

1 LAW OFFICES OF DAVID YOUNG
David Young, SBN 55341
2 11845 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 1110
Los Angeles, CA 90064
3 Telephone: (310) 575-0308
Facsimile: (310) 575-0311
4 Email: dyounglaw@verizon.net

5 *Attorney for Plaintiffs/Petitioners*

6 JAMES L. BUCHAL (SBN 258128)
MURPHY & BUCHAL LLP
7 3425 SE Yamhill Street, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97214
8 Telephone: (503) 227-1011
Facsimile: (503) 573-1939

9 *Attorney for Plaintiffs The New 49'ers Inc. et al.*

10
11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
12 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
13

<p>14 Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule 1550(b)) 15 16 SUCTION DREDGE MINING CASES 17 18 19 20 21 22</p>	<p>Judicial Council Proceeding No. JCPDS 4720 DECLARATION OF CLAUDIA J. WISE IN SUPPORT OF MINERS' JOINT MOTION FOR INJUNCTION AGAINST DEFENDANTS Judge: Hon. Gilbert G. Ochoa Dept.: S36 Date: June 23, 2015 Time: 8:30 a.m.</p>
<p>23 24 Related Actions: 25 <i>Karuk Tribe of California, et al. v. California</i> 26 <i>Department of Fish and Game</i> 27 <i>Hillman, et al. v. California Department of</i> 28 <i>Fish and Game</i></p>	<p>RG 05211597 – Alameda County RG 09434444 – Alameda County</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Karuk Tribe of California, et al. v. California Department of Fish and Game

RG 1263796 – Alameda County

Kimble, et al. v. Kamala Harris, Attorney General of California, et al.

CIVDS 1012922 – San Bernardino County

Public Lands for the People, et al. v. California Department of Fish & Game, et al.

CIVDS 1203849 – San Bernardino County

The New 49er's, et al. v. State of California; California Department of Fish and Game, et al.

SCCV 120048 – Siskiyou County

Foley, et al. v. State of California; California Department of Fish and Wildlife, et al.

SCSCCV 13-00804 – Siskiyou County

Walker v. Harris, et al.

34-2013-80001439 – Sacramento County

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Claudia J. Wise declares:

1. I retired after 32 years of civil service with the United States Environmental Protection Agency as a Physical Scientist/Chemist. I have been a member of many scientific projects over the years starting my federal career in the Fish Toxicology arena and ending it with the Salmon Restoration division. I have worked on projects ranging from urban fish populations and fish avoidance testing to eelgrass habitat and global climate change. I have been and remain a strong proponent of protecting the environment. My Curriculum Vitae is attached to this Declaration as Exhibit 1.

2. I have been involved in temperature surveys on the Klamath River in California in regards to suction dredge activity and existing conditions of refugia. We have found specified natural refugia to be no better in many cases to that of dredge made refugia.

3. I have studied a plethora of peer reviewed papers too numerous to list here regarding effects of suction dredging on the environment. Most have come to the same conclusion of insignificant or *de minimis* environmental impact that is local and temporary in its effect on the streams inhabitants.

4. It appears that although there are many peer reviewed journal articles written that support this conclusion giving the proof already at hand that the dredging community is not significantly harming the environment or the fish this issue is re-surfacing in this Court. My experience regarding suction dredge mining is that the fish are very happy to feed from the dredged spoils presented to them and rest in the dredge holes left much like in natural refugia. I have never seen or heard of any harm that has come to any fish present during suction dredging activities. California Fish and Wildlife currently have rules and regulations that do regulate dredging out of situations that would be harmful to fish, such as, spawning seasons.

Mercury Toxicity Allegedly Associated with Suction Dredge Mining Poses No Real Threat to the Health of Californians.

5. For nearly 50 years there has been a large body of (peer reviewed) evidence published that demonstrates that dietary selenium moderates or counteracts mercury toxicity. Mercury exposures that might otherwise produce toxic effects are counteracted by selenium,

1 particularly when the Se:Hg molar ratios approach or exceed one to one. This is because
2 selenium has a high affinity to bind with mercury thereby blocking it from binding to other
3 substances, such as brain tissue. This has practical significance because even if fish ingest
4 mercury which then becomes available for human consumption, such mercury may be
5 effectively inert because selenium concentrations in the fish may protect humans who eat them.

6 6. A group of scientists from USEPA published research in 2009 that included data
7 from fish samples collected in California which, in all cases, contained proportions of mercury to
8 selenium that were adequate to protect fish, wildlife and human health. Results showed that
9 100% of the freshwater fish surveyed in California had sufficient selenium to protect them and
10 their consumers against mercury toxicity (Peterson et al, 2009). This may be why no one has
11 ever become sick from eating sport fish in California, even though mercury warnings have been
12 issued.

13 7. A 2011 report by the California Water Board, Contaminants in Fish from
14 California Rivers and Streams¹ showed no significant mercury contamination in areas where
15 suction dredge mining continued for years. Concentrations in the Klamath River, a favored area
16 for suction dredging, were very low. Indeed, in general river and stream locations outside the
17 Delta region all had low or moderate methyl mercury contaminations. And in its SEIR, the
18 Department concluded that mercury mitigation actions were not "believed to be necessary to
19 avoid deleterious effects to fish" (DSEIR at 5-29).

20 8. In 2010 as a member of the CDFG Suction Dredge Public Advisory Committee, I
21 gave a presentation to the group sharing these and other facts, a true copy of which is attached
22 hereto as Exhibit 2. The California Department of Fish and Game (now CDFW) never offered
23 any response to this information.

24 9. Since that time research points even more strongly to a beneficial health value
25 obtained from selenium in living organisms being the most crucial factor. Adverse health effects
26 caused from exposure to mercury may not be due to mercury in itself but rather the fact that

27 _____
28 ¹ This report is available online at
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/docs/rivers_study/rs_rptonly.pdf.

1 mercury irreversibly binds with selenium, producing a deficiency of this essential micronutrient
2 all living organism require for critical functions (Sørmo et al., 2011), especially in the brain and
3 nervous system. All living organisms require selenium to be healthy however there is no known
4 requirement by the body for mercury. (Ralston, 2014)

5 10. In personal communications, Dr. Ralston, a well-known ecotoxicologist, recently
6 told me that only 2 percent of waters of the United States have any real need for mercury
7 remediation and nearly all waters of California are not in this category.

8 11. Aside from grossly polluted environments, mercury is normally a problem only
9 where the rate of natural formation of methyl mercury from inorganic mercury is greater than the
10 reverse reaction. Methyl mercury is the only form of mercury that accumulates appreciably in
11 macroinvertebrates and fish. Environments that are known to favor the production of methyl
12 mercury include certain types of wetlands, dilute low-pH lakes in the Northeast and North
13 central United States, parts of the Florida Everglades, newly flooded reservoirs, and coastal
14 wetlands, particularly along the Gulf of Mexico, Atlantic Ocean, and the Sacramento-San
15 Joaquin Delta and San Francisco Bay (USGS 2000). Mercury does not form the potentially toxic
16 compound methylmercury in areas of high dissolved oxygen such as gold-bearing rivers and
17 streams where suction dredge mining occurs, but more in low-dissolved oxygen areas such as
18 swamps and deltas.

19 12. Since the cessation of hydraulic mining, accumulated sediment from hydraulic
20 placer mining has been transported to the Delta and Bay by sustained remobilization (James,
21 1991). The mercury used by early hydraulic miners move downstream with this sediment. If not
22 collected and removed from the environment, mercury in California rivers and streams is
23 guaranteed to end up farther downstream, and eventually in the Delta or the Bay, where
24 methylation is a real environmental problem. In particular, mercury left in place is vulnerable to
25 the next storm event moving it downstream closer to, and eventually into, the Bay and Delta.

26 **Suction Dredges Benefit the Environment by Removing Mercury.**

27 13. I have spent much time over the last decade studying mercury effects on the
28 environment in relation to suction dredging activity. A paper published by the California Water

1 Board's Water Quality Division (Humphreys, 2005) ("Board") discussed mercury losses and
2 recovery during small-scale suction dredging. He demonstrated that a suction dredge in the
3 American River was able to collect 98 percent of the measured mercury processed through the
4 dredge. The results may have been higher if the investigators had been using a dredge with the
5 modern jet flare design.

6 14. Removing 98 percent of mercury before it reaches the Delta and Bay is a very
7 significant positive environmental impact and it would be irresponsible to not allow mercury to
8 be removed from the rivers and streams whenever it is found in this fashion.

9 15. In Humphreys report (2005), the author expressed concern for the loss of a small
10 portion (2%) of the mercury from the back end of the sluice box. In the conclusions it was than
11 ten times higher than that needed to classify it as hazardous waste. Yet 98 percent of the
12 mercury was now secured and the process did not add any mercury to the system that was not
13 already present. The small fraction lost, because of its density, would relocate back onto the
14 river floor buried in the sediment close to where it was removed while dredging.

15 16. In my opinion it would be a highly irresponsible management practice to leave a
16 large portion of mercury in the rivers and streams because of unrealistic concerns for the lesser
17 amount moving only a short distance away from an operating dredge. Most likely, the
18 movement of fine mercury would extend no farther than 50-feet off the end of the sluice box.
19 The distance transported would relate to the distance a turbidity plume might extend downstream
20 from a small-scale suction dredge.

21 17. In fact, according to Humphrey's study in 2005 mercury was seen moving
22 downstream and re-deposited on bedrock already dredged clean. The important fact here is
23 mercury was flowing down stream in a suction-dredge-free zone during lower river flows than
24 take place under high winter river conditions. Whatever incremental contribution suction
25 dredging might make to this process is obviously insignificant compared to the benefit of
26 removing 98% of the mercury.

27 //

28 //

1 **The Flouring Issue.**

2 18. Mercury can become floured, i.e., put into small particles like specks of flour.
3 One charge against suction dredges is that they may flour mercury they encounter in larger units.
4 In general, flouring is aggravated by agitation, exposure of mercury to air, and other chemical
5 reactions.

6 19. In the test described by Humphreys (2005), a small portion of floured mercury
7 was collected in the sediments as they escaped the sluice box. It is unclear from reading the
8 Humphrey's report whether or not the floured mercury was already present in the river
9 sediments. If one were to study the picture in the report that showed the results of panning
10 materials from a nearby creek it does appear that the mercury in the materials was already
11 floured. In any event, because the study was conducted in a seriously contaminated area it is
12 impossible to determine what portion of flouring of mercury was caused by the crash box design
13 of the suction dredge in use. Moreover, because the crash box may also have caused flouring,
14 the results do not demonstrate adverse impacts from using a more modern jet-flare-type suction
15 dredge, which would also probably improve mercury recovery.

16 20. More study is required to see if reducing the amount of floured mercury would be
17 enhanced by utilizing the modern jet flare style suction dredge. The jet flare which is widely in
18 use today, in the suction dredge mining community, is the best equipment available for collecting
19 fine gold and because of this design and the density of mercury 13.53 grams per cubic centimeter
20 (g/cm³) it would be more effective in collecting mercury particles with little disturbance that
21 would result in further breaking the mercury particles down.

22 21. In either event, floured mercury is still in elemental form, not methylated.
23 Regardless of surface area it would be no more or no less toxic than the 98 percent collected by
24 the dredge.

25 **Suction Dredges Make No Appreciable Contribution to Ambient Mercury Concentrations.**

26 22. The remarkable position of the Department and Water Board is that even though
27 suction dredges may remove over 98% of the mercury they encounter, dredging should be
28 restricted because the process of suction dredging may result in increased mercury

1 concentrations into the environment. In the SEIR, the Department characterized this as a
2 “significant and unavoidable” impact of permitting dredging, while acknowledging that few
3 studies are available on the issue.

4 23. However, there was a cumulative impact study using an 8 and 10-inch dredge
5 (actually operating in a flowing river) commissioned by the USEPA (Royer et al., 1999), which
6 demonstrated values of dissolved mercury that were actually greater *upstream* of the dredge,
7 suggesting that any effect of the dredge was likely within the range of natural variation. The
8 operator reported observing deposits of liquid mercury within the sediments he was working.
9 This is the most relevant piece of published scientific evidence, addressing dredging at intensity
10 beyond that typically experienced in California, with real world interceptions of occasional
11 mercury deposits. Neither the Department nor the Water Board has ever offered information to
12 undermine the conclusions of this study.

13 24. Instead, they have pointed to a report by Fleck et al. (2011). But this report
14 attempted to infer conclusions about the effect of suction dredges with an entirely different
15 mechanism, involving re-circulating water through a hand-dug hole in the most highly mercury
16 contaminated area known to the State of California. To utilize this setup to infer effects for
17 suction dredging is, to put it bluntly, the poorest excuse for science that Mr. Greene and I we
18 have observed in our combined 60+ years of scientific research.

19 25. A further defect of the Fleck et al. report analysis was to predict the impact of
20 suction dredges by using mining industry data to compare output between differing dredge sizes
21 using 100 percent sand for the dredged material. This type of material is not represented in real
22 world riverbed materials processed by gold suction dredge miners. Materials found in all mining
23 areas are composed of boulders, cobbles, gravel, sand etc. Using only sand, although perfect for
24 comparing dredge size output in a factory, is a misrepresentation of real world conditions.

25 **Suction Dredges Can Also Aid in Targeted Mercury Remediation.**

26 26. Providing a program to collect mercury from miners would aid the Water Board’s
27 mission of reducing mercury contamination in the deltas and bays where mercury methylation is
28 a large concern. It is most important to reduce the total amount of mercury in the streams and

1 rivers and its transport downstream into the bays and deltas. This is defined as a part of water
2 pollution control regulations goal to reduce the Total Maximum Daily Load ("TMDL") of
3 contaminants such as mercury.

4 27. Suction dredges are being used by government agencies to remediate stream
5 conditions in some cases. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
6 (2006) ("NOAA"), Duck Creek, a surface water body in Alaska, is impaired by urban runoff
7 from non-point source pollutants including, heavy metals, hydrocarbons, iron flocs and excess
8 nutrients. This small coastal stream originates from a spring that drains runoff from Mendanhall
9 Valley, a relatively high density residential and business area. Historically there were runs of
10 nearly 10,000 chum salmon and Coho runs of about 500 fish in Duck Creek. Currently the chum
11 run is extinct and the Coho run consists of only 20 fish. Restoration at Duck Creek involves the
12 development and implementation of bioremediation methods to restore water quality and
13 anadromous fish habitat in impaired streams. NOAA scientists attempted to correct the degraded
14 conditions by using high-pressure jet pumps and suction dredges to remove fine sediment from
15 the streambed.

16 28. The suction dredge community could provide the state with a source of help that
17 is willing to do what they do best, prospecting for gold. In the event that suction dredge miners
18 run across a hot spot of mercury, the miners would be willing to hand it over to a collection
19 facility if such a facility existed. The Board's Water Quality Division report (Humphreys, 2005)
20 idea of paying the miners for their efforts would help facilitate this plan. The cost would be
21 much less than what is presently being spent on remediation activity that is less effective.

22 29. The Water Board has spent a lot of time and money on mercury remediation
23 projects with limited success though in 2001 EPA, Region 9 located in San Francisco, California
24 did collect mercury from miners very effectively. Collections of mercury are currently
25 happening in Oregon and Washington through the states respective Division's of Ecology and
26 with even greater success at miner's rallies.

27 30. During the first EPA, Region 9 mercury "milk run" in 2000 agency personnel
28 were able to collect 230 pounds of mercury from miners. The total amount of mercury collected

1 was equivalent to the mercury load in 47 years' worth of wastewater discharge from the city of
2 Sacramento's sewage treatment plant or the mercury in a million mercury thermometers. (US
3 EPA, 2001.)

4 31. Over the past four years, the Resources Coalition and other small-scale miners
5 associations in Washington have turned in 127 pounds of mercury and eight pounds of lead for
6 safe disposal with the help from the Washington Department of Ecology. Ecology staff attended
7 miners' rallies in Oroville and Monroe, explaining the state's program for proper disposal of lead
8 and mercury. (ENS) 2007

9 32. The mining community of today is, in my opinion, the only group that is in a
10 position with the technology to help out at a very economical price to the public. Any residual
11 mercury remaining after dredging a location is that much less to worry about in our Nation's
12 waterways.

13 33. In my opinion, suction dredge mining is beneficial to the rivers and streams in
14 California.

15 I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
16 foregoing is true and correct.

17 Executed on May 18, 2015.

18 *Claudia J. Wise*

19
20

Claudia J. Wise

References

- 1
2 Alpers, C.N., Hunerlach, M.P., May, J.T., and Hothem, R.L., 2005, Mercury contamination from
3 historical gold mining in California: U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2005-3014, 6p.
4 <http://pubs.water.usgs.gov/fs2005-3014>
- 5 Humphreys, R., 2005, Losses and Recovery During a Suction Dredge Test in the South Fork of the
6 American River. Staff Report, State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality.
- 7 James, A.L., 1991, Incision and morphologic evolution of an alluvial channel recovering from
8 hydraulic mining sediment: Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 103, p. 723-736.
- 9 Miners Remove Gold Rush Mercury from Washington Streams, Environment News Service (ENS)
10 2007 <http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/sep2007/2007-09-18-096.asp>
- 11 NOAA, 2006. Duck Creek Water Quality and Anadromous Fish Habitat Restoration
12 http://www.photolib.noaa.gov/habrest/erp_duc.html
- 13 Peterson, S. A.; Ralston, N. V. C.; Peck, D. V.; Van Sickle, J.; Robertson, J. D.; Spate, V. L.;
14 Morris, J. S. 2009. How might selenium moderate the toxic effects of mercury in stream fish in
15 western U.S.? Environ. Sci. Technol. 43, 3919-3925.
- 16 Ralston, N. V. C. 2014, Personal communication
- 17 Royer, Todd V., Aaron M. Prussian, and G. Wayne Minshall. 1999. Impact of suction dredging
18 on water quality, benthic habitat, and biota in the Fortymile River and Resurrection Creek,
19 Alaska. US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Seattle, Washinton. Final Report.
- 20 Sørmo, Eugen G., Tomasz M. Ciesielski, Ida B. øverjordet, Syverin Lierhagen, Grethe S. Eggen,
21 Torunn Berg, and Bjørn M. Jenssen. 2011, Selenium Moderates mercury Toxicity in Free-
22 Ranging Freshwater Fish. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2011, 45, 6561-6566.
- 23 USEPA, 2001. Mercury Recovery from Recreational Gold Miners.
24 http://www.epa.gov/region09/cross_pr/innovations/merrec.html
- 25 USGS, 2000. Mercury in the Environment, USGS Fact Sheet 146-00 (October 2000)
26 Environments Where Methyl mercury is a Problem.
- 27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Carole Caldwell, hereby declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following facts are true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years, and not a party to or interested in the within entitled cause. I am an employee of Murphy & Buchal, LLP and my business address is 3425 SE Yamhill Street, Suite 100, Portland, Oregon 97214.

On May 18, 2015, I caused the following document to be served:

DECLARATION OF CLAUDIA J. WISE IN SUPPORT OF MINERS' JOINT MOTION FOR INJUNCTION AGAINST DEFENDANTS

by transmitting a true copy in the following manner on the parties listed below:

Honorable Gilbert Ochoa
Superior Court of California
County of San Bernardino
San Bernardino Justice Center
247 West 3rd Street
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0210
Via U.S. Mail

Chair, Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Court Programs and Services Division
(Civil Case Coordination)
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via U.S. Mail

Bradley Solomon
Deputy Attorney General
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
E-mail: Bradley.Solomon@doj.ca.gov
Via E-mail

Marc Melnick
Office of the Attorney General
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612
E-mail: Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov
Via E-mail

John Mattox
Department of Fish & Game
1416 Ninth Street, 12th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
E-mail: jmattox@dfg.ca.gov
Via E-mail

James R. Wheaton
Environmental Law Foundation
1736 Franklin Street, 9th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
E-mail: wheaton@envirolaw.org
E-mail: elfservice@envirolaw.org
Via E-mail

Glen Spain
Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's
Association
Southwest Regional Office
P.O Box 11170
Eugene, OR 97440
E-mail: fishlifr@aol.com
Via E-mail

Jonathan Evans
351 California St., Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94104
E-mail: jevans@biologicaldiversity.org
Via E-mail & U.S. Mail

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

E. Robert Wright
Friends of the River
1418 20th St., Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95811
E-mail: bwright@friendsoftheriver.org
Via E-mail

Lynne R. Saxton
Saxton & Associates
912 Cole Street, #140
San Francisco, CA 94117
E-mail: lynne@saxtonlegal.com
Via E-mail

Keith Robert Walker
9646 Mormon Creek Road
Sonora, CA 95370
Via U.S. Mail



Carole Caldwell
Declarant