered in this EIS/EIR would change the status of these State filings.</p>
WSWR-4	<p>Summary of Effects to Water Rights/Water Supply for Alternatives 2 and Alternative 3 for Municipal, Agricultural, and Tribal Use</p> <p>The EIS/EIR analyzed effects on water supplies for Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. For a full description of those effects see Section 3.8. This section does not find that removal of the Four Facilities would provide more water; rather, this section indicates that removal would not directly affect agricultural or municipal water supply because the Four Facilities do not provide water supply for municipal, agricultural, and tribal use.</p> <p>The main water bodies that store water for agricultural use in the Klamath Basin are Upper Klamath Lake, a natural lake now controlled by Link River Dam; the Lost River; and the Klamath River from the Keno Impoundment. Upper Klamath Lake holds 83 percent of the total storage capacity of the reservoirs on the Klamath River (FERC 2007) and approximately 98 percent of active storage (Greimann 2011). Neither Link River nor Keno Dams are being considered for removal. As a result, the removal of the Four Facilities would not negatively affect the water supply or water rights for Reclamation's Klamath Project.</p> <p>In the Lower Klamath Basin, some agricultural diversion of water occurs for farming and ranching from tributaries such as the Shasta, Scott, Salmon, and Trinity Rivers. However the Four Facilities are located on the main stem Klamath River therefore these diversions of water from tributaries would not be affected by removal of the Four Facilities.</p> <p>Associated reservoirs for J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams contain 14 percent of the total storage capacity and 2 percent of the active storage on the Klamath River. These dams were designed for short-term water storage and for water to be released at specific times and volumes for power purposes.</p> <p>The Four Facilities are owned and operated by PacifiCorp. The associated water rights owned by PacifiCorp are for power generation, to refill regulatory storage space in Iron Gate Reservoir, 98 cubic foot per second for fish propagation facilities and fish culture, and 5,475 acre-feet for irrigation of 43 acres and stock watering of 200 animals from April 1 through October 31. As of December 2010, the only potential loss to farming/ranching due to removal of the Four Facilities would be the 5,475 acre-feet of irrigation water currently assigned to PacifiCorp. Water rights information is found in the EIS/EIR Section 3.8. and this section specifically discusses the current water rights in the Klamath Basin.</p> <p>Two State filings in Siskiyou County were identified which could be developed into diversions from the Mainstem Klamath. Applications were submitted in 1956 by the State Water Resources Control Board to preserve water for future use and development. The SWRCB holds this water in trust for the people of California. Any development of this water would need to be consistent with a coordinated plan such as the State's Water Plan or a County General Plan. Parties who seek to develop water supply projects may petition the SWRCB to assign all or part of the State-filed applications to them. Both applications are for the use of 60,000 acre-feet from the Klamath River with a point of diversion from</p>

	<p>the current location of Iron Gate Dam. One stated use is for power and one has the stated uses of domestic, municipal, recreational, fish culture, fish and wildlife protection and /or enhancement, industrial and irrigation. (e-wrims 5-17-2012). Since 1956, no diversion infrastructure has been installed nor planned for construction involving these water rights applications. None of the alternatives considered in this EIS/EIR would change the status of these State filings.</p> <p>There are potential effects to water rights which are associated with Interim Measures (IMs) that could result in changes to PacifiCorp's water rights. Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 include Interim Measures that would control operations until the dams were removed. Interim Measure 16 would eliminate three screened diversions from Shovel and Negro Creeks and would seek to modify PacifiCorp's water rights to move the points of diversion to the mainstem Klamath River. Section 3.8 found this impact to be less than significant because it would not affect the exercise of the water right (i.e. the quantity of water diversions) or flow in the Klamath River.</p> <p>The first year following dam removal, there is the potential for some sedimentation of pump intakes in the first 10 to 15 miles downstream from Iron Gate Dam. (p 3.8-17 in the Draft EIS/EIR) Under mitigation measure WRWS-1 (p 3.8-26 in the Draft EIS/EIR), the DRE will assess each pump location at legitimate points of diversion and investigate intake and pump sites at the request of the water user. If effects on water supply intakes occur as a result of dam removal, the DRE would complete modifications to intake points as necessary to reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. (p 3.8-17 in the Draft EIS/EIR).</p> <p>The EIS/EIR analyzes impacts to the City of Yreka's water supply associated with the pipeline relocation in Section 3.8. The quantity and quality of the City of Yreka's water diversions at Fall Creek would not change because of the action alternatives.</p> <p>The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes the KBRA as a connected action to Alternatives 2 and 3. Water supply and water rights effects of the KBRA are analyzed on pages 3.8-18 to 3.8-24. As discussed on page 3.8-18, a primary purpose of the KBRA is to increase water supply reliability. The KBRA would establish water diversion limitations that would be more reliable in the long-term and simultaneously develop programs to address decreased diversions.</p> <p>The KBRA would include the Water Use Retirement Program (WURP), a voluntary program for the purpose of supporting fish populations restoration by permanently increasing inflow to Upper Klamath Lake by 30,000 acre-feet per year. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes impacts from the WURP on pages 3.8-21 and 3.8-22, and concludes that "Implementation of the WURP is anticipated to have a less than significant impact to water rights because rights would be voluntarily retired. Implementation of the WURP is expected to have no effect to water supply because there would be no changes to diversions."</p> <p>To date, only the Federal Indian reserved water rights of the Klamath Tribes, both as part of the Adair litigation and now as part of the on-going Klamath River Adjudication in Oregon, have been the subject of a water rights adjudication within the Klamath Basin. Under the KBRA, these claims--to Upper Klamath Lake (Case 286 in the Oregon adjudication) and to the Klamath River from the Lake to the Oregon border (Case 282)--would be subordinated in relation to Reclamation's Klamath Project as specified in the KBRA.</p> <p>No claims were filed by or on behalf of the California tribes as part of the Oregon adjudication, and no adjudication in California has addressed the nature and extent of the Winters rights of the California tribes. No provision of the KBRA/KHSA waives or releases water, fishing, or any other rights in California held by the United States or any Indian tribe (KBRA Section 15.3.2.A). Nothing in the KBRA determines any tribal rights in California. The KBRA does not affect the ability of the California tribes or others to challenge or limit other users in Oregon as may be appropriate. Nothing in the KBRA or otherwise affects the ability of California tribes to continue exercising whatever rights they have, in the interim or otherwise and with or without an adjudication or negotiated settlement to define their rights with specificity. Nothing in the KBRA affects the ability of the United States or any other tribe to develop and assert water rights claims in California in the context of a State adjudication or other action.</p>
WSWR-5	<p>Klamath Adjudication</p> <p>The KBRA and KHSA do not have the effect of amending or expanding any claim in the Klamath adjudication. Neither the KHSA nor the KBRA affect any water rights in the adjudication other than</p>

	<p>those voluntarily included in the agreements. Parties to the Klamath basin adjudication may enter into settlement agreements to resolve contests with claimants. The KBRA and KHSA are included in such a contest settlement agreement.</p> <p>The proposed dam removal is not expected to directly impact any part of the adjudication. Information about the status of the adjudications process and individual claims and/or contests is available at: http://www.wrd.state.or.us/OWRD/ADJ/index.shtml.</p> <p>To date, only the Federal Indian reserved water rights of the Klamath Tribes, both as part of the Adair litigation and now as part of the on-going Klamath River Adjudication in Oregon, have been the subject of a water rights adjudication within the Klamath Basin. Under the KBRA, these claims--to Upper Klamath Lake (Case 286 in the Oregon adjudication) and to the Klamath River from the Lake to the Oregon border (Case 282)--would be subordinated in relation to Reclamation's Klamath Project as specified in the KBRA.</p> <p>No claims were filed by or on behalf of the California tribes as part of the Oregon adjudication, and no adjudication in California has addressed the nature and extent of the Winters rights of the California tribes. No provision of the KBRA/KHSA waives or releases water, fishing, or any other rights in California held by the United States or any Indian tribe (KBRA Section 15.3.2.A). Nothing in the KBRA determines any tribal rights in California. The KBRA does not affect the ability of the California tribes or others to challenge or limit other users in Oregon as may be appropriate. Nothing in the KBRA or otherwise affects the ability of California tribes to continue exercising whatever rights they have, in the interim or otherwise and with or without an adjudication or negotiated settlement to define their rights with specificity. Nothing in the KBRA affects the ability of the United States or any other tribe to develop and assert water rights claims in California in the context of a State adjudication or other action.</p>
WSWR-7	<p>Effects to Water Rights/Water Supply from Dam Removal as Described in KHSA</p> <p>The Draft EIS/EIR analyzes potential effects to water rights in Section 3.8 for dam removal as described in KHSA. The only potential effect to water rights would be associated with Interim Measures (IMs) that could result in changes to PacifiCorp's water rights (see page 3.8-17). The KHSA includes IMs that would control operations until the dams were removed. IM 16 would eliminate three screened diversions from Shovel and Negro Creeks and would seek to modify PacifiCorp's water rights to move the points of diversion to the mainstem Klamath River. Section 3.8 found this impact to be less than significant because it would not affect the exercise of the water right (i.e., the quantity of water diversions) or flow in the Klamath River.</p> <p>While dam removal as described in KHSA would not directly affect water rights, the EIS/EIR analyzes the potential for indirect effects from removal, such as sedimentation of diversion pumps downstream from Iron Gate Dam or changes in surface water flows (page 3.8-14 through 3.8-17). These impacts were found to be less than significant after mitigation. The KBRA would improve the reliability of water deliveries through several programs (see pages 3.8-18 through 3.8-24).</p> <p>The first year following dam removal, there is the potential for some sedimentation of pump intakes in the first 10 to 15 miles downstream from Iron Gate Dam. (p 3.8-17 in the Draft EIS/EIR) Under mitigation measure WRWS-1 (p 3.8-26 in the Draft EIS/EIR), the DRE would assess each pump location at legitimate points of diversion and investigate intake and pump sites at the request of the water user. If effects on water supply intakes occur as a result of dam removal, the DRE would complete modifications to intake points as necessary to reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. (p 3.8-17 in the Draft EIS/EIR).</p>
WSWR-9	<p>Information on Downstream Diversions</p> <p>(A) Collecting information about all of the downstream diversions on the Klamath River would be prohibitively difficult, and would not change the significance finding related to this impact.</p> <p>(B) The downstream diversions are on private property. The property owners would need to grant access to the Lead Agencies to investigate the diversions likely leading to an incomplete dataset similar in content to the data currently used in the analysis of water rights/water supply. Information collection would include extensive data collection efforts regarding the type of diversion facility, elevation, location, screening, and canal or pipeline to the place of use. Some of this information collection would occur in the river, which would increase its expense.</p>

	<p>(C) The incomplete information would also not change the finding of significance for the water supply impact. The Lead Agencies performed detailed hydraulic, hydrologic, and sediment transport modeling; however, all models have a margin of error. Even small deviations in localized sediment deposition at a site could affect the ability to use diversion facilities. Because of this uncertainty, the Lead Agencies would declare these impacts to be significant and in need of mitigation even if this information was available and indicated that the impact could be minor.</p> <p>(D) NEPA contains requirements about incomplete or unavailable information (40 CFR Section 1502.22). These requirements relate to information that is “essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives.” Because this information would not change the finding of significance or mitigation, it would not substantively help choose between alternatives.</p> <p>(E) The impact analysis related to the downstream water supply impacts and the applicable mitigation measure have been revised to increase the specificity and explain these issues. Changes are reflected in Section 3.8.4.3, under the impact analysis for the Proposed Action.</p>
WSWR-10	<p>Effects on City of Yreka Water Supply</p> <p>The Lead Agencies recognize that less information is available about the replacement pipeline for the City of Yreka water supply than for other elements of the Proposed Action; therefore, the analysis of this element has been denoted as programmatic in the EIS/EIR. Chapter 2 has also been modified so that other potential pipeline configurations would be considered in cooperation with the City of Yreka during the design phase. The permit approvals, related environmental review, and consultation needed for the Proposed Action as a whole are included in Chapter 7 of the EIS/EIR.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies considered changes in pipeline length and found that the pipeline would not be noticeably longer. For the proposed pipeline bridge, the pipe would maintain a constant elevation across the reservoir, rather than dropping down to the river bottom, but would be shifted slightly upstream to permit continued operation of the existing pipeline until the new pipeline is complete. The Water Supply/Water Rights section has been edited to clarify what is meant by “a short amount of time.” A shutdown of approximately 12 hours would be sufficient to connect the new pipeline to the existing pipeline. Rob Taylor, Water Manager for the City of Yreka, stated in an August 24, 2010 email that “with the new 2.5 million gallon tank that will be online within 2 years, we could be shut down 12 to 18 hours in the summer and up to 72 hours in the winter” (Taylor 2010). The work would likely be scheduled to take place during the winter to add a factor of safety that the work would be complete without affecting the water supply. These estimates and other details would be reviewed and modified if necessary during the final design process to prevent any interruption of water service to the City of Yreka.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies recognize that cathodic protection is important to the City of Yreka, and will work with the City of Yreka to design an appropriate system during the next phase of development.</p> <p>The EIS/EIR analyzes impacts to the City of Yreka’s water supply associated with the pipeline relocation in Section 3.8. The quantity and quality of the City of Yreka’s water diversions at Fall Creek would not change because of the action alternatives.</p>
WSWR-11	<p>Effects on Refuge Water Supply</p> <p>(A) Implementation of programs under the KBRA would increase the amount of water in the Klamath River and maintain the elevation of Upper Klamath Lake. Water allocations and delivery obligations would also be established for the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) and Tule Lake NWR increasing the certainty of water deliveries. Therefore, no impacts on waterfowl using the NWRs, and bald eagles that prey on them are anticipated. Potential effects of the proposed water diversion limitations on fish and wildlife are discussed Sections 3.3 and 3.5.</p> <p>(B) The current allocation to the refuges during drought years is 0.0 acre-feet. Under the KBRA, the NWRs would be guaranteed an allocation that could range from 48,000 acre-feet in normal to wet years down to 24,000 acre-feet in drier years. If the available water does not allow for an allocation of 24,000 acre-feet, then all water users would share in the reductions beyond that point. Similarly, the KBRA provides for a range of water diversions to irrigators depending on whether a particular year is projected to be wetter or drier than normal.</p> <p>(C) Potential effects of the proposed water diversion limitations on fish and wildlife are discussed Sections 3.3 and 3.5. The KBRA does not supersede existing laws or regulations and does not exempt</p>

	any actions from compliance with ESA or CESA. Project level actions and decisions will continue to be made in compliance with existing laws and regulations.
WSWR-19	<p>Downstream Water Supply Effects</p> <p>As described in Section 3.8 of the EIS/EIR, flows through the Hydroelectric Reach from Keno Dam downstream to Iron Gate Dam are related to Upper Klamath Lake elevations, flows diverted to and returned from Reclamation's Klamath Project, relatively small storage capacities of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project developments, and the releases out of Iron Gate Dam (Draft EIS/EIR, p. 3.8-9). Upper Klamath Lake holds 83 percent of the total storage capacity of the reservoirs on the Klamath River (FERC 2007) and approximately 98 percent of active storage. Link River Dam controls Upper Klamath Lake and would remain under all alternatives. Associated reservoirs for J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate Dams contain 14 percent of the total storage capacity and only 2 percent of the active storage on the river (EIS/EIR, p. 3.8-9).</p> <p>The purpose for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project facilities is power generation, and although the operation of these facilities can alter flow patterns (power peaking) within this reach, the operation of these facilities does not create additional storage of water that could be used to supplement flows in the river downstream. The total amount of active storage available within the four hydroelectric reservoirs is only 11,749 acre-feet and release of this pool would eliminate the ability of these projects to generate hydropower. The presence of the reservoirs actually reduces the annual volume of water that would otherwise flow downstream because of evaporative losses related to the large surface area created by the impoundments. Removal of the hydroelectric project reservoirs would result in a slight increase in flow as the evaporative losses would be reduced. The estimated loss in water associated with evaporation is about 6,153 AF per year (Reclamation 2012d).</p> <p>As described in Section 3.3.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Proposed Action would result in flows more favorable to all life stages of salmonids, and would provide suitable habitat for resident riverine species, anadromous fish and lamprey in the hydroelectric reach from the upstream end of J. C. Boyle Reservoir to Iron Gate Dam. In the lower Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam, over the long term, the Proposed Action would alter the hydrograph so that the duration, timing, and magnitude of flows would be more similar to the unregulated conditions under which the native fish community evolved (Hetrick et al. 2009). The Proposed Action would have a beneficial effect on essential fish habitat (efh) for chinook and coho salmon in the long term. (Draft EIS/EIR, p. 3.3-93).</p>

Chapter 12

References

Ackerman, N.K., Pyper, B., Courter, I., and Cramer, S. 2006. Estimation of returns on naturally produced coho to the Klamath River. Review draft. Klamath coho integrated modeling framework technical memorandum No. 1 of 8. Prepared by Cramer Fish Sciences, Gresham, Oregon, for the Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Basin Area Office, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

Administrative Law Judge. 2006. Decision, In the Matter of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project (License Applicant PacifiCorp). Docket Number 2006-NMFS-0001, FERC Project Number 2082, dated September 27, 2006. Alameda, California, U.S. Coast Guard, 94 pp.

Aldous, A., McCormick, P., Ferguson, C., Graham, S., and Craft, C. 2005. Hydrologic Regime Controls Soil Phosphorus Fluxes in Restoration and Undisturbed Wetlands: Restoration Ecology, vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 341-347.

American Rivers. 2011. Elwha River Restoration. Accessed on December 6, 2011. Available at: <http://www.americanrivers.org/our-work/restoring-rivers/dams/projects/elwha-river-background.html>.

Anderson, David. 2012. Email Communication between D. Anderson, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and C. Anderson, U.S. Geological Survey. Re: Draft - Background Metals Guidance Document, June 25, 2012.

Araki, H., Berejikian, B.A., Ford, M.J., and Blouin, M.S. 2008. Fitness of hatchery-reared salmonids in the wild. *Evol. Appl.* 2008; 1:342-355.

Armstrong, N., and Ward, G. 2008. Coherence of nutrient loads and AFWO Klamath River grab sample water quality database. Technical Report. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, Arcata, California.

Asarian, E., and Kann, J. 2011. Phytoplankton and nutrient dynamics in Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs, 2005-2010. Technical Memorandum. Prepared by Kier Associates, Eureka, California, and Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon, for the Klamath Basin Tribal Water Quality Work Group.

Asarian, E., Kann, J., and Walker, W.W. 2009. Multi-year nutrient budget dynamics for Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs, California. Prepared by Riverbend Sciences and Kier Associates, Eureka, California; Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon; and William Walker, Concord, Massachusetts for the Karuk Tribe, Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California.

Asarian, E., Kann, J., and Walker, W.W. 2010. Klamath River nutrient loading and retention dynamics in free-flowing reaches, 2005-2008. Final Technical Report to the Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Klamath, California.

Backer, L.C., McNeel, S.V., Barber, T., Kirkpatrick, B., Williams, C., Irvin, M., Zhou, Y., Johnson, T.B., Nierenberg, K., Aubel, M., LePrell, R., Chapman, A., Foss, A., Corum, S., Hill, V.R., Kieszak, S.M., and Cheng, Y-S. 2010. Recreational exposure to microcystins during algal blooms in two California lakes: *Toxicon*, vol. 55, No. 5, pp. 909-921.

Bartholomew, J.L., Atkinson, S.D., Hallett, S.L., Zielinski, C.M., and Foott, J.S. 2007. Distribution and abundance of the salmonid parasite *Parvicapsula minibicornis* (Myxozoa) in the Klamath River Basin (Oregon-California, USA). *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms* 78:137-146.

Bartholomew, J.L., and Foott, J.S. 2010. Compilation of Information Relating to Myxozoan Disease Effects to Inform the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement. Available at: http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/Disease%20synthesis_11-1_final.bartholomew.foott.pdf.

Baxter, R., Breuer, R., Brown, L., Conrad, L., Feyrer, F., Fong, S., Gehrts, K., Grimaldo, L., Herbold, B., Hrodey, P., Mueller-Solger, A., Sommer, T., and Souza, K. 2010. IEP 2010 pelagic organism decline workplan and synthesis of results. Interagency Ecological Program Report. Available at: <http://www.water.ca.gov/iep/docs/FinalPOD2010Workplan12610.pdf>.

Bender Rosenthal, Inc (BRI). 2011. Iron Gate and Copco Dams Removal, Dam Removal Real Estate Evaluation Report. Prepared for U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Reclamation, March 22, 2012. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

_____. 2012. Dam Removal Real Estate Evaluation Update Report, December 2004 and 2006, Siskiyou County, California. Prepared for U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Reclamation, July 16, 2012. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

Bernot, M.J., and Dodds, W.K. 2005. Nitrogen retention, removal, and saturation in lotic ecosystems. *Ecosystems* 8:442-453. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/25053841.pdf>.

Beyer, J.M. 1984. Rainbow Trout Fishery and Spawning Stock in the Upper Klamath River Wild Trout Area, Copco, California. Faculty of Humboldt State University. Arcata, California, Humboldt State University, 62 pp.

Blue Green Algae Work Group. 2010. Draft Voluntary Statewide Guidance for Blue-Green Algae Blooms – July 2010. Blue Green Algae Work Group of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), California Department of Public Health (CDPH), and Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). July 2010. Available at: <http://www.cdph.ca.gov/HealthInfo/environhealth/water/Documents/BGA/BGAdraftvoluntarystatewideguidance-07-09-2010.pdf>.

Bohlen, C., and Lewis, L.Y. 2008. Examining the Economic Impacts of Hydropower Dams on Property Values Using GIS. *Journal of Environmental Management*, July 2008.

Born, S.M., Genskow, K.D., Filbert, T.L., Hernandez-More, N., Keefer, M.L., and White, K.A. 1998. Socioeconomic and Institutional Dimensions of Dam Removals, The Wisconsin Experience. *Environmental Management* 22(3): 359-370.

Bradbury, J.P., Colman, S.M., and Reynolds, R.L. 2004. The history of recent limnological changes and human impact on Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon: *Journal of Paleolimnology*, vol. 31, pp. 151-165.

Brockbank, D.S. 2011. Testimony regarding benefits of the Klamath Hydropower Settlement Agreement for PacifiCorp rate payers versus the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing process. Dean S. Brockbank, Vice President and General Counsel of PacifiCorp Energy, Portland, Oregon, 16 pp.

Brown, L.R., and Moyle, P.B. 1991. Status of Coho Salmon in California. Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service. Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, University of California, Davis, California.

Buchanan, D.V., Hanson, M.E., and Hooton, R.M. 1997. Status of Oregon's bull trout: distribution, life history, limiting factors, management considerations, and status. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland, Oregon.

Buchanan, D., Buettner, M., Dunne, T., and Ruggerone, G. 2011a. Klamath River Expert Panel FINAL REPORT Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives on Resident Fish, with the assistance of Atkins (formerly PBS&J): 94 pp. + appendices. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/Resident%20Fish%20Final%2004%2011%2011.pdf>.

Buchanan R., Townsend, R., Skalski, J., and Ham, K. 2011b. The effect of bypass passage on adult returns of salmon and steelhead: an analysis of PIT-tag data using the program ROSTER. Draft report. Prepared by Battelle, Pacific Northwest Division, Richland, Washington, for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla District, Washington.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1990. Final Eligibility and Suitability Report for the Upper Klamath Wild and Scenic River Study. March 1990. BLM, Klamath Falls Resource Area, Klamath Falls, Oregon. Available at: <http://soda.sou.edu/awdata/040224a1.pdf>.

_____. 2002. Instream flow analysis for the Bureau of Land Management Federal Reserved Water Right, Claim Number 376, for the Klamath Wild and Scenic River in Oregon.

Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). 2005. Natural Flow of the Upper Klamath River. Report dated November 2005. Accessed on September 19, 2012. Available at: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/kbao/docs/undepleted_klam_fnl_rpt.pdf.

_____. 2011. Reservoir Area Management Plan for the Secretary's Determination on Klamath River Dam Removal and Basin Restoration, Technical Report No. SRH-2011-19. Prepared for the Mid-Pacific Region, Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated June 2011. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

_____. 2012a. Benefit Cost and Regional Economic Development Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon. Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated December 2011; updated January 2012. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

_____. 2012b. Detailed Plan for Dam Removal – Klamath River Dams. Klamath Hydroelectric Project FERC License No. 2082, Oregon-California. Report dated September 15, 2011. Accessed on November 2, 2011. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

_____. 2012c. Economics and Tribal Summary Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon. Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated December 2011; updated January 2012. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

_____. 2012d. Hydrology, Hydraulics and Sediment Transport Studies for the Secretary's Determination on Klamath River Dam Removal and Basin Restoration. Technical Report No. SRH-2011-02. Prepared for the Mid-Pacific Region, Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated April 2011; updated January 2012. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

_____. 2012e. Hydropower Benefits Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon. EC-2011-02. Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated August 2011; updated 2012. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

_____. 2012f. Irrigated Agriculture Economics Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon. Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado. Report dated September 2011; updated 2012. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

_____. 2012g. Facts and Figures for the Lease Land Program. June 12, 2012. Available at: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/kbao/operations/land_lease/.

_____. 2012h. Removal of Iron Gate and J.C. Boyle Earth Dams on the Klamath River. Technical Memorandum No. KM-8311-1 dated April 2012. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

Bureau of Reclamation and PacifiCorp. 2012. Agreement in Principle for Transfer of Keno Dam. Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, Sacramento, California, August 2012.

Butcher, J. 2008. Nutrient dynamics in the Klamath. Memorandum from J. Butcher, Tetra Tech, Inc., Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, to the Klamath TMDL Technical Team, February 12.

Butler, V.L., Miller, J.A., Yang, D.Y., and Misarti, N. 2010. The use of archaeological fish remains to establish predevelopment salmonid biogeography in the Upper Klamath Basin. Final Report. Portland State University Department of Anthropology, Portland, Oregon.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 1954. Fish Bulletin No. 98: The Life Histories of the Steelhead Rainbow Trout (*Salmo gairdneri gairdneri*) and Silver Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) With Special Reference to Waddell Creek, California, and Recommendations Regarding Their Management.

_____. 1994. Petition to the Board of Forestry to list coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) as a sensitive species. Redding, California, 109 pp.

_____. 2002. Status Review of California Coho Salmon North of San Francisco. Report to the California Fish and Game Commission, Appendix D. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.

_____. 2006. Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Klamath Hydroelectric Project, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project No. 2082-027. Sent November 29, 2006, by Donald Koch, Regional Manager, Northern California-North Coast Region, Redding, California.

_____. 2009. Technical Memorandum: Preliminary Evaluation of the Hart Bypass as Proposed in Siskiyou County's Congressional Briefing Paper: Solutions and Alternatives for the Klamath River.

California Energy Commission (CEC). 2011. Commission Guidebook, Renewables Portfolio Standard Eligibility, 4th Edition.

California Fish and Game Commission (CFGF). 1913. Twenty-second Biennial Report for the years 1910-1912. Sacramento, California.

California, Oregon, U.S. Department of the Interior, and PacifiCorp (CA, OR, DOI, PacifiCorp). 2008. Agreement in Principle (to Negotiate Dam Removal). November 13, 2008. Agreement signed by all parties, 32 pp.

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). 2011. In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp (U901E), an Oregon Company, for an Order Authorizing a Rate Increase Effective January 1, 2011, and Granting Conditional Authorization to Transfer Assets, pursuant to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement. May 6, 2011. Available at: http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/FINAL_DECISION/134812.htm#P56_1425.

_____. 2012. California Renewable Portfolio Standards Program Overview. February 1, 2012. Available at: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Renewables/overview.htm>.

California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2011. California Electronic Water Rights Information Management System. Accessed on December 17, 2011. Available at: <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/ewrims/>.

_____. 2012. California Electronic Water Rights Information Management System. Accessed on May 17, 2012. Available at: <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/ewrims/>.

Camp, Dresser & McKee (CDM). 2011a. Klamath Settlement Process Sediment Management in the Reservoirs. June 2011. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

_____. 2011b. Screening-level evaluation of contaminants in sediments from three reservoirs and the estuary of the Klamath River, 2009–2011. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Interior, Klamath River Secretarial Determination, Water Quality Sub-Team, Sacramento, California. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

- Chorus, I., and Bartram, J. 1999. Toxic cyanobacteria in water: a guide to public health consequences, monitoring and management. Für WHO durch E & FN Spon/Chapman & Hall, London.
- Christian, R.R., Jr., Bryant, W.L., and Stanley, D.W. 1986. The relationship between river flow and *Microcystis aeruginosa* blooms in the Neuse River, North Carolina. Project No. WRRRI 85-02-70037. Prepared by Biology Department and Institute for Coastal and Marine Resources, East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina.
- Cobb, J.N. 1931. Pacific Salmon Fisheries. Appendix XIII. Report of the United States Commissioner of Fisheries for the Fiscal Year 1930. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Fisheries, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington.
- Colman, S.M., Bradbury, J.P., and Rosenbaum, J.G. 2004. Paleolimnology and paleoclimate studies in Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon. *Journal of Paleolimnology* 31: 129-138.
- Connor, W.F., Sneva, J.G., Tiffan, K.F., Steinhorst, R.K., and D. Ross. 2005. Two alternative juvenile life history types for fall Chinook salmon in the Snake River Basin. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 134: 291-304.
- Coots, M. 1962. Klamath River 1957 and 1958 King Salmon Counts, Klamathon Racks Siskiyou County. Redding, California, Inland Fisheries, California Department of Fish and Game.
- Dean, R. 2010. Siskiyou County Environmental Health Department. Telephone communication with Alexandra Kleyman, CDM, on December 2, 2010.
- Deas, M. 2008. Nutrient and organic matter fate and transport in the Klamath River: June to September 2007. Prepared by Watercourse Engineering, Inc., Davis, California, for PacifiCorp, Portland, Oregon.
- Deas, M.L., Vaughn, J.C., and Tanaka, S.K. 2009. Algaecide Pilot Study, Copco Reservoir 2008. Available at: http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Hydro/Hydro_Licensing/Klamath_River/2008AlgaecidePilotStudy.pdf.
- Deas, M., Vaugh, J., and Limanto, E. 2010. Copco Reservoir and Klamath River Particulate Matter Settling Pilot Study: 2008. Memo dated October 8, 2010, submitted to PacifiCorp.
- Department of the Interior (DOI). 1993. Memorandum from John D. Leshy, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, to the Secretary of the Interior, regarding Fishing Rights of the Yurok and Hoopa Valley Tribes, 32 pp. + appendices.

_____. 2003. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation Economic Analysis of Dam Decommissioning. EC-2003-01. Available at: <http://www.usbr.gov/pmts/economics/reports/DamRemovalPaper2.pdf>.

_____. 2007. The Department of the Interior's Filing of Modified Terms, Conditions, and Prescriptions. Klamath Hydroelectric Project No. 2082. Sacramento, California, 650 pp.

_____. 2008. Data Quality Management Guide (Version 4.5). August 2008, Washington, DC. Available at: http://www.nps.gov/gis/egim/library/DataQuality_2008_0824_DOI%20Data%20Quality%20Management%20Guide.pdf.

_____. 2011. Potential Effects of Implementing the KHSA and KBRA on Trust Resources and Cultural Values. Sacramento, California. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

_____. 2012b. Assessment of Potential Changes to Real Estate Resulting from dam removal: Klamath Secretarial Determination Regarding Potential Removal of the lower Four Dams on the Klamath River. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

DOI, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). 2012a. Current Effects of Pacificorp Dams on Indian Trust Resources and Cultural Values. Sacramento, California. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

DOI and Department of Commerce (DOC), National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service. 2012. Klamath Dam Removal Overview Report for the Secretary of the Interior. An Assessment of Science and Technical Information. October 2012. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

Dunne, T., Ruggerone, G., Goodman, D., Rose, K., Kimmerer, W., and Ebersole, J. 2011. Klamath River Expert Panel Final Report: Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives on Coho Salmon and Steelhead. Published April 25, 2011. Funded by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service but produced with assistance from Atkins Company, San Diego, California, 380 pp.

Dunsmoor, L., and Huntington, C. 2006. Suitability of Environmental Conditions within Upper Klamath Lake and the Migratory Corridor Downstream for Use by Anadromous Salmonids. Technical Memorandum for the Klamath Tribes, 80 pp.

Eilers, J.M., Kann, J., Cornett, J., Moser, K., and St. Amand, A. 2004. Paleolimnological evidence of change in a shallow, hypereutrophic lake: Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon. *Hydrobiologia* 520: 7-18.

Evermann, A.M., and Clark, H.W. 1931. A distributional list of the species of freshwater fishes known to occur in California. California Division of Fish and Game, Fish Bull. No. 35, 67 pp.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). 1995. Decommissioning Policy.

_____. 2007. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Hydropower License, Klamath Hydroelectric Project, FERC Project No. 2082- 027, FERC/EIS-0201F. Washington, DC, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of Energy Projects, Division of Hydropower Licensing.

_____. 2009. Public Meeting on Agreement in Principle for Klamath Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Proceeding FERC Project No. 2082. Powerpoint presentation. January 29, 2009. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of Energy Projects, Division of Hydropower Licensing. Available at: <http://www.klamathbasincrisis.org/Poweranddamstoc/nodams/toc.htm>.

Fetcho, K. 2008. 2007 Klamath River blue-green algae summary report. Final Report. Prepared by the Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Klamath, California.

Fetcho, K. 2010. Re: October 26 and 27 phytoplankton results posting lifted. Memorandum to Klamath River BGA Workgroup from K. Fetcho, Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Klamath, California. November 12.

Foott, S. 2012. Email communication with J. Hamilton. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, January 23, 2012.

Foott, J.S., Bartholomew, J.L., Perry, R.W., and Walker, C.E. 2011. Conceptual Model for Disease Effects in the Klamath River. 11p.

Fortune, J.D., Gerlach, A.R., and Hanel, C.J. 1966. A study to determine the feasibility of establishing salmon and steelhead in the upper Klamath Basin. Oregon State Game Commission and Pacific Power and Light, 129 pp.

Fry, D.H. 1973. Anadromous fishes of California. California Department of Fish and Game, 112 pp.

Gannett, M.W., Lite, K.E. Jr., La Marche, J.L., Fisher, B.J. and Polette, D.J. 2010. Ground-Water Hydrology of the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon and California. U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2007-5050, Version 1.1, April 2010. Available at: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2007/5050/>.

Gatschet, A.S. 1890. The Klamath Indians of Southwestern Oregon. USDI U.S. Geographical and Geological Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region: 1-106.

Good, T.P., Waples, R.S., and Adams, P. (editors). 2005. Updated status of federally listed ESUs of West Coast salmon and steelhead. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-66, 598 pp.

Goodman, D., Harvey, M., Hughes, R., Kimmerer, W., Rose, K., and Ruggerone, G. 2011. Scientific Assessment of Two Dam Removal Alternatives on Chinook Salmon. Final, June 3, 2011, funded by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service but produced with assistance from Atkins Company, San Diego, California, 172 pp.

Green, M. 2012. Email communication with E. Vasquez. Bureau of Reclamation, June 11, 2012.

Greimann, B.P. 2011. Hydraulic Engineer, Reclamation, Denver Federal Center. Email correspondence with C. Park, CDM, March 16, 2011.

Greimann, B.P. 2012. Hydraulic Engineer, Reclamation, Denver Federal Center. Email communication with Renee Snyder, Bureau of Land Management, May 15, 2012.

Groot, C., and Margolis, L. (editors). 1991. Pacific Salmon Life Histories. UBC Press, Vancouver, 564 pp.

Hackett, S., and Hansen, D. 2008. Cost and Revenue Characteristics of the Salmon Fisheries in California and Oregon. Technical report prepared for the National Marine Fisheries Service, October 3, 2008.

Hamilton, J.B., Curtis, G.L., Snedaker, S.M., and White, D.K. 2005. Distribution of anadromous fishes in the upper Klamath River watershed prior to hydropower dams - a synthesis of the historical evidence. Fisheries 30: 10-20.

Hamilton, J., Hampton, M., Quinones, R., Rondorf, Dennis, Simondet, J., and Smith R. 2010. Synthesis of the Effects to Fish Species of Two Management Scenarios for the Secretarial Determination on Removal of the Lower Four Dams on the Klamath River. Prepared by the Biological Subgroup (BSG) for the Secretarial Determination (SD) Regarding Potential Removal of the Lower Four Dams on the Klamath River, final draft, November 23, 2010.

Hamilton, J., Rondorf, D., Hampton, M., Quiñones, R., Simondet, J. and Smith, T. 2011. Fish Species of Two Management Scenarios for the Secretarial Determination on Removal of the Lower Four Dams on the Klamath River.

Hardy, T. 2008. Support for the Klamath Settlement Agreement. April 23, 2008.

Hardy, T., Addley, C., and Saraeva, E. 2006. Evaluation of instream flow needs in the lower Klamath River. Phase II, final report. Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC, Institute for Natural Systems Engineering, Utah Water Research Laboratory, Utah State University, Logan.

Hartman, R. 2012. National Weather Service (NWS). Telephone conversation with Dennis Lynch, USGS. Re: Klamath River Forecasting Plans if the PacifiCorp Dams are Removed, May 11, 2012.

Hendrix, N. 2011. Forecasting the response of Klamath Basin Chinook populations to dam removal and restoration of anadromy versus no action. R2 Resource Consultants, Inc., Redmond, Washington.

HDR. 2009. Jackson County Gold Ray Dam Sediment Assessment Report – Final. October 2009. HDR, Inc., Portland, Oregon.

Hetrick, N.J., Shaw, T.A., Zedonis, P., Polos, J.C., and Chamberlain, C.D. 2009. Compilation of information to inform USFWS Principals on technical aspects of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement relating to fish and fish habitat conditions in the Klamath Basin, with emphasis on fall Chinook salmon. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, Arcata, California. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

Huisman, J., Sharples, J., Stroom, J.M., Visser, P.M., Kardinaal, W.E.A., Verspagen, J.M.H., and Sommeijer, B. 2004. Changes in turbulent mixing shift competition for light between phytoplankton species. *Ecology* 85: 2,960–2,970.

Huntington, C.W. 2006. Estimates of anadromous fish runs above the site of Iron Gate Dam. Clearwater BioStudies, Inc., Canby, Oregon.

Huntington, C.W., and Dunsmoor, L.K. 2006. Suitability of environmental conditions within upper Klamath Lake and the migratory corridor downstream for use by anadromous salmonids. Technical memorandum prepared for the Klamath Tribes.

Hurst, C.N., Holt, R.A., Bartholomew, J.L. 2012. Dam Removal and Implications for Fish Health: *Ceratomyxa shasta* in the Williamson River, Oregon, USA. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 32(1), pp. 14-23.

Kann, J. 2008. Microcystin bioaccumulation in Klamath River fish and freshwater mussel tissue: preliminary 2007 results. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon, for the Karuk Tribe of California, Orleans, California.

Kann, J., and Asarian, E. 2006. Longitudinal analysis of Klamath River phytoplankton data 2001-2004. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon, and Kier Associates, Blue Lake and Arcata, California, for the Yurok Tribe Environmental Program, Klamath, California.

Kann, J., and Bowman, C. 2012. Middle Klamath River toxic cyanobacteria trends, 2010. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland,

Oregon, and Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California, for the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California.

Kann, J., and Corum, S. 2009. Toxigenic *Microcystis aeruginosa* bloom dynamics and cell density/chlorophyll a relationships with microcystin toxin in the Klamath River, 2005-2008. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon, and the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources for the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California.

Kann, J., and Smith, V.H. 1999. Chlorophyll as a predictor of elevated pH in a hypereutrophic lake: estimating the probability of exceeding critical values for fish success using parametric and nonparametric models. Can. J. Fish Aquat. Sci 56: 2262-2270.

Kann, J., and Walker, W.W. 1999. Nutrient and hydrologic loading to Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon, 1991-1998. Draft report submitted to the Klamath Tribes, Chiloquin, Oregon, and the Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

Kann, J., Bowater, L., and Corum, S. 2010. Middle Klamath River toxic cyanobacteria trends, 2009. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences, LLC, Ashland, Oregon, and the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources for the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California.

Kann, J., Bowater, L., Johnson, G., and Bowman, C. 2011. Preliminary 2010 microcystin bioaccumulation results for Klamath River salmonids. Technical memorandum prepared by Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences LLC for the Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Orleans, California.

Kirk, S. 2011. Draft Issue Paper: Water Quality Certification Procedures for Klamath River Restoration Project. October 2011. 18 p. Available at: <http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/standards/klamath.htm#docs>.

Klamath Fish Health Assessment Team (KFHAT). 2005. End of Year Report, 2004. March 16, 2005.

Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (KRBFTF). 1991. Long range plan for the

Klamath Basin Conservation Area Fishery Restoration Program. Prepared with assistance from William M. Kier Associates, Sausalito. City of Yreka, California.

Klamath Settlement Group (KSG). 2007. The Best Hope for Solving the Klamath River Crisis. July 27, 2007. Eureka Times Standard, Eureka, California. Available at: http://www.times-standard.com/allopinion/ci_6488120.

_____. 2008. Proposed Klamath River Basin Restoration Agreement for the Sustainability of Public and Trust Resources and Affected Communities (Draft 11).

January 15, 2008. Available at: <http://www.klamathbasincrisis.org/settlement/ProposedKlamathBasinRestorationAgreement011508Draft11.pdf>.

_____. 2009. Proposed Klamath River Basin Restoration Agreement for the Sustainability of Public and Trust Resources and Affected Communities (Working Draft). May 6, 2009. Available at: <http://www.klamathbasincrisis.org/settlement/documents/KBRA050609.pdf>.

_____. 2010. Summary of Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement. May 2010. Available at: <http://216.119.96.156/Klamath/Summary%20of%20Klamath%20Settlement%20Agreements%204-5-10.pdf>.

Klamath Water Users Association. 2011. Klamath Water Users Association Annual Report 2010. Klamath Falls, Oregon. Available at: <http://kwua.org/sites/kwua.org/files/3-31%20FINAL%20AM%20REPORT-TJ.pdf>.

Kope, R.G. 1992. Evaluating Management Options for Klamath Chinook. Salmon Management in the 21st Century: Recovering Stocks in Decline. Proceedings of the 1992 Northeastern Pacific Chinook and Coho Workshop. Boise, Idaho, September 28-30, 1992. Idaho Chapter of the American Fisheries Society and the Western Division of the American Fisheries Society, pp. 214-223.

Kruse, S.A., and Scholz, A.J. 2006. Preliminary Economic Assessment of Dam Removal: The Klamath River. Published by Ecotrust.

Lawson, P.W. 1993. Cycles in ocean productivity, trends in habitat quality, and the restoration of salmon runs in Oregon. Fisheries 18(8): 6–10.

Leitritz, E. 1970. A History of California's Fish Hatcheries 1870-1960. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 150, Inland Fisheries Branch, Sacramento, California.

Lindley, S.T., and Davis, H. 2011. Using model selection and model averaging to predict the response of Chinook salmon to dam removal. Review draft report, May 16, 2011. National Marine Fisheries Service, Fisheries Ecology Division, NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Santa Cruz, California. Accessed on December 21, 2011. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/sites/klamathrestoration.gov/files/lindleyDavis%20Review%20Draft.pdf>.

Ly, J., and Ruddy, Z. 2011. Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Recovery Domain, 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation of Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Coho Salmon ESU. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Long Beach, California.

Lynch, D. 2011. Infeasibility of the mechanical removal of reservoir bottom sediments if Klamath River dams are removed in 2020.

Lytle, M. 2000. Water Quality Data Review and Wetland Size Estimate for the Treatment of Wastewaters from the Klamath Straits Drain. Draft technical memorandum, July 28, 2000. Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Project Office, Klamath Falls, Oregon, 15 pp.

Mackie, T. 2005. Cyanobacteria Field Survey: Upstream and Downstream of the Irongate Dam, Klamath River, Siskiyou County. California Department of Health Services, September 16, 2005.

Maule, A.G., VanderKooi, S.P., Shively, R.S., Hamilton, J., Stocking, R., and Bartholomew, J. 2009. Physiological Development and Vulnerability to *Ceratomyxa shasta* of Fall-run Chinook Salmon in the Upper Klamath River Watershed. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 29: 1743-1756.

Mauser, D., and Mayer, T. 2011. Effects of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement on Lower Klamath, Tule Lake, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Tulelake, California, 75 pp.

Mefford, B. 2011. Review of proposal entitled "Proposal alternative tunnel route Shasta Nation anadromous fish bypass," by J. Bacigalupi and H.L. Lake. Letter to John Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, November 8, 2011, 2 pp.

Mertzman, S.A. 2000. K-Ar results from the southern Oregon-northern California Cascade Range: Oregon Geology, vol. 62, No. 4, pp. 99-123.

Miller, M.A., Kudela, R.M., Mekebri, A., Crane, D., Oates, S.C. et al. 2010. Evidence for a novel marine harmful algal bloom: cyanotoxin (microcystin) transfer from land to sea otters. PLoS ONE 5: e12576. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0012576.

Moisander, P.A., Ochiai, M., and Lincoff, A. 2009. Nutrient limitation of *Microcystis aeruginosa* in northern California Klamath River reservoirs. Harmful Algae doi:10.1016/j.hal.2009.04.005.

Moyle, P.B. 1976. Inland fishes of California. University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 415 pp.

Murray Pacific Company. 1995. Amendment to the Habitat Conservation Plan and Incidental Take Permit PRT-777837 for the Northern Spotted Owl on Timberlands Owned by the Murray Pacific Corporation. Lewis County, Washington.

Myers, J., Busby, P., Grant, S., Iwamoto, R., Kope, R., Mahnken, C., Matthews, G., Roni, P., Schiewe, M., Teel, D., Wainwright, T., Waknitz, F.W., Waples, R., Williams, J., Bryant, G., Wingert, C., Lindley, S., Adams, P., Wertheimer, A., and Reisenbichler, R. 1997. Review of the Status of Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) from Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, West Coast Chinook Salmon Biological Review Team, 480 pp.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service. 1997. Endangered and threatened species: threatened status for southern Oregon/northern California coast evolutionarily significant unit of coho salmon. Federal Register 62: 24588-24609.

_____. 2006. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: threatened status for Southern Distinct Population Segment of North American green sturgeon: final rule. Federal Register 71: 17757-17766.

_____. 2007. National Marine Fisheries Service Modified Prescriptions for Fishways and Alternatives Analysis for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project (FERC Project No. 2082), 151 pp.

_____. 2008. Southwest Regional Office – Protected Resource Division. Available at: <http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/deter/index.htm>. Accessed on October 18, 2010.

_____. 2010. Biological opinion on the operation of the Klamath Project between 2010 and 2018. Prepared for Bureau of Reclamation by NOAA Fisheries Service, Southwest Region. Available at: http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/klamath/FINAL-Klamath_Ops_031510.pdf.

_____. 2012. Ocean Sport Fishing Economics Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on Whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.

National Research Council (NRC). 2004. Endangered and Threatened Fishes in the Klamath River Basin - Causes of Decline and Strategies for Recovery. National Research Council of the National Academies, National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

_____. 2008. Hydrology, Ecology, and Fishes of the Klamath River Basin. National Research Council of the National Academies, National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

North American Electric Reliability Corporation. 2010. 2010 Long-Term Reliability Assessment. October, 2010.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB). 2010. Klamath River total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) addressing temperature, dissolved oxygen, nutrient, and microcystin impairments in California, the proposed site specific dissolved oxygen objectives for the Klamath River in California, and the Klamath River and Lost River implementation plans. Final Staff Report with Appendices. North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Rosa, California.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2012. Toxicological Summary and Suggested Action Levels to Reduce Potential Adverse Health Effects of Six Cyanotoxins.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, California Environmental Protection Agency, Sacramento, California, May 2012. Available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/peer_review/docs/calif_cyanotoxins/cyanotoxins053112.pdf.

Oosterhout, G.R. 2005. KlamRAS results of fish passage simulations on the Klamath River. Final report, Eagle Point, Oregon.

Oregon Agricultural Information Network (OAIN). 2010. Klamath County 2010 Data. Available at: <http://oain.oregonstate.edu/SelYearCharts.asp?sCountyName=Klamath&sCountyId=18>.

Oregon Department of Energy. 2012. Summary of Oregon's Renewable Portfolio Standards. January 19. Available at: http://www.oregon.gov/ENERGY/RENEW/RPS_Summary.shtml.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). 2006. Letter from Hydro Power Program Biologist, High Desert Region, to John Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Re: PacifiCorp Fish Salvage Records, August 7, 2006.

_____. 2011. Letter from Lead Project Manager, Fish Screening and Passage Program, Re: Proposed By-Pass Alternatives to Dam Removal on the Klamath River, December 30, 2011, 12 pp.

Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. 2008. Letter to Honorable Senator Doug Whitsett, Oregon Senate. May 13, 2008, 2 pp.

Oregon Health Authority. 2012. Algae Bloom Advisories. Available at: <http://public.health.oregon.gov/HealthyEnvironments/Recreation/HarmfulAlgaeBlooms/Pages/Blue-GreenAlgaeAdvisories.aspx>. Accessed on September 28, 2012.

Oregon Historical Society. 2002. The Oregon History Project, Link River Dam, 1938. Available at: <http://ohs.org>. Accessed on May 18, 2012.

Oregon Public Utilities Commission. 2010. Order No. 10-364. Entered September 16, 2010. In the Matter of PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power Application to Implement the Provisions of Senate Bill 76. Available at: <http://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2010ords/10-364.pdf>.

Pacific Fishery Management Council. 2011. Preseason Report III: Analysis of Council Adopted Management Measures for 2011 Ocean Salmon Fisheries. (Document prepared for the Council and its advisory entities.) Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon.

Pacific Lumber Company. 1999. Habitat Conservation Plan for the Properties of the Pacific Lumber Company, Scotia Pacific Holding Company, and Salmon Creek Corporation.

PacifiCorp. 2008. 2008 Integrated Resource Plan, Volume I. PacifiCorp IRP Resource Planning, Portland, Oregon. Available at: <http://www.pacificorp.com/es/irp.html>. Accessed on November 30, 2010.

_____. 2009. Plan for Water Quality Management Actions for Copco and Iron Gate Reservoirs. Portland, Oregon. April 30, 2009. Available at: https://www.google.com/url?q=http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/docs/klamath_ferc2082/wq_activities043009.pdf&sa=U&ei=A95kUIjNLcf62AW0x4HoCw&ved=0CAcQFjAA&client=internal-uds-cse&usg=AFQjCNHdJtox7ilvamDsQ3b2i5n5eq_v5g.

_____. 2011. Condit Overview. Available at: http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Hydro/Condit_Overview.pdf. Accessed on December 6, 2011.

_____. 2012. Energy Gateway: Bringing New Transmission to the West. Available at: <http://www.pacificorp.com/energygateway>.

Perry, R.W., Risley, J.C., Brewer, S.J., Jones, E.C., and Rondorf, D.W. 2011. Simulating water temperature of the Klamath River under dam removal and climate change scenarios. U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 2011, U.S. Department of Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia.

Peterson, J., Glazier, E., Wagschal, A., Pomeroy, C., Madge, L., Stanley, L., Scalf, R., Stevens, J., Godde, P., and Stevens, M. 2010. North Coast Pre-MLP A Community Based Socioeconomic Characterization and Risk Assessment. Technical report prepared by Impact Assessment, Inc., for the County of Humboldt Headwaters Fund.

Pierce, R. 1998. Klamath Salmon: Understanding Allocation. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force, 32 pp.

Poff, L., Allan, D., Bain, M., Karr, J., Prestegard, K., Richter, B., Sparks R., and Stromberg, J. 1997. The natural flow regime. *Bioscience* 47(11): 769-784.

Poff, N.L., Allan, J.D., Palmer, M.A., Hart, D.D., Richter, B.D., Arthington, A.H., Rogers, K.H., Meyer, J.L., and Stanford, J.A. 2003. River flows and water wars: emerging science for environmental decision making. *Frontiers in Ecology* 1(6): 298-306.

Power, M.E., Parker, M.S. and Dietrich, W.E. 2008. Seasonal reassembly of a river food web: floods, droughts, and impacts of fish. *Ecological Monographs* 78: 263–282.

Prager, M.H., and Mohr, M.S. 2001. The Harvest Rate Model for Klamath River Fall Chinook Salmon, with Management Applications and Comments on Model Development and Documentation. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 21:533–547, 2001.

Provencher, B., Sarakinos, H., and Meyer, T. 2008. Does Small Dam Removal Affect Local Property Values? An Empirical Analysis. Agricultural and Applied Economics, Staff Paper Series No. 501, July 2006.

Radford, Linda. 2011. Email communication with J. Vorpagel. California Department of Fish and Game, November 17, 2011.

Raymond, R. 2008. Results of 2007 phytoplankton sampling in the Klamath River and Klamath Hydroelectric Project (FERC Project No. 2082). Final report prepared by E&S Environmental Chemistry, Inc., Corvallis, Oregon, for PacifiCorp, Portland, Oregon.

_____. 2009. Results of Cyanobacteria and Microcystin Monitoring in the Vicinity of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project. June 8, 2009. Available at: http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Hydro/Hydro_Licensing/Klamath_River/Results_of_Cyanobacteria_and_Microcystin_Monitoring_June_8_2009.pdf.

_____. 2010. Phytoplankton species and abundance observed during 2009 in the vicinity of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project. Prepared by E&S Environmental Chemistry, Inc., Corvallis, Oregon, for PacifiCorp Energy, Portland, Oregon.

Roninger T. 2012. Memorandum to the file prepared by Trisha Roninger, July 2, 2012. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

Salter, J.F. 2003. A Context Statement Concerning the Effect of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project on Traditional Resources Uses and Cultural Patterns of the Karuk People Within the Klamath River Corridor. Report prepared for PacifiCorp.

Samarin, P. 2012. Email communication with D. Van Dyke. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, February 29, 2012.

Sandercock, F.K. 1991. Life history of coho salmon. In Pacific salmon life histories, C. Groot and L. Margolis, editors. UBC Press, Vancouver, Canada, 564 pp.

Shannon & Wilson, Inc. 2006. Sediment sampling, geotechnical testing and data review report: segment of Klamath River, Oregon and California. Prepared by Shannon & Wilson, Inc., Seattle, Washington, for California Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, California.

Shapovalov, L., and Taft, A.C. 1954. The life histories of the steelhead rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri*) and silver salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) with special reference to Waddell Creek, California, and recommendations regarding their management.

Simplicity Health. 2012. Available at: <http://www.simplicityhealth.com>. Accessed on May 2, 2012.

Simpson Timber Company. 1992. Habitat Conservation Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl on the California Timberlands of Simpson Timber Company.

Snyder, J.O. 1931. Salmon of the Klamath River, California. Division of Fish and Game, Bulletin No. 34.

Spier, L. 1930. Klamath Ethnography. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.

Stanford, J., Ward, J., Liss, W., Frissell, C., Williams, R., Lichatowich, J., and Coutant, C. 1996. A general protocol for restoration of regulated rivers. Regulated Rivers: Research and Management, vol. 12, pp. 391-413.

Stillwater Sciences. 2008. Klamath River dam removal study: sediment transport DREAM-1 simulation. Technical report prepared by Stillwater Sciences, Arcata, California, for California Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, California.

_____. 2009a. Dam removal and Klamath River water quality: a synthesis of the current conceptual understanding and an assessment of data gaps. Technical report prepared by Stillwater Sciences, Berkeley, California, for State Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, California.

_____. 2009b. Effects of sediment release following dam removal on the aquatic biota of the Klamath River, Arcata, California. Prepared for the California State Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, California, 91 pp.+ figures.

_____. 2010. Anticipated sediment release from Klamath River dam removal within the context of basin sediment delivery. Final report prepared by Stillwater Sciences, Berkeley, California, for State Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, California.

Stocking, R.W., and Bartholomew, J.L. 2007. Distribution and habitat preference of *Manayunkia speciosa* (*Polychaeta/Sabellidae*) and infection prevalence with the parasite *Ceratomyxa shasta* (*Myxozoa*) in the Klamath River. Journal of Parasitology 93: 78-88.

Strassburger, M. 2011. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Written communication with J. Jones (via Chris Park), CDM, July 5, 2011.

Taylor, R. 2010. Water Manager for the City of Yreka. Email communication with T. Hepler, Bureau of Reclamation, August 24, 2010.

Tinniswood, W. 2006. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Written communication Re: Summary of Klamath Redband and Steelhead Comparisons with J. Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, June 28, 2006.

_____. 2011. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Email communication with J. Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, December 21, 2011.

Tolhurst, J.W. 1995. Historic Analysis of Geomorphic Channel Changes, Lower Mad River, Humboldt County, California. Department of Geology, Humboldt State University, Arcata, California.

Tsosie, R. 2003. The Indian Trust Doctrine after the 2002-2003 Supreme Court Term. 39 Tulsa Law Review, pp. 271, 272.

United States, California, Oregon, and PacifiCorp. 2008. Klamath Hydroelectric Project Agreement in Principle between California, Oregon, PacifiCorp, and the United States. Signed November 13, 2008. 32 pp.

U.S. Commission on Fish and Fisheries. 1895. Report of the Commissioner of Fisheries, 1895.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2004. Cumulative watershed effects analysis for the Klamath National Forest. Quantitative models for surface erosion, mass wasting, and ERA/TOC.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2003. EPA Region 10 Guidance for Pacific/Northwest State and Tribal Temperature Water Quality Standards. EPA 910-B-03-002, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, 49 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2004. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: 90-day finding on a petition to list three species of lampreys as threatened or endangered. Federal Register 69: 77158-77167.

_____. 2007. Formal Consultation on the Proposed Relicensing of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project, FERC Project No. 2082, Klamath River, Klamath County, Oregon, and Siskiyou County, California, City of Yreka, California. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office, p. 156.

_____. 2008. Formal Consultation on the Bureau of Reclamation's Proposed Klamath Project Operations from 2008 to 2018. April 2, 2008.

_____. 2011. Lower Snake River Compensation Plan. July 8. Available at: www.fws.gov/lsnakecomplan.

_____. 2012a. Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Pacific Southwest Region. Available at: <http://www.fws.gov/klamathbasinrefuges/lowerklamath/lowerklamath.html>. Accessed on June 12, 2012.

_____. 2012b. Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Pacific Southwest Region. Available at: <http://www.fws.gov/klamathbasinrefuges/tulelake/tulelake.html>. Accessed on June 12, 2012.

U.S. Fish Commission. 1913. Report of the Commission of Fisheries for Fiscal Year 1913.

VanderKooi, S.P., Burdick, S.M., Echols, K.R., Ottinger, C.A., Rosen, B.H., and Wood, T.M. 2010. Algal toxins in upper Klamath Lake, Oregon: linking water quality to juvenile sucker health. U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2009-3111, U.S. Geological Survey, Western Fisheries Research Center, Seattle, Washington. Available at: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2009/3111/pdf/fs20093111.pdf>.

Van Rijn, L.C. 1984. Sediment transport, Part II: Suspended load transport. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 110(11): 1613-1641.

Wales, J.H. 1951. The Decline of the Shasta River King Salmon Run. Bureau of Fish Conservation, California Division of Fish and Game, April 10, 1951, 82 pp.

Walker, W.W. 2001. Development of a phosphorus TMDL for Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

Ward, G., and Armstrong, N. 2010. Assessment of primary production and associated kinetic parameters in the Klamath River. Draft report prepared for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, Arcata, California.

Watercourse Engineering, Inc. 2011. Klamath River baseline water quality sampling, 2009 Annual Report. Prepared for the KHSA Water Quality Monitoring Group.

Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC). 2009. 2009 Power Supply Assessment. October 1, 2009. Available at: <http://www.wecc.biz/Planning/ResourceAdequacy/PSA/Documents/2009%20Power%20Supply%20Assessment.pdf>.

White, D. 2011. Preliminary evaluation of fish passage alternatives to dam removal. Memorandum from David White to Rick Wantuck, National Marine Fisheries Service, and John Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, October 13, 2011, 2 pp.

Wilson, R. 2012. University of California, Davis. Email communication with Michael Green, Bureau of Reclamation, June 13, 2012.

Withler, F.C. 1982. Transplanting Pacific Salmon. *Canadian Tech Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 1079, 27 pp.

Wong, S., Barry, M., Aldous, A., Rudd, N., Hendrixson, H., and Doehring, C. 2011. Nutrient Release from a Recently Flooded Delta Wetland: Comparison of Field Measurements to Laboratory Results. *Wetlands*, vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 433-443.

World Health Organization (WHO). 2003. Guidelines for Safe Recreational Water Environments, Vol. 1: Coastal and Fresh Water, World Health Organization, Geneva.

_____. 2009. Guidelines for Safe Recreational Water Environments, Vol. 1: Coastal and Fresh Water with Addendum. World Health Organization, Geneva.
Available at: http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/bathing/srwe1/en/index.html.

Yurok Tribe Environmental Program. 2008. Final 2008 Klamath River Nutrient Summary Report. YTEP Water Division, Klamath, California, 37 pp.

Zedonis, P., Anderson, C., Keydel, S., Dillon, J., Cook, C. and Vorpagel, J. 2011. Assessment of Long Term Water Quality Changes for the Klamath River Basin Resulting from KHSA, KBRA, and TMDL and NPS Reduction Programs. Available at: <http://klamathrestoration.gov/keep-me-informed/secretarial-determination/role-of-science/secretarial-determination-studies>.