

12/2009 – 02/2022 Media Statements

Fish can be helped without removing dams

Dec 2, 2009

I mostly prefer that none of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams be removed from the Klamath River. My opinion is that both extra water release from the Klamath River dams to provide more Klamath River mouth water during the fall salmonid upriver migrations and construction of an Iron Gate Dam fish ladder are the only improvements necessary for adequate Klamath River fish use.

I believe that the clean renewable hydroelectric power that is generated from John C. Boyle, Copco I, Copco II and Iron Gate dams is vital for humanity's best survival, avoids much global warming pollution for humanity, and is more important for humanity's survival than is Klamath River fish migration that would be additional, per Klamath River dam removal, to fish migration already possible in the Klamath River. John C. Boyle Dam already has a fish ladder and so should definitely be retained.

Perhaps if PacifiCorp sells Copco I, Copco II and Iron Gate dams to the U.S. government or receives voluntary donations for and/or levies a rate increase for fish ladder construction, then fish ladders would be affordable for those dams.

Rather than suffer loss of the four aforementioned Klamath River hydroelectric dams, I am agreeable to keeping both John C. Boyle and Iron Gate dams and removing only Copco I and Copco II dams, providing that prior to removal of Copco I and Copco II dams, an Iron Gate Dam fish ladder is built and the John C. Boyle Dam downriver fish passage facilities are optimized for fish passage.

Danny Hull
Klamath Falls

Removal of Klamath dams would be a swindle

Feb 12, 2010

A 2007 cost estimate for installing adequate new fish passage facilities in Iron Gate, Copco II, Copco I, and, possibly J.C. Boyle Klamath River dams was \$300 million. Payment very likely may be per: A small long-term PacifiCorp electricity selling price increase; Pacific Power's "Blue Sky" voluntary donations; the U.S.A. **Endangered Species Act** of 1973 "(a) FINDINGS — The Congress finds and declares that — (5) encouraging the states and other interested parties, through **federal financial assistance** and a system of incentives, to develop and maintain conservation programs, which meet national and international standards, is a key to meeting the nation's international commitments and to better safeguarding, for the benefit of all

citizens, the nation's heritage in fish, wildlife, and plants.”

Each dam is readily accessible to new fishway installation because: Iron Gate has an easily alterable, long, wide north end spillway; Copco II is “only 33 feet high” and has a long, shallow riverbed front approach; Copco I has easily modifiable, outside of the dam's east end, a diversion tunnel, 356 feet by 16 feet by 18 feet, with an original 2 feet/100 feet grade. J.C. Boyle already has an adequate fish ladder.

In-river deep downtube flow feeds for some of the dams' turbine feed tubes and/or a Klamath “A Canal”-type fish screen for dams' feed flume may be necessary to help direct downriver fish traffic through the dams' fishways.

A near future decades' removal of any of the dams, per and in consequence of only the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement and fishways absence, is a swindle against humanity's best welfare and environmental health. Motives for the swindle are: Discrediting of the Endangered Species Act; promotion of fossil fuel combustion-powered electricity generation; financial transaction incurred per both dam removal and electricity generation system substitution for removed dams.

Danny Hull
Klamath Falls

IF FISH PASSAGE NOT IMPROVED, FEDERAL DAM TAKEOVER BEST

APR 22, 2010

PacifiCorp should upgrade the Klamath River hydroelectric dams with adequate fishways or transfer ownership of those dams to the federal government so that the government will operate the dams beneficially for all, including releasing water for fish passage enhancement.

Upstream from Iron Gate Dam, Klamath River is one of the most nutrient-rich Pacific Northwest rivers. An argument against improving Iron Gate and Copco I dams, maintains that:

- Some autumn Klamath River salmon runs suffer from low water and increasing global warming that exacerbate two salmon parasite-caused diseases of primarily the mainstem Klamath River (each parasite involved also lives in the same eutrophic warm water worm type);
- The over 4.5 miles-long, likely thermoclined with cool water, deep reservoirs behind the dams, having warm upper level waters, support a greater toxic blue-green algae growth percentagewise than is in Upper Klamath Lake (most of Upper Klamath Lake's blue-green algae is nontoxic aphanizomenon);
- The dams' reservoirs' coolest waters' total dissolved oxygen content, may be low during some

salmon migration months;

■ Adding fishways to the dams is too costly to PacifiCorp; selling the dams might yield electricity sales competition against PacifiCorp.

Since per a 1,150 cubic feet/second moderate river-flow rate, J.C. Boyle Dam's (98 megawatts, elevation 3,781 feet) 68-foot maximum dam height, 3.6 miles-long reservoir of 3,495 acre-feet water storage, completely changes water every 1.54 days, and Copco II Dam's (27 megawatts, elevation 2,493 feet) 33-foot maximum dam height, 0.3 mile-long reservoir of 73 acre-feet water storage changes its water every hour, both reservoirs likely may be kept sufficiently cool per fish - adequate river flow. Copco II and J.C. Boyle dams are strong enough and a dam center fish ladder could strengthen Copco II Dam.

I prefer retaining J.C Boyle Dam or Copco II Dam more than I prefer retaining Iron Gate Dam or Copco I Dam.

Danny Hull
Klamath Falls

Move a head on ways to cut fossil fuel use

Jul 31, 2010

In reference to the announcement that the U.S. Senate will not, on the Senate floor, consider and vote on a comprehensive global warming reducing and clean renewable energy promoting bill before the August recess, here is a partial copy of my July 28 vote for the president of the United States of America:

“Dear Mr. President,

“In consequence of the extraordinary current and forthcoming hazard of fossil fuel combustion-caused global warming, herewith now I vote for you to this year 2010, before the Nov. 2 public elections, convene the U.S. Senate so that the Senate will consider and vote on a comprehensive global warming reducing and clean renewable energy bill.

“The Kerry-Lieberman American Power Act is a good starting point for a much necessary, national climate and energy plan because it sets a limit on heat-trapping emissions.

“In addition to curbing global warming, this bill could become part of a comprehensive plan that reduces USA dependence on oil and creates new clean energy jobs.

“I hope that you may ensure that this legislation both includes a cap on carbon pollution and invests in clean energy that’s made in America. “Specifically, the USA needs to promote USA electricity-generating boats that provide natural water flow-powered, paddlewheel-driven

electricity-generating electric generators as being environmentally safe, wanted vitally and clean renewable energy-powered electricity generation sources to soon substitute for fossil fuel combustion-produced electricity generation with.”

Danny Hull
Klamath Falls

Water bill still needs improvement

Dealings with dams, specifically, could be much better for the Basin

By DANNY HULL Guest Writer Feb 1, 2015

My current vote with the President of the United States of America, the U.S. Congress, and Oregon and Klamath County Government personnel, is against the U.S. Senate Bill 133 Klamath Water Recovery and Economic Restoration Act, and for both retaining the Klamath River hydroelectric dams, and improving those dams with fish passageway modification(s), where such improvement is most necessary.

Here are reasons why I prefer to keep and improve fish passageways for the Klamath River hydroelectric dams:

1. The U.S. Department of the Interior should purchase the Klamath River hydroelectric dams and manage those dams for multiuse of the Klamath River, including anadromous fish migration, Klamath Basin and California agriculture irrigation, Tulelake and Lower Klamath Lake Wildlife Refuge water supply, flood control, emergency electricity generation, recreation, wildlife habitat and fire suppression.

Transfer of Upper Klamath Lake/Klamath River water, per new pipelines to California’s Clear Lake Reservoir and — from Copco I and/or Iron Gate Reservoirs—Lake Shastina, could provide substantially improved water access for Oregon and California irrigators, and — per Clear Lake Reservoir Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, and — per Lake Shastina — salmon migrations in two rivers (Shasta, Klamath).

2. The Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement is bad, and is an extortion against humanity. Both Klamath Basin and California agriculture will lose irrigation water if the Klamath River hydroelectric dams are destroyed.

3. Currently, there is no good reason to now commence destroying the Klamath River hydroelectric dams. Funds that PacifiCorp is collecting for Klamath River hydroelectric dam demolition, could rather be applied, and are virtually adequate to pay for, adequate fish passageway construction for all four Klamath River hydroelectric dams. The seasonal toxic bluegreen algae bloom in some of the dams’ reservoirs, does not excessively interfere against and/or excessively damage any current, often or nonrare occasional, wildlife and/or human essential use of Klamath River.

4. Currently, the Klamath River hydroelectric J.C. Boyle Dam is certainly salmon migration ready enough.

5. The Klamath River is a publicly owned multiuse river, and isn't owned only by salmon fisherfolks and agriculture irrigators. For any person(s) to completely destroy any Klamath River hydroelectric dam as that dam is now, is a great public waste and wrongful error against the person(s).

6. People have advocated for destruction of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams so as to avoid fish right of way and water use civil lawsuits against Klamath River dam operations, and per greed for: Government grant funds, demolition funds, substitution of fossil fuel combustion powered electricity generation for hydroelectric power, fish habitat right of way control of Klamath River, irrigation water right of way control of Klamath River, electricity grid electricity provision, subversion and/or subordination of America's republic democracy of the Klamath River, so as to provide a culturally racial private enterprise Klamath River hegemony on the Klamath River.

I am much dissatisfied with Oregon's U.S. senators' failure to defend the Klamath River hydroelectric dams.

The author Danny Hull is a biologist and Water Quality Control Environmental Health Technologist. He was born in, and has lived 46 years in, Klamath Falls. He has a bachelor's degree in biology and an associated degree in Water Quality Control Environmental Health Technology.

COMMENTS CAN BE MADE ON LOCAL DAMS

Letter to the editor Jun 5, 2016

I approve and vote for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission conclusively rejecting — per Docket Number P-2082-027 — both destroying all Klamath River hydroelectric dams, and destroying each dam of any Klamath River hydroelectric dam(s).

Comments concerning 30-year or 50-year re-licensing for the Klamath River hydroelectric dams, possibly per U.S.A. Constitution Amendment 1, may be received of FERC per: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, or <https://ferconline.ferc.gov/QuickComment.aspx> ref. Docket# P-2082-027 or P-2082-000, or <http://www.ferc.gov/contact-us/contact-us.asp>, or Public Inquiries 1-866-208-3372, or Regional Fairness Boards 1-888-734-3247, or nonofficially per customer@ferc.gov.

Four primary complaints against the dams are:

- 1) No fish passageways around Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate dams;
- 2) the same toxic algal varieties (anabaena and microcystis) that are only minorily present in Upper Klamath Lake, being present in greater total algae population minorily-only percentages in the hydroelectric dam reservoirs;
- 3) seasonally warm dam reservoir surface water;
- 4) hydropowered electricity generation competition against fossil fuel (esp. subterranean-extracted natural gas) combustion-powered electricity generation.

I also approve and vote for the United States of America Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation to both purchase the four (i.e.: J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, Copco 2, Iron Gate) Klamath River hydroelectric dams, and maintain, manage, and where necessary improve (e.g., in some of those dams install fish passageway facilities) those dams for multiuse of the Klamath River. That includes — though is not limited to — anadromous fish migration, Klamath Basin and California agriculture irrigation, subsistence, sport, and commercial fishing, Tulelake and Lower Klamath Lake Wildlife Refuge water supply, wildlife habitat, multisource clean renewable hydroelectric power generation, recreation, Klamath River mouth sandbar displacement per river flow regulation (dredging can help also), and fire suppression.

Danny L. Hull

Save the Klamath River dams.

The Klamath River hydroelectric dams should be saved.

Aug 24, 2020

The dams are opposed by a coalition of ecoterrorists, fossil fuel advocates, “poor me” prestige seekers, climate change deniers, anti-farming bigots, “we’re only trying to help” Democrats and Republicans, electric power production competitors and economically corrupt fishery scientists.

The Klamath River is a multi-use river, and per humanity’s river-dependent survival, it entirely currently belongs to people before any of it belongs to fish.

I believe the Department of the Interior should purchase and manage the Klamath River hydroelectric dams, and where necessary, the dams should be improved with fishways and fish screens, so that the dams continue to provide much multi-use — including hydroelectric power production — of the Klamath River, and so that the dams are responsibly managed as public property per the U.S.A.’s national citizenship.

Danny Hull

Klamath Falls

{An Excerpt About The 8/24/2020 Letter's Editing

December 17, 2021

Dear[Herald & News Editor]:

. . . "My H&N 12/05-08/2019 letter (concerning city council's new home camping rules) was processed very well per H&N. However some of my subsequent H&N letters were poorly H&N edited, and left my signature print-purporting a position that substantially and significantly wasn't mine." [A previous H&N editor] "always allowed me the H&N maximum word count content, yet two of my post-2019 H&N letters were greatly depleted of personal statements, so that the remaining content was much less well supported and much fewer than 310 words; and my last two 2021 H&N letters have been entirely refused publication.

Another major H&N "Letter to the Editor" policy that I find deficient is H&N's stipulation that "Letters should focus on the opinion of the writer, not facts. Any statement of facts not generally known or accepted to be true will be removed at the editor's discretion." That stipulation includes a blatant call for opinionated, biased, not truthfully supported with actual occurrence and correct measures, misleading rhetoric. Example one: My 8/26/2020 letter to the H&N Editor was unnecessarily, imprecisely, and deleteriously H&N Editor-edited from" [anti-farming hunter/gatherer bigots] ""hunter/gatherer bigots" to" [anti-farming bigots] ""bigots"; however in that letter's context of then current bigotry, the group "hunter/gatherer bigots" is a subset of the group "bigots" that is not equal to the entire group of then current bigots, since humanity diversified to agriculture about 9,000 years ago, unless the term "bigots" is always and only a synonym or an abbreviation of the term "hunter/gatherer bigots", neither of which the term "bigots" is. Example 2: As a water quality technologist, when I want to advocate for Upper Klamath Lake (UKL) water distribution, I want to note an abundance of historical, laboratory, field, and/or estimated UKL water condition numerical measures, all preferably with researchable references, from which reasonable water distribution may be indicated."

Letter: Extinction part of natural cycles

Feb 26, 2021

Per climate change, how can we have the most Klamath River Basin fish, agriculture, water conservation, and clean renewable hydroelectric power?

Answer: Adequate federally owned dams. A recent hose assembly that automatically sorts upriver migrating fish and transports them over dams is safe and cost effective.

I'm not surprised that Bureau of Reclamation seeks to optimize sucker reproduction with irrigation diversion flow-adjusted Upper Klamath Lake levels and Link River Dam. Before Link River Dam's 1921 construction as primarily a diversion dam, Link River's minimum UKL-derived water flow was Link River's natural Putnam's Point reef at 4,137 feet in elevation. That reef was artificially removed, reportedly in 1917.

According to a 2001 story in the Herald and News, "Klamath Lake ... elevations set at maximum of 4,143 feet ... and minimum of 4,137 to protect diked riparian property."

Recall removal of Chiloquin's Sprague River dam for upriver spawning run access for suckers that wouldn't ascend the dam fish ladder?

I suspect non-native fish species, especially catfish, prey on local suckers. Species extinction naturally happens, like bison naturally emit biocycle greenhouse gas methane.

Danny Hull
Klamath Falls

Letter: Still ways to preserve dams, improve fish passage

Herald & News edited and Jan 19, 2022 published version of D. Hull's 01/17/2022 letter:

“Since many of us believe that the Klamath River hydroelectric dams deserve to be saved from destruction, and deserve some improvement for fish passage at those dams, some of us are yet seeking ways for preservation and improvement of those dams.

Here's a quick inexpensive plan to accomplish that: The federal government purchases the dams, possibly quite inexpensively because the dams are currently slated for complete destruction.

Iron Gate Dam's hydroelectric turbine is removed from the dam; one or both hydroelectric turbines of Copco 1 Dam are also removed. The turbine removals are so that the water flow turbine feed tubes that fed water to the removed turbines are used for downstream-only fish passage.

Fish sorting and fish elevator tubes are installed at Iron Gate and Copco 1 dams to provide optional fish sorting, with fish elevation over those dams, and may be installed at Copco 2 Dam at J.C. Boyle Dam, to supplement the currently adequate — though amenable to improvement — J.C. Boyle Dam fish ladder.

The Iron Gate and Copco 1 dams' water flow turbine feed tubes, which this plan removes turbines from, are fitted with deeper reservoir intakes, so that fish both may pass upriver and downriver through that installed fish ladder, and fish are safely prevented from entering Copco 2's turbine canal.

Also, Iron Gate Fish Hatchery is retained, to supplement salmonid reproduction.”

Danny Hull
Klamath Falls

{“01_21_2022 **A Possibly Never Sent Publishment Editing Question**

Dear” [Herald & News Editor]:

“Can you please help *H&N* publish my original 307 word 01_17_2022 letter correctly as I wrote it? Along with herewith attaching a printed .pdf copy -- i.e. "01_17_2022 H&N Save Klamath Hydro Dams Plan.pdf" -- from *H&N*, of my original letter to *H&N*, I here print that original 307 word letter *H&N* copy so:” . . .

“Since many of us U.S.A. citizens believe that the Klamath River hydroelectric dams, both deserve to be saved from destruction, and deserve some improvement for fish passage at those dams, some of us are yet seeking ways for preservation and improvement of those dams. Here's a quick, inexpensive plan to accomplish that: (1) The federal Government purchases the dams, possibly quite inexpensively because the dams are currently slated for complete destruction; (2) Iron Gate Dam's hydroelectric turbine is removed from the dam; one or both hydroelectric turbines of Copco 1 Dam are removed from the dam. The turbine removals are so that the water flow turbine feed tubes, that fed water to the removed turbines, are used for downstream-only fish passage. (3) Fish sorting and fish elevator tubes, are installed at Iron Gate and Copco 1 dams, to provide optional fish sorting with fish elevation over those dams, and may optionally be installed at Copco 2 Dam, to supplement installing a fish ladder at Copco 2 Dam with, and may optionally be installed at J.C. Boyle Dam, to supplement the currently adequate – though amenable to improvement – J.C. Boyle Dam fish ladder; (4) the Iron Gate and Copco 1 dams' water flow turbine feed tubes, which this plan removed turbines from, are fitted with deeper reservoir intakes, so that the tubes may provide downriver fish passage, when those tubes' reservoirs' water levels are lowered for any of a variety of causes, (5) a low – Copco 2 is only 36 feet high – fish ladder and a fish diverting screen, are installed in the Copco 2 Dam complex, so that fish both may pass upriver and downriver through that installed fish ladder, and so fish are safely prevented from entering Copco 2's turbine canal. (6) Iron Gate fish hatchery is retained, to supplement salmonid reproduction. **(307 Words).**” {Author's 08/11/2022 note: This 01_17_2022 dam complex modification plan, was opposed because it didn't better provide fish ladders for small fish to move up the river of.”}

Why is my original "U.S.A. Citizens" phrase modification of my "us" peer group in the first sentence of my original 01_17_2022 letter, omitted for a contextually overgeneralized "us" grouping in the first sentence of *H&N*'s 01/19/2022 version of my 01_17_2022 letter? I accept that *H&N* paragraph indentations substitute well for my letter's numerical topic headings.

H&N's abridgement of numerical heading (3) of my original 01_17_2022 letter, misprioritizes installment of fish sorting and fish elevator tubes at Copco 2 Dam, per not indicating that that fish sorting and fish elevator tubes installment, is optionally supplemental to "installing a fish ladder at Copco 2 Dam with"; and falsely claims that installment of fish sorting and fish elevator tubes at Copco 2 Dam may occur "at J.C. Boyle Dam"; and newly prioritizes that installment of fish sorting and fish elevator tubes at Copco 2 Dam, "to supplement the currently adequate – though amenable to improvement – J.C. Boyle Dam fish ladder."

What kind of *Herald and News* disarranged condensation is "so that fish both may pass upriver and downriver through that installed fish ladder, and fish are safely prevented from entering Copco 2's turbine canal", that *H&N* edits the numerical headings (4) and (5) clauses of my original 01_17_2022 letter with? That *H&N* corrupt abridgement, rewording, and description: [1] does not describe a possible function of "deeper reservoir intakes" for "The Iron Gate and Copco 1 dams' water flow turbine feed tubes", because preventing fish from entering Copco 2's turbine canal, is impossible of those "deeper reservoir intakes", and thus falsifies the numerical headings (4) and (5) clauses of my 01_17_2022 letter; [2] omits the very powerful reservoir level fluctuation function and compensation ("water levels are lowered for any of a variety of causes") that the "deeper reservoir intakes" could provide; [3] omits the height description and emphasis for installation of a brand new fish ladder in fish ladder-less Copco 2 Dam, [4] substitutes an *H&N* original "that fish ladder" phrase for my letter's original "tubes" wording; [5] substitutes an *H&N* original repurposing of my (2) designated Iron Gate Dam's and Copco 1 Dam's turbine-removed water flow feed tubes' "downstream-only fish passage" use, as " *Iron Gate and Copco 1 dams' water flow turbine feed tubes, which this plan removes turbines from, are fitted with deeper reservoir intakes, so that fish both may pass upriver and downriver through that installed fish ladder;*", although admittedly I might better have said (2) ". . . so that the water flow turbine feed tubes, that fed water to the removed turbines, are used primarily or exclusively for downstream-only fish passage." } }

Letter: More reasons to keep Klamath dams

Feb 25, 2022

Per my January Herald and News letter preference for the federal government purchasing Iron Gate and Copco 1 dams, removing the turbines from both dams and converting them to upriver and downriver valved fishways: I also prefer using Iron Gate and Copco 1 reservoirs for seasonal river flow adjustments.

Notch Iron Gate Dam north end overflow channel, if necessary, so that a low valve and pipeline drain may be installed in Iron Gate Reservoir, to provide convenient water withdrawal for adjustment of the 190 miles of Klamath River between Iron Gate and the Pacific.

Install if necessary, a low valve and pipeline drain through the concrete plug at the east end in the Copco 1 Dam south end Klamath River bypass rock tunnel, to provide water withdrawal for adjustment of the 8.8 miles of Klamath River between Copco 1 to Iron Gate Dam.

Currently, I find J.C. Boyle Dam reservoir as having greatly mitigable daily and usually negligible effect on Klamath River water quality. Its fish ladder can be improved, though it is better than minimally adequate for fish passage. Also, providing that Copco 2 Dam complex has an adequate turbine canal fish screen and an adequate, approximately 25-foot high fish ladder is installed, I estimate that Copco 2 will provide negligible environmental impact to the Klamath River.

Retention of the Iron Gate fish hatchery appears to me a very cost-effective way to supplement salmonid reproduction.

Danny Hull
Klamath Falls

Council's camping decision sounds like more expense for taxpayers

Dec 13, 2019

Biology doesn't guarantee that every animal will be born equipped to adequately compensate material life's survival necessities, for the environment's demand on that animal.

Nowhere in energy transfer is humanity guaranteed that material market production will at all times, provide adequate revenue for every person to pay their nonspiritual dues of ("the market shall vary"). Land (e.g. material) is a necessary factor of production, is in time-dependent finite supply, and thus is fair to share and co-administer based on the rights and right of way of both each individual and groups.

Apparently per violation of U.S. Constitution Amendment 4 "probable cause," the city council wants to require campers on, and/or every Klamath Falls private land camping-permitting owner of, Klamath Falls' private land, to be qualified to receive city permission for no greater than four campers at a time, to for no more than 21 days in a 12-month period, camp per the landowner's permission on the landowner's property, because the campers and/or the landowners might otherwise leave the campers' trash on the landowners' land.

Feeble, and sounds like another pathetic lawyer grab for a court case job at taxpayer expense.

Certainly another excellent reason for our south suburbs to refuse annexation into Klamath Falls. So who can afford shelter for the homeless (I myself was evicted from trailer camping on government forest land in 1986), and where can the homeless afford shelter?

Also, remember U.S. Constitution Amendment 1 "no law ... abridging the right of the people ... to petition...."? A Klamath Falls city employee informed me, that for me to file a Klamath Falls city complaint, a Klamath Falls police officer had to (apparently agree to?!) file it.

Danny Hull
Klamath Falls

From *Herald & News* 12/04/2019 newspaper:

“City council enters into development agreement for Esplanade and Main ... Camping

The council also voted to adopt an ordinance that will limit camping on private property. The ordinance allows camping on private property for seven days without a permit but stays between eight and 21 days require a permit which must be posted on the entrance to the property.

Camping for more than 21 days in a 12 month period is prohibited. According to the ordinance, camping is limited to the property owner or those who have written permission from the property owner, and no more than one shelter and a maximum of four people are allowed.

One section of the ordinance was taken out at the request of” [one city councilman]. “The section would have required campers to have proof of a porta-potty or gray water sump or recycled gray water.

“I don’t think, when I think about our city, we want to see a porta-potty placed in someone’s backyard,”” [the councilman said]. “He said most people will probably use the restroom on the property they are camping on or use public restrooms so that part of the ordinance is not necessary. The council unanimously voted to omit the section regarding porta-potties and to adopt the ordinance.”

U.S. Constitution Fourth Amendment

“The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.”