

MAR 31 2000

Re: Dam Removal

Stevens Co. Farm Bureau  
1997 Ray Anderson Rd  
Kettle Falls, WA 99141  
3-27-00

Stevens Co. Farm Bureau is responding to the  
SNAKE RIVER DEIS  
(Lower Snake River Juvenile Salmon Migration Feasibility Study DEIS)

We go on record demanding that the dams be left functioning as intended and that sincere science continues.

We do not believe there has been adequate time to study the 4000 page DEIS or that all the studies have been completed or reported; and that the full impact of the proposed action is understood. We believe the public has been misinformed; both as to benefits and costs, short and long term.

**Purpose:**

We believe the stated purpose is deliberately misleading and narrow; and that the real purpose is dam removal, not salmon proliferation; and that this is part of the larger U.N. directed scheme of global reorganization. These projects individually and collectively (i.e. WILDLANDS, WILD RIVERS, BIOSPHERE, HERITAGE AREAS, ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT, REGIONALISM, CASCADIA, HABITATE, etc.) all done under the cloak of Environmentalism; and specifically in this case, the E.S.A., with the full intent of disrupting our economy, culture, independence and sovereignty; as so stated in the U.N. documents (i.e. BIODIVERSITY TREATY, AGENDA 21, etc.).

**Scope:**

This DEIS has limited the possibilities for fish management to certain salmonoides. It has also limited that approach to the Snake River, focusing on the lower 4 dams and specifically their removal. This ignores a large part of the fish life span, travels, and pertinent factors effecting their health, safety and production.

**Conclusion:**

We believe as stated in purpose; this whole exercise was done with a preconceived notion and forgone conclusion to fit the over all agenda and not designed for fish survival. It's about people management and control of resources fitting in with "Cascadia", "Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management" and "The Wilding of America," etc.

*(Where the DEIS Supports Dam Removal A-Fish Appendix)*

**Science:**

We believe to say, "The Transportation System and fish passage structures cannot be further improved" is untrue; and wrong to not give the recent improvements time to produce results. It is also misleading to credit dam removal with benefits to the entire salmon life cycle when so much of it is spent in the ocean.

The four dams now focused on have been there 25-38 years. The fact that fish still return indicates the dams do not preclude survival or the fish wouldn't be there; especially considering the earlier larger populations were attained without the recent improvements in the system.

You state: "If the dams are killing fish"? We prefer to address the known causes of mortality first; and these are not even mentioned on your plan. Many studies and experts substantiate the deleterious greater effect of other factors: i.e. mammal and tern predation; illegal fishing; legal fishing problems as by catch, dumping, net systems, Indian preference, limits; pollution; stream and oceans conditions; hatchery management; etc.

We certainly agree with the "if" part of the dam removal idea bringing desired results; especially knowing there were salmon population depletions long before the dams or other man caused-changes were in effect. Fish hatcheries have been in use over 100 years and native salmon were the stock; so we doubt any genetic problem.

They are all the same fish in different waters. In fact, we resent the arbitrary and senseless killing of returning spawners. These fish have proven themselves by running the entire gauntlet from river tributary or hatchery to ocean and back, a three to five year cycle; only to be destroyed, wasted and denied the opportunity to spawn, fulfilling their natural purpose. Surely it must be evident to those interested in salmon that the individual spawners who pair up from different runs are the natural provision providing genetic diversity and avoiding the inbreeding you claim to be concerned with.

We believe some of these recent "studies" and "practices" have been done for deleterious effect to cloud the issue and force your "answer" to the "perceived problem." We also believe that the hatcheries have been a large factor in sustaining the salmon stocks over the past 100 years. Many dedicated people have spent much time, thought, money and effort to accomplish this. Much of what is being proffered as science is propaganda. We remember the long-term project carried out by Washington State University on salmonoid improvement and the Kokanee Project and more recent solid scientific information.

We believe the statement "no other action short of dam removal have been identified" is untrue and especially in view of the fact the C.O.R.P. has stated their own doubts. The term "extinction" is sensational, replacing real science, in order to stir emotion to panic the general public, ignorant of the facts, in to endorsing this rash action before they are fully informed. We also notice the effort for support for dam removal is being sought and received far outside the area and population effected or cognizant. We resent this being discriminated against. There is much more to consider than the narrow question of extinction of this relatively small fish population; even if that were to happen, which we doubt is necessary even keeping the dams.

We believe the science presented in the economic aspect is equally spurious; costs to be greater; benefits to be dubious and only the beginning of on-going ramifications, losses and problems. The silting, transportation, erosion, power replacement, irrigation, etc are not being fairly represented. For example: water temperatures are cooler in the impounded water than before the dams were built, contrary to what is being told the public. Erosion was and would be greater in the free flowing river. Irrigation demand is in July and August but the spring run-off peak is mid-June and would be gone in the open river. Direct grain freight costs will more than double not including the infrastructure costs.

Our stated concerns and more were only increased by the recent presentation by Save Our Salmon and associates in Colville. It only further highlighted the misinformation, mistrust, questionable source science and one-sided approach to sway public opinion.

We beg you to not be pressured into this inadvisable, destructive and costly action. We pray that cooler heads will prevail. Thank you.

*(reference sheet included)*

Sincerely,  
Stevens County Farm Bureau  
By the Board of Directors

*Dale K. Fortune* *Brd member*

Dale Fortune

References

*(partial)*

- Battelle Marine Lab Study
- Northwest Power Planning Council
- NW Fisheries Science Center
- Jet Propulsion Lab-Pasadena
- Idaho Water Users Assoc.
- Common Sense Salmon Recovery vs. NMFS
- Fisheries Research, University of Washington, Drs. Hilborn, Coronado
- College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University, Dr. W. G. Pearcy
- Pacific Halibut Comm., Dr. Steven Hare
- Canadian Dept. of Fisheries, Dr. David Welch
- University of Washington, Drs. Matura, Francis
- University of Idaho, Brian Dennis, Professor of Wildlife and Statistics
- Dr. Victor Kaczynski, Consultant
- John K. Carlisle - Nature Not Man
- Oregon Governor John Rodgers, 1899 State of the State
- Columbia River Alliance
- The Great Salmon Hoax - Buchal
- Senator Bob Morton, Salmon Gram
- Winthrop Fish Slaughter - J. P. Andrist
- Seattle Times 8-3-99
- Willapa Herald 11-3-99
- Methow Valley News 9-30-99, 11-4-99 Solveig Torkik