

[Quoted from April 08, 2023 Herald and News newspaper]

Klamath River: First dam removal is this summer

Removal of the Copco 2 dam, one of four Klamath River dams that will be coming down, is still on schedule to be removed this summer.

Mark Bransom, CEO for Klamath River Renewal Corporation (KRRC), said projects preparing for removing Copco 2 are on schedule with the actual removal planned between June and October. The other three hydroelectric dams — Copco 1, Irongate and John C. Boyle — are planned to be removed in 2024 making the project the largest dam removal effort in U.S. history. A report by a Medford television station caused some confusion when it indicated that no dams would be removed until next year.

“We’re optimistic we can stick to the schedule,” Bransom said of removing Copco 2 this summer and the other three dams in 2024. “Everything is clicking well. We have all the necessary approval and authorizations to proceed.”

Copco 2 is located below Copco 1 and the Copco Reservoir and above the Iron Gate Reservoir and Iron Gate Dam. Bransom noted a series of actions are being taken in advance of all four dam removals. For Copco 2, pre-removal work includes mobilizing and setting up offices, constructing road and infrastructure improvements, installing a 24- by 60-foot culvert at Fall Creek, installing a 260-foot prefabricating truss bridge over the Klamath River at Daggett Road, installing 3,300-feet of 24-inch steel, waterline for the city of Yreka, removing 13 recreational facilities at all four reservoirs, and drilling and blasting a 90-foot long 10-1/2-foot tunnel at the base of Copco 1 dam.

Other work includes constructing new access roads to both Copco dams, demolishing an existing concrete diversion dam, and removing existing on-site residential buildings.

According to the construction overview, Copco 2 will be removed by drilling and blasting with

the removal projected to be completed this fall. A restored river channel will be built through the existing dam footprint.

In addition, during the next several months reservoirs behind the existing dams will be simultaneously drawn down and other projects completed before the dams are removed. The pre-removal work will include demolishing 100,000 cubic yards of concrete, 1.3 million cubic yards of excavation, 70,000 cubic yards of “drill and shoot,” and 2,000 tons of steel demolition. Resource Environmental Solutions (RES) will revegetate the impacted areas with native plant species. More than 11 billion native seeds have already been collected and propagated. Monitoring to ensure revegetation success, control invasive species and other restoration activities will last several years, until about 2030.

Based on the current schedule, the J.C. Boyle Dam will be the second dam removed, followed by Copco 1 and Irongate. Restoration of the reservoirs and tributaries will begin in early 2024. The four dams have a combined height of 411 feet. Copco 2, which became operational in 1925, is the shortest of the four with a hydraulic height of 27 feet and structural height of 63 feet.

The construction overview indicates the four dams impound about 15 million cubic yards of sediment. “When the reservoirs are drained, about half that sediment, or estimated 7 million cubic yards, will wash downstream. The project needs to drawdown the three largest reservoirs simultaneously in January and February 2024 to limit the salmon spawning impact. Then dam removal will be completed by the middle of October when the next round of adults (salmon) come back upstream.”

Cost for the dam removals and restoration activities are estimated at \$450 million. The former dam owner, PacifiCorp, is providing \$200 million, which was collected as ratepayer surcharges, while the state of California is providing the remaining \$250 million from voter-approved bond funds allocated for the project. PacifiCorp and the states of Oregon and

California have also agreed to contribute up to an additional \$15 million each — or another \$45 million — to cover any unanticipated cost overruns. If the costs exceed the contingency, the states and utility have agreed to cover such overruns."

Removal of any of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams is more than asinine, it is subversive to agriculture, aquaculture, clean renewable energy-based human survival, and United States of America national security. KRRC has much money that it wants to start spending, and likely could so begin per destroying the 3.6MW Link River hydroelectric complex, rather than destroy 27 MW Copco 2, which is the easiest Klamath River hydroelectric dam to build a completely new fish ladder for.

Talk about corrupt: "If the costs exceed the contingency, the states and utility have agreed to cover such overruns." Another example of private enterprise, including the energy, social culture, fisheries, and advocacy industries bribing bureaucrats to create and fund superfund waste site expenses. Historically such unnecessary waste takes a decadence form of "we are so disposed of wealth – i.e. with such a surfeit or deficit of wealth – that we can afford to address our bill payment, per greatly wasting value about our bill payment".

Now citizens, I Danny Lee Hull, can't alone save your backsides against this reticent, irresponsible, and selfish waste of proven adequately valuable, human-produced human life support infrastructure. Have we forgotten that much per muscle power and hand tools, China built three long walls against trespass? Never the less, our beloved U.S.A. national government is late to save our Klamath River hydroelectric dams, and people want to know where I'm coming from in advocating for those dams salvation, so I'll try to post some pictures, e.g. Files 61 & 62 of my [Save Klamath River Hydroelectric Dams](#) webpage, of my dam-supported development.

As with Washington State's White Salmon River Condit Dam unnecessary destruction, apathy per the entropy fact, that economically, wasting humanity's life support costs less in opposing disorder than does keeping humanity alive, may yet leave people “incredulous” that much – yes thousands from billions -- of humanity, would justify their “of no salvation except divine ordination”, extremely likely impending material death, as worthy of an extinction of humanity. Notice I wrote “material death”, and not “spiritual death”. God has plenty of time to correct us spiritually for our material trespasses, and to reward us spiritually for our sinless behaviour. However our ability – including our opportunity -- to truly voluntarily invest ourselves conscientiously, sinlessly to benefit humanity, is substantially limited, and we should value our opportunity so greatly.

I placed “Incredulous” in quotes, so that you may be aware and/or again recognize, that you are valued for right of way prestige to your neighbors, including what they may derive involuntarily from you to someone's horror. If we have witnessed anything profound of growing up with some bullies, its certainly that those bullies were greatly content – oftentimes of their emotional discomfort (and have we seen drugs* estrange people of their emotional stability and control?!) -- to waste humanity at an early age.

The dams are of an early age, an early age of: Adverse climate change, repayment of climate and dollar cost for construction of the dams, clean climate friendly financially profitable support of humanity, reparability for a long dam service life, optional use including repurposing for wildlife habitat and agriculture irrigation offset, available reliable electricity production variety. I have been actively seeking to save – and where necessary improve – the Klamath River hydroelectric dams, since the 1960's!

Destroying the dams within a most likely immediately forthcoming 30 years of climate change and tectonics, is excessively premature. Also please be aware of the constant human apathy with trespass, and the human right to nontresspassingly coexist and/or sinlessly coexist with trespass, of which many neighbors prefer to waste of human negligence, rather than correct

– or futilely try to correct (“better luck next time”, hey?) -- human negligence.

Fascination with “irrevocable” responsibility for trespass (here again, “spiritual death is too good for 'em, when regardless of their trespasses and/or nontrespasses, they are entirely affordable for the Lord God Almighty to restore to spiritual correctness”(would that restoration be much too good for 'em, so let 'em be restored so anyway?! Mercy.)), has mesmerized more than one fatigued gent into silly waste of resources.

*”How sweet it is”, for I haven't hereof forgotten that hereof I have written that taboo word “drug”. How so? Before I give some of my credentials, hereof let's note that historically excess ethyl alcohol, amphetamine, and heroin have all excessively reduced patience, so that trespass resulted. My credentials include more satisfactorily accomplished college chemistry than I here prefer to list, including: three terms of General Chemistry, five terms of Organic Chemistry, two terms of Clinical Biochemistry, two terms of graduate Biochemistry, two terms of Water Quality Chemistry, Hematology, Serology.

“Drug”. From 1994 to 1998, I spent four consecutive years of greater than 50 hours nonsalaried labor per week, correcting -- per rewriting -- the U.S.A.'s drug approval laws. I sent that drug law correction compendium to my Congressperson in 1998 or so, and my Congressperson – who is now deceased – wrote back to me that my Congressperson had sent a copy of my drug law correction compendium to the FDA (Food and Drug Administration). Last year or so, I reviewed the U.S.A.'s current drug approval laws, and found none of my corrections in those laws, and almost an equal amount of incorrect per ambiguity, new U.S.A. Drug approval laws, to go with the yet present, mostly original U.S.A. Drug approval laws that I had sent corrections for.

Now wait, wait a minute, “maybe” no one else told you that for example, in 1989 or so, I circulated a petition at my expense in southern Oregon, to legalize a good enough in my opinion anti-HIV (anti-human immuno deficiency virus) vaccine; a vaccine that U.S.A.

taxpayers paid for, and that was produced of a U.S.A. government laboratory, and that was in my opinion wrongly denied legal sale for medicinal purposes to the public. (A current fraud about HIV is: HIV hides out in some monocytes, some T lymphocytes, and bone marrow dormant in some stem cells, like Chicken Pox virus hides out in human bodies and later emerges as Shingles; so peek a boo, “therefore when a standard type HIV antigen (HIV part) -based vaccine induces -- likely with substantial difficulty in moderately or greatly advanced HIV-caused AIDs -- safe and effective immunity against human blood circulating HIV; sneaky HIV may have already hid away from that immunity, and the HIV will reactivate later, proving the vaccine wasn't effective enough to release for legal sale in the first place, because nothing but complete eradication of all HIV code – including all hidden HIV code – from the body is sufficient proof of anti-HIV vaccine sufficiency.” However, like Chicken Pox coming back as Shingles, vaccine immunity possibly may reactivate upon our body being challenged again with HIV virus, or possibly may be re-induced per booster vaccine.

Now here is some more “peek-a-boo” about HIV: After the world's governments had first vetoed and/or failed to approve and provide what I believed to be adequate anti-HIV vaccines, I – painfully per my severe kidney ulcers – estimated that a drug that would block enzymes that HIV depends on, might allow human immunity adequate time to destroy HIV sufficiently. That HIV destruction now indeed appears to happen often.)

Like the Red Cross, I'm opposed to the illegal “thrill” drugs “no man's land” waste of lives; and these days with greatly toxic synthetic drugs cheaply and easily available, “thrill” drugs' waste of lives is all too possible. Are you prepared to dare to be a square, and “just say no” to risking greatly dying of a “thrill” drug, because you don't want to be a “wallflower” or a “partypoop” at a private party, where, without ingesting or partaking of those illegal drugs, you have witnessed illegal “thrill” drugs transacted?

Have I overlooked each individual's personal right, to without trespassing on others, cause suicide to that individual. No, and we should be aware that New Hampshire's State motto of

“Live Free or Die” is partly antithetical to “Live Enslaved or Die”; however, for example in the case of slow, moderately fast, or fast suicide per illegal “thrill” drugs, (and here I would like to say in the case of slow, moderately fast, or fast natural death per opposition to involuntary enslavement) the U.S.A. remains cognizant that the aforementioned “thrill” drugs examples (i.e. ethyl alcohol, amphetamine, heroin) are “regulated” (“Chug-a-lug, chug-a-lug, when you want to parley rendezvous, where you goin' now 'til you pass through, chug-a-lug chug-a-lug.”) substances, that have a variety of values per a variety of people; so like “different strokes for different folks”, and even more difficultly, like fairly coexisting with unfairness; default regulation of the aforementioned “thrill” drugs (and here I'd like to say “and of the aforementioned natural death per opposition to involuntary enslavement”, also) is a sign convention occurrence with many persons.

The term “involuntary enslavement” is neither an oxymoron (i.e. ambiguous or a contradiction in terms) nor need a person sell themselves into slavery, to prove that it isn't real slavery that they bought; like red white and white red may suffice as a pink mix of both, for both (with regard to rivers, we may recall a famous claim of “First come, only serve”, while we thirst to death for abundant fresh water to drink). Similarly, here's a proposition for us: The weather is poor enough to dam outside. Sign on to stay cleanly renewably electrified, agricultured, and aquacultured inside, with dam-assisted salmon passage outside; or lose salmon-assist dam passage to only nature-assist river passage. (Ex. Per rare though previously verifiable reports, in the late 1800's or early 1900's, truly there was a landslide in the Klamath River Canyon, that stopped upriver salmon migration until the landslide was blasted open.) The Klamath River is a multi-use river, it isn't for fish habitat only or ultimately.

Deconstruction of Copco 2 Dam **commenced** in the week prior to 6/24/2023. Copco 1, Iron Gate, and J.C. Boyle dams are scheduled to be completely removed in 2024. The Democrat Party has been adamant that salmon migration can only be restored on the Klamath River

per complete destruction of the four aforementioned Klamath River hydroelectric dams, although J.C. Boyle dam already has an adequate fish ladder and turbine canal fish screen, and Copco 1, especially 33' high Copco 2, and Iron Gate dams are each adequately modifiable with fish ladder, whoosh elevator tube, and if necessary fish screen additions. Locally the Republican Party purported to support keeping the dams, however they never either submitted a bill for U.S.A. Government purchase of the dams to Congress, or voted to the U.S.A. Presidential Administration for the U.S.A. Presidential Administration to purchase or confiscate the dams for national security.

Perhaps the Democrat Party now awaits to see if the U.S.A. national public will withhold money from, or refuse to donate money to Democrat Party election campaigns, until the Democrat Party stops destruction of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams. Even though I am a registered Democrat, and I have been instrumental in electing 2/3 of the democrat candidates who, in a close election per which I financially supported their candidacy of, were elected, I am now withholding all of my financial and all of my possibly forthcoming, new declaration stated, support for Democrat candidate campaigns, until the Democratic Party stops destruction of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams. I estimate that if the U.S.A. national public now – commencing June 2023 -- stops contributing financial donations to the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, until either both parties or the Democrat Party stop(s) destruction of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams, the Democratic Party will stop destruction of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams within three weeks or less.

Upon petitioning the U.S.A. Presidential Administration to save – and where necessary improve with fishway modifications – the Klamath River hydroelectric dams, the U.S.A. Presidential Administration's response was “Finish the job”; however destroying the Klamath River hydroelectric dams, is completely ambiguous and opposite to the correctly adequate way to “Finish the job” saving the Klamath River hydroelectric dams. Although J.C. Boyle Dam is, and since its completion has always been, salmonid passage adequate, the KRRC (Klamath River Renewal Corporation) plans on destroying J.C. Boyle Dam (68' high) first in 2024, apparently because by leaving the two tallest (126' high Copco 1 and 194' high Iron

Gate) Klamath River hydroelectric dams impounding the river, KRRC has a stronger claim for new and additional dam destruction funding allocation.

Call me a holdover from other administrations, destruction of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams is a **pirate** takeover much supported of the fossil fuel industry, including corporate Democrats, dinosaur era Republicans, and false modesty fools, who of their indolence and pretense, are fond of claiming “We didn't know no better, that was those other guys, poor us, give us benefit at someone else's expense” (I had to grow up with a backstabbing father who made similar claims. Like we ordered in the Navy, “Shift status.”, “Guide-on bearer, guide on.”, “Pass in review.”; and as quoted from an early Klamath Basin newspaper: “Hew to the mark, let the chips fall where they will.”).

Admittedly, correctly deciding development of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams, requires recognition of details and complex environmental production understanding, both things of which I have specialized in, accomplished, and greatly presented per my webpage at <https://www.voterspetition.com/SaveKlamathRiverHydroelectricDams.html>. So mateys, I **recommend** withholding, and I am **refusing to provide, U.S.A. political party financial donations, until the U.S.A. Government stops destruction of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams!**

Incidentally, the private advocacy enterprise beggars, have decided to incessantly target the Snake River hydroelectric dams also, with “No way for salmon except no dams on salmon rivers.” demand. Nice and concise, simple for simpletons, gimmees. Patience with incompetence, for if they can't “grow up” adequately responsibly competent, they need to be wards – (though are they affordable wards?) – to and/or for those who have “grown up” adequately responsibly competent.

Here are five natural environment enterprise advocate organizations that are on record for supporting unnecessary destruction of the Klamath River hydroelectric dams: Sierra Club (rationale: “You can't win 'em all.”); Natural Resources Defense Council, NRDC (rationale:

“We might as well appear professional too.”); Center for Biological Diversity (rationale: “When in “roam”, be a roamer; me too.”); Earthjustice (rationale: “Like the engineers say; “Build 'em up or tear 'em down, it all pays the same.”); Defenders of Wildlife (rationale: “When in “roam”, be a roamer; me too.”). Some of these organizations' problem is similar to the Navy's problem, to wit: “The pirates are gone, so who needs to pay support for the Navy?” In other words, these natural environment advocacy organizations find that their assistance is needed intermittently, and they lack financial and/or piece de resistance social merit cause support, in the intermittent interims. Shall ecoterrorism pay their bills for them?

(Some obscurely intelligible environmental health mumblings and grumblings: “A little simple acid/base chemistry can show how ecoterrorism has supported “pump and dump” fossil fuel production, while ecoterrorism campaigned against plastics such as some PFAS (polyfluoroalkyl substances), and “pump and dump” refused to, for example, employ 600 lbs pressure, 500°F, and 900°F during a 120 consecutive minutes thermal conversion process (TCP, see <https://changingworldtech.com/>, 2017, or [Anything Into Oil](#), Discover Magazine, April 30, 2003) of many geosurface carboniferous biologic wastes to “biodiesel”; not to mention how some PFAs do not promote more than very mildly hazardous acid formation before those PFAs are greatly heated, so that although the PFAs last stably molecularly in the environment,, of weathering the PFAs slowly spread out and coexist neutrally and nonreactively greatly with the environment.”)

All too often, several natural environment advocacy organizations decide against multi-use of the environment, for only single natural use instead. The “only natural” movement shelters a “no synthetic medicine is good medicine” subversion against humanity's survival, that also supports an international monopoly denial of every recently discovered good new medicine provision to the general public, so that many recently discovered good new medicines remain mostly unknown of to the public, and scarcely even available at tremendous high price to wealthy individuals per “drug research” opportunity! We truly need, and don't have, a “newly discovered drug”, research, development, and availability opportunity, drug watch public advocacy group.

The most important criteria for evaluating drugs, is safeness and effectiveness for specific use of each drug; that is, the quality and quantity of safety and effect, that the drug has for each specific use, that the drug is sought approved for. Does the drug have a good-health-benefiting effect, and is the total effect of the drug safe enough? Do you find that a drug that is extremely safe to the body, though the drug has little or no good-health support beneficial therapeutic effect, -- except perhaps a personally derived, placebo or treatment effort satisfaction effect -- is worthy per proper informative labeling, of marketing as a drug? Well, apparently because such low, and/or no, material benefit effect chemicals, might divert funding from good medicines, those chemicals are usually denied government marketing approval to be sold as drugs.