

Contents

Executive Summary	ES-1
ES.1 Introduction.....	ES-1
ES.2 Background.....	ES-5
ES.2.1 Basin Timeline	ES-7
ES.2.2 Activities Leading to the Development of the KHSA and the KBRA	ES-7
ES.3 Environmental Review.....	ES-17
ES.4 Klamath Settlement Agreements	ES-18
ES.4.1 Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement.....	ES-18
ES.4.2 Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement	ES-19
ES.5 Alternatives Development	ES-19
ES.5.1 Public Scoping and Alternatives Identification	ES-19
ES.6 Alternatives Receiving Full Analysis in the EIS/EIR.....	ES-21
ES.6.1 Alternative 1 - No Action/No Project Alternative	ES-21
ES.6.2 Alternative 2 - Full Facilities Removal of Four Dams (Proposed Action)	ES-22
ES.6.3 Alternative 3 - Partial Facilities Removal of Four Dams	ES-24
ES.6.4 Alternative 4 - Fish Passage at Four Dams.....	ES-24
ES.6.5 Alternative 5 - Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate	ES-26
ES.7 Effects of the No Action, Proposed Action, and Alternatives	ES-27
ES.7.1 Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	ES-27
ES.7.2 Balancing Impacts and Benefits of the Alternatives.....	ES-40
ES.7.3 Environmentally Preferable/Superior Alternative	ES-45
ES.7.4 Controversies and Issues Raised by Agencies and the Public	ES-46
ES.8 References	ES-48
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1-1
1.1 Physical and Biological Setting	1-2
1.1.1 Geography and Topography	1-2
1.1.2 Climate and Hydrology.....	1-2
1.1.3 Biology.....	1-5
1.2 People and Historic Setting.....	1-8
1.2.1 Tribes	1-8
1.2.2 Early Euroamerican Settlement and Hydroelectric History.....	1-10
1.2.3 Water Use and Management.....	1-10
1.2.4 Reclamation’s Klamath Project	1-13
1.2.5 Adjudication.....	1-15
1.2.6 Klamath Hydroelectric Project and Relicensing.....	1-16

1.3	KHSA and KBRA	1-18
1.3.1	KHSA.....	1-19
1.3.2	KBRA	1-23
1.4	NEPA/CEQA	1-28
1.4.1	NEPA/CEQA Requirements.....	1-28
1.4.2	Purpose and Need/Project Objectives.....	1-29
1.5	References.....	1-30
Chapter 2	Proposed Action and Description of the Alternatives	2-1
2.1	NEPA Requirements.....	2-1
2.2	CEQA Requirements	2-1
2.3	Alternatives Development	2-2
2.4	Proposed Action and Alternatives	2-7
2.4.1	Facilities Common to All Alternatives	2-7
2.4.2	Alternative 1: No Action/No Project Alternative	2-13
2.4.3	Alternative 2: Full Facilities Removal of Four Dams (Proposed Action)	2-19
2.4.4	Alternative 3: Partial Facilities Removal of Four Dams.....	2-61
2.4.5	Alternative 4: Fish Passage at Four Dams	2-70
2.4.6	Alternative 5: Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate	2-83
2.5	Preferred Alternative.....	2-86
2.6	References.....	2-87
Chapter 3	Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences.....	3.1-1
3.1	Introduction	3.1-1
3.1.1	Format of the Environmental Analysis.....	3.1-2
3.2	Water Quality.....	3.2-1
3.2.1	Area of Analysis	3.2-1
3.2.2	Regulatory Framework	3.2-4
3.2.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.2-19
3.2.4	Environmental Consequences.....	3.2-33
3.2.5	Mitigation Measures	3.2-147
3.2.6	Summary of Short-term and Long-term Effects on Water Quality	3.2-148
3.2.7	References.....	3.2-162
3.3	Aquatic Resources	3.3-1
3.3.1	Area of Analysis	3.3-1
3.3.2	Regulatory Framework	3.3-3
3.3.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.3-3
3.3.4	Environmental Consequences.....	3.3-47
3.3.5	References.....	3.3-219
3.4	Algae	
3.4.1	Area of Analysis	3.4-1
3.4.2	Regulatory Framework	3.4-1
3.4.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.4-2
3.4.4	Environmental Consequences.....	3.4-9

	3.4.5	References	3.4-28
3.5		Terrestrial Resources	3.5-1
	3.5.1	Area of Analysis	3.5-1
	3.5.2	Regulatory Framework	3.5-1
	3.5.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.5-3
	3.5.4	Environmental Consequences	3.5-41
	3.5.5	References.....	3.5-79
3.6		Flood Hydrology	3.6-1
	3.6.1	Area of Analysis	3.6-1
	3.6.2	Regulatory Framework	3.6-3
	3.6.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.6-4
	3.6.4	Environmental Consequences	3.6-19
	3.6.5	References.....	3.6-40
3.7		Groundwater	3.7-1
	3.7.1	Area of Analysis	3.7-1
	3.7.2	Regulatory Framework	3.7-1
	3.7.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.7-1
	3.7.4	Environmental Consequences	3.7-14
	3.7.5	References.....	3.7-23
3.8		Water Supply/Water Rights	3.8-1
	3.8.1	Area of Analysis	3.8-1
	3.8.2	Regulatory Framework	3.8-1
	3.8.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.8-4
	3.8.4	Environmental Consequences	3.8-12
	3.8.5	References.....	3.8-27
3.9		Air Quality	3.9-1
	3.9.1	Area of Analysis	3.9-1
	3.9.2	Regulatory Framework	3.9-1
	3.9.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.9-3
	3.9.4	Environmental Consequences	3.9-8
	3.9.5	References.....	3.9-27
3.10		Greenhouse Gases/Global Climate Change	3.10-1
	3.10.1	Area of Analysis	3.10-1
	3.10.2	Regulatory Framework	3.10-1
	3.10.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.10-2
	3.10.4	Environmental Consequences	3.10-12
	3.10.5	References.....	3.10-47
3.11		Geology, Soils, and Geologic Hazards	3.11-1
	3.11.1	Area of Analysis	3.11-1
	3.11.2	Regulatory Framework	3.11-1
	3.11.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.11-1
	3.11.4	Environmental Consequences	3.11-17
	3.11.5	References.....	3.11-29
3.12		Tribal Trust	3.12-1
	3.12.1	Area of Analysis	3.12-2
	3.12.2	Regulatory Framework	3.12-2

3.12.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.12-2
3.12.4	References.....	3.12-47
3.13	Cultural and Historic Resources	3.13-1
3.13.1	Area of Analysis	3.13-1
3.13.2	Regulatory Framework	3.13.1
3.13.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.13-8
3.13.4	Environmental Consequences.....	3.13-26
3.13.5	References.....	3.13-41
3.14	Land Use, Agricultural and Forest Resources	3.14-1
3.14.1	Area of Analysis	3.14-2
3.14.2	Regulatory Framework	3.14-8
3.14.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.14-9
3.14.4	Environmental Consequences.....	3.14-19
3.14.5	References.....	3.14-31
3.15	Socioeconomics	3.15-1
3.15.1	Area of Analysis	3.15-1
3.15.2	Regulatory Framework	3.15-1
3.15.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.15-3
3.15.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.15-25
3.15.4	References.....	3.15-100
3.16	Environmental Justice.....	3.16-1
3.16.1	Area of Analysis	3.16-1
3.16.2	Regulatory Framework	3.16-1
3.16.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.16-3
3.16.4	Environmental Consequences.....	3.16-23
3.16.5	References.....	3.16-37
3.17	Population and Housing.....	3.17-1
3.17.1	Area of Analysis	3.17-1
3.17.2	Regulatory Framework	3.17-2
3.17.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.17-3
3.17.4	Environmental Consequences.....	3.17-8
3.17.5	References.....	3.17-16
3.18	Public Health and Safety, Utilities and Public Services, Solid Waste, Power.....	3.18-1
3.18.1	Area of Analysis	3.18-1
3.18.2	Regulatory Framework	3.18-3
3.18.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.18-4
3.18.4	Environmental Consequences.....	3.18-14
3.18.5	References.....	3.18-32
3.19	Scenic Quality.....	3.19-1
3.19.1	Area of Analysis	3.19-1
3.19.2	Regulatory Framework	3.19-1
3.19.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.19-2
3.19.4	Environmental Consequences.....	3.19-11
3.19.5	References.....	3.19-37
3.20	Recreation	3.20-1
3.20.1	Area of Analysis	3.20-1

3.20.2	Regulatory Framework	3.20-2
3.20.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.20-2
3.20.4	Environmental Consequences	3.20-34
3.20.5	References.....	3.20-66
3.21	Toxic/Hazardous Materials	3.21-1
3.21.1	Area of Analysis	3.21-1
3.21.2	Regulatory Framework	3.21-1
3.21.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.21-2
3.21.4	Environmental Consequences/Environmental Impacts	3.21-5
3.21.5	References.....	3.21-18
3.22	Traffic and Transportation	3.22-1
3.22.1	Area of Analysis	3.22-1
3.22.2	Regulatory Framework	3.22-1
3.22.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.22-4
3.22.4	Environmental Consequences	3.22-7
3.22.5	References.....	3.22-23
3.23	Noise and Vibration	3.23-1
3.23.1	Area of Analysis	3.23-1
3.23.2	Regulatory Framework	3.23-1
3.23.3	Existing Conditions/Affected Environment.....	3.23-3
3.23.4	Environmental Consequences	3.23-8
3.23.5	Mitigation Measures	3.23-22
3.23.6	References.....	3.23-26
Chapter 4	Cumulative Effects.....	4-1
4.1	Cumulative Effects Overview	4-1
4.1.1	Regulatory Requirements.....	4-1
4.2	Cumulative Effects Methods.....	4-3
4.2.1	Identifying Past, Present, and Future Actions Contributing to Cumulative Effects.....	4-3
4.2.2	Cumulative Effects Area of Analysis	4-5
4.2.3	Timeframe.....	4-8
4.2.4	Mitigation.....	4-8
4.3	Actions and Projects Considered in Cumulative Effects Analysis	4-9
4.3.1	Documents Reviewed	4-9
4.3.2	Cumulative Projects	4-21
4.4	Cumulative Effects Analysis.....	4-27
4.4.1	Water Quality.....	4-28
4.4.2	Aquatic Resources	4-54
4.4.3	Algae	4-89
4.4.4	Terrestrial Resources	4-95
4.4.5	Flood Hydrology	4-106
4.4.6	Groundwater	4-111
4.4.7	Water Supply/Water Rights	4-116
4.4.8	Air Quality	4-124
4.4.9	Greenhouse Gases/Global Climate Change	4-131

4.4.10	Geology, Soils and Geologic Hazards	4-137
4.4.11	Tribal Trust	4-143
4.4.12	Cultural and Historic Resources	4-145
4.4.13	Land Use, Agricultural and Forest Resources	4-151
4.4.14	Socioeconomics	4-156
4.4.15	Environmental Justice	4-160
4.4.16	Population and Housing	4-164
4.4.17	Public Health and Safety, Utilities and Public Services, Solid Waste, and Power.....	4-168
4.4.18	Scenic Quality	4-176
4.4.19	Recreation	4-183
4.4.20	Toxic/Hazardous Materials	4-192
4.4.21	Traffic and Transportation	4-195
4.4.22	Noise and Vibration	4-202
4.5	References.....	4-207
Chapter 5	Other Required Disclosures.....	5-1
5.1	Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitment of Resources.....	5-1
5.2	Relationship Between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity	5-2
5.2.1	Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement	5-2
5.2.2	Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement	5-4
5.2.3	Keno Transfer	5-5
5.2.4	East and West Side Facilities	5-6
5.3	Growth Inducing Impacts	5-6
5.4	Summary of Environmental Impacts	5-7
5.5	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-99
5.5.1	Water Quality	5-99
5.5.2	Aquatic Resources	5-100
5.5.3	Algae	5-100
5.5.4	Air Quality	5-100
5.5.5	Green House Gases/Global Climate Change	5-101
5.5.6	Cultural and Historic Resources	5-101
5.5.7	Socioeconomics	5-102
5.5.8	Environmental Justice.....	5-104
5.5.9	Scenic Quality.....	5-104
5.5.10	Recreation	5-106
5.5.11	Noise and Vibration	5-106
5.6	Environmentally Preferable/Superior Alternative	5-106
5.7	Controversies and Issues Raised by Agencies and the Public	5-108
5.8	References.....	5-110
Chapter 6	Compliance with Applicable Laws, Policies, and Plans	6-1
6.1	Related Laws, Rules, Regulations, Executive Orders, and Other Authorities.....	6-1
6.2	References.....	6-10

Chapter 7	Consultation and Coordination, Document Availability, and Distribution List.....	7-1
7.1	Public Involvement	7-1
7.1.1	Public Scoping	7-1
7.2	Agency Coordination	7-1
7.2.1	Cooperating Agencies	7-2
7.2.2	Reviewing Agencies	7-5
7.3	Government-to-Government Consultation	7-5
7.4	Non-Government Organization Coordination	7-6
7.4.1	Stakeholder Briefings and Technical Workshops.....	7-6
7.4.2	Briefings on Request.....	7-7
7.5	Endangered Species Act Consultation	7-8
7.6	Consultation under the Magnuson-Stevens Act.....	7-8
7.7	Consultation Pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA.....	7-9
7.8	Environmental Justice – E.O. 12898.....	7-10
7.9	Document Availability.....	7-11
7.9.1	Libraries and Federal and State Agencies.....	7-12
7.9.2	Website	7-13
7.10	Distribution List.....	7-13
7.10.1	Elected Officials, Representatives and Government Agencies.....	7-13
7.10.2	Businesses, Organizations, and Individual Members of the Public.....	7-15
7.11	References.....	7-16
Chapter 8	List of Preparers and Contributors.....	8-1
Chapter 9	Glossary	9-1

Tables

Table ES-1.	Hydroelectric Dams (Four Facilities) on the Mainstem Klamath River....	ES-14
Table ES-2.	KBRA Program Summary	ES-23
Table ES-3.	Timetable for Fish Passage Improvements at each Dam from Date of FERC License Renewal	ES-25
Table ES-4.	Summary of Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	ES-28
Table ES-5.	Summary of Adverse Environmental Effects Related to NEPA	ES-37
Table ES-6.	Summary of Major Long-Term Benefits for Salmonid Restoration and Water Quality	ES-44
Table ES-7.	Summary of Controversies and Issues Raised by Agencies and the Public	ES-47
Table 1-1.	Linkage of KBRA Programs, Plans, Commitments to Dam Removal	1-26
Table 1-2.	Cooperating Agencies	1-29
Table 2-1.	Location of CEQA Guidelines Section 15124 Project Description Components	2-2
Table 2-2.	Initial Alternatives	2-4
Table 2-3.	Alternatives Selected for Analysis in EIS/EIR	2-7
Table 2-4.	Dam and Powerhouse Components	2-7
Table 2-5.	Power Generation Facilities	2-8
Table 2-6.	Interim Measures included in the No Action/No Project Alternative.....	2-15
Table 2-7.	Status of TMDLs in the Klamath River Basin.....	2-18
Table 2-8.	Sediment Stored In Reservoirs	2-20
Table 2-9.	KHSA Interim Measures that would not produce Environmental Effects	2-21
Table 2-10.	KHSA Interim Measures Analyzed in the Proposed Action	2-22
Table 2-11.	Drawdown Plans for J.C. Boyle, Copco 1, and Iron Gate Reservoirs	2-31
Table 2-12.	Workforce Projections for the Proposed Action.....	2-32
Table 2-13.	Recreation Facilities under the Proposed Action.....	2-35
Table 2-14.	Non-Federal Parties to the KBRA	2-39
Table 2-15.	Summary of KBRA Programs	2-40
Table 2-16.	KBRA Fisheries Restoration Projects.....	2-43
Table 2-17.	KBRA Fisheries Reintroduction Projects	2-45
Table 2-18.	KBRA Fisheries Monitoring Projects.....	2-46
Table 2-19.	Reclamation’s Klamath Project Diversion Limitations per KBRA Appendix E-1	2-50
Table 2-20.	KBRA Environmental Water Management Projects	2-59
Table 2-21.	Summary of Features to be Removed or Retained with Alternative 3	2-62
Table 2-22.	Estimated Construction Workforce for Partial Removal at each Facility....	2-69
Table 2-23.	Minimum Structure Footprint and Dimensions for Fish Ladders at Each Dam.....	2-72
Table 2-24.	Fish Passage Improvements under the Fish Passage at Four Dams Alternative	2-73

Table 2-25.	Estimated Minimum Amount of Reinforced Concrete Necessary for Fish Ladder at Each Dam.....	2-74
Table 2-26.	Timetable for Fish Passage Improvements at each Dam from Date of FERC License Renewal	2-82
Table 2-27.	Estimated Average Construction Workforce for Fish Passage at Four Dams	2-83
Table 2-28.	Estimated Construction Workforce for Full Removal of Iron Gate and Copco 1 Dams with Fish Passage at Copco 2 and J.C. Boyle Dams	2-85
Table 2-29.	Recreation Facility Changes under the Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate Alternative	2-86
Table 3.1-1.	KBRA Plans and Programs Analyzed	3.1-5
Table 3.2-1.	Location of Klamath River Basin Features Relevant to the Water Quality Area of Analysis.	3.2-2
Table 3.2-2.	Designated Beneficial Uses of Water in the Area of Analysis.	3.2-4
Table 3.2-3.	Oregon Surface-Water Quality Objectives Relevant to the Proposed Action and Alternatives	3.2-7
Table 3.2-4.	California Surface-Water Quality Objectives.....	3.2-9
Table 3.2-5.	Minimum DO Concentrations Based on Percent Saturation Criteria	3.2-11
Table 3.2-6.	Hoopa Valley Tribe Surface-Water Quality Objectives	3.2-12
Table 3.2-7.	California Marine Water Quality Objectives Relevant to the Proposed Action and Alternatives	3.2-13
Table 3.2-8.	Water Quality Impaired Water Bodies within the Area of Analysis	3.2-14
Table 3.2-9.	Status of TMDLs in the Klamath Basin.....	3.2-15
Table 3.2-10.	Summary of Water Quality Criteria or Targets for Toxicogenic Blue-Green Algae and Algal Toxins in the Area of Analysis	3.2-45
Table 3.2-11.	Summary of Model Predictions for SSCs in the Klamath River Downstream of Iron Gate Dam for the Proposed Action	3.2-92
Table 3.2-12.	Estimated Short-term Immediate Oxygen Demand (IOD) and Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) by Month for Modeled Flow and SSCs Immediately Downstream of Iron Gate Dam Under the Proposed Action.....	3.2-107
Table 3.2-13.	Estimated Location of Minimum Dissolved Oxygen and Location at which Dissolved Oxygen Would Return to 5 mg/L Downstream of Iron Gate Dam Due to High Short-term SSCs Under the Proposed Action.....	3.2-108
Table 3.2-14.	Summary of Short-Term (<2 years) and Long-Term (2–50 years) Water Quality Impacts	3.2-149
Table 3.3-1.	Declines in Klamath River Anadromous Fish	3.3-5
Table 3.3-2.	Estimated Volume of Sediment Currently Stored within Hydroelectric Reach Reservoirs	3.3-31
Table 3.3-3.	<i>C. shasta</i> Genotypes in the Klamath Basin.....	3.3-38
Table 3.3-4.	2010 Biological Opinion Proposed Flows and Lake Elevations	3.3-43
Table 3.3-5.	Proposed Action, Most-Likely Scenario SSCs Compared With Normal Existing Conditions (50% Exceedance Probabilities) and Proposed Action, Worst-Case Scenario Compared with Extreme Existing	

	Conditions (10% Exceedance Probabilities) For Fall- Run Chinook Salmon	3.3-98
Table 3.3-6.	Proposed Action, Most-Likely Scenario SSCs Compared With Normal Existing Conditions (50% Exceedance Probabilities) and Proposed Action, Worst-Case Scenario SSCs Compared with Extreme Existing Conditions (10% Exceedance Probabilities) For Spring-Run Chinook Salmon.....	3.3-104
Table 3.3-7.	Proposed Action, Most-Likely Scenario SSCs Compared With Normal Existing Conditions (50% Exceedance Probabilities) and Proposed Action, Worst-Case Scenario SSCs Compared with Extreme Existing Conditions (10% Exceedance Probabilities) For Coho Salmon	3.3-108
Table 3.3-8.	Proposed Action, Most-Likely Scenario SSCs Compared With Normal Existing Conditions (50% Exceedance Probabilities) and Proposed Action, Worst-Case Scenario SSCs Compared with Extreme Existing Conditions (10% Exceedance Probabilities) For Summer and Winter Steelhead	3.3-114
Table 3.3-9.	Proposed Action, Most-Likely Scenario SSCs Compared With Normal Existing Conditions (50% Exceedance Probabilities) and Proposed Action, Worst-Case Scenario Compared with Extreme Existing Conditions (10% Exceedance Probabilities) For Pacific Lamprey.....	3.3-122
Table 3.3-10	Proposed Action, Most-Likely Scenario SSCs Compared With Normal Existing Conditions (50% Exceedance Probabilities) and Proposed Action, Worst-Case Scenario Compared with Extreme Existing Conditions (10% Exceedance Probabilities) For Green Sturgeon.....	3.3-125
Table 3.3-11.	Comparison of Short-term SCC Effects from the Proposed Action with and without Mitigation Measures; most-likely scenario (i.e. 50% Exceedance Probabilities) for Fall- and Spring-Chinook and Coho Salmon	3.3-203
Table 3.3-12.	Comparison of Short-term SCC Effects from the Proposed Action with and without Mitigation Measures; most-likely scenario (i.e. 50% Exceedance Probabilities) for Steelhead and Pacific Lamprey	3.3-206
Table 3.3-13.	Comparison of Short-term SCC Effects from the Proposed Action with and without Mitigation Measures; most-likely scenario (i.e. 50% Exceedance Probabilities) for Green Sturgeon and Suckers.....	3.3-209
Table 3.3-14.	Comparison of Short-term SCC Effects from the Proposed Action with and without Mitigation Measure AR-8 for Freshwater Mussels	3.3-210
Table 3.3-15.	Comparison of Short-term SCC Effects from the Proposed Action with and without Mitigation Measures; worst-case scenario (10% Exceedance Probabilities) for Fall- and Spring-Chinook Salmon.....	3.3-211
Table 3.3-16.	Comparison of Short-term SCC Effects from the Proposed Action with and without Mitigation Measures; worst-case scenario (10% Exceedance Probabilities) for Coho Salmon and Steelhead	3.3-213
Table 3.3-17.	Comparison of Short-term SCC Effects from the Proposed Action with and without Mitigation Measures; worst-case scenario (10%	

	Exceedance Probabilities) for Pacific Lamprey, Green Sturgeon, and Suckers.....	3.3-215
Table 3.3-18.	Comparison of Short-term SCC Effects from the Proposed Action with and without Mitigation Measures; worst-case scenario (10% Exceedance Probabilities) for Freshwater Mussels	3.3-218
Table 3.4-1.	Summary of Algae Impacts	3.4-24
Table 3.5-1.	River Reaches in the PacifiCorp Study.....	3.5-4
Table 3.5-2.	Distribution of Vegetation Cover Types Mapped in 2002 in the PacifiCorp Study.....	3.5-9
Table 3.5-3.	Sub-Classification of Vegetation Cover Types Mapped in 2002 in the PacifiCorp Study Area	3.5-10
Table 3.5-4.	Special-Status Species Known to Occur in the Project Area	3.5-23
Table 3.5-5.	No Surface-Disturbing Activity Spatial Buffers and Seasonal Timing Restriction Stipulations for Raptor Nests	3.5-75
Table 3.6-1.	Biological Opinion Requirements for Iron Gate Dam Releases (cfs).....	3.6-9
Table 3.6-2.	USGS Gages on the Klamath River.....	3.6-14
Table 3.6-3.	Historic Monthly Average Flows (cfs) in Wetter Years (10% Exceedance Level) during Water Years 1961-2009 on the Klamath River.....	3.6-15
Table 3.6-4.	Annual and Seasonal Daily Flows	3.6-16
Table 3.6-5.	Flood Frequency Analysis on Klamath River for 10-yr to 100-yr Floods based upon Full Period of Record of Each Gage	3.6-17
Table 3.6-6.	Modeled Average Monthly Flows (cfs) in Wetter Years (10% Exceedance Level) on the Klamath River under the No Action/No Project Alternative	3.6-21
Table 3.6-7.	No Action/No Project Alternative Resource Management Actions Affecting Flood Hydrology on the Klamath River	3.6-22
Table 3.6-8.	Flood Flow Exceedance: Modeled Wet Water Year Flows on the Klamath River under the Proposed Action	3.6-27
Table 3.6-9.	Flood Attenuation of Iron Gate and Copco 1 Reservoirs	3.6-30
Table 3.7-1.	Well Construction Information for Wells within 2.5 Miles of J.C. Boyle Reservoir	3.7-10
Table 3.8-1.	Upper Klamath Basin Hydrologic Sub-Basins	3.8-6
Table 3.9-1.	Federal Attainment Status of the Study Area	3.9-4
Table 3.9-2.	California Air Quality Attainment Status for the Study Area.....	3.9-7
Table 3.9-3.	Uncontrolled Emissions Inventories for the Proposed Action	3.9-12
Table 3.9-4.	Uncontrolled Emissions Inventories for the Partial Facilities Removal Alternative.....	3.9-19
Table 3.9-5.	Uncontrolled Emissions Inventories for the Fish Passage at Four Dams Alternative.....	3.9-21
Table 3.9-6.	Uncontrolled Emissions Inventories for the Fish Passage at Two Dams, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate Alternative	3.9-23
Table 3.9-7.	Summary of Mitigated Emissions by Alternative.....	3.9-26
Table 3.10-1.	Projected Changes in Air Temperature under Existing Conditions.....	3.10-4
Table 3.10-2.	Projected Seasonal Changes in Precipitation.....	3.10-6

Table 3.10-3.	Representative Carbon Sequestration Rates and Saturation Periods for Key Agricultural and Forestry Practices.....	3.10-17
Table 3.10-4.	Uncontrolled Direct GHG Emissions Inventories for Proposed Action – Full Facilities Removal.....	3.10-22
Table 3.10-5.	Electricity Generation GHG Emissions from Replacement Sources after Removal of Four Dams (Existing Resource Mix).....	3.10-28
Table 3.10-6.	Electricity Generation GHG Emissions from Replacement Sources after Removal of Four Dams (33 Percent RPS).....	3.10-29
Table 3.10-7.	Adjusted Power Replacement Emissions Without Methane Emissions from Reservoirs.....	3.10-30
Table 3.10-8.	Uncontrolled Direct GHG Emissions Inventories for Partial Facilities Removal.....	3.10-33
Table 3.10-9.	Uncontrolled Direct GHG Emissions Inventories for Fish Passage at Four Dams.....	3.10-37
Table 3-10-10.	Electricity Generation GHG Emissions from Replacement Sources after Fish Passage Construction (Current Resource Mix).....	3-10-38
Table 3-10-11.	Electricity Generation Indirect GHG Emissions from Replacement Sources after Fish Passage Construction (33 Percent RPS).....	3-10-38
Table 3-10-12.	Adjusted Power Replacement Emissions With Methane Emissions from Reservoirs.....	3-10-39
Table 3-10-13.	Uncontrolled Direct GHG Emissions Inventories for Fish Passage at Two Dams, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate.....	3-10-41
Table 3.10-14.	Electricity Generation GHG Emissions from Replacement Sources after Removal of Two Dams (Current Resource Mix).....	3.10-42
Table 3.10-15.	Electricity Generation GHG Emissions from Replacement Sources after Removal of Two Dams (33 Percent RPS).....	3.10-43
Table 3.10-16.	Adjusted Power Replacement Emissions With Methane Emissions from Reservoirs.....	3-10.43
Table 3.10-17.	Impact Summary Table (Without Methane Generation from Reservoirs).....	3.10-45
Table 3.10-18.	Impact Summary Table (With Methane Generation from Reservoirs) ..	3.10-45
Table 3.11-1.	Cumulative Annual Sediment Delivery to the Klamath River.....	3.11-10
Table 3.11-2.	Physical Properties of Reservoir Sediment.....	3.11-11
Table 3.11-3.	Estimated Future Sediment Volume in Reservoirs under the No Action/No Project Alternative.....	3.11-18
Table 3.11-4.	Estimated Particle Sizes that would be Suspended at Average and Maximum Daily Discharge Rates.....	3.11-21
Table 3.11-5.	Comparison of Wet and Dry Reservoir Samples.....	3.11-23
Table 3.12-1.	Effects of Current Dam Operations on Klamath Tribes Trust Resources and Rights.....	3.12-9
Table 3.12-2.	Effects of Current Dam Operations on Resources Traditionally Used by the Karuk Tribe.....	3.12-20
Table 3.12-3.	Effects of Current Dam Operations on Hoopa Valley Indian Tribe Trust Resources and Rights.....	3.12-30
Table 3.12-4.	Effects of Current Dam Operations on Yurok Tribe Trust Resources and Rights.....	3.12-40

Table 3.12-5.	Effects of Current Dam Operations on Trust Resources and Rights and Resources Traditionally Used by the Resighini Rancheria.....	3.12-44
Table 3.13-1.	Klamath Hydroelectric Facilities Historic District National Register Eligibility Recommendation	3.13-25
Table 3.14-1.	Kuchel Act Lands in Reclamation’s Klamath Project, 2009	3.14-6
Table 3.14-2.	2009 Irrigable Lands in Reclamation’s Klamath Project by State.....	3.14-16
Table 3.14-3.	Klamath County Agricultural Land	3.14-18
Table 3.14-4.	Acres of Agricultural Land in Siskiyou and Modoc Counties	3-14-19
Table 3.15-1.	Summary of the 2009 Regional Economy for Klamath and Siskiyou Counties	3.15-4
Table 3.15-2.	Summary of the Regional Economy for San Francisco Management Area (San Mateo, San Francisco, Marin, and Sonoma Counties, CA)..	3.15-7
Table 3.15-3.	Summary of the Regional Economy for the Fort Bragg Management Area (Mendocino County, CA).....	3.15-7
Table 3.15-4.	Summary of the 2009 Regional Economy for the KMZ-CA (Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, CA).....	3.15-8
Table 3.15-5.	Summary of the 2009 Regional Economy for the KMZ-OR (Curry County, OR).....	3.15-8
Table 3.15-6.	Summary of the Regional Economy for the Central Oregon Management Area (Coos, Douglas, and Lane Counties OR)	3.15-9
Table 3.15-7.	Landings of Troll-Caught Chinook Salmon and Coho Salmon (# fish), 1981-2010, by Management Area.....	3.15-9
Table 3.15-8.	Landings of Troll-Caught Chinook Salmon and Coho Salmon (1000s of pounds dressed weight), 1981-2010, by Management Area	3.15-10
Table 3.15-9.	Ex-vessel Value of Troll-Caught Chinook Salmon and Coho Salmon (\$1000s, Base Year=2012), 1981-2010, by Management Area.....	3.15-10
Table 3.15-10.	Ocean Sport Salmon Effort (# angler days) during 1981-2010, by Management Area.....	3.15-13
Table 3.15-11.	Ocean Sport Chinook and Coho Landings (# fish) during 1981-2010, by Management Area.....	3.15-13
Table 3.15-12.	Summary of the Regional Economy for Del Norte, Humboldt and Siskiyou Counties in California and Klamath County, OR	3.15-14
Table 3.15-13.	Summary of the 2009 Regional Economy for Klamath, Jackson, Humboldt, and Siskiyou Counties	3.15-15
Table 3.15-14.	Commercially Guided Whitewater Boating Trips on Upper Klamath River from 2001 to 2009.....	3.15-16
Table 3.15-15.	Commercially Guided Whitewater Boating Trips on Lower Klamath River from 2000 to 2009.....	3.15-17
Table 3.15-16.	Whitewater Boating User Days on the Klamath River from 1994 to 2009.....	3.15-17
Table 3.15-17.	Income, Poverty and Unemployment for Affected Federally Recognized Tribes	3.15-18
Table 3.15-18.	Yurok and Hoopa Valley Reservation Indian Tribes Gillnet Chinook Salmon Spring and Fall Run Harvest (# fish) from 1981 to 2010.....	3.15-19
Table 3.15-19.	Siskiyou County Average Tax Revenues from 2000 to 2010.....	3.15-21

Table 3.15-20.	Siskiyou County Annual Tax Amount Received from PacifiCorp from 2000 to 2011	3.15-22
Table 3.15-21.	Summary of the 2009 Regional Economy for Klamath, Modoc, and Siskiyou Counties	3.15-23
Table 3.15-22.	Crop Acreage Summary for Irrigated Agriculture in Reclamation’s Klamath Project Lands.....	3.15-24
Table 3.15-23.	Representative Crop Prices from 2005 to 2009	3.15-25
Table 3.15-24.	Average Gross Farm Revenue Generated on Reclamation’s Klamath Project Lands from 2005 to 2009.....	3.15-25
Table 3.15-25.	Expenditures per User Day for Whitewater Boating on the Klamath River.....	3.15-36
Table 3.15-26.	Daily Expenditures per Person for Hunting and Wildlife Viewing.....	3.15-40
Table 3.15-27.	Regional Economic Effects from Annual O&M Expenditures for the No Action/No Project Alternative	3.15-40
Table 3.15-28.	Annual Ex-Vessel Revenue for Management Areas for the No Action/No Project Alternative	3.15-41
Table 3.15-29.	Regional Economic Total Effects from Ocean Commercial Fishing under No Action/No Project Alternative	3.15-41
Table 3.15-30.	Regional Economic Effects from Reservoir Recreation for the No Action/No Project Alternative	3.15-43
Table 3.15-31.	Regional Economic Effects from In-river Salmon Fishing for the No Action/No Project Alternative	3.15-42
Table 3.15-32.	Regional Economic Effects from In-river Steelhead fishing for the No Action/No Project Alternative	3.15-43
Table 3.15-33.	Total Annual Recreational Salmon Effort, Nonresident Effort and Nonresident Expenditures for the No Action/No Project Alternative .	3.15-44
Table 3.15-34.	Regional Economic Effects from Ocean Sport Salmon Fishing for the No Action/No Project Alternative	3.15-44
Table 3.15-35.	Regional Economic Effects from Whitewater Recreation for the No Action/No Project Alternative	3.15-45
Table 3.15-36.	Total Economic Effects over a 15 year period of In-Region Spending for Ongoing Restoration Actions under the No Action/No Project Alternative.....	3.15-49
Table 3.15-37.	Gross Farm Revenue for the No Action/No Project Alternative during Drought Years.....	3.15-50
Table 3.15-38.	Regional Economic Effects from Irrigated Agriculture for the No Action/No Project Alternative during Drought Years	3.15-51
Table 3.15-39.	Regional Economic Effects from Refuge Hunting for the No Action/No Project Alternative	3.15-52
Table 3.15-40.	Total Economic Effects over a 15 year period of In-Region Spending for Tribal Program under the No Action/No Project Alternative	3.15-52
Table 3.15-41.	Regional Economic Effects from Dam Decommissioning for Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-53
Table 3.15-42.	Regional Economic Effects from O&M Expenditures between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-54

Table 3.15-43.	Mitigation Costs by Facility and Year (2012 \$) for Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-55
Table 3.15-44.	Regional Economic Effects from Mitigation Expenditures for Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-55
Table 3.15-45.	Annual Ex-vessel Revenue for Management Areas	3.15-56
Table 3.15-46.	Regional Economic Effects from Ocean Commercial Fishing between the No Action Alternative and Alternative 2, the Proposed Action	3.15-57
Table 3.15-47.	Regional Economic Effects from Reservoir Recreation between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-58
Table 3.15-48.	Total Annual Recreational Salmon Effort, Nonresident Effort and Nonresident Expenditures by Fishing Mode and Management Area for Alternative 2, the Proposed Action	3.15-58
Table 3.15-49.	Regional Economic Effects from Ocean Sport Salmon Fishing between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-59
Table 3.15-50.	Regional Economic Effects from In-river Salmon Fishing between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-60
Table 3.15-51.	Regional Economic Effects from Whitewater Recreation between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-61
Table 3.15-52.	Potentially Affected and Affected Parcels by Land Use in Siskiyou County.....	3.15-64
Table 3.15-53.	Regional Economic Effects of KBRA Fishery Program Actions Relative to No Action/No Project Alternative over a 15-year period ..	3.15-67
Table 3.15-54.	Regional Economic Effects of KBRA Water Resources Program Actions Relative to No Action/No Project Alternative over a 15-year period	3.15-70
Table 3.15-55.	Gross Farm Revenue by IMPLAN crop sectors between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative 2, the Proposed Action for Drought Years	3.15-72
Table 3.15-56.	Regional Economic Effects from Gross Farm Revenue between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-72
Table 3.15-57.	Regional Economic Effects from Increased Pumping Costs between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-73
Table 3.15-58.	Regional Economic Effects from Lost Agricultural Production for the WURP	3.15-74
Table 3.15-59.	Regional Economic Effects from Refuge Recreation between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative 2, the Proposed Action.....	3.15-75
Table 3.15-60.	Regional Economic Effects of KBRA Regulatory Assurance Actions Relative to No Action/No Project Alternative over a 15-year period..	3.15-76

Table 3.15-61.	Regional Economic Effects of KBRA Tribal Program Actions Relative to No Action/No Project Alternative over a 15-year period	3.15-79
Table 3.15-62.	Regional Economic Effects from Dam Decommissioning for Alternative 3.....	3.15-80
Table 3.15-63.	Regional Economic Effects from O&M Expenditures between the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative 3.....	3.15-81
Table 3.15.64.	Mitigation Costs by Facility Year (2012 \$) for Alternative 3	3.15-81
Table 3.15-65.	Summary of Regional Economic Effects for Each Alternative	3.15-89
Table 3.15-66.	Summary of Regional Economic Effects over 15 Years of Ongoing Restoration Activities and KBRA Implementation	3.15-96
Table 3.15-67.	Positive Effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives	3.15-99
Table 3.16-1.	Population, Race, and Ethnicity, 2005-2009 American Community Survey	3.16-3
Table 3.16-2.	Tribal Enrollment within the Area of Analysis, 2005.....	3.16-4
Table 3.16-3.	Income and Poverty, 1999	3.16-5
Table 3.16-4.	Poverty in Siskiyou County	3.16-5
Table 3.16-5.	Income and Poverty in Tribes, 1999	3.16-6
Table 3.16-6.	Housing and Employment.....	3.16-6
Table 3.16-7.	Housing, Labor, and Employment, 2005	3.16-7
Table 3.16-8.	Employment and Labor Force, 2005-2009, American Community Survey	3.16-7
Table 3.16-9.	Federal Funds Distribution for Social Programs, 2010	3.16-8
Table 3.16-10.	Local Funds Distributed for Government Services, 2010	3.16-9
Table 3.16-11.	Beneficial Effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives	3.16-37
Table 3.17-1.	Cities Included for Analysis.....	3.17-2
Table 3.17-2.	Klamath Falls and County Housing Estimates	3.17-4
Table 3.17-3.	Medford and Jackson County Housing Estimates	3.17-5
Table 3.17-4.	Siskiyou County Housing Estimates.....	3.17-6
Table 3.17-5.	Unincorporated Areas Housing Estimates	3.17-8
Table 3.17-6.	Approximate Commute Distances	3.17-9
Table 3.18-1.	Area of Analysis for Utilities and Public Services	3.18-3
Table 3.18-2.	Utilities and Public Services in the Study Area	3.18-9
Table 3.18-3.	Regional Landfills and Recycling Centers and Type of Waste Accepted	3.18-11
Table 3.18-4.	Klamath Hydroelectric Project Facilities.....	3.18-13
Table 3.18-5.	Summary of Solid Waste Generation for Each Action Alternative	3.18-22
Table 3.19-1.	Visual Resource Inventory Matrix.....	3.19-6
Table 3.19-2.	Summary of Features that Would Be Removed under the Proposed Action Alternative and that would be Retained under the Partial Facilities Removal Alternative	3.19-28
Table 3.19-3.	Minimum Structure Footprint for Fish Ladders under the Fishway Alternatives	3.19-33
Table 3.20-1.	Public Lands Offering Recreational Opportunities in the Vicinity of the Klamath River	3.20-5
Table 3.20-2.	Rivers Providing Recreational Fishing Opportunities in the Region.....	3.20-7
Table 3.20-3.	Rivers with Whitewater Boating Opportunities in the Region	3.20-7

Table 3.20-4.	Comparison of Subject Reservoirs with Lakes and Reservoirs in the Region	3.20-8
Table 3.20-5.	Keno Impoundment/Lake Ewauna Developed Recreation Facilities	3.20-11
Table 3.20-6.	Acceptable Flow Ranges for Various River-Based Activities for Reaches of the Klamath River	3.20-13
Table 3.20-7.	J.C. Boyle Reservoir Developed Recreation Facilities	3.20-17
Table 3.20-8.	Hell's Corner Reach Developed Recreation Facilities	3.20-18
Table 3.20-9.	Copco 1 Reservoir Developed Recreation Facilities	3.20-18
Table 3.20-10.	Iron Gate Reservoir Developed Recreation Facilities	3.20-19
Table 3.20-11.	River-Based Recreation Opportunities below Iron Gate Dam	3.20-23
Table 3.20-12.	Estimated Number of Recreational Salmon Angler Days and Chinook Harvest on the Klamath River (excluding the Trinity River),	3.20-26
Table 3.20-13.	Estimated Number of Recreational Steelhead Angler Days on the Klamath River (excluding the Trinity River).....	3.20-26
Table 3.20-14.	Comparison of 1981 Flows to the Acceptable Range for Whitewater Boating and Fishing	3.20-31
Table 3.20-15.	Estimated Abundance of Fish Species at the 1981 WSR Designation ...	3.20-33
Table 3.20-16.	Estimated Number of Days Meeting the Range of Acceptable Flows for Recreational Activities on the Klamath River.....	3.20-41
Table 3.20-17.	Beneficial Effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives	3.20-63
Table 3.22-1.	Local and Regional Access Roads Relative to KHSA.....	3.22-2
Table 3.22-2.	Traffic Flow Projections	3.22-12
Table 3.23-1.	Maximum Allowable Noise Levels from Construction Equipment in Siskiyou County, CA	3.23-2
Table 3.23 2.	Existing Noise Levels at Residential Receptors Near Construction Sites.....	3.23-7
Table 3.23-3.	Existing Peak Hour L_{eq} Along Proposed Haul and Commute Routes	3.23-8
Table 3.23-4.	Construction Operations, Equipment Types, and Their Noise Levels.....	3.23-9
Table 3.23-5.	Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment.....	3.23-10
Table 3.23-6.	Summary of Noise Levels from Deconstruction Activities for the Proposed Action.....	3.23-13
Table 3.23-7.	Summary of Vibration from Construction Activities for the Proposed Action.....	3.23-15
Table 3.23-8.	Summary of Construction-Related Traffic Noise from Off-site Hauling and Construction Worker Commute for the Proposed Action.....	3.23-15
Table 3.23-9.	Summary of Noise Levels from Construction Activities for the Fish Passage at Four Dams Alternative	3.23-18
Table 3.23-10.	Summary of Vibration Levels at Receptors from Construction Activities for the Fish Passage at Four Dams Alternative	3.23-19
Table 3.23-11.	Summary of Construction-Related Traffic Noise from Off-site Hauling for the Fish Passage at Four Dams Alternative.....	3.23-20
Table 3.23-12.	Summary of Construction-Related Traffic Noise from Off-site Hauling for the Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2, Remove Copco 1 and Iron Gate Alternative.....	3.23-22
Table 4-1.	Method for Developing the Cumulative Condition	4-4
Table 4-2.	Cumulative Effects Area of Analysis by Resource.....	4-6

Table 4-3.	Plans, Programs, and Other Documents Considered in Cumulative Effects Analysis	4-10
Table 4-4.	Projects Considered in Cumulative Effects Analysis	4-22
Table 4-5.	Summary of Water Quality Impacts from Chapter 3.....	4-29
Table 4-6.	Summary of Aquatic Resources Impacts from Chapter 3	4-55
Table 4-7.	Summary of Algae Impacts from Chapter 3	4-89
Table 4-8.	Summary of Terrestrial Resources Impacts from Chapter 3	4-96
Table 4-9.	Summary of Flood Hydrology Impacts from Chapter 3.....	4-106
Table 4-10.	Population Projections for the Eight Klamath Basin Counties.....	4-109
Table 4-11.	Summary of Groundwater Impacts from Chapter 3	4-112
Table 4-12.	Summary of Water Rights/Water Supply Impacts from Chapter 3	4-116
Table 4-13.	Summary of Air Quality Impacts from Chapter 3	4-125
Table 4-14.	Summary of Greenhouse Gases/Global Climate Change Impacts from Chapter 3.....	4-132
Table 4-15.	Summary of Geology, Soils and Geologic Hazards Impacts from Chapter 3.....	4-137
Table 4-16.	Summary of Cultural and Historic Resources Impacts from Chapter 3	4-145
Table 4-17.	Summary of Land Use, Agricultural and Forest Resources Impacts from Chapter 3.....	4-152
Table 4-18.	Summary of Population and Housing Impacts from Chapter 3.....	4-165
Table 4-19.	Summary of Public Health and Safety, Utilities and Public Services, Solid Waste, and Power Impacts from Chapter 3.....	4-168
Table 4-20.	Summary of Scenic Quality Impacts from Chapter 3.....	4-177
Table 4-21.	Summary of Recreation Impacts from Chapter 3	4-184
Table 4-22.	Summary of Toxic/Hazardous Materials Impacts from Chapter 3.....	4-192
Table 4-23.	Summary of Traffic and Transportation Impacts from Chapter 3	4-196
Table 4-24.	Summary of Noise and Vibration Impacts from Chapter 3	4-203
Table 5-1.	Summary of Environmental Impacts	5-8
Table 5-2.	Summary of Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	5-75
Table 5-3.	Summary of Environmental Effects Relative to NEPA.....	5-84
Table 5-4.	Wild and Scenic River Resource Effects	5-94
Table 5-5.	Summary of Controversies and Issues Raised by Agencies and the Public	5-108
Table 6-1.	Related Federal Laws, Rules, Regulations, Executive Orders, and Other Authorities	6-1
Table 6-2.	California State Statutes and Regulations.....	6-5
Table 6-3.	Oregon State Statutes and Regulations	6-7
Table 6-4.	Local Plans and Policies	6-8
Table 7-1.	EIS/EIR Participating Agencies	7-2
Table 7-2.	Cooperating Agencies	7-3
Table 7-3.	Cooperating Agency Meeting Updates	7-4
Table 7-4.	Meetings with Potential Cooperating Agencies or Non-Government Groups	7-4
Table 7-5.	Tribal Consultations.....	7-6
Table 7-6.	Stakeholder Briefings and Technical Workshops.....	7-7
Table 7-7.	Libraries with Draft EIS/EIR Available	7-12

Table 7-8. Federal and State Agencies with Draft EIS/EIR Available 7-13
Table 7-9. EIS/EIR Distribution List 7-14

Figures

Figure ES-1.	The Klamath Basin	ES-6
Figure ES-2.	Klamath Basin Timeline	ES-8
Figure ES-3.	J.C. Boyle Dam and Powerhouse	ES-15
Figure ES-4.	Copco 1 Dam and Powerhouse	ES-15
Figure ES-5.	Copco 2 Powerhouse and Dam	ES-16
Figure ES-6.	Iron Gate Dam, Reservoir, and Power Generating Facilities	ES-16
Figure ES-7.	Alternatives Development and Screening Process	ES-30
Figure ES-8.	Simulation of Iron Gate Dam Before and After Full Facilities Removal ..	ES-23
Figure ES-9.	Simulation of Partial Facilities Removal	ES-24
Figure ES-10.	Example of Cast-In-Place Pool and Weir Fish Ladder	ES-25
Figure 1-1.	Klamath Basin.....	1-3
Figure 1-2.	Klamath Basin Timeline Since 1905	1-11
Figure 1-3.	Klamath Basin Expenditures (Sheets 2011)	1-13
Figure 1-4.	Reclamation’s Klamath Project	1-14
Figure 2-1.	Alternatives Development and Screening Process	2-3
Figure 2-2.	J.C. Boyle Dam and Powerhouse.....	2-9
Figure 2-3.	Example Flows in Peaking Reach downstream from J.C. Boyle Powerplant	2-10
Figure 2-4.	Copco 1 Dam and Powerhouse	2-11
Figure 2-5.	Copco 2 Powerhouse and Dam	2-12
Figure 2-6.	Iron Gate Dam, Reservoir, and Power Generating Facilities.....	2-13
Figure 2-7.	No Action/No Project Flows below Iron Gate Dam in Wet, Average, and Dry Years	2-16
Figure 2-8.	Proposed Action Flows at the Iron Gate Gauge in Wet, Average, and Dry Years	2-19
Figure 2-9.	J.C. Boyle Haul Roads and Disposal Sites	2-24
Figure 2-10.	Copco 1 and Copco 2 Haul Roads and Disposal Sites.....	2-28
Figure 2-11.	Iron Gate Haul Roads and Disposal Sites	2-30
Figure 2-12.	Anticipated Schedule for Full Facilities Removal	2-31
Figure 2-13.	On-Project Area	2-49
Figure 2-14.	Key Milestones before Diversion Limits are Implemented.....	2-52
Figure 2-15.	Off Project Irrigation Area.....	2-56
Figure 2-16.	View of J.C. Boyle Dam showing portion of dam and fish ladder to be removed for the Partial Facilities Removal Alternative	2-64
Figure 2-17.	Copco 1 showing portion of dam to be removed for the Partial Facilities Removal Alternative	2-65
Figure 2-18.	Copco 2 dam showing portion of dam to be removed for the Partial Facilities Removal Alternative	2-66
Figure 2-19.	Section view of Iron Gate Dam showing 100-foot-wide bottom notch with different potential side slopes	2-67

Figure 2-20. Iron Gate dam showing portion of dam to be removed for the Partial Facilities Removal Alternative 2-68

Figure 2-21. Anticipated Schedule for Partial Facilities Removal 2-69

Figure 2-22. Example of cast-in-place pool and weir fish ladder..... 2-72

Figure 2-23. Conceptual Layout of J.C. Boyle Fish Passage Facilities..... 2-75

Figure 2-24. Copco 1 Fish Ladder Configuration and Floating Surface Bypass Collector..... 2-77

Figure 2-25. Example of Floating Surface Bypass Collector in Upper Baker Dam, Washington 2-78

Figure 2-26. Copco 2 Fish Ladder and V-screen, along the left side of the river, for power water diversion..... 2-79

Figure 2-27. Modifications at the tailrace of the Copco 2 Powerplant would extend the bank and install a tailrace barrier screen 2-80

Figure 2-28. Conceptual fish passage facilities layout for Iron Gate Dam showing fish ladder, water intake screen, and spillway transition modifications..... 2-81

Figure 2-29. Anticipated schedule for Fish Passage at J.C. Boyle and Copco 2 Dams with Removal of Copco 1 and Iron Gate Dams 2-85

Figure 3.2-1. Water Quality Area of Analysis..... 3.2-3

Figure 3.2-2. Summary of Anticipated Effects of Inorganic and Organic Contaminants in Klamath Reservoir and Estuary Sediments Under the No Action/No Project Alternative and the Proposed Action. This does not include an evaluation of the physical effects (e.g., dissolved oxygen, suspended sediment). (1): Qualitative evaluation conducted for this exposure scenario 3.2-74

Figure 3.2-3. Predicted Water Temperature at the California-Oregon State Line (RM 208.5) for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to the Proposed Action (TOD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario) 3.2-78

Figure 3.2-4. Estimated Changes in Daily Maximum Klamath River Water Temperatures at \approx RM 198 due to the Presence of Copco 1 and 2 Reservoirs for the 2000 Calendar Year. Positive Values Represent an Increase above Modeled Natural Conditions. 3.2-79

Figure 3.2-5. Simulated Hourly Water Temperature Downstream of Iron Gate Dam (RM 190.1) Based on Year 2004 for Existing Conditions Compared to Hypothetical Conditions without J.C. Boyle (JCB), Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate (IG) Dams..... 3.2-81

Figure 3.2-6. Simulated Hourly Water Temperature Immediately Upstream of the Scott River Confluence (RM 143.9) Based on Year 2004 for Existing Conditions Compared to Hypothetical Conditions without J.C. Boyle (JCB), Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate (IG) Dams..... 3.2-81

Figure 3.2-7. Simulated Hourly Water Temperature Downstream of the Salmon River Confluence (\approx RM 66) Based on Year 2004 for Existing Conditions Compared to Hypothetical Conditions without J.C. Boyle (JCB), Copco 1, Copco 2, and Iron Gate (IG) Dams..... 3.2-82

Figure 3.2-8.	Suspended Sediment Concentrations Modeled at J.C. Boyle Reservoir Under the Proposed Action Assuming Typical Dry Hydrology	3.2-85
Figure 3.2-9.	Suspended Sediment Concentrations Modeled at J.C. Boyle Reservoir Under the Proposed Action Assuming Median Hydrology	3.2-85
Figure 3.2-10.	Suspended Sediment Concentrations Modeled at J.C. Boyle Reservoir Under the Proposed Action Assuming Typical Wet Hydrology	3.2-86
Figure 3.2-11.	SSCs Modeled Downstream of Iron Gate Dam Under the Proposed Action Assuming Typical Dry Hydrology.....	3.2-90
Figure 3.2-12.	SSCs Modeled Downstream of Iron Gate Dam Under the Proposed Action Assuming Median Hydrology	3.2-91
Figure 3.2-13.	SSCs Modeled Downstream of Iron Gate Dam Under the Proposed Action Assuming Typical Wet Hydrology	3.2-91
Figure 3.2-14.	Annual predicted sediment delivery to the Pacific Ocean under the Proposed Action and the No Action (background conditions) by Water Year. Note: model results are only valid for the year of dam removal. No significant increase in sediment loads is predicted in years following dam removal.....	3.2-95
Figure 3.2-15.	Comparison of TP and TN Concentrations from Iron Gate Dam to Turwar (RM 5.8) for June–October and July–September 2007–2008: (a) Measured Current Conditions (Red Circle), (b) Dams-Out Estimate using Calculated Percent Retention Rates by Reach (Blue Cross), and (c) Dams-Out Estimate using Percent Retention Rates Predicted by the Empirical Relationship between Reach Inflow Concentration and Retention.....	3.2-102
Figure 3.2-16.	Predicted Dissolved Oxygen Downstream of J.C. Boyle Dam (RM 224.7 to 228.3) for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to the Proposed Action (TOD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario)	3.2-105
Figure 3.2-17.	Predicted Dissolved Oxygen at the Oregon-California State Line (RM 208.5) for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to the Proposed Action (TOD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario)	3.2-105
Figure 3.2-18.	Predicted Dissolved Oxygen Downstream of Iron Gate Dam (RM 190.1) for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to the Proposed Action (TCD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario)	3.2-110
Figure 3.2-19.	Predicted Dissolved Oxygen Downstream of the Mainstem Confluence with the Shasta River (RM 176.7) for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to the Proposed Action (TCD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario).....	3.2-111
Figure 3.2-20.	Predicted Dissolved Oxygen at Seiad Valley (RM 129.4) for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to the Proposed Action (TCD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario).....	3.2-111
Figure 3.2-21.	Predicted Dissolved Oxygen Just Upstream of the Confluence with the Trinity River (RM 42.5) for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to	

the Proposed Action (TCD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario)..... 3.2-112

Figure 3.2-22. Predicted pH Downstream of J.C. Boyle Reservoir (RM 224.7) for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to the Proposed Action (TOD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario)..... 3.2-114

Figure 3.2-23. Predicted pH at the Oregon-California State Line (RM 208.5) for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to the Proposed Action (TOD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario)..... 3.2-114

Figure 3.2-24. Predicted Klamath River pH Immediately Downstream of Iron Gate Dam for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to the Proposed Action (TCD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario) 3.2-116

Figure 3.2-25. Predicted Klamath River pH upstream of the Scott River (RM 143.0) for the Klamath TMDL Scenarios Similar to the Proposed Action (TCD2RN Scenario) and the No Action/No Project Alternative (T4BSRN Scenario)..... 3.2-116

Figure 3.2-26. Simulated Hourly Water Temperature Downstream of Iron Gate Dam (RM 190.1) Based on Year 2004 for Current Conditions Compared to Hypothetical Conditions: (a) without Iron Gate (IG), Copco 1 and 2, and J.C. Boyle (JCB) Dams and (b) without Iron Gate (IG) and Copco 1 and 2 Dams 3.2-139

Figure 3.3-1. Five Study Reaches within the Area of Analysis for the Aquatic Resources Analysis 3.3-2

Figure 3.3-2. Normal conditions (50 Percent Exceedance Probability) SSCs for Three Locations Downstream of Iron Gate Dam under Existing Conditions, as Predicted Using the SRH-1D Model..... 3.3-29

Figure 3.3-3. Extreme conditions (10 Percent Exceedance Probability) SSCs for Three Locations Downstream of Iron Gate Dam under Existing Conditions, as Predicted Using the SRH-1D Model..... 3.3-29

Figure 3.3-4. Mobilization Flow and Return Period at which Sediment Mobilization Occurs (Reclamation 2011) 3.3-33

Figure 3.3-5. Comparison of SSCs under Proposed Action and Existing Conditions at Iron Gate Dam, as Predicted Using SRH-1D Model 3.3-76

Figure 3.3-6. Comparison of SSCs under Proposed Action and Existing Conditions at Orleans, as Predicted Using SRH-1D Model..... 3.3-77

Figure 3.3-7. Comparison of SSCs under Proposed Action and Existing Conditions at Klamath Station, as Predicted Using SRH-1D Model 3.3-78

Figure 3.3-8. Cumulative Sediment Erosion from Dams in the Hydroelectric Reach During 2020 Drawdown Beginning in January 3.3-79

Figure 3.3-9. Reach-Averaged Erosion in the Hydroelectric Reach during Wet Year (Reclamation 2011)..... 3.3-80

Figure 3.3-10. Reach-Averaged D16 and D50 in Copco 1 Reservoir Reach Following Dam Removal (Reclamation 2011) 3.3-81

Figure 3.3-11.	Simulated Bed Composition from Copco 2 to Iron Gate Reservoirs during Two Successive Dry Water Years after Dam Removal	3.3-82
Figure 3.3-12.	Reach Averaged Bed Elevation during Two Successive Wet, Median, or Dry Water Years from Iron Gate Dam to Bogus Creek (Reclamation 2011).....	3.3-83
Figure 3.3-13.	Simulated Bed Composition from Iron Gate Dam to Bogus Creek during Two Successive Dry Water Years Dam Removal.....	3.3-84
Figure 3.3-14.	Simulated D50 (mm) from Iron Gate Dam to Bogus Creek during Successive Wet, Median, and Dry Water Years	3.3-85
Figure 3.5-1.	PacifiCorp Terrestrial Resources Study Area	3.5-2
Figure 3.5-2.	PacifiCorp Terrestrial Resources Study Area	3.5-7
Figure 3.6-1.	Flood Hydrology Affected Area	3.6-2
Figure 3.6-2.	Historical Upper Klamath Basin Hydrology Before Dams, National Wildlife Refuges, and Reclamation’s Klamath Project	3.6-6
Figure 3.6-3.	USGS Stream Gage Locations.....	3.6-14
Figure 3.6-4.	Daily Average Flows at Five USGS Stream Gages on Klamath River	3.6-15
Figure 3.6-5.	Stream Flows Downstream from Iron Gate Dam in Wet, Average, and Dry Years	3.6-16
Figure 3.6-6.	Stream Flows Downstream from J.C. Boyle Dam in Wet, Average, and Dry Years	3.6-17
Figure 3.6-7.	Modeled Flow Exceedances under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Proposed Action Near Keno Dam.....	3.6-28
Figure 3.6-8.	Modeled Flow Exceedances under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Proposed Action Below J.C. Boyle Dam	3.6-28
Figure 3.6-9.	Modeled Flow Exceedances under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Proposed Action Below Iron Gate Dam.....	3.6-29
Figure 3.6-10.	Modeled Flow Exceedances under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Proposed Action Near Seiad Valley.....	3.6-29
Figure 3.6-11.	Modeled Flow Exceedances under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Proposed Action at Orleans.....	3.6-30
Figure 3.7-1.	Generalized Groundwater Potentiometric Surface Contour Map and Groundwater Flow Directions in the Upper Klamath Basin.....	3.7-3
Figure 3.7-2.	Enlarged Portion of the Generalized Groundwater Potentiometric Surface Contour Map and Flow Directions for the Areas Around J.C. Boyle, Copco, and Iron Gate Reservoirs	3.7-4
Figure 3.7-3.	Locatable Wells within 2.5 Miles of J.C. Boyle Reservoir and Cross-Section Locations.....	3.7-9
Figure 3.7-4.	J.C. Boyle Reservoir Cross-Sections J and K.....	3.7-11
Figure 3.7-5.	J.C. Boyle Reservoir Cross-Section L	3.7-12
Figure 3.8-1.	Area of Analysis	3.8-5
Figure 3.8-2.	Schematic of Reclamation’s Klamath Project	3.8-8
Figure 3.8-3.	Flows for different year types under the Proposed Action and No Action Alternatives just downstream from Iron Gate Dam	3.8-15
Figure 3.8-4.	90% Exceedence Flows Near Seiad Valley, Orleans, and Klamath for Dam Removal and No Action Alternatives	3.8-15

Figure 3.8-5.	Annual flows under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Proposed Action.....	3.8-19
Figure 3.9-1.	Area of Analysis for both KHSA and KBRA.....	3.9-2
Figure 3.9-2.	Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5}) NAAQS and CAAQS Designations.....	3.9-5
Figure 3.9-3.	Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5}) and Carbon Monoxide (CO) NAAQS Designations in Oregon.....	3.9-6
Figure 3.9-4.	Ozone (O ₃) NAAQS and CAAQS Designations	3.9-7
Figure 3.9-5.	Federal Class I Areas	3.9-10
Figure 3.10-1.	California GHG Emission Sources (as of 2008).....	3.10-11
Figure 3.10-2.	Oregon GHG Emission Sources (as of 2007).....	3.10-11
Figure 3.10-3.	PacifiCorp Power Control Area Generation Resource Mix	3.10-26
Figure 3.11-1.	Klamath Basin Physiographic Provinces	3.11-3
Figure 3.11-2.	Existing Potential Landslide Areas.....	3.11-14
Figure 3.14-1.	Area of Analysis for the Land Use Effects of the KHSA.....	3.14-3
Figure 3.14-2.	National Wildlife Refuges and Agricultural Designations in and Around the Reclamation's Klamath Project	3.14-4
Figure 3.14-3.	Land Use – Keno Dam.....	3.14-10
Figure 3.14-4.	Land Use – J.C. Boyle Dam.....	3.14-11
Figure 3.14-5.	Upper Klamath Basin Agricultural Resources.....	3.14-12
Figure 3.14-6.	Land Use – Copco 1 and Copco 2 Dams	3.14-13
Figure 3.14-7.	Land Use – Iron Gate Dam	3.14-14
Figure 3.14-8.	Williamson Act Lands in the Project Area	3.14-17
Figure 3.15-1.	Socioeconomic Area of Analysis.....	3.15-2
Figure 3.15-2.	Klamath Management Zone Boundary and Ports.....	3.15-6
Figure 3.16-1.	Tribal Lands Near Haul Routes	3.16-28
Figure 3.17-1.	Population and Housing Area of Analysis.....	3.17-2
Figure 3.17-2.	Census Block Groups.....	3.17-7
Figure 3.18-1.	Area of Analysis	3.18-2
Figure 3.18-2.	Hospitals and Fire Stations near the Project Area	3.18-7
Figure 3.18-3.	Fire Hazard in the Area of Analysis	3.18-8
Figure 3.18-4.	PacifiCorp Service Area	3.18-12
Figure 3.19-1.	Project Area Land Ownership for BLM and USFS	3.19-4
Figure 3.19-2.	Key Observation Points from PacifiCorp (2004) Report.....	3.19-8
Figure 3.19-3.	Historic River Channel for J.C. Boyle Reservoir	3.19-15
Figure 3.19-4.	Historic River Channel at Copco Reservoir.....	3.19-16
Figure 3.19-5.	Historic River Channel at Iron Gate Reservoir.....	3.19-16
Figure 3.19-6.	Iron Gate Dam before removal and a simulation of what the facility could look like after full removal.....	3.19-18
Figure 3.19-7.	Copco 1 Dam before removal and a simulation of what the facility could look like after full removal.....	3.19-19
Figure 3.19-8.	View of Copco 2 Powerhouse and Historic Structure	3.19-20
Figure 3.19-9.	View of J.C. Boyle Powerhouse	3.19-29
Figure 3.19-10.	Example of cast in place pool and weir fish ladder used for fish passage, similar to that proposed for upstream fish passage for all four dams under this alternative.....	3.19-34

Figure 3.19-11. Example of fish ladder built into steep bedrock similar to Copco 1 option	3.19-34
Figure 3.20-1. Regional Recreation Areas	3.20-4
Figure 3.20-2a. Iron Gate Recreation Areas.....	3.20-14
Figure 3.20-2b. Copco Recreation Areas	3.20-15
Figure 3.20-2c. J.C. Boyle Recreation Areas	3.20-16
Figure 3.20-3. Klamath Wild and Scenic River Corridor.....	3.20-27
Figure 3.20-4. Comparison of Available Recreation Flows - Keno Reach	3.20-42
Figure 3.20-5. Comparison of Available Recreation Flows - JC Boyle Bypass Reach .	3.20-42
Figure 3.20-6. Comparison of Available Recreation Flows - Hells Corner Reach	3.20-43
Figure 3.20-7. Comparison of Available Recreation Flows - Copco 2 Bypass Reach...	3.20-43
Figure 3.20-8. Comparison of Available Recreation Flows - Iron Gate to Scott River Reach.....	3.20-44
Figure 3.20-9. Comparison of Available Recreation Flows - Scott River to Salmon River Reach.....	3.20-44
Figure 3.20-10. Comparison of Available Recreation Flows - Salmon River to Trinity River Reach.....	3.20-45
Figure 3.20-11. Comparison of Available Recreation Flows - Trinity River to Ocean Reach.....	3.20-45
Figure 3.21-1. School Sites in the Project Area.....	3.21-6
Figure 3.21-2. HTRW Sites, Keno Dam and Reservoir	3.21-7
Figure 3.21-3. HTRW Sites, Iron Gate and Copco Dams and Reservoirs	3.21-8
Figure 3.21-4. HTRW Sites, J.C. Boyle Dam and Reservoir	3-21-9
Figure 3.22-1. Regional Access Routes Relative to the KHSA	3.22-2
Figure 3.22-2. Copco Road (north of river, facing west)	3.22-5
Figure 3.22-3. Access Bridge at J.C. Boyle Dam.....	3.22-6
Figure 3.22-4. Bridge Accessing Lakeview Road (looking south)	3.22-6
Figure 3.23-1. Primary Haul Routes From Dam Sites.....	3.23-2
Figure 3.23-2. J.C. Boyle Noise Receptors (Closest Receptors to J.C. Boyle Dam)	3.23-4
Figure 3-23-3. Copco 1 & 2 Noise Receptor (Closest Receptor to Copco 1 and Copco 2 Dams).....	3.23-5
Figure 3.23-4. Iron Gate Noise Receptors (Closest Receptor to Iron Gate Dam)	3.23-6
Figure 3.23-5. Parcel Lots within One-Mile of Iron Gate Dam	3.23-24
Figure 3.23-6. Parcel Lots within One-Mile of Copco 1 and 2 Dams	3.23-25

Appendices

- A Alternatives Report
- B Standard Operating Procedures and Best Management Practices Common to the Action Alternatives
- C Water Quality Supporting Technical Information
- D Water Quality Environmental Effects Determination Methodology Supplemental Information
- E An Analysis of Potential Suspended Sediment Effects on Anadromous Fish in the Klamath Basin
- F An Analysis of Potential Bedload Sediment Effects on Anadromous Fish in the Klamath Basin
- G Vegetation Communities and Habitat Types Mapped by PacifiCorp
- H Special-Status Species Surveys Conducted by PacifiCorp
- I Special-Status Species Table
- J Modeled Changes to the 100 year Floodplain
- K Groundwater Well Data
- L Water Rights
- M Air Quality Impacts
- M Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts
- O County Economic Descriptions
- P KBRA Regional Economic Effects IMPLAN Analysis
- Q Aesthetics/Visual Resources Technical Report
- R Recreation Data Input
- S Transportation and Circulation Analysis Data
- T 2020 Traffic Volume Projections
- U Noise and Vibration Impact Analysis

