

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



FILED

06-21-12
02:35 PM

Application of PACIFICORP
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.

A. 10-03-015

**LATE FILED COMMENTS OF THE
SISKIYOU COUNTY WATER USERS ASSOCIATION
ON THE PETITION FOR MODIFICATION**

EDWARD G. POOLE, Esq.
ANDERSON & POOLE
601 California Street, Suite 1300
San Francisco, CA 94108-2812
Telephone: 415-956-6413
Facsimile: 415-956-6416
epoole@adplaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR THE SISKIYOU COUNTY
WATER USERS ASSOCIATION

June 20, 2012

Pursuant to the verbal ALJ ruling at the prehearing conference of June 19, 2012, the Siskiyou county Water Users Association (SCWUA) hereby submits these late-filed comments on the Petition for Modification filed by Pacific Power.

In its Petition for Modification, Pacific Power requests the Commission to revise the Commission's Decision (D.)11-05-002 (issued May 6, 2011), with respect to the authorized surcharge PacifiCorp may collect pursuant to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSa). The limited nature of this request is tantamount to allowing the fox to guard the chickens. The error that was made and that led to this request by PacifiCorp was entirely of their making. The company had plenty of time to set up the trusts and should have known that their delays would result in less time to collect the surcharge. They argue that the establishment of these trust accounts was delayed. If so then it was entirely of their doing. They state that the shortened time period requires them to request this acceleration. When one examines the facts, it is clear that the delays were a result entirely of PacifiCorp mis-handling of their time. Why should the ratepayers be penalized for the inadequacy of PacifiCorp managerial actions?

SCWUA submits that the entire issue being discussed revolves around and indeed rests upon the validity of the KHSa document. The finding of facts by the CPUC clearly states this to be the case. In Siskiyou County, nearly 14,000 (79.4%) of the voting citizens in the November 2010 election, voted against the removal of the dams. This vote was referred to as Measure G. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a certified copy of the results of the 2010 election). This measure was promoted by and written by our group, the Siskiyou County Water Users Association (SCWUA). As a result,

SCWUA feels compelled to respond to the issues raised regarding the surcharges and the dams. How is their voice to be heard? It isn't included in any of the material presented by the Commission. So SCWUA is compelled to represent the nearly 14,000 people who voted to retain the Dams. These people have been silenced by the CPUC and PacifiCorp.

In addition, SCWUA is compelled to point out that PacifiCorp has recently written a letter to Mr. Ed Randolph of the CPUC concerning the KHSA agreement and included copies of letters from John Bezdek, Advisor to the Chief of Staff of the DOI and one from Liane Randolph, General Counsel of the State of California Natural Resources. It is clear from the comments made that indeed these agencies are concerned about the ability to conclude the dam removal process by 2020. The evidence of their concern is spelled out in those letters that have been sent to the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding. Both letters try to dispel the notion that there might be a problem for the U. S. Department of Interior in getting the dams out.

One doesn't have to look too far to see that things are changing. The Congressional Committee on Natural Resources chaired by Doc Hastings and including Tom McClintock has recently questioned the Non-Use Valuation Survey conducted by the Department. In so doing they raised ethical questions concerning the use of cash to induce responses to the so called survey document. Considerable time had been spent by RTI together with the DOI and the many future beneficiaries of the largesse being created by the KHSA and funneled through the KBRA. In fact the slanting of this survey was so bad that even the attorney for PacifiCorp at that time Mr. Van Ness Feldman raised the issue of the obfuscation of the "real cost" of the dam removal. The

drafters of the survey responded curtly **“including every nuance or detail about the KHSA or KBRA would create an excessive cognitive burden on survey respondents”**. In fact, RTI and the DOI wanted to make certain that they got the “correct” responses from the respondents. No independent thinking was to be allowed. Another example, also in response to a question raised by Van Ness Feldman listed as Comment 4, was that the “reasons for declining fish populations” should include fish disease or habitat degradation, which are major factors affecting the salmon populations in the basin. The response to his issue by RTI was that the respondents had adequate information to answer the question and it wasn’t necessary to provide more information.

Recently a prominent scientist, Dr. Paul Houser was fired by the Bureau of Reclamation, and is now in “whistleblower” status. Dr. Houser, who had been hired to oversee the scientific integrity of the EIR/EIS presentation discovered that some of the documents had been intentionally misrepresented in the “Summary of Key Conclusions: Draft EIS/EIR” in order to support Secretary Salazar’s and the DOI commitment to dam removal. Secretary Salazar had publicly stated in 2009 his intention to issue a Secretarial determination to destroy the dams. When Dr. Houser raised his concerns regarding the slanting of summary conclusions in the documents he was fired for basically refusing to go along “with the program”.

The objections to the KHSA are becoming loud and frequent now, including from some tribal beneficiaries. Recently the Hoopa Tribe filed a Petition to drop the KHSA agreement and go back to the FERC for a solution. Several other tribes are making considerable comments on the issue of the KHSA.

Further evidence of the deterioration of support for the KHSA comes from the recent series of elections in the Northwest. In Oregon for example, Tom Mallams, Gail Whitsett and Doug Whitsett, all ardent supporters of keeping the dams in, won their respective elections in the heart of the Klamath area. In addition in California, all of the proponents of keeping the dams in won their respective races. This includes among others, Doug LaMalfa, Brian Dahle, Ted Gaines and Tom McClintock.

In short the KHSA must be considered in any review concerning the surcharges as both PacifiCorp and the CPUC use the KHSA as the basis for moving forward and support for the surcharges. Congress is not about to approve funds to support this multi-billion dollar project which has identifiable negative consequences in the event things go wrong. It can be said that things may go very wrong indeed if the release of sediments into the rivers and ocean end up causing pollution of significant environmental proportions. Millions of fish could die, rivers polluted for decades, flooding returns and water storage capability is wiped out along with cheap, abundant and clean hydropower which cannot be replaced. This is an experiment of unimaginable potential consequences. How can the CPUC blithely accept its portion of responsibility for creating this situation? *Why is there no requirement being made by the CPUC to assure the residents, who will be affected by this calamity, that alternate power at the same price structure will be forthcoming.*

In summation, the CPUC has no choice but to examine the validity of the KHSA and evaluate the reasonableness that the dams will be removed. For our part, we raise the following questions which should be considered: no Congressional funding, no California funding, the EIR EIS is still not completed, the transfer of the Keno dam to the

US has not been concluded, no Secretarial Determination has been made which is now overdue, a conflict of interest issue for Secretary Salazar, questions concerning the violation of the Administrative Code in the meetings that produced the KHSA document, the lack of integrity in the science included in the EIR/EIS documents. The KHSA is not a fully ratified and binding document. It seems unreasonable to think that the ratepayers should be penalized by having to pay in advance for questionable dam removal.

Dated: June 20, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

By:

EDWARD G. POOLE, Esq.
ANDERSON & POOLE
601 California Street, Suite 1300
San Francisco, CA 94108-2812
Telephone: 415-956-6413
Facsimile: 415-956-6416
epoole@adplaw.com

EXHIBIT A

To

**LATE FILED COMMENTS OF THE
SISKIYOU COUNTY WATER USERS ASSOCIATION
ON THE PETITION FOR MODIFICATION**



Our Klamath Basin Water Crisis
Upholding rural Americans' rights to grow food,
own property, and caretake our wildlife and natural resources.

U.S House of Representatives, Natural Resources Committee, Chairman Doc Hastings 6/6/12

House Votes to Prohibit Federal Government from Mailing Out Cash for Surveys

WASHINGTON, D.C. - The House of Representatives today passed, in a bipartisan vote of 355 to 51, an amendment by Congressman Scott Tipton (CO-03) to an amendment to the FY 2013 Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act to prohibit the federal agencies under the bill from mailing out cash as an incentive to complete government surveys.

"Enticing survey responses with cash incentives to prove a societal need for a project is wrong on so many levels," said Rep. Tipton. "First and foremost, it's a blatant waste and abuse of taxpayer dollars. Collecting data this way is disingenuous, and a downright sneaky move by this Administration's cadre of out-of-touch bureaucrats."

In 2011, the Department of the Interior (DOI) distributed a nationwide survey with the questionable purpose of measuring the societal, non-economic value of removing four privately owned dams on the Klamath River in Oregon and California. The survey consisted of several waves of mailings, some of which included a two dollar bill used as an incentive to respond, and a letter sent to non-responders promising that DOI will send an additional \$20 if the completed survey is returned before a specific deadline. According to the Federal Register, an estimated 10,400 households were contacted about the survey.

In March 2012, House Natural Resources Committee Chairman Doc Hastings (WA-04) and Water & Power Subcommittee Chairman Tom McClintock (CA-04) sent letters to the Bureau of Reclamation and the Office of Management and Budget requesting information on the use of American tax dollars to pay for the controversial DOI survey. The Agencies have since confirmed that the survey in question cost over \$850,000.

###

<http://naturalresources.house.gov>

[Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Twitter](#)

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. section 107, any copyrighted material herein is distributed without profit or payment to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only. For more information go to: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/usccode/17/107.shtml>

[Home](#)

[Contact](#)

Page Updated: Thursday June 07, 2012 02:09 AM Pacific

Copyright © klamathbasincrisis.org, 2001 - 2012, All Rights Reserved

Resighini Rancheria

Welcome

Welcome to the website of the Resighini Rancheria. We are a federally recognized Tribe with a Reservation at the top of the Klamath River estuary. Our site explains who we are and provides information about the Klamath River, the federal dam removal process, and the Klamath Settlement.


A big shift has happened with regard to dam removal. The Secretary of Interior was unable to render his expected March 2012 Decision because there is no authorizing legislation. The legislation has strong opposition and little prospect of passage in this or any future Congress. [Read Secretary of Interior's February 17 press release](#) regarding delaying the Decision.

It has also become clear that the Klamath Settlement is compromising protection for endangered species and subverting the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The Resighini Rancheria has discovered that the the Bureau of Reclamation and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have failed to protect the Lost River and shortnose sucker populations in Tule Lake. The details are outlined in this [letter to Secretary of Interior Salazar](#).

In addition, flows to the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuges are at dangerously low levels, resulting in a serious threat to both fish and wildlife. This situation prompted a [letter from 26 environmental organizations](#) also to Secretary Salazar. See the [Media](#) page for Press Releases and more information.

[Back to FERC/CA 401 Certification](#): The Resighini Rancheria and Hoopa Valley Tribe believe that the best and quickest way to get dams removed is not through a Secretarial Decision but rather through the FERC Klamath Hydroelectric Project (KHP) relicensing process. Although FERC will not force dam decommissioning, their process will have that result. We are calling on all friends of the Klamath River to join us at the California State Water Resources Control Board Meeting in Sacramento sometime in May to ask them to lift the abeyance on their Clean Water Act and Federal Power Act authority (401 Certification) and to take action to prevent relicensing of the KHP and to promote expeditious decommissioning of the dams.

[Social Justice](#): The Resighini Rancheria was excluded from Klamath Settlement negotiations. Our rights to protect water quality and fisheries would have been terminated by an affirmative Decision by the Secretary of Interior and implementation of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA). Similar social injustice would also befall the Hoopa Valley Tribe and Quartz Valley Indian Community. Non-Party Tribes strongly object to the prospect of extending the Klamath Settlement Agreement.




[Ecological Restoration](#): Our people and all indigenous peoples of the Klamath Basin have harmony based cultures. People, the salmon, and all the plants and animals of the basin have a right to exist and are part of the natural balance. We are concerned that the dam removal package will not heal the Klamath River on which we have relied since time immemorial. The only valid scientific solution to Klamath

River water quality problems is to restore ecological function by expanding wetlands and reducing the footprint of agriculture in the Upper Klamath Basin.

KBRA/KHSA: The Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA) and the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) together comprise the Klamath Settlement and both would have been implemented by an affirmative Secretary of Interior Decision. The KBRA compromises the Endangered Species Act and shifts water delivery priority from Tribal Trust to Klamath Irrigation Project customers. Actions under the KBRA are not enough to cure the water pollution problems. **Dam removal should not be tied to a bad water deal!**

DEIS/DEIR: The Klamath Hydroelectric Project Facilities Removal Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/DEIR) addressed only the impacts of the KHSA. However, if the KHSA were implemented, the KBRA would also have been automatically implemented as well. Ironically, the DEIS/DEIR did not analyze the effects of KBRA, despite its well recognized problems (see Chinook Expert Panel report and Coho-Steelhead Expert Panel report). As a consequence of this "piecemealing" the DEIS/DEIR was in flagrant violation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Questions are now being raised about the scientific integrity of the government dam removal process due to a whistle-blower complaint.



Legislation: The Secretary of Interior was unable to render the scheduled March 2012 Decision on dam removal because there was no authorizing legislation. Congressman Thompson's HR-3398 stalled in the House and Senator Merkley's SB-1851 has no momentum in the Senate. This pork barrel/poison pill legislation must be replaced with bills that take an ecological restoration approach.

© 2011-2012 Resighini Rancheria
Template design by Andreas Viklund

SISKIYOU COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
NOVEMBER 2, 2010 CONSOLIDATED GENERAL ELECTION
CERTIFIED RESULTS
STATEMENT OF VOTES CAST

Date: 11/29/10
 Time: 10:34:21
 Page: 381 of 390

	Measure G - Dam Removal (Advisory Vote Only)									
	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	Times Blank Voted	Times Over Voted	YES		NO		
Jurisdiction Wide										
P1002 MONTAGUE 2										
Polling	290	1	70	9	0	6	8.57%	64	91.43%	
VBM	290	1	154	5	0	22	14.29%	132	85.71%	
Total	290	2	224	14	0	28	12.50%	196	87.50%	
P1003 WILLOW CREEK										
Polling	475	1	149	10	0	24	16.11%	125	83.89%	
VBM	475	1	199	10	0	24	12.06%	175	87.94%	
Total	475	2	348	20	0	48	13.79%	300	86.21%	
P1010 MCCLLOUD 1										
Polling	335	1	86	19	0	18	20.93%	68	79.07%	
VBM	335	1	121	15	0	24	19.83%	97	80.17%	
Total	335	2	207	34	0	42	20.29%	165	79.71%	
P1011 MCCLLOUD 2										
Polling	362	1	85	17	0	15	17.65%	70	82.35%	
VBM	362	1	147	16	0	28	19.05%	119	80.95%	
Total	362	2	232	33	0	43	18.53%	189	81.47%	
P1105 DORRIS 1										
Polling	365	1	112	19	0	12	10.71%	100	89.29%	
VBM	365	1	102	12	0	18	17.65%	84	82.35%	
Total	365	2	214	31	0	30	14.02%	184	85.98%	
P1110 MONTAGUE 1										
Polling	711	1	157	35	0	20	12.74%	137	87.26%	
VBM	711	1	257	26	0	28	10.89%	229	89.11%	
Total	711	2	414	61	0	48	11.59%	366	88.41%	
P2009 DUNSMUIR 3										
Polling	246	1	53	12	0	13	24.53%	40	75.47%	
VBM	246	1	92	16	0	30	32.61%	62	67.39%	
Total	246	2	145	28	0	43	29.66%	102	70.34%	
P2014 MT SHASTA 3										
Polling	856	1	223	49	0	92	41.26%	131	58.74%	
VBM	856	1	341	40	0	109	31.96%	232	68.04%	
Total	856	2	564	89	0	201	35.64%	363	64.36%	
P2015 MT SHASTA 5										
Polling	440	1	99	15	0	50	50.51%	49	49.49%	
VBM	440	1	206	19	0	105	50.97%	101	49.03%	
Total	440	2	305	34	0	155	50.82%	150	49.18%	
P2019 KINSTREY										
Polling	873	1	230	43	0	89	38.70%	141	61.30%	
VBM	873	1	347	37	0	126	36.31%	221	63.69%	
Total	873	2	577	80	0	215	37.26%	362	62.74%	
P2101 DUNSMUIR 1										
Polling	539	1	175	22	0	77	44.00%	98	56.00%	
VBM	539	1	196	16	0	64	32.65%	132	67.35%	
Total	539	2	371	38	0	141	38.01%	230	61.99%	
P2102 DUNSMUIR 2										
Polling	478	1	152	12	0	60	39.47%	92	60.53%	
VBM	478	1	168	19	0	42	25.00%	126	75.00%	
Total	478	2	320	31	0	102	31.88%	218	68.13%	
P2110 MT SHASTA 1										
Polling	656	1	191	21	0	88	46.07%	103	53.93%	
VBM	656	1	186	19	0	67	36.02%	119	63.98%	
Total	656	2	377	40	0	155	41.11%	222	58.89%	
P2111 MT SHASTA 2										
Polling	805	1	258	23	0	119	46.12%	139	53.88%	
VBM	805	1	276	23	0	99	35.87%	177	64.13%	
Total	805	2	534	46	0	218	40.82%	316	59.18%	
P2115 MT SHASTA 4										
Polling	630	1	164	20	0	79	48.17%	85	51.83%	

This instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office.
 ATTEST:
 COLLEEN SETZER
 County Clerk
 of the State of California
 in and for the County of Siskiyou.
 By *Colleen Setzer*

SISKIYOU COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
 NOVEMBER 2, 2010 CONSOLIDATED GENERAL ELECTION
 CERTIFIED RESULTS
 STATEMENT OF VOTES CAST

Date: 11/29/10
 Time: 10:34:21
 Page: 382 of 390

Measure G - Dam Removal (Advisory Vote Only)										
	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	Times Blank Voted	Times Over Voted	YES		NO		
VBM	630	1	233	20	0	94	40.34%	139	59.66%	
Total	630	2	397	40	0	173	43.58%	224	56.42%	
P3001 EDGEWOOD										
Polling	292	1	54	9	0	12	22.22%	42	77.78%	
VBM	292	1	140	15	0	36	25.71%	104	74.29%	
Total	292	2	194	24	0	48	24.74%	146	75.26%	
P3004 GRENADA										
Polling	541	1	147	13	0	19	12.93%	128	87.07%	
VBM	541	1	206	8	0	24	11.65%	182	88.35%	
Total	541	2	353	21	0	43	12.18%	310	87.82%	
P3006 LK SHASTINA M										
Polling	458	1	99	4	0	23	23.23%	76	76.77%	
VBM	458	1	240	3	0	28	11.67%	212	88.33%	
Total	458	2	339	7	0	51	15.04%	288	84.96%	
P3007 LK SHASTINA E										
Polling	825	1	208	16	0	44	21.15%	164	78.85%	
VBM	825	1	394	26	0	63	15.99%	331	84.01%	
Total	825	2	602	42	0	107	17.77%	495	82.23%	
P3009 MAYTEN										
Polling	364	1	114	12	0	12	10.53%	102	89.47%	
VBM	364	1	143	6	0	12	8.39%	131	91.61%	
Total	364	2	257	18	0	24	9.34%	233	90.66%	
P3014 SISSON										
Polling	584	1	141	30	0	37	26.24%	104	73.76%	
VBM	584	1	239	26	1	72	30.13%	167	69.87%	
Total	584	2	380	56	1	109	28.68%	271	71.32%	
P3021 WEED 3										
Polling	471	1	125	4	1	46	36.80%	79	63.20%	
VBM	471	1	251	10	0	98	39.04%	153	60.96%	
Total	471	2	376	14	1	144	38.30%	232	61.70%	
P3111 WEED 1										
Polling	657	1	196	15	0	30	15.31%	166	84.69%	
VBM	657	1	192	8	1	31	16.15%	161	83.85%	
Total	657	2	388	23	1	61	15.72%	327	84.28%	
P3112 WEED 2										
Polling	683	1	139	19	0	32	23.02%	107	76.98%	
VBM	683	1	211	17	0	41	19.43%	170	80.57%	
Total	683	2	350	36	0	73	20.86%	277	79.14%	
P4030 FOREST MTN										
Polling	829	1	226	23	0	18	7.96%	208	92.04%	
VBM	829	1	355	14	0	29	8.17%	326	91.83%	
Total	829	2	581	37	0	47	8.09%	534	91.91%	
P4110 YREKA 1										
Polling	680	1	131	23	0	25	19.08%	106	80.92%	
VBM	680	1	287	32	0	43	14.98%	244	85.02%	
Total	680	2	418	55	0	68	16.27%	350	83.73%	
P4112 YREKA 2										
Polling	699	1	181	30	0	19	10.50%	162	89.50%	
VBM	699	1	299	22	0	33	11.04%	266	88.96%	
Total	699	2	480	52	0	52	10.83%	428	89.17%	
P4115 YREKA 3										
Polling	845	1	160	34	0	44	27.50%	116	72.50%	
VBM	845	1	265	32	0	27	10.19%	238	89.81%	
Total	845	2	425	66	0	71	16.71%	354	83.29%	
P4116 YREKA 4										
Polling	497	1	106	16	0	14	13.21%	92	86.79%	
VBM	497	1	191	29	0	30	15.71%	161	84.29%	
Total	497	2	297	45	0	44	14.81%	253	85.19%	
P4118 YREKA 5										

SISKIYOU COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
 NOVEMBER 2, 2010 CONSOLIDATED GENERAL ELECTION
 CERTIFIED RESULTS
 STATEMENT OF VOTES CAST

Date:11/29/10
 Time:10:34:21
 Page:383 of 390

		Measure G - Dam Removal (Advisory Vote Only)							
		Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	Times Blank Voted	Times Over Voted	YES		NO
	Polling	824	1	169	26	0	21	12.43%	148 87.57%
	VBM	824	1	320	26	0	45	14.06%	275 85.94%
	Total	824	2	489	52	0	66	13.50%	423 86.50%
P4121 YREKA 6									
	Polling	608	1	117	20	0	16	13.68%	101 86.32%
	VBM	608	1	285	27	0	46	16.14%	239 83.86%
	Total	608	2	402	47	0	62	15.42%	340 84.58%
P5003 GREENVIEW									
	Polling	545	1	180	4	0	32	17.78%	148 82.22%
	VBM	545	1	239	7	0	44	18.41%	195 81.59%
	Total	545	2	419	11	0	76	18.14%	343 81.86%
P5005 ETNA 2									
	Polling	902	1	292	11	0	25	8.56%	267 91.44%
	VBM	902	1	389	10	0	60	15.42%	329 84.58%
	Total	902	2	681	21	0	85	12.48%	596 87.52%
P5008 FT JONES 2									
	Polling	518	1	182	7	0	24	13.19%	158 86.81%
	VBM	518	1	209	2	0	25	11.96%	184 88.04%
	Total	518	2	391	9	0	49	12.53%	342 87.47%
P5011 HAPPY CAMP									
	Polling	599	1	215	25	0	65	30.23%	150 69.77%
	VBM	599	1	140	16	0	46	32.86%	94 67.14%
	Total	599	2	355	41	0	111	31.27%	244 68.73%
P5012 HORN BROOK									
	Polling	281	1	69	3	0	2	2.90%	67 97.10%
	VBM	281	1	112	5	0	12	10.71%	100 89.29%
	Total	281	2	181	8	0	14	7.73%	167 92.27%
P5015 QUARTZ VALLEY									
	Polling	259	1	67	3	0	15	22.39%	52 77.61%
	VBM	259	1	128	11	0	12	9.38%	116 90.63%
	Total	259	2	195	14	0	27	13.85%	168 86.15%
P5103 ETNA 1									
	Polling	455	1	186	7	0	26	13.98%	160 86.02%
	VBM	455	1	138	6	0	19	13.77%	119 86.23%
	Total	455	2	324	13	0	45	13.89%	279 86.11%
P5107 FT JONES 1									
	Polling	370	1	112	6	0	13	11.61%	99 88.39%
	VBM	370	1	137	3	0	14	10.22%	123 89.78%
	Total	370	2	249	9	0	27	10.84%	222 89.16%
M1001 BOGUS									
	Polling	244	1	0	0	0	0	-	0 -
	VBM	244	1	169	9	0	13	7.69%	156 92.31%
	Total	244	2	169	9	0	13	7.69%	156 92.31%
M1070 COPCO CONS									
	Polling	99	1	0	0	0	0	-	0 -
	VBM	99	1	79	4	0	7	8.86%	72 91.14%
	Total	99	2	79	4	0	7	8.86%	72 91.14%
M1007 DORRIS 2									
	Polling	202	1	0	0	0	0	-	0 -
	VBM	202	1	142	14	0	17	11.97%	125 88.03%
	Total	202	2	142	14	0	17	11.97%	125 88.03%
M1008 GRASS LAKE									
	Polling	5	1	0	0	0	0	-	0 -
	VBM	5	1	5	0	0	0	0.00%	5 100.00%
	Total	5	2	5	0	0	0	0.00%	5 100.00%
M1009 MACDOEL									
	Polling	235	1	0	0	0	0	-	0 -
	VBM	235	1	159	15	0	16	10.06%	143 89.94%
	Total	235	2	159	15	0	16	10.06%	143 89.94%

SISKIYOU COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
NOVEMBER 2, 2010 CONSOLIDATED GENERAL ELECTION
CERTIFIED RESULTS
STATEMENT OF VOTES CAST

Date: 11/29/10
 Time: 10:34:21
 Page: 384 of 390

	Measure G - Dam Removal (Advisory Vote Only)							
	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	Times Blank Voted	Times Over Voted	YES		NO
M1090 PONDOSA CONS								
Polling	6	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	6	1	5	1	0	1	20.00%	4 80.00%
Total	6	2	5	1	0	1	20.00%	4 80.00%
M1015 MCCLLOUD 3								
Polling	159	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	159	1	118	11	0	49	41.53%	69 58.47%
Total	159	2	118	11	0	49	41.53%	69 58.47%
M1020 TULELAKE 2								
Polling	106	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	106	1	67	2	0	24	35.82%	43 64.18%
Total	106	2	67	2	0	24	35.82%	43 64.18%
M1095 TULELAKE 3								
Polling	68	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	68	1	50	2	0	8	16.00%	42 84.00%
Total	68	2	50	2	0	8	16.00%	42 84.00%
M1022 TENNANT								
Polling	31	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	31	1	26	0	0	4	15.38%	22 84.62%
Total	31	2	26	0	0	4	15.38%	22 84.62%
M1023 LITTLE SHASTA A								
Polling	197	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	197	1	139	8	0	10	7.19%	129 92.81%
Total	197	2	139	8	0	10	7.19%	129 92.81%
M1026 BIG SPRINGS								
Polling	270	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	270	1	195	11	0	46	23.59%	149 76.41%
Total	270	2	195	11	0	46	23.59%	149 76.41%
M1117 TULELAKE 1								
Polling	266	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	266	1	168	15	0	28	16.67%	140 83.33%
Total	266	2	168	15	0	28	16.67%	140 83.33%
M3050 GAZELLE CONS								
Polling	209	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	209	1	145	9	0	20	13.79%	125 86.21%
Total	209	2	145	9	0	20	13.79%	125 86.21%
M3013 WARREN								
Polling	265	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	265	1	177	8	0	21	11.86%	156 88.14%
Total	265	2	177	8	0	21	11.86%	156 88.14%
M3026 MONTAGUE 3								
Polling	21	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	21	1	17	1	0	1	5.88%	16 94.12%
Total	21	2	17	1	0	1	5.88%	16 94.12%
M4050 DELPHIC CONS								
Polling	237	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	237	1	166	3	0	12	7.23%	154 92.77%
Total	237	2	166	3	0	12	7.23%	154 92.77%
M4032 GREENHORN 4								
Polling	174	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	174	1	134	7	0	7	5.22%	127 94.78%
Total	174	2	134	7	0	7	5.22%	127 94.78%
M5050 CALLAHAN CONS								
Polling	241	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	241	1	176	4	0	57	32.39%	119 67.61%
Total	241	2	176	4	0	57	32.39%	119 67.61%
M5060 KLAMATH RIVER CONS								
Polling	206	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
VBM	206	1	155	5	0	26	16.77%	129 83.23%

Date: 11/29/10
Time: 10:34:21
Page: 385 of 390

SISKIYOU COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
NOVEMBER 2, 2010 CONSOLIDATED GENERAL ELECTION
CERTIFIED RESULTS
STATEMENT OF VOTES CAST

	Measure G - Dam Removal (Advisory Vote Only)									
	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	Times Blank Voted	Times Over Voted	YES		NO		
Total	206	2	155	5	0	26	16.77%	129	83.23%	
M5065 SEIAD CONS										
Polling	261	1	0	0	0	0	-	0		
VBM	261	1	165	16	0	61	36.97%	104	63.03%	
Total	261	2	165	16	0	61	36.97%	104	63.03%	
M5070 HAMBURG CONS										
Polling	157	1	0	0	0	0	-	0		
VBM	157	1	105	6	0	31	29.52%	74	70.48%	
Total	157	2	105	6	0	31	29.52%	74	70.48%	
M5080 OAK KNOLL CONS										
Polling	170	1	0	0	0	0	-	0		
VBM	170	1	107	11	0	11	10.28%	96	89.72%	
Total	170	2	107	11	0	11	10.28%	96	89.72%	
M5038 GREENHORN 5										
Polling	246	1	0	0	0	0	-	0		
VBM	246	1	182	10	0	24	13.19%	158	86.81%	
Total	246	2	182	10	0	24	13.19%	158	86.81%	
Total										
Polling	25922	63	5820	686	1	1376	23.64%	4444	76.36%	
VBM	25922	63	11386	826	2	2264	19.88%	9122	80.12%	
Total	25922	126	17206	1512	3	3640	21.16%	13566	78.84%	

Tribe asks feds to resume Klamath dams relicensing

By JEFF BARNARD, AP Environmental Writer
Wednesday, May 30, 2012

(05-30) 05:01 PDT, CA (AP) --

Frustrated that a deal to remove a string of hydroelectric dams from the Klamath River in Northern California has stalled, the Hoopa Tribe has petitioned federal authorities to restart the bureaucratic process in hopes it will get the dams out of the river more quickly.

Tribal attorney Tom Schlosser said Tuesday the current agreement is hopelessly bogged down in Congress and going back to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission offers the best chance to open up the river for struggling salmon and to improve water quality.

PacifiCorp, the Portland, Ore.-based utility that owns the dams, says it wants to stick with the current plan.

Dam removal is part of the agreements signed in the Oregon Capitol two years ago to end a century of water battles in the Klamath Basin.

<http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/n/a/2012/05/30/state/n050112D53.DTL>

© 2012 Hearst Communications Inc. | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Feedback](#) | [RSS Feeds](#) | [FAQ](#) | [Site Index](#) | [Contact](#)



Seton Medical Center

Find An Orthopedic Physician That's Right For You

[Get More](#)

Member of Daughters of Charity Health System