

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

PUBLIC MEETING SESSION  
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
DRAFT LOWER SNAKE RIVER JUVENILE SALMON MIGRATION  
FEASIBILITY REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
WITH  
FEDERAL CAUCUS CONSERVATION OF COLUMBIA BASIN FISH  
"ALL-H PAPER"  
  
LEWIS-CLARK CONVENTION CENTER  
800 PORT DRIVE  
CLARKSTON, WASHINGTON  
  
PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION  
FEBRUARY 10, 2000  
HELD AT 1:30 P.M. - 12:30 A.M.  
  
COURT REPORTER: KRISTI LYNN EVANS, RPR, CSR NO. 661  
  
K & K REPORTING  
Rt. 1 Box 36H  
Kooskia, Idaho 83539

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

PANEL APPEARANCES

MR. BILL SHAKE  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife

MR. RIC ILGENFRITZ  
National Marine Fisheries Service

BRIGADIER GENERAL CARL STROCK  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

MS. SARAH McNARY  
Bonneville Power Administration

MR. MIKE CROUSE  
Bureau of Land Management

MS. CATHRYN COLLIS  
Moderator

STACEY WILLIAMS  
Moderator

1           BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled matter came on  
2 for hearing at the hour of 1:30 p.m., Thursday, February 10,  
3 2000, at the Lewis-Clark Convention Center, Clarkston,  
4 Washington, State of Washington.

5           (Overview presentation was given but not reported.)

6           (Whereupon the following public comment session was had  
7 as follows, to-wit:)

8           MS. COLLIS: Okay, before we start our public comment  
9 period, let me do a couple of things. First let me again  
10 remind you of the ground rules. Please treat one another with  
11 respect. No clapping, booing, cheering, all that kind of  
12 stuff. Hold your applause no matter how you feel about what's  
13 being said. Take your opportunity to respond to that in your  
14 comments, either written or oral.

15           Let me also say, if the presentations that you just heard  
16 raised any questions in your mind, since we are not going to do  
17 our Q and A period, please be sure and take your questions to  
18 staff members in the open house.

19           And also, just a note, we -- it's been my experience so  
20 far with our hearings that we can probably accommodate maybe 50  
21 to 60 people before we break at 5:00, depending on how quickly  
22 people are prepared to get to the mic and that kind of thing.

23           I have 150 people signed up to speak, so we are obviously  
24 not going to get to everybody, so one more time I want to  
25 invite you to make your comments either on tape recorder in the

1 room next door, room 103, or get your comments in in writing.  
2 Now, the advantage to getting your comments in in writing is  
3 that you are not held to any time limit or even page limit, so  
4 you can say all you want.

5 Here in this room and over on the tape recorder you are  
6 held to a three-minute time limit. So, those are your other  
7 alternatives, and I would urge you to take advantage of them.

8 Now, the way this is going to work is I'm going to call  
9 your name to come to the microphone based on our sign-up  
10 sheets, and you saw out there that we had four lines for  
11 sign-up sheets. And what I'm going to do is take the first  
12 name on the first sign-up sheet and then the first name on the  
13 second sign-up sheet and go across all four sheets like that  
14 and then come back and start at number two and go down the list  
15 like that.

16 I'll call the name of the person who is up to testify and  
17 the person who is next. If the person who is next could get to  
18 the other microphone and be ready, that would really help us  
19 get through as many comments as we can to accommodate as many  
20 of you as we can.

21 Also, I'm going to ask if the people standing in the  
22 doorway could be sure to leave a space, an opening, because  
23 some of the people who have signed up are out in the foyer  
24 waiting to come in when their name is called, so please keep an  
25 aisle open there, if you would.

1           Please watch the lights in front of you. The green light  
2 means speak. The yellow light indicates one minute left, and  
3 the red light means stop. And again, I'll help you with that,  
4 whatever that means.

5           GEN. STROCK: If Cathryn let's you keep talking we are  
6 going to stop listening when the red light goes off.

7           MS. COLLIS: And again, the faster you can sum up and let  
8 the next person come up with people and comments, we can  
9 accommodate.

10           Again, because the meeting is being transcribed, please  
11 indicate whether you are commenting on the Corps' EIS, the  
12 Federal Caucus All-H Paper, or the John Day Drawdown Study or  
13 any of those or all of those. And if you don't know or aren't  
14 sure, that's okay. We will use our judgment to be sure and get  
15 your comments to the right place.

16           We are going to begin by allowing some of our elected  
17 officials a brief word, and then I'll begin on our list. From  
18 the tribe we have three elected officials who would like to  
19 speak: Sam Penney first and then James Holt and then Jamie  
20 Pinkham. So you if you can get ready, please. The microphones  
21 are right there and right there. Are you Sam? Okay, great.  
22 If you can get over there and James over there and be ready and  
23 Jaime in the wings, that would be great. Thank you. Go  
24 ahead.

25           MR. PENNEY: Thank you. My name is Sam Penney. I'm

1 Chairman of the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee. First of  
2 all, I would like to express to the federal officials that the  
3 tribe will be looking forward to a government-to-government  
4 consultation with the Tribe as outlined in President Clinton's  
5 Memorandum on government-to-government relationships, as well  
6 as the suggested order on enhancing inner-governmental  
7 partnerships which both say that prior to implementation of any  
8 action, a tribe must be consulted prior to any action that  
9 impacts tribal trust resource. So, we will look forward to a  
10 government-to-government meeting with the federal officials  
11 here today.

12 One thing I would like to also express, I'm wearing a  
13 medallion that was given to me by the late Richard Half Moon's  
14 family. Richard was a -- served the Nez Perce Tribal Executive  
15 Committee for 33 years and served 17 years of those as Chairman  
16 of the Nez Perce Tribe.

17 At first I wasn't concerned when I saw the ad in the  
18 paper about where it says D-Day, but yesterday one of my  
19 colleagues came in and said they heard an ad on the radio that  
20 had the same description but had gunfire on it. I expressed to  
21 my colleague that I felt that wasn't very considerate of those  
22 veterans that served during World War II and to use the word  
23 D-Day for this meeting. There are many veterans, not only here  
24 in this country, but around the world that fought and gave  
25 their lives during D-Day.

1           Also, for the federal officials and other elected  
2 officials, many times I get questions about treaties. And a  
3 treaty by definition is an agreement or contract between two or  
4 more nations or sovereigns, and these are ratified by the  
5 sovereigns, in our case, between the United States Government  
6 and the Nez Perce Tribe. So, the treaties are valid to this  
7 day.

8           And also, I'd like to point out Article XI of the U.S.  
9 Constitution, which is commonly called the supremacy clause.  
10 What the supremacy clause says is: "This Constitution, and the  
11 Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance  
12 thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under  
13 the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of  
14 the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby,  
15 any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the  
16 Contrary notwithstanding."

17           And further it goes on. The second paragraph says: "The  
18 Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members  
19 of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and  
20 judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several  
21 States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this  
22 Constitution."

23           MS. COLLIS: Wrap it up, please.

24           MR. PENNEY: So, I will remind you, please, by taking  
25 that oath you also swear to uphold the treaties that are

1 between the tribe and the United States.

2 Also, my final comment on the All-H Paper: I know people  
3 have added a human aspect. I think that's important, but I  
4 would like to add one more on behalf of the tribe, and that's  
5 the word honor. We expect the treaties to be honored by the  
6 federal government and the following agencies on the treaty's  
7 reserved right to fish for salmon. Thank you.

8 MS. COLLIS: Thank you. Appreciate it. James Holt.

9 MR. HOLT: Good afternoon. My name is James Holt. I'm  
10 also a member of the tribe's governing body, and I'm also the  
11 Chairman of the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fishing  
12 Commission. I would like to talk to you today about the  
13 importance of the salmon for our culture.

14 For more than 10,000 years the Nez Perce Tribe has been  
15 relying on the salmon and have lived and fished in this  
16 country. Not a mere decade it appears that salmon are on the  
17 brink of extinction, gone forever. The Nez Perce people will  
18 not accept extinction as the inevitable price of progress.

19 We support the breach of the four lower Snake dams as the  
20 best means for restoring the salmon for our future generations  
21 who will inherit this landscape and the waters of the Salmon  
22 and the Clearwater, the Snake, and the Columbia Rivers.

23 Man is destroying our mother earth. Almost seems without  
24 disregard of our future and unborn generations, and that's not  
25 right.

1           In our 1855 treaty with the United States, the Nez Perce  
2 Tribe expressly reserved the rights to take fish at all usual  
3 and accustomed places. In the words of the United States  
4 Supreme Court, our fishing rights were not much less necessary  
5 to the existence of the Indian people than the very atmosphere  
6 they breathe.

7           Today it's almost inconceivable that every run of salmon  
8 that returns to Nez Perce Country is either extinct or listed  
9 on the Endangered Species list as threatened or endangered.

10           We know that the Nez Perce Tribe as a people have more to  
11 lose than anyone if the salmon runs go away forever. The tribe  
12 is deeply involved in salmon recovery measures, but we know  
13 that these efforts alone cannot save the salmon. We know that  
14 the dams kill up to 99 percent of the salmon. We know that  
15 from the scientific studies that breaching the four lower Snake  
16 dams is the best option for saving these salmon from  
17 extinction.

18           These dams which some see as mines of progress have a  
19 different meaning to me. These dams have become a symbol of  
20 death, the death of the ultimate extinction of the salmon.  
21 These concrete modelists are more like tombstones. But it's  
22 not too late to save these salmon and undue the damage that man  
23 has done and so that we have clean water and waterways for the  
24 tribes and the people that will come after us.

25           The Nez Perce Tribe supports investments in the economic

1 package to offset the economic cost of breaching in our local  
2 communities. But the region will benefit from salmon and clean  
3 water.

4       It is clear that a decision to breach the dams will  
5 require more than support of the best science which we have.  
6 More than being a threat of extinction that hangs over our  
7 heads like a black cloud. It will require courage, strength,  
8 and determination on the part of our leadership and our policy  
9 makers here in the region and the federal government. So I  
10 urge you to resist calls for maintaining the status quo here in  
11 the region when it comes to salmon and dams. If you continue  
12 to choose this course, the face of the evidence which pointly  
13 clears -- points towards the extinction of the salmon, there  
14 will be no decision to make. The sound will be gone.

15       MS. COLLIS: Wrap up please, James.

16       MR. HOLT: So the Nez Perce Tribe urges you, then, to  
17 breach the lower Snake dams. It's the only decision we can  
18 make for our future. Thank you.

19       MS. COLLIS: Thank you, James. Jamie.

20       MR. PINKHAM: Thank you. My name is Jamie Pinkham. I'm  
21 the Treasurer for the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee, and  
22 I would like to welcome you to Nez Perce country.

23       In the Chairman's opening remarks he referred to a  
24 colleague of his and that colleague happened to be mine. My  
25 uncle was in World War II. He was in France at Normandy on a

1 beach called Omaha, and after the war he returned to his  
2 homeland as a fisherman to fish where his father and  
3 grandfathers had fished for generations. And he wore a uniform  
4 for a country that wasn't always kind to his ancestors.

5         But he served his country well, and he fought for  
6 democracy. He fought to secure individual and community  
7 liberties. And if we are to draw upon the lessons of D-Day in  
8 this debate, it should be in the core values of duty in the  
9 example that they set by serving along side people of different  
10 cultures, people from different countries, people with  
11 different values. And he served together honorably. And this  
12 should serve as ground rules, not just inside this room but for  
13 outside as well.

14         In the Governor's state address he talked about the pride  
15 that must be Idaho's in its diversity. In that respect, the  
16 spirit of diversity, the tribal voice must be heard because the  
17 voice that expresses the sacred allegiance with nature and its  
18 boundaries, such as the salmon.

19         It expresses a moral and a legal obligation in treaties a  
20 century and a half old, and it also expresses a voice rooted in  
21 the history over 10,000 years on the landscape including this  
22 place we are meeting today.

23         It's important to note that the Nez Perce Tribe is a  
24 leader in salmon recovery. We endorse, obviously, the removal  
25 of the four lower Snake River dams, but also we need to look at

1 the other contributions the Nez Perce Tribe is making.

2 We are innovative and on the cutting edge of science and  
3 technology in our production and supplementation efforts to  
4 help restore harvestable levels of salmon.

5 We work on tribal land that is co-managed on federal  
6 lands to restore and protect salmon habitat. And we have a  
7 tribal conservation enforcement function to ensure our  
8 ceremonial subsistence harvest provides adequate returns for  
9 today's production quotas.

10 Yet even in light of these accomplishments and efforts we  
11 also must weigh the devastating impact caused by the mainstream  
12 river system as juveniles migrate to sea or as the adults  
13 return to the healing waters of their birth to renew life.

14 In the tribal position we expect that the federal  
15 government not only be accountable for the decision, but also  
16 be accountable for the consequence of the decision by  
17 mitigating the economic impacts felt by the dams when they are  
18 removed.

19 In reviewing the Pacific Northwest forest plan to  
20 safeguard another endangered species the federal government  
21 provided economic adjustment initiatives that was about 999.6  
22 million, almost one billion dollars over a five-year period to  
23 help rebuild economies in transition. This came from sixteen  
24 programs from ten federal agencies where worker training,  
25 community and infrastructure development and ecosystem

1 development for land restoration.

2           And to conclude, by no means is breaching the easy  
3 decision. It's perhaps one of the most gut wrenching decisions  
4 elected political leaders, including tribes, must make. The  
5 easy decision is the status quo. If we thrive on diversity, we  
6 should not let personal attacks and hollow information define  
7 the character of this debate. When this debate is over,  
8 regardless of its outcome, we will continue to be neighbors,  
9 and I pray that the character of this debate does not break the  
10 bond of the community. Thank you.

11           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Jamie. Lieutenant Governor  
12 Otter, are you here and would you like to comment? And after  
13 Lieutenant Governor, Jeff Nasset, would you come up, please.

14           LT. GOV. OTTER: Good afternoon, members of the Caucus.  
15 It's my pleasure to welcome you to Idaho, almost. I guess  
16 that's where we were going to start, when I started writing the  
17 comments that's where we were going to meet. But I have the  
18 distinct honor of leading a delegation from Boise today that  
19 represents not only the Legislative and Executive branches of  
20 government, but also represents the entire state. And we want  
21 the Lewiston area of Idaho to know that the entire state stands  
22 behind Lewiston, Idaho.

23           Let me note at the outset that the state is continuing to  
24 assess the documents which you have provided us through the  
25 Army Corps of Engineers and the Federal Caucus. As you may

1 know Governor Kempthorne has sworn a group of advisors known as  
2 the salmon cabinet. For all of the relevant state agencies  
3 have been meeting since last year to develop the scientific and  
4 technical data, and they are still putting together that  
5 information and results of those studies will be presented to  
6 you in two weeks at another meeting that you're going to have  
7 in Idaho.

8 Our state does stand ready to work with the federal  
9 government to develop a plan in cooperation with the federal  
10 government, but we are not going to tolerate any attempt by  
11 Washington D.C. to dictate solutions to Idaho.

12 If you want a road map on how not to work with the state  
13 on issues such as this, I point to your colleagues in the  
14 Forest department, the Forest Service, trying to do -- and what  
15 they are trying to do with President Clinton's initiative on  
16 the roadless proposal. And that's why I'm pleased that you are  
17 taking this information and taking it out for public comment.  
18 And that's why I'm pleased that you are holding off on  
19 announcing a preferred course of action until you have these  
20 hearings.

21 But I am here to tell you that on behalf of the Governor  
22 of this state that I hold and insist on two principals that are  
23 nonnegotiable. No. 1, Idaho will not support additional flows  
24 of Idaho's water above and beyond that which is authorized by  
25 Idaho State Law.

1           Second, Idaho categorically will not support breaching  
2 the Snake River dams as part of the recovery plan. The All-H  
3 Paper covers all the biological and technical areas: harvest,  
4 habitat, hatcheries, and hydropower. There's one H that seems  
5 to be left out, and that's humans, real people, real families  
6 that could be affected by the decisions that you consider on  
7 this issue.

8           They are here in numbers today, and they will tell you  
9 much better than I could about their ability to work and live  
10 here and whether or not their lives can be maintained or  
11 devastated depending upon the options you choose. Thank you  
12 very much.

13           MS. COLLIS: Thank you very much. I'd ask you to hold  
14 your applause, please. Thank you very much. Please watch the  
15 ground rules. Thanks a lot. Appreciate it. Jeff, go ahead.

16           MR. NESSETT: Thank you. I would like to welcome all of  
17 you to the Lewis/Clark Valley, and we appreciate what you are  
18 doing for us, giving us an opportunity to speak on an issue, as  
19 you can see, is very, very important to our area.

20           On Resolution 9868 the Lewiston City Council would like  
21 to move and present: Scientists have been unable to come to a  
22 consensus on the best method to restore salmon and steelhead  
23 runs in the Snake River. We are opposing recommending removal  
24 of the four lower Snake River dams located in Eastern  
25 Washington State and removal of the four lower Snake River dams

1 would have an adverse effect on jobs and community structure in  
2 the City of Lewiston.

3 And, therefore, be it resolved by the Mayor and the  
4 Council of the City of Lewiston, Idaho, the City Council and  
5 the City of Lewiston supports efforts to restore salmon and  
6 steelhead runs in the Snake River system and to preserve the  
7 benefits of a remarkable river system and the dams which make  
8 those benefits possible.

9 That this Resolution shall take effect and be in full  
10 force from and after its passage and approval, dated this 21st  
11 day of September, 1998, signed by myself, Mayor Jess Nessett,  
12 of Lewiston, Idaho.

13 From your own reports in 1888 the Corps' report warns  
14 Congress of an enormous reduction in the numbers of spawning  
15 fish in the Columbia River. Much has happened since then.  
16 Much will continue to happen.

17 We ask that in your consideration you not consider only  
18 the four Hs, but the 5th H which is the human and human economy  
19 that are really going to be significantly impacted in our  
20 area. Please take that into consideration.

21 We want dams and we want fish, and we ask you to make it  
22 happen.

23 MS. COLLIS: Thank you very much, Jeff. Senator Stegner,  
24 are you here? Want to make comments. After Senator Stegner  
25 Keith Johnson is the State Controller. Are you here, Keith?

1 Great. Thank you. And just one more, let me just get one more  
2 in the wings. Thank you very much, Senator. Bruce Newcomb,  
3 are you here? Speaker of the House. Great. Thank you. Those  
4 three are next. Thanks.

5 MR. STEGNER: Good afternoon. I'm Joe Stegner, an Idaho  
6 State Senator from District 6 which is basically Lewiston. I  
7 am going to try to make three quick points in three minutes.

8 The first point I've told you before. I wish I had kept  
9 track of the number of times I've attended Corps of Engineer  
10 hearings on this issue. So, I'm going to tell you what I told  
11 you last year and the year before and the year before for the  
12 last five years and maybe longer. To breach the dams will  
13 cripple this area. I believe that, and I think the majority of  
14 the people that live here believe that.

15 We want the navigation benefits. We want the recreation  
16 benefits. We want the power generation benefit, and we want  
17 the cultural and social advantages the dams provide. And we  
18 would like them maintained.

19 The second point is that quite often because we  
20 prioritize dams, we are characterized as being anti-fish, and  
21 that's not true. It's an unfair characterization. One that I  
22 don't appreciate, and one that many people in the Valley don't  
23 appreciate.

24 We would like solutions to the fish issues that maintain  
25 the dams in their current state. That is the basic premise of

1 many people's position here in the Valley.

2           The third point is that Idaho is united on this issue.  
3 We have brought to speak today, some this afternoon and some  
4 tonight the President Pro-tem of the Senate, the Speaker of the  
5 House of Representatives, the full delegation from District 6  
6 in Lewiston, and Lieutenant Governor from the State of Idaho  
7 and a Representative from the Controller's Office. I think  
8 that speaks highly of the dedication of the State in commitment  
9 on this issue. We will not be divided on this issue like we  
10 have in the past. I think we have strong support for  
11 maintaining control of our destiny, control of our water, and  
12 maintenance of the dams on the Snake River. Thank you.

13           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Joe. Keith.

14           MR. JOHNSON: Good afternoon. My name is Keith Johnson.  
15 I'm the Chief Deputy State Controller for the State of Idaho.  
16 I'm here representing the elected State Controller J.D.  
17 Williams. He, unfortunately, is unable to be here due to  
18 unfortunate scheduling conflicts. But I assure you he  
19 understands the magnitude and importance of these issues, and  
20 genuinely would have preferred to give his remarks personally.  
21 He asked that I do so instead.

22           His comments are as follows: As a statewide elected  
23 official I have a great concern and responsibility for the  
24 general well-being of Idaho's ecological and economic interest.  
25 As a member of the State Board of Land Commissions I am also

1 responsible for the direction and control of disposition of 2.4  
2 million acres of public land.

3           These dual roles require I do my best to protect the  
4 often competing economic and environmental interests of Idaho.  
5 One of the most important issues facing Idaho today is the  
6 management of our water. Water is the lifeblood of our state.  
7 Under the roles of the capacities in shipping, logging,  
8 farming, recreation, and electricity.

9           As a longtime public servant in Idaho I have gained a  
10 great deal of experience in reviewing similar situations and I  
11 know full well the difficulties that result when environments  
12 and livelihoods collide. So it was after careful consideration  
13 of a vast amount of information I must conclude any decision to  
14 breach the lower Snake River dams at this time is speculative  
15 at best and should, therefore, be avoided.

16           How Idaho's water is utilized and the cost of the Idaho  
17 State fish habitat must be decided carefully, judicially, and  
18 locally. Dam breaching will have culpable and far-reaching  
19 negative effects on the working people in Idaho. Vital  
20 economic activity will return only after recovery, 24, 48 years  
21 into the future.

22           We can be assured jobs will be lost if the dams were  
23 breached. What we cannot be assured the salmon will be saved  
24 as a result. Gambling on what might happen 25 years from now  
25 with the livelihoods of current working Idahoans is a form of

1 environmental and economic roulette bankrupt of any reasonable  
2 natural resource.

3       Until science can provide reliable assurance that the  
4 salmon and steelhead stocks will actually recover from dam  
5 breaching, the existing livelihoods of Idahoans must remain  
6 paramount.

7       In addition, the evidence presented by the past  
8 scientists which support dam breaching focus on the best case  
9 scenario to provide ability to salmon under such an option.  
10 However, the estimated effects on salmon viability under a  
11 bargaining alternative focus on the worst case scenario.

12       Furthermore, the secondary environmental impacts were not  
13 even considered. If the dams on the lower Snake Rivers were  
14 breached, 37,000 acres of farmland will be left fallowing.  
15 Farming is life for the land and provide habitat for countless  
16 species. If we decide to breach the dams we must consider the  
17 viability of this ecosystem as well.

18       When I talk with the working families of Idaho I'm going  
19 to reflect on the authority of the Army Corps of Engineers. I  
20 can empathize with many people who feel alienated from their  
21 government since it was inevitable 150 scientists convened to  
22 determine the best options for Idaho resources then offer only  
23 one. Let's pull the plug on the dams and see what happens.

24       It is trusted and guaranteed when an environmental group  
25 in support of dam destruction American rivers is funded by a

1 Houston based company producing gas fire turbines.

2 It is the people living and working and raising their  
3 families in Idaho who are best able to make common sense  
4 decisions regarding our rivers, not the federal government.

5 I was born and raised here, and I, too, take offense at  
6 the idea Idahoans do not care about Idaho's environment. The  
7 decision to take away income should not be based upon  
8 speculation, theories, or wishful ideas.

9 MS. COLLIS: I need you to sum up now, please, Keith.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Any solution to this issue must consider  
11 and encompass all sides. Idaho accepts the burden in the fight  
12 to save the salmon but dam destruction, which is also economic  
13 destruction, is neither the only solution or the best solution.  
14 Idaho is and will be a state of opportunity, but only if  
15 Idahoans are allowed to utilize the natural resources in a  
16 responsible manner with the benefit of our working families.  
17 Thank you.

18 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Keith. Bruce?

19 MR. NEWCOMB: Hi. I'm Bruce Newcomb, and I'm the Speaker  
20 of the House and an Idaho Representative. The first position  
21 is that in respect to the four Hs, when you choose to breach  
22 the lower dams you make an irreversible decision. And I think  
23 before you make that decision, that all of the other  
24 alternatives should be explored. And by everyone's admission,  
25 the one opponent that's been left off everybody's studies are

1 -- is the ocean review. And primarily because variables are  
2 hard and difficult to isolate.

3 But when you take variables such as 50 mile nets and you  
4 take El Nino, El Nina, and temperatures -- and I think we've  
5 learned a lot about temperatures in the recent years as far as  
6 what that means to the salmon. And if you look at the Oregon  
7 studies on the LC River, and I have nieces involved in those  
8 studies, they found out that they actually changed the genetic  
9 makeup of the DNA of the smolts and they were unable to survive  
10 in the ocean because the change in temperature because the DNA  
11 was actually changed because the temperature was not a factor  
12 in considering in raising those fish in the hatchery. So that  
13 was changed so they could better able survive in the ocean.

14 The other thing is I, too, agree with the Governor's  
15 statement there are five Hs here, and the 5th H being humans.  
16 I think the socioeconomic impacts of everyone concerned needs  
17 to be taken in consideration as we go down this row.

18 The one thing we have in the Northwest that we have as an  
19 economic benefit is the cheap power, and that keeps us able to  
20 export what we have to export. So, the transportation studies  
21 are such a factor. If we get give away our cheap power by  
22 breaching the four lower dams you have eliminated the ability  
23 to manage PTO and the future, or the BPA, and other power  
24 companies.

25 So as we go down this road I think we need to balance the

1 economic impacts for salmon recovery and the economic impacts  
2 for human beings. And I don't think dam breaching should be  
3 one of those considerations at this point. So, that's my  
4 statement. Thank you.

5 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Bruce. Okay. We are going to  
6 start with Bruce Elmquist and move to Gary Lane who is second  
7 and on deck is Tom Stuart. Please be ready. Are you Bruce?  
8 Go.

9 MR. ELMQUIST: I am a river guide and drift boat  
10 manufacturer in the Riggins area. I think that the livelihood  
11 of my family and that of my community is just as important as  
12 anyone else's, and we depend on harvestable levels of salmon  
13 and steelhead.

14 I support breaching the lower Snake dams. With all costs  
15 considered it is the cheapest option on the table. We are  
16 kidding ourselves if we think that the wild salmon and  
17 steelhead in the Snake, Salmon, and Clearwater River systems  
18 will not continue on the road to extinction if we don't do the  
19 right thing, soon.

20 We don't own these fish or the river. As humans, we are  
21 not entitled to run a species into extinction. An overwhelming  
22 number of scientists have concluded that breaching of the lower  
23 Snake dams, out of 500 in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, is the  
24 best chance that these fish have of being restored to  
25 self-sustaining harvestable levels as required by laws and

1 treaties.

2           But we are not talking about destroying these dams. We  
3 are talking about moving some dirt. The concrete portions will  
4 remain intact. Relatively few jobs will be lost as a direct  
5 result of the dams being breached. Indeed, some 4 to 5,000  
6 jobs could be created and over 170 million dollars realized by  
7 economically depressed river communities such as Riggins,  
8 Orofino, Salmon, and Stanley, as well as Lewiston and  
9 Clarkston. A recovery plan must include investing in  
10 communities negatively affected by dam removal.

11           The relatively small percentage of electricity generated  
12 by these dams could easily be recovered by the development of  
13 low impact alternative sources. But I would not mind paying a  
14 few dollars more a month.

15           The apparently cheap river transportation now enjoyed is  
16 made possible by the American taxpayer who paid for the dams  
17 and along with the BPA ratepayers currently pays for virtually  
18 100 percent of costs for maintenance of the locks, dredging of  
19 the channel, etcetera.

20           With the dams breached, we would offset increased  
21 shipping costs with taxpayer investment in highway and rail  
22 infrastructure.

23           And here's something that doesn't seem to fit. Potlatch  
24 has come out in full force against breaching. They have spent  
25 a lot of money on ads and rallied their workers. Why?

1 Virtually no one would lose their jobs at the mill and only 20  
2 percent of their product is shipped by barge.

3           Could it be that with the salmon extinct and the  
4 prohibitive regulations of the Endangered Species Act out of  
5 the way, it would be much easier for the corporation to exploit  
6 timber? And the potential costs of tens of billions of dollars  
7 in reparations to the Columbia Basin Indian Tribes would be  
8 footed by the American taxpayer. I don't know, but it has to  
9 be said.

10           And it is only a matter of time before humans come to the  
11 reality that the natural systems of this planet are not set up  
12 for us to operate outside of. Eventually we will be directly  
13 affected. Why not correct our mistakes now? It is not going  
14 to get any easier. And time has run out for the fish.

15           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Bruce. Gary Lane, Tom Stuart,  
16 and on deck -- please hold your applause -- Russ Evans.

17           MR. LANE: Everyone here is an environmentalist. We all  
18 care about our surroundings. However, it is our perspectives  
19 that divide us, and our fear that guides us. Fear of losing  
20 fish, fear of losing jobs. Fear is a powerful motivator. It  
21 often blinds one to the truth.

22           MS. COLLIS: Please identify yourself.

23           MR. LANE: I'm an outfitter in Riggins. Sorry. I would  
24 like to address my comments to the All-H Paper and the draft  
25 EIS paper. I started out years ago as a wildlife biologist,

1 but through evolution I now live in Riggins and own Wapiti  
2 River Guides.

3 My business and the livelihoods of the guides who work  
4 with me is directly dependent upon the fishery. And, we  
5 consider fish guiding to be just as important to the world as  
6 are the jobs of other people who cut trees, barge goods, raise  
7 wheat, or run cattle.

8 Having examined tons of scientific data, I conclude that  
9 breaching dams is our only hope for restoring a harvestable  
10 fishery. Implementing all other options and ignoring dam  
11 breaching, is like pushing a parachute -- or a person out of an  
12 airplane without a parachute. If we do not breach the dams and  
13 only focus on all the other options, the results will be even  
14 more taxing.

15 If you are a logger, farmer, or rancher and are unhappy  
16 with the amount of federal control now, why would you support  
17 options that invite vastly more restrictions? While it is true  
18 that dam breaching will eliminate a few jobs, it is equally  
19 true that it will also sustain many present jobs as well as  
20 create new ones where none exist now. In the long run, far  
21 more people will benefit economically with dam breaching.

22 These four local dams were constructed mostly for the  
23 benefit of the immediate valley. If they breach them, the rest  
24 of the nation will hardly feel the impacts that the local  
25 valley people will feel.

1           Therefore, maybe we should make the Lewiston/Clarkston  
2 area a "Ground Zero National Sacrifice Area." That is what our  
3 government did to the salmon in 1947 with a federal memorandum  
4 declaring that the fishery must be sacrificed for the sake of  
5 regional development.

6           Now, of course I really don't support either absurdity.  
7 They are both ridiculous. But, breaching these dams will not  
8 destroy the regional economy, despite the fear instilled into  
9 many people under the control of those in power of a company  
10 town.

11           Extinction is forever. Dams can be reinstated. Besides,  
12 it is a sin to totally destroy what The Creator created.  
13 Fortunately, the Endangered Species Act provides a moral  
14 opportunity and legal obligation to restore fish.

15           To eliminate all native salmonids throughout this entire  
16 watershed is a national disgrace. It is as horrible as the  
17 buffalo killings sanctioned by our government to eliminate  
18 Indian people and take their lands.

19           Not only are we still legally bound to honor Indian  
20 rights to a share of the fish, by treaty, but if those fish  
21 become extinct, we are also morally and legally bound to  
22 compensate them economically for that loss.

23           Wouldn't it be better to spend our tax dollars helping  
24 restore fish, than compensating a people for fish that are no  
25 longer there?

1 Ignoring nature's biological capacity for salmon survival  
2 by waving a magic wand of superior technology is a false hope  
3 and a pitiful arrogance. It is one giant leap backwards for  
4 mankind.

5 I believe we can learn some strong lessons about salmon  
6 by paying attention to the ways that the Native American people  
7 look at nature. They have a more personal relationship to  
8 salmon and look at him as a brother. Their attitude towards  
9 nature is about community and the wisdom inherent in a natural  
10 economy. We must foster a more gracious attitude towards  
11 nature and learn how to balance our world view with theirs.

12 Most importantly, we stand at the very edge of a great  
13 waterfall with an imminent tidal wave right behind us. We must  
14 urge Congress --

15 MS. COLLIS: Gary, I need you to wrap up, please.

16 MR. LANE: We must urge Congress to speed up the process  
17 of dam breaching before the salmon follow the passenger pigeon  
18 to the happy hunting grounds.

19 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Gary.

20 MR. STUART: The Federal Caucus and the audience, thank  
21 you for coming to Clarkston today. I will comment on both the  
22 DEIS and the All-H Paper. I'm Tom Stuart, a Stanley, Idaho,  
23 businessman. I'm president of Idaho Rivers United. Our  
24 membership strongly supports restoring the Idaho salmon, and we  
25 believe that breaching is required.

1           And we know that Idaho is caught between a rock and a  
2 hard place on this issue. When the four lower Snake River dams  
3 were built we honestly believed we could still have healthy  
4 salmon runs and keep our salmon fishing, but we know now that  
5 that simply wasn't true. We might wish it were true, might  
6 even lie to ourselves about it for a while longer, but you  
7 know, deep down we know we just screwed up. We just simply  
8 screwed up. I think the biologists know it. You folks,  
9 federal agencies, know it. I think all know it deep down. So  
10 the big question here is not what salmon need. That's easy.

11           What I'm hearing, the audience is hearing, in the parking  
12 lot today is mostly about fear and concerns and worries, and  
13 that's -- I'm disappointed to say is what's missing in the  
14 federal planning efforts to date. And that's a commitment to  
15 help people with legitimate fears and concerns while we make  
16 the changes that we must for salmon.

17           So let's broaden human vision just a little bit here and  
18 think about it a little bit. First I want to mention the  
19 outfitters and guides in the fishing related jobs, I think it's  
20 too easy to forget those people. We shouldn't forget the  
21 25,000 fishing jobs that have been lost in the region already,  
22 and the 3,000 more currently dependent on steelhead fishing in  
23 Idaho. Let's make the commitment to those people, too.

24           Some people will definitely need help with a breaching  
25 scenario. There's no denying that. But here's where I think

1 the process has failed. The federal family has not planned for  
2 the mitigation or the transition that's required. I would like  
3 to see a federal commitment to keeping people whole while we  
4 undue a big mistake we made 30 years ago with these last four  
5 dams.

6 So what do people need? Pasco farmers on those 37,000  
7 acres need help watering their crops. They don't need dams.  
8 Grain growers in this region need a competitive way to ship  
9 without dams. So let's figure out what's needed and let's  
10 modernize our system and move on, while we restore the Snake  
11 River.

12 Expand the rail terminals at the port facilities. That's  
13 a no brainer. And more than anything else Lewiston needs an  
14 improved highway network so as part of the package let's expand  
15 U.S. Highway 12 out to Tri-Cities. That's a four-lane  
16 opportunity, people.

17 Specifics on the DEIS All-H Paper, one, abandon fish  
18 barging and trucking. That approach hasn't worked in 20 years  
19 and won't restore salmon. Breaching is part of the only plans  
20 that work for all Snake River stocks.

21 Two, Ric, I read this to you at NMFS specifically,  
22 correctly the major errors of the CRI that you know exist from  
23 agency inputs and an excellent TU study need fish as well. In  
24 salmon science I will remind you to defer to the states and  
25 tribes as the law requires.

1           Three, commit to restoring Snake River salmon now, even  
2 if it means breaching. That's a tough nut to crack, but I  
3 think we have to go there. But most importantly to the human  
4 factor let's get our mitigation plans in place and move  
5 quickly. I'll conclude.

6           MS. COLLIS: Thank you.

7           MR. STUART: For people, let's modernize Lewiston's  
8 transportation system. Help our shippers and get water to  
9 farmers. For salmon and the people who depend on them, will  
10 need breach. Now, that's how to take care of all the people,  
11 not just a few.

12          MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Tom.

13          MR. STUART: That's what will work, and that's what we  
14 need in this decision.

15          MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Tom. Russ Evans, then Elder  
16 Axtell and after Elder Axtell, Jack Kappas.

17          MR. EVANS: Taking out the lower Snake River dams should  
18 never have been an option. It is our own scientific lunacy by  
19 on a unproved theory and also an economic disaster to the 10th  
20 magnitude. There's so many variables to this problem that you  
21 can't just pinpoint one solution.

22               For instance, in 1977 the surface of the Pacific Ocean  
23 temperature rose about two degrees weakening the food chain as  
24 much as 70 percent. The world's largest Caspian tern colony,  
25 the bird, is located near the mouth of the Columbia where they

1 consume as much as 25 million salmon smolt a year, which is  
2 approximately 30 percent of the total population of salmon  
3 smolts in the rivers.

4         Something else the salmon have to put up with is some 60  
5 miles of gill nets on the Columbia River. These are only a few  
6 of the main variables to take under consideration, which you  
7 know with all the challenges facing the salmon there is some  
8 good news. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric  
9 Administration for the past 20 to 30 years the ocean has been  
10 in a warm cycle. That's about the same time the dams were  
11 built and the salmon and the steelhead dramatically started to  
12 decline.

13         Now they say that it is changing to a cold cycle. Lo and  
14 behold, the numbers indicate, according to the Army Corps of  
15 Engineers, that 4,000 spring and summer salmon were counted  
16 past the Lower Granite Dam in 1999. That's ten times more than  
17 in 1998 and 40 times more than in 1994. At Bonneville Dam the  
18 counts were the highest since the 1970s. This year the  
19 National Marine Fisheries are predicting as many as 140,000  
20 salmon will make it through.

21         With such good news, why all the fuss? Well, in a  
22 nutshell we can put most of the blame on the ever-growing  
23 eco-monsters called the environmental movement. Their agenda  
24 is very similar to the global elites for bent on the tearing  
25 down and dismantling of America so that they can equal things

1 out throughout the world and have a planned socialist world  
2 society where no country has any more than another. Which  
3 really means we will all be poor. They use deceit and illusion  
4 as their sword and dupe many into their paganistic nature is  
5 God and nature knows best philosophy.

6           What better way to cripple a country than to lock up its  
7 recourses and destroy its agricultural and industrial base by  
8 removing its cheap and efficient transporting of goods to and  
9 from its major seaports, not to mention the cost efficient,  
10 plentiful, pollution free hydroelectric power.

11           I suggest to you that destroying the dams is every bit as  
12 treasonous and an act of war on the people of this region and  
13 the United States of America, as it would be if a foreign  
14 invader initiated a bombing raid and took a mountain of high  
15 tech missiles. Leave the dams alone.

16           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Russ. Elder Axtell, please. Let  
17 me tell you what this is about. I can't allow you to boo one  
18 another because that sets up an atmosphere of intimidation.  
19 There's a lot of views in this room, and we want to hear from  
20 them all. If I can't allow you to boo, then I can't,  
21 obviously, allow clapping, either. That's the same  
22 atmosphere. So, I would like to ask you, please, to  
23 cooperate.

24           If you agree or disagree, you'll get your chance to make  
25 your comments either here today or in writing or next door.

1 Please use those avenues and let us proceed. Elder.

2 ELDER AXTELL: Thank you. My name is Horace Axtell. I'm  
3 a Nez Perce -- full blood Nez Perce. I want to talk about my  
4 ancestry. Also, I would like to make a comment about D-Day. I  
5 was in World War II. I had a lot of friends, relatives, that  
6 shed blood and lost lives on D-Day. I don't like that, what  
7 was in the paper. It hurts. You don't know what hurt is. You  
8 come here and talk about life. Many lives have been lost  
9 because of this.

10 What we are here for is to talk about livelihood. Talk  
11 about water. Water is the most important element to our  
12 people, the Nez Perce. A long time ago our people used to roam  
13 the land. Wherever they went they had clean water. Water is a  
14 purification to our bodies. And what I see now is a  
15 purification of our waters has destroyed -- our water has been  
16 destroyed. Where do we have to go to get clean water anymore?  
17 You have to go to the store to buy it. You have to go to the  
18 store and buy bottled water to make sure that you've got clean  
19 water.

20 Water is the most important element to all things that  
21 grow, all plants, animals, fish, anything has to have water.  
22 So I'm very honored that I can say these few words regarding  
23 the life of our ancestors who lived here a long time before  
24 anything -- any other people came to this land. And the  
25 survival of our people were just as good then or even better

1 than they are now. We never had any of these kind of diseases  
2 that affects all people from pollution, from bad water, bad  
3 fish even now.

4 All I can say now is people are very concerned about  
5 these dams. I was concerned about the first dam that was built  
6 down there at The Dalles. There we lost all our fish. We  
7 don't get the fish like that anymore. People make so many  
8 comments about breaching, and I'm certainly glad I can say that  
9 we should breach these dams. And what I see now is a lot of  
10 people that don't eat salmon. Thank you.

11 MS. COLLIS: Thank you very much. Please, folks, please.  
12 Jack Kappas and then Barb Gaskell is next and after Barb is  
13 Jerry Ausman.

14 MR. KAPPAS: My name is Jack Kappas. I live and make a  
15 living in Riggins, Idaho. Nowadays the strength of the economy  
16 in Riggins is based on tourism, chiefly white water rafting,  
17 jet boating, hunting, and most importantly, steelhead fishing.  
18 Salmon fishing used to be the big fishing event in Riggins but  
19 over the years wild salmon runs have almost ceased to exist on  
20 the Salmon River.

21 Restoring wild steelhead and salmon runs to healthy  
22 numbers will ensure lots of fish for future generations of  
23 people that live in Idaho and is especially important for the  
24 small communities along the Snake, Clearwater and Salmon  
25 Rivers. Towns like Riggins. Make no mistake about it. If the

1 salmon and steelhead disappear from the Salmon River, the  
2 businesses of Riggins will dry up and disappear also.

3         The people that live in Riggins have just as much right  
4 to make a living off fish as the people of Lewiston and  
5 Clarkston do on toilet paper.

6         For salmon and steelhead recovery I strongly support  
7 Alternative 4 on the Corps' Draft EIS. Breaching the four  
8 lower Snake dams is the best plan to restore our salmon and  
9 steelhead to self-sustaining harvestable levels as required by  
10 law and treaties.

11         The Yakima River, Hanford Reach smolt to adult recovery  
12 rate for salmon/steelhead is performing much better than the  
13 return of these fish above the four lower Snake River dams.  
14 There is nothing else to do for the salmon by tweaking  
15 hydropower flows for these four dams.

16         On the four H Papers on Habitat I support Option 3, and  
17 in Harvest I support Option 3. But remember, don't punish the  
18 victims. The tribe and the fisherman have very little effect  
19 on the salmon and steelhead mortality. It's the dams that  
20 cause the mortality. Hatcheries, I support Option 3. I like  
21 to catch hatchery -- eat hatchery fish as much as anybody,  
22 steelhead, but I'm ready to sacrifice my fishing if it means  
23 the good wild runs of steelhead and salmon can come back.

24         Hydropower, I support Option 3. There is a 100 -- 80 to  
25 100 percent chance of recovery for wild steelhead if these dams

1 are breached. Give it 100 years. If it doesn't work, put a  
2 lot of people back to work rebuilding the dams.

3 At least we'll be able to look at our -- the future  
4 generations in the eyes and say honestly to them, that we tried  
5 everything we could to save the salmon. Those dams don't make  
6 sense for people or salmon.

7 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Jack. Okay, Barb is next and  
8 then Jerry Ausman and then Ernie Wilson is on deck.

9 MS. GASKELL: Hi. My name is Barb Gaskell. I am a guide  
10 on Idaho's Salmon River out of Riggins. I am here today to  
11 show my support for breaching the four salmon killing dams on  
12 the lower Snake River. My livelihood is also directly affected  
13 by this issue. But that's not the main reason I'm here. I am  
14 here to speak on behalf of these fish.

15 These dams have changed the characteristics of the river  
16 and placed salmon on the brink of extinction. Other than our  
17 moral obligation to save these fish are the laws and treaties  
18 that need to be honored and that mandate these fish must be  
19 saved from extinction.

20 Letting the fish go extinct would be the most expensive  
21 option of all, causing taxpayers tens of millions of dollars in  
22 reparations to Indian tribes, which would be more than  
23 warranted on their part. Dam breaching is the cheapest option  
24 on the table.

25 In a futile attempt to help these young fish get down

1 stream, hundreds of millions of your taxpayer dollars have been  
2 spent on the effective schemes. Over 3 billion dollars have  
3 been wasted in the last 20 years. How much more are you  
4 willing to spend on failed recovery plans? They have not  
5 worked.

6 Fighting other insurmountable odds to make their way home  
7 to spawn, these dams take a heavy toll on returning adult fish.  
8 If these fish are allowed to go extinct, the Snake River Basin  
9 will lose a vital link in its web of life.

10 We have the moral obligation to undue what man has done  
11 to one of nature's species. All things are connected and  
12 whatever we do to earth's creatures we do to ourselves.

13 I urge you to remove the blinders and realize that we  
14 need to take action now. We must urge our elected officials to  
15 support salmon and steelhead recovery by the best option  
16 available, dam breaching.

17 It is the only thing that makes environmental and  
18 economic sense. Time is critical in this issue. We don't have  
19 another 20 years to keep doing what has been proven to be a  
20 failure.

21 If you walk down the street every day and you know there  
22 is a hole in the street that you can't avoid and will always  
23 fall in, would you finally go down another street or would you  
24 just keep falling in the hole? These dams don't make sense for  
25 people or salmon.

1           Our governmental officials have made several references  
2 to the human factor. Maybe they are forgetting another part of  
3 the human factor, and that is our Native American Brothers and  
4 Sisters. Maybe you could all take a lesson from them about  
5 taking care of and having regard for our precious mother earth  
6 and her resources.

7           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Barb. Okay, Jerry.

8           MR. AUSMAN: Correct.

9           MS. COLLIS: Go. After Jerry is Ernie Wilson and then  
10 Vania Bybee.

11           MR. AUSMAN: Okay. Let me start out by saying there is  
12 free beer in the parking lot. Now that I've got everybody's  
13 attention. Okay, the proposal to destroy the federal dams on  
14 the Snake River just doesn't make any sense. All we want to do  
15 is what is best for the salmon and the steelhead runs, as well  
16 as what's best for all of the people involved.

17           We must focus on proposals that really work. We must  
18 also avoid radical ideas that will clearly have devastating  
19 results, not just to the economy and all the people, but to our  
20 environment as well. We need concentrate more on the time that  
21 the steelhead and salmon spend growing in the ocean so it will  
22 help and increase the percentage of return upstream.

23           From the time the steelhead and salmon smolt arrive at  
24 the mouth of the Columbia, of an estimated 25 million of these  
25 young fish die when they are going through their adaptation to

1 the saltwater. This is about 30 percent of the total young  
2 population of each one of these species.

3       What survives of this must now spend an average of two to  
4 four years trying to out swim its natural predators, as well as  
5 foreign and domestic fishing fleets in our oceans. The  
6 percentage for returns for migration to the Columbia and Snakes  
7 must go through adaptation to the fresh water. This time they  
8 are easy prey for natural predators such as the sea lions.  
9 What the sea lions take from the returning salmon and  
10 steelheads are devastating to the species.

11       The percentage that makes it through this gauntlet must  
12 now face man's reaping of the species before it even reaches  
13 the first of the dams on the lower Snake River. In turn, the  
14 lower tribes also, commercial fishing, and domestic fishing  
15 also reap what should be coming up our way. They are not  
16 denominational on what they harvest. They do not put back  
17 what's supposed to be in our water.

18       Therefore, the proposal to destroy the dams on the Snake  
19 River are basically environmentalism in its finest. This is  
20 definitely not a solution to help save our steelhead and salmon  
21 runs. Thank you.

22       MS. COLLIS: Thank you very much. Okay, thanks, and then  
23 Ernie Wilson and Vania and after Vania Kirk, I think it's  
24 Barnum. Ernie?

25       MR. WILSON: Yes.

1 MS. COLLIS: Are you with us?

2 MR. WILSON: Right here.

3 MS. COLLIS: Thanks.

4 MR. WILSON: Yeah, hi. I'm Ernie Wilson from Lewiston.

5 I'm just here to say that I oppose tearing out the dams. I

6 would like to thank the General for bringing up the point of

7 the sediment that's going to be let loose after those dams are

8 tore out. I believe the Corps was the ones that stated that

9 the release of that sediment will kill the fish, all the fish

10 in the river. That will also take anywhere from 8 to 20 some

11 years or longer for the fish to come back.

12 The other thing I keep hearing is that everybody is

13 concerned about our endangered fish. If everybody is so

14 concerned about them, why don't we quit the fishing. If the

15 Indians need to harvest fish, let's do it off the dams. Let's

16 do it at the ladders and get the gill nets out of the rivers

17 where they are taking and they are killing all the species.

18 That which isn't beneficial to them they throw away.

19 All we are asking for is a workable solution. If

20 everybody's concerned, let's get together and take some

21 measures to eliminate the things that we have now on hand.

22 That's about all I have got to say.

23 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Ernie. Okay, Vania and then Kirk

24 Barnum and then Carl Younce. And let me just remind you, if

25 you need me to bring the mic to you, just raise your hand when

1 your name comes up, and I'll bring it to you.

2 MS. BYBEE: My name is Vania Bybee. I am 17 years old.  
3 I'm from Lapwai High School.

4 MS. COLLIS: Can you speak up into the mic, please,  
5 Vania?

6 MS. BYBEE: I was asked to speak this morning as a tribal  
7 youth representative. The reason I said I would give this  
8 speech is because I feel strongly about the dam breaching.  
9 There are several reasons for these feelings. One reason is  
10 because I'm worried about my future.

11 For many years my ancestors used to be able to go down  
12 and fish, and the fish was plentiful then. Now that the four  
13 lower dams have been built the salmon rivers runs have  
14 plummeted by nearly 90 percent. When I was younger I grew up  
15 on fish. Nowadays you can hardly catch a fish. I am hoping  
16 that when I have children there will be fish to catch.

17 Another reason is when our tribal people have gatherings  
18 fish is one of the main foods brought and enjoyed by our tribal  
19 elders who and which grew up on fish. I have read and have  
20 heard that a healthy -- fish is a healthy food to be available  
21 for everybody, and now if we keep going the way that we are  
22 going, there will be no more food or fishing, which will  
23 violate my treaty rights that I want to continue using  
24 throughout my future.

25 My biggest fear would be the extinction of fish that my

1 children, my grandchildren will not be able to use. Now I  
2 think we must take the major step the development of our fish.  
3 When we built the dams it may have been our biggest mistake.  
4 Several fish have gone extinct and may be extinct, too. For  
5 example, the coho have been extinct. The sockeye is now  
6 endangered. The Chinook are slowly dying away. They say by  
7 the year 2,017 they will be extinct. They most -- most of all  
8 the steelhead are threatened.

9 I hope the right decision will be made so my future and  
10 other young people's future may be somewhat secured by taking  
11 appropriate action to save the fish, and if breaching the dams  
12 is a solution, let's do it. Thank you.

13 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Vania. Kirk is next and then  
14 Carl Younce and then Larry Lodge.

15 MR. BARNUM: I'm a steelhead guide from Riggins, Idaho.  
16 Like many folks here today --

17 MS. COLLIS: Could I get you to state your name for the  
18 record, please?

19 MR. BARNUM: Kirk Barnum. Steelhead guide from Riggins,  
20 Idaho. Like many folks here today my job in the economic  
21 growth of my community depends on a healthy fishery, but this  
22 runs far deeper than just economics. It's about keeping one of  
23 the earth's species from extinction. The natural river option  
24 is the only sensible alternative for these fish to be saved.

25 25 years of technology and 3 billion dollars have proven

1 that we don't know how to save the salmon either way.  
2 Bypassing the dams is the only course of action we can take  
3 that we know works. A lot of people don't realize the natural  
4 river option is not about dam removal. The dams will be saved  
5 and the fish will be allowed to migrate freely around them.

6 This downtime will provide the Corps with a long needed  
7 opportunity to go back to the drawing board and turn these  
8 dinosaurs into efficient producers of power while providing for  
9 safe fish passage. I remember a quote from the tribes during  
10 the Umpqua Wilderness debates about 16 years ago. It goes:

11 The white man's ultimate goal is see himself as the Creator.

12 I think that's true of us. If we are going to play God  
13 with the rivers, let's start making some management decisions  
14 that make sense. Why should every other system in the country  
15 follow the progress of technology and the dams remain ancient?

16 The planet and our population are dynamic systems that  
17 call for dynamic management. Not management that chooses to  
18 stay the same using philosophies the old west to make a buck.

19 We can't keep making decisions based on economics and  
20 convenience while our natural capital is being depleted at the  
21 break neck speeds of American consumers and waste.

22 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Kirk. Okay. Carl and then Larry  
23 Lodge and after Larry is Cliff Wasem.

24 MR. YOUNCE: Thank you. My name is Carl Younce. I am  
25 Regional Director of Lewiston Grain Growers, a Division of

1 Cenex Harvest States. We are a farmer owned cooperative that  
2 serves areas in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho with over 1200  
3 members. Cenex Harvest States is a large regional Cooperative  
4 that serves Farmers throughout a good segment of the United  
5 States.

6 I have a Resolution adopted by the Board of Cenex Harvest  
7 States with, over 320,000 members, opposing the breaching of  
8 the dams.

9 I am here to offer testimony in favor of salmon and in  
10 favor of dams. I represent the agriculture sector and the  
11 industry sector. We believe that dam breaching is an extreme  
12 and risky action. What we know is that dam breaching may or  
13 may not help the salmon, but it will certainly hurt the  
14 economy. A lot of jobs and our way of life are put at stake.

15 Our agriculture is suffering through some of the worst  
16 prices in history, and we can ill-afford a drop in income  
17 because of a breaching of dams and higher transportation  
18 costs. I personally did an analysis of the costs of breaching  
19 to our Ag sector and far from the 6 cents to 21 cents in  
20 Montana, I found that the bottom line impact was 35 cents per  
21 bushel or more in our region of Idaho. The price received in  
22 Lewiston, Idaho is roughly 2.55 to the grower. This is a drop  
23 of around 14 percent when profit margins are breaking even to a  
24 little above and a little below, depending on the producer. I  
25 believe the one issue that remains secondary in your work is

1 economics of the people impacted.

2           What happens to our transportation if you were to  
3 breach? Shipments of fuel, fertilizers, grains, forest  
4 products and other commodities by other modes of  
5 transportation; regional air freight is incapable of handling  
6 bulk products currently barged on the river; the rail system is  
7 currently operating at or near capacity and cannot accommodate  
8 large increases in tonnage without major infrastructure  
9 investments; grain cars are more efficiently and economically  
10 utilized for the long-hauling mid-western grains to our coastal  
11 ports; and, therefore, are in short supply regionally.

12           Many of our roads and highways are currently experiencing  
13 structural inadequacies and bordering upon congestion and  
14 capacity problems and are inadequate to transport said  
15 commodities without significant structural and capacity  
16 improvements.

17           Road taxes and user fees will go up to offset impending  
18 damage due to increased freight hauling.

19           Loss of river barging as a freight hauling option would  
20 reduce competition and would inherently result in increased  
21 freight mobility costs via truck and rail and prices to the  
22 consumer.

23           The most environmentally friendly mode of transportation  
24 is the river. The emissions of hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide,  
25 and nitrous oxide are on the average, less than 1/3rd of rail

1 and 1/9th of truck. The other benefits of power generation,  
2 flood protection, farm land irrigation, and recreational  
3 opportunities are very important to the Pacific Northwest.

4       If we are really trying to save the salmon, why not  
5 question what is happening in the ocean? What about all the  
6 silt that will be created? Why not question the terns eating  
7 the smolts? Why not study the damage the seals do to the  
8 salmon? Why not question why rivers with no dams are  
9 experiencing similar declines? What about the true, negative  
10 effects on other species? Aren't the improvement to the dams  
11 and barging of fish having a positive result?

12       It just makes sense to provide some solutions to these  
13 questions before we engage in extreme, uncertain actions.

14       I hear the statement that tourism dollars will go up  
15 significantly, but in reality I believe the opposite effect  
16 will happen. There is no method of rational thinking that  
17 supports this.

18       Help me to understand how we will create more jobs by  
19 taking out the dams. The infrastructure of the United States  
20 is the envy of the world. If you take out what took many years  
21 to build, you will put us at a disadvantage in a global  
22 economy, and we can ill-afford it.

23       MS. COLLIS: Carl, I need to ask you to wrap up, please.

24       MR. YOUNCE: Losses of the dams could devastate our  
25 community. I firmly believe that we can protect our way of

1 life, save the salmon, and keep the dams. Thank you.

2 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Carl. Larry Lodge and then Cliff  
3 Wasem and then Carla HighEagle.

4 MR. LODGE: Thank you. My name is Larry Lodge, and I'm  
5 glad I have this opportunity to speak to you. I work for  
6 Potlatch Corporation. And I do help in the production of  
7 toilet paper, and I'm probably sure everybody here is glad of  
8 that.

9 I just want to say I've seen the proposals on the  
10 pro-breaching, and a lot of the words I hear is: "maybe," "we  
11 believe," "we think." Well, to tell you the truth those really  
12 aren't good enough for us. If we can't prove that we are going  
13 to have a return on those fish and you are going to tear all  
14 those dams out, the money invested, you guys, it's immoral.  
15 It's totally immoral. The decision to do that, to build those  
16 as we have over the 30 years, to tear them out and some people  
17 say, well, if the fish don't come back, we'll just rebuild  
18 them. Well, the infrastructure is already here.

19 Until you guys stop the harvest on the coast, you stop  
20 the slaughter in the Columbia River, and a moratorium of at  
21 least ten years on tribal fisheries, on commercial fisheries,  
22 and our great friends and countries from around the world that  
23 are slaughtering our fish, we are not going to get those  
24 returns back.

25 So, I would hope you do the right thing. My position

1 is: If you take those dams out, it's damn foolish.

2 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Larry. Okay, Cliff. Are you  
3 Cliff?

4 MR. WASEM: Cliff Wasem.

5 MS. COLLIS: Okay, and then after Cliff, Carla  
6 HighEagle. Go ahead, Cliff.

7 MR. WASEM: You engineers, engineers learn mathematics,  
8 and they learn it very, very well. And they probably know more  
9 about mathematics than probably anybody but an actuary. And  
10 they use it in their trade. Mathematics is an exact science,  
11 and they use it to build structures, dams, buildings, highways,  
12 infrastructures that have made this country great.

13 Engineers create. They are not designed to destroy.  
14 Engineers shouldn't be even considering taking out our dams on  
15 this river that they built that are so productive. There is no  
16 cost effective way to consider it.

17 The returns, sure it should be gotten. The nitwits in  
18 Washington D.C. that say that we can't harvest, the predators  
19 in the ocean ought to be put out of work and out of business,  
20 locked up. Fact is it's criminal. We need to get the nets out  
21 of the rivers and out of the oceans and the fishermen shoved  
22 back over 200 miles, a 200 mile limit for fishing.

23 But if I or a group of men went down there and blew up  
24 one of those earthen parts of your dam, we would be in jail big  
25 time. We would be criminals. And it's just as criminal for us

1 to do it after we've had all kinds of hearings as it would be  
2 if we did it without even considering that.

3 But the main thing is who's financing this thing?  
4 Where's the money coming from? A lot of good meaning people  
5 are in this audience that want to breach the dams. They are  
6 being used by folks in the environmental business, the moguls,  
7 the socialists, the Marxists in our universities. They are  
8 being used by the tax refundations with their billions of  
9 dollars.

10 They are being used by the international oil companies  
11 that are financing the environmentalist movement. They are  
12 being used by our federal government and all the grants. They  
13 are being taken advantage of by Bruce Babbitt and his Bolshevik  
14 bandits, being very plain and up front about it.

15 And we've got to stop. We've got to understand who it  
16 is. Because fish are just the excuse. They are not the reason  
17 for destruction. These people want to destroy the  
18 infrastructure of America. Reduce it to make it more easily  
19 integrated in an international world global government run by  
20 socialists. Thank you very much.

21 MS. COLLIS: Thank you.

22 MS. HIGHEAGLE: Good afternoon, members of the panel. My  
23 name is Carla HighEagle. I'm a member of the Nez Perce Tribe.  
24 It is an honor for me to present testimony on behalf of the  
25 Tribe today. I would like to say that I stand right here

1 behind everything that our Chairman and our Tribal Executive  
2 Committee has stated, the words of our elders, and the words of  
3 our youth.

4         When the Creator placed the Indian people here on this  
5 land we received instructions to take care of this earth, our  
6 brothers and sisters, the salmon, the eagle, and the bear, and  
7 all living things. And as long as we did this, the cycle of  
8 life would continue. We have done this way of life for  
9 thousands of generations. It has sustained us and who we are  
10 as Nez Perce people.

11         The journals of Lewis and Clark bear testament to the  
12 abundance of salmon that once filled this very river outside  
13 these walls. Governor Stevens who negotiated several treaties  
14 with the tribes in the Northwest could not complete a single  
15 treaty without providing for the gathering right of fish and  
16 shellfish. So important was the fisheries to our region.

17         When the dams were built the fishery began to disappear,  
18 and as more dams were built more salmon disappeared. Our  
19 elders of this generation can tell you how there used to be  
20 fish in this very river and its tributaries and how it's  
21 changed within the short span of our lifetime.

22         I hold here in my hand a memo from the Assistant  
23 Secretary of the Interior written in 1947, and I would like to  
24 have this entered into the record. What the memo states is  
25 that the Fish and Wildlife Service considers the construction

1 of the dams will lead to the extermination of the salmon.

2           It further states that the Department agrees that the  
3 Columbia River Fisheries should not be allowed to block the  
4 full development of the other resources of the river, and the  
5 government should direct its efforts to ameliorate the injured  
6 interests.

7           This is the same department, the Department of Interior,  
8 that is responsible for the production of the Indian Treaty  
9 Rights that were to be as long as the grass grows and as long  
10 as the rivers flow. So this issue is not new, and it is up to  
11 us to decide and to debate what legacy we wish to leave for our  
12 children.

13           As Indian people we have seen the loss from Celilo Falls  
14 to Rapid River. We have witnessed. We have suffered. We have  
15 fought. We have been arrested and we have been taken to court  
16 to defend this fishing right that we have and hold sacred. So  
17 it's not new to us. Our position is clear. We will fight for  
18 the salmon, and we will fight for our way of life.

19           These rivers here are the lifeblood of our region. The  
20 dams are clogging the arteries to the very heartland of our  
21 ancestral places. We don't want the salmon to become extinct.  
22 What will be next? America responded to saving the bald  
23 eagle. I ask that we take the expense to save the Salmon.

24           MS. COLLIS: Okay. First let me commend you all for  
25 adhering to our ground rules and for the respect that you are

1 displaying for your fellow community members. I appreciate  
2 that very much, and I'm sure you all do as well. We are going  
3 to take a quick break and allow our panel members to stretch  
4 their legs. When we come back, Rita Carlsen will be at the mic  
5 and then Billy Chetwood. And we will be back at exactly 25  
6 after so be ready.

7 (Recess taken.)

8 MS. COLLIS: Come back in, whoever wants to, and take  
9 your seat. Is Rita here? After Rita is Billy Chetwood and  
10 after Billy is Dave, looks like B-e-h-r-e-n-s. I'm not sure.  
11 Thank you very much. Also I have a request, if anyone is going  
12 to Kamiah, we have a woman here who could use a ride, so if --  
13 she's right here in the front row. If you get a chance, you  
14 can either let her or me know. Okay. Thank you very much.  
15 Okay. Let's go. Well, we need a couple more panel members.  
16 I'm sorry. Hold on, Rita.

17 GEN. STROCK: Generals are never late. You were just  
18 early.

19 MS. COLLIS: Okay. Go. Rita, you were early, but go.

20 MS. CARLSEN: Thank you. My name is Rita Carlsen, and I  
21 am opposed to breaching or bypassing any of the dams on the  
22 Snake or Columbia Rivers. I believe that there has been  
23 inadequate emphasis directed at more logical problems related  
24 to the recovery efforts of the salmonid species.

25 There is already indisputable data that smolts can be

1 successfully transported around the dams and released in free  
2 running waters. The rate of survival of those smolts is in  
3 the range of 96 percent. Obviously, this should demonstrate  
4 that we can maintain the dams and look at other alternatives.

5         It has also been shown that habitat loss is not a major  
6 contributor to the endangerment of the fish survival.

7 Scientists have demonstrated that there is abundant spawning  
8 areas available and that quality of these spawning areas is  
9 better -- actually better on managed forest lands than on the  
10 roadless areas.

11         The real problem it's not getting the smolts through or  
12 around the dams. The real problem is the number of fish  
13 available to make the return trip. That number is controlled  
14 by the perils these fish face while in the ocean environment  
15 and in the transition areas both on their way to the ocean and  
16 on their way back.

17         I believe the ocean conditions have played a primary role  
18 in the number of fish available to make the return trip. El  
19 Nino and El Nina water patterns have had a major impact on  
20 these species' survival, both by a change in the available  
21 traditional food sources and by allowing an increase of  
22 predator species.

23         I believe the other real threat to survival of anadromous  
24 fish lies in the harvest factor. The United States commercial  
25 and sports fisheries have been severely restricted. Predators,

1 as well as Indian and foreign fisheries have been left almost  
2 unchecked.

3 The concept of breaching our hydropower facilities should  
4 not even be considered until the harvest factor is properly and  
5 adequately addressed. I also would like to go on record as  
6 saying that I am very proud of Idaho delegation, and I support  
7 all their comments they made earlier today. Thank you.

8 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Rita. Okay, Billy, you are up  
9 next, and then Dave -- you have to remind me again -- Behrens.  
10 Thank you.

11 MR. CHETWOOD: Thank you. I haven't been called Billy  
12 since I was 15. I am Bill Chetwood. I live in Lewiston,  
13 Idaho. I would like to speak on the draft EIS. I have been at  
14 hearings on this river since 1961. I can't count how many I've  
15 been to. I hope this is the last. For the first time somebody  
16 isn't saying we are going to do another study that will only  
17 take another four years, so I hope this is the last one we have  
18 to go to. I hope something is done.

19 The dams were put on the Snake River to expand navigation  
20 up to Lewiston, Idaho. This system in place has cost our  
21 nation millions of dollars each year in subsidies to  
22 transportation and fish mitigation for studies and fixes. In  
23 addition to this, regional taxes; that is, the taxes on the  
24 ports, are about 1 million 219,540 dollars a year on the local  
25 people.

1           The tax was put in place as a start-up tax, and the ports  
2 after that would be self-sustaining. Those taxes are still in  
3 place, and apparently the port districts will never be  
4 financially independent. The Corps told us don't worry about  
5 the dams going in. If a problem develops, we'll fix it. The  
6 problems developed immediately, and all the fixes haven't  
7 worked.

8           Now the Snake River salmon are near extinction and the  
9 steelhead aren't far behind. As the salmon go, so go the  
10 steelhead. This river and its fish are a national treasure,  
11 and it is reasonable to expect federal mitigation, the monies  
12 so that restoration will not follow disproportionately on the  
13 backs of the local and regional communities. The subsidies,  
14 power and transportation are not entitlements. I think we have  
15 to remind people of that.

16           However, let us reduce those national costs, the annual,  
17 by returning to an open river and put this subsidy money into  
18 an alternate transportation system. If we do that, we'll all  
19 be winners.

20           MS. COLLIS: Thank you. Just to make you feel young  
21 again, thank you, Billy. Okay, Dave and then Don Wilson.

22           MR. BEHRENS: Okay. We had some comments about the All-H  
23 Paper.

24           MS. COLLIS: Dave, can I get you to state your name for  
25 the record?

1           MR. BEHRENS: Oh, Dave Behrens, and I'm from Lewiston,  
2 Idaho. There were some comments made about the All-H Paper and  
3 forgetting the human part of it. We also forgot one letter, P,  
4 for predator. If you were really intent on saving the fish  
5 runs, the predators at the mouth of the Columbia have got to be  
6 reduced. A farmer cannot build up a heard of beef cows if  
7 every year he sends all his efforts to the slaughter house.

8           This is essentially what is happening with the fish runs  
9 and not just in the Snake River, but every river up and down  
10 the coast of America and Canada. Dams are not the reason for  
11 the low returns of steelhead and salmon. Some of the rivers do  
12 not have a single dam on them.

13          If your group has enough power to instigate the removal  
14 of the dams, you surely have got enough power to get the seals,  
15 the sea lions, and the terns off the protected list. Here are  
16 a couple of things that you as a group can do that will not  
17 impact people and even help some people.

18          First, get the harbor seals and the lions off the  
19 protected list and let any Indian tribe or Eskimo group that  
20 wants or can use, needs the blubber, harvest up to 50 percent  
21 of it.

22          Second, plant trees on the shores of Rice Island inland  
23 for a couple hundred FBRs. You can try the hybrid poplar that  
24 is being raised commercially now. They seem to grow anywhere  
25 there is plenty of water. They can be a source of income for

1 the Corps of Engineers, and also would force the terns to find  
2 a different area to nest and live. In fact, if this had been  
3 done several years ago, we probably wouldn't even be on this  
4 place right now.

5         Removing the dams will greatly increase the amount of air  
6 pollution because the increased number of trucks needed to  
7 transport the grains and other goods to the coast or overseas  
8 shipment. The same people will complain about the air  
9 pollution that will come with the increased traffic which also  
10 complain to you about breaching these dams.

11         Highways would have to be restructured, as well as the  
12 railroad to handle the additional traffic. This will cost  
13 hundreds of millions of dollars that don't need to be spent.  
14 The cost of the four dams has to be and had to have been in the  
15 hundreds of millions of dollars. If you had that much money of  
16 your own invested in the stock market, would you throw all your  
17 stock certificates into the fire and burn them and lose all  
18 that money? I don't think you would do that. That is exactly  
19 what you are doing with taxpayers' money that is invested in  
20 these dams if the dams are breached.

21         You are the experts in your chosen field. Please stop  
22 listening to the extreme preservation groups that seems to be  
23 the case and look at all the options that will not put a severe  
24 impact on the population of the areas involved. The removal of  
25 dams should not even have been on your to-do list for the

1 fish. Thank you.

2 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Dave. Don Wilson, and then Ralph  
3 Hodge, and after Ralph is Reed Burkholder.

4 MR. WILSON: I'm Don Wilson, and I'm retired from  
5 Potlatch Corporation. I want to say that I have seen the fish  
6 in the rivers in the northern part of the state. I fish the  
7 Coeur d'Alene River and rivers up in that area. And from the  
8 time I started fishing until now, you cannot imagine the  
9 difference in the amount of fish. There just aren't as many,  
10 and it isn't only fish, it's all species in the wildlife. It  
11 has declined over the years, and it's not because of the dams  
12 that has caused this, it's just because there's more people  
13 than to harvest what we have. It's what I believe.

14 So, taking the dams out I don't think is the solution. I  
15 think we need to work on some of the other alternatives a  
16 little harder that isn't -- doesn't have quite the impact,  
17 money-wise, and things that you can change in a month or two  
18 back one way or another and not have the amount of cost. So, I  
19 would suggest that we try those alternatives before we spend  
20 the money removing the dams. I thank you for letting me speak.

21 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Don. Ralph Hodge, Reed  
22 Burkholder, and then Dave Beuke. Ralph, are you here? Thanks.

23 MR. HODGE: My name is Ralph Hodge, and I'll reflect my  
24 remarks both EIS and the All-H Paper. I'm a member of the  
25 Pacific Allied Industrial Chemical Energy Worker's Union, Local

1 8369 in Richland. We have a lot of companies out in Hanford  
2 and also all the Tidewater workers. My day job is a licensed  
3 tankerman and an agricultural chemical handler for Tidewater  
4 terminals in Pasco. No, Tidewater didn't send me up here  
5 today, nor did they ten years ago when I attended the original  
6 salmon summit. I came in sport of brothers and sisters at the  
7 Potlatch Corporation, and being raised up at Colfax on a small  
8 farm, also the farmers and orchardists that rely so much on the  
9 irrigation and transportation that our dams provide.

10 I wish to remind some of the concepts and common sense  
11 that have been ascertained over the past ten years. We want  
12 the same fish. Every citizen in the Northwest supports that  
13 endeavor. But it's still going to take a balance and  
14 comprehensive effort.

15 Latest scientific data suggests that removing Snake River  
16 dams is not the best way to recover endangered salmon. Why are  
17 salmon runs also declining on rivers without dams? Why is the  
18 Hanford Reach such a wonderful salmon spawning ground despite  
19 those salmon having to go through dams? Predators near the  
20 mouth of the Columbia, terns and others are not being addressed  
21 effectively.

22 We need to continue the course of technological upgrades  
23 such as dam bypass systems, turbine streams, continued  
24 transportation, and other innovations that have made the river  
25 significantly safer for fish since the dams were constructed.

1 There's just too much focus on the dams alone.

2 Let's remember our economic stability, united balance.

3 It's only fair. And I wish to endorse the 5th H also. Thank  
4 you.

5 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Ralph. Okay, Reed Burkholder,  
6 and after Reed is Dave Beuke. And after Dave is Bob. I think  
7 it's DeBarde. I'm not sure. Go ahead.

8 MR. BURKHOLDER: I'm Reed Burkholder. I'm from Boise,  
9 Idaho. I'm a citizen from Boise, and I support breaching the  
10 dams. There is little reason for anybody outside of this  
11 Valley, in Lewiston and Clarkston, to want to save the dams.  
12 We can decide no flood control, for it is not saved by the  
13 dams. If the irrigational value of these dams is those 13  
14 farms out of Ice Harbor pool, that's roughly one half of one  
15 percent of Washington's cropland.

16 From a public or a common good point of view it's  
17 meaningless, those 37,000 acres. That's very meaningful to the  
18 farm workers and to the owners. But from the common good point  
19 of view, we are dealing with a very, very small amount of  
20 irrigated agriculture.

21 So there's little reason outside of this Valley for any  
22 of us, State of Boise, Southern Idaho, who wants to save the  
23 dams. From our point of view we take a look at the  
24 navigational system. It's 140 miles from Lewiston to Pasco.  
25 For crying out loud, the grain is going to Japan or ports

1 further.

2           How do you suppose North Dakota grain gets to Portland?  
3 It goes on a railroad car. How do you suppose Southern Idaho  
4 grain gets to Portland? It goes on a railroad car. How do you  
5 suppose Montana grain, 95 percent goes to Portland. It goes on  
6 a railroad car. Hey, folks, railroad cars don't cause  
7 endangered species, but these dams do.

8           How about the electricity? I want to just emphasize  
9 there's little reason for people outside of this Valley to want  
10 to save the dams. Four percent of the region's power and 1.5  
11 percent of Idaho's electricity, 1/6th of 1 percent of my  
12 electricity in Idaho power district of Boise.

13           Has anybody looked at the Wall Street Journal lately? I  
14 challenge you to check out the Dow Jones electricity price  
15 index. They are published every day of the week, Monday  
16 through Friday. What it's showing us is shocking. Since these  
17 free markets went into existence in about 1992, public prices  
18 at the wholesale level are being reported every day.

19           In Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland on the 33 of  
20 the 45 days I just checked, it was cheaper in Pennsylvania than  
21 it was in Portland. What this is showing -- check out Chicago.  
22 It's called synergy in the Wall Street Journal. What this  
23 shows is that wholesale electricity prices are roughly the same  
24 nationwide. They are the same if you are burning coal. They  
25 are the same if you are burning natural gas or running a

1 nuclear power plant or running a hydro plant.

2           What happens if we breach the dams? Nothing. I  
3 challenge you to ask any economist, what are they anticipating  
4 happens to the price of electricity in the west, and they will  
5 tell you, nothing. There's little reason for any of us outside  
6 of this Valley to want to save the dams.

7           And I have one criticism for the DEIS. You are really  
8 short on mitigation information. I would like you to go back.  
9 Think it through. What are you going to do about Potlatch?  
10 What are you going to do about grain growers? What are you  
11 going to do about those 13 farmers?

12           In Idaho we have 22 farmers I can think of who pump out  
13 of the Snake River. 200 had 900 feet. We're asking these Ice  
14 Harbor farmers --

15           MS. COLLIS: You need to wrap up.

16           MR. BURKHOLDER: We are asking these Ice Harbor farmers  
17 to pump an additional 75 to 96 feet. It's a technological,  
18 easy thing to do. Thank you very much.

19           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Reed. Dave Beuke and Thomas  
20 Joseph.

21           MR. BEUKE: My name is --

22           MS. COLLIS: Excuse me. I made a mistake. Let me  
23 correct that, please, Dave, before you start. After Dave was  
24 Bob. I think it's D-e-B-a-r-d-e, but I'm not sure about that.  
25 Thank you. Go ahead. Thanks.

1 MR. BEUKE: My name is David Beuke. I represent the  
2 National Resource Committee for the Chambers of Lewiston and  
3 Clarkston. Our community is made of up of business industry,  
4 labor, agricultural, ports, public officials, and many others  
5 that are involved in our local economy.

6 We stand together against breaching, drawdowns, flow  
7 augmentation, and we also stand for saving the fish. We want a  
8 common sense approach on fish recovery. We regard the river  
9 system we now have as a native link in the transportation  
10 system that serves the Inland Northwest. The hydropower and  
11 irrigation are essential to the economy of the region. Flood  
12 control is a lifesaving benefit of the Columbia River System.  
13 Although, it is not directly related to the four lower Snake  
14 River dams. What we are talking about here is the whole  
15 Columbia River System, the John Day Study is also included in  
16 that.

17 Removal of the four lower Snake River dams will not solve  
18 the fish problem. It would cause a loss of jobs and fish.  
19 Removing them would cause more harm than it would do good. The  
20 solutions to the fish runs will be found in science and  
21 technology as many have eluded to in the past statements.

22 In the meantime, harvest should be better controlled,  
23 both in the ocean and in the rivers. Maybe even a moratorium  
24 for a while until we try to recover some of these stocks.  
25 Predation and fish passage improvements should be pursued. In

1 other words, we need to work on getting rid of the predators,  
2 and we need to do more to our dams to facilitate fish passage.

3 We should replant our headwaters, whether or not it is  
4 with a natural stock or not. Otherwise, we will never recover  
5 meaningful fish runs. We should reach international fishing  
6 agreements with our neighbor nations and with those who are not  
7 our neighbors.

8 I go to an article that appeared in the National  
9 Geographic in November of 1995. Matter-of-fact, it was voted  
10 most severe edition to the protective study of ocean  
11 fisheries. They predicted that in five years from that time  
12 that if oppression that was put on the fish and all the  
13 fisheries of the world was kept up, there wouldn't be a fishery  
14 -- sustainable fishery left in ten years.

15 I believe that their predictions are very close to being  
16 true. We have over harvested our fishing stocks out of  
17 existence and we have done nothing to do anything about that.

18 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Dave.

19 MR. BEUKE: I'm not done yet.

20 MS. COLLIS: Oh, yes, you are. Oh, yes, you are. You're  
21 done.

22 MR. BEUKE: Okay.

23 MS. COLLIS: No, your time is up. Thanks. Bob DeBarde  
24 and then Ron Wise and then Darci Daniels. Bob, are you here?  
25 We need to get you up to the mic fast. Bob? No. Okay. Ron

1 Wise, and then Darci Daniels and Thomas Joseph. Go ahead. We  
2 need Ron. Are you here? Come on up. You're Ron?

3 MR. WISE: Good afternoon. My name is Ron Wise, and I  
4 live here in the Valley. And my remarks are going to be  
5 addressed to the DEIS. Here in the Valley we have been  
6 inundated for years with the statement that breaching the dams  
7 would devastate the local economy. No evidence is offered  
8 backing up this contention, and sad to say, there is little in  
9 the Corps' EIS to clarify this belief.

10 There is no doubt that people feel threatened for their  
11 jobs. Perception is reality, and this reality is real. In an  
12 effort to reduce this anxiety I would like to paraphrase some  
13 of the ideas of Professor Tom Power of the University of  
14 Montana. If we study the economics of rural towns in the  
15 Inland Northwest for 30 years, and his research offers valuable  
16 insights for all of us, simply pared down he says:

17 Most predictions of economic catastrophes in extractive  
18 industry such as logging and mining turn ought to be wrong.  
19 For example, in 1990 the Idaho State Legislature ordered a  
20 study of timber supply in Northern Idaho. The study said that  
21 not only would the timber supply fall off, but there would be a  
22 loss of 3,000 jobs, etcetera, etcetera.

23 The only thing they got right was the fall off of timber  
24 supply. The loss of jobs and small towns drying up and blowing  
25 away did not happen. In fact, just the opposite occurred. In

1 1988 to 1997 there were more people, more income, and net gain  
2 of 2,000 new jobs.

3       Catastrophic predictions are based on four fallacies, and  
4 they are: One, it assumes the economy is static. In reality  
5 the economy is constantly changing and adapting to new  
6 conditions. Two, it assumes that people are passive. In  
7 reality most people are able to change and adapt. Three, it  
8 assumes that people who lose jobs stay that way, rather than  
9 seeking and getting new jobs. Four, it assumes the rearview  
10 mirror posture that only those economic opportunities of the  
11 past will be so in the future. This is incorrect because there  
12 are always new opportunities.

13       In short, this view of economic devastation assumes that  
14 we don't have a market economy; that people don't have an  
15 entrepreneurial spirit, and that we are all collectively one  
16 quart low. Is this true of the people of this Valley? I think  
17 not. Yes, there will be changes in the Valley. If we work  
18 together we will come out with an experience of a healthier  
19 economy. The time to act is now before it is too late.

20       In conclusion, I support removing the dams to restore the  
21 wild steelhead and salmon for mitigation for both adversity  
22 affected by dams bypassing. That is only fair. And I urge the  
23 Army Corps of Engineers to contract with Professor Tom Power to  
24 assist in improving the economic part of the EIS. Thank you.

25       MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Ron. Darci is up next and after

1 Darci is Thomas Joseph and on deck we have Pete Ellsworth.

2 MS. DANIELS: My name is Darci Daniels. I'm from  
3 Lewiston, Idaho. The Snake River salmon faces many obstacles  
4 in their quest for survival, including a dramatic increase in  
5 the number --

6 MS. COLLIS: Darci, can you just speak a little bit more  
7 into the mic? Thank you.

8 MS. DANIELS: Including a dramatic increase in the number  
9 of predators along the migration mouth. Both terns whose  
10 population has exploded to the completion of Rice Island and  
11 sea lions have tripled in numbers since the mid-1970s. They  
12 also face navigation of the Columbia and Snake River  
13 hydroelectric systems and harvest by man in both the rivers and  
14 in the ocean. However, the majority of the salmon's life-span  
15 is spent in the ocean so ocean conditions have a huge impact on  
16 the survival rate of the species.

17 As James Anderson of the University of Washington  
18 Fisheries writes: Our research suggests that although many  
19 factors that cause salmon decline, barging and improved dam  
20 passage have mitigated many of the effects of the dams. For  
21 our ocean survival resulting from a shift in the ocean regime  
22 is an important, if not the most important factor in the recent  
23 decline of the stocks.

24 Research also at the University of Washington points that  
25 Pacific deco oscillation, a recurring pattern of Pacific

1 atmosphere and ocean variability which shows a strong  
2 correlation to salmon production and survival rates. This is  
3 best characterized as an alternating 20- to 30-year long regime  
4 consulated by the next reversals.

5         From 1977 through the mid-1990s ocean conditions have  
6 favored Alaska's stock and disfavored west coast stocks. But  
7 the latest data from the NOAA shows that the next reversal of  
8 ocean conditions may have begun. In 1999 the ocean temperature  
9 actually dropped, signaling the beginning of a cooler weather  
10 regime which should have a dramatic impact on west coast salmon  
11 survival rates.

12         Even the most ardent supporters of breaching the four  
13 lower Snake River dams end up that doing so is no guarantee of  
14 bringing back the salmon runs. There is speculation that  
15 releasing the millions of tons of sediment built up behind  
16 these dams downstream they actually refer to decimate the very  
17 runs we are trying to save.

18         Considering all these facts, I would ask that you,  
19 instead, put your support behind the efforts at furthering  
20 hatchery science, improving barging techniques, and diminishing  
21 the predatory threats the salmon will have on your dream.  
22 These efforts can keep the risks at sustainable levels until  
23 the next shift in climate takes effect which should return  
24 ocean environment conditions to those that favor the Snake  
25 River and salmon returns. Thank you.

1 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Darci. Okay, Thomas Joseph and  
2 after Thomas is Pete Ellsworth and then on deck is Neil, I  
3 think it's Toothaker.

4 Let me just say that our court reporter has asked those  
5 of you who speak fast naturally or in order to get your three  
6 minutes -- your comments in in three minutes, if you have your  
7 comments in writing, she would appreciate getting a copy so she  
8 can make sure she doesn't miss something in your comments. Go  
9 ahead. Thanks.

10 MR. THOMAS: Hello. My name is Thomas Joseph, and I  
11 would like to thank you people for coming here and listening to  
12 us speak, and I would like to thank you guys as well for coming  
13 and showing your partnership in a town meeting that we are  
14 having today. I would like to thank the Tribal Officers, the  
15 Tribal Representatives that came and as well as our state  
16 representatives that came.

17 I would like to challenge our state representatives to do  
18 what they are obligated to do, which is what's best for the  
19 State of Idaho and what's best for the State of Idaho's  
20 people. Obviously they don't really like to listen to what we  
21 have to say because they would be here today if they were.  
22 They just came and said their lines and then cut out. They got  
23 better things to do than listen to the people that vote them  
24 in.

25 Anyways, I would like to push them to say do what's best

1 for Idaho and what's best for Idaho is bringing the salmon back  
2 to us. I am a member of Lewiston. I live in Lewiston. I am a  
3 member of this Valley. I also -- I used to live on the  
4 Reservation out there so that's also my community. I consider  
5 everybody in here my community. So when these salmon -- when  
6 these salmon go away -- and there is going to be struggles that  
7 our community will face, we'll face that as a community, and  
8 we'll face that together. And by us doing that together we  
9 will be able to overcome the loss of jobs or the loss of money  
10 that a lot of us might face. But when the salmon do come back  
11 up the river us as a community will stand together and rejoice  
12 that as well. That's what needs to happen.

13       Us as a community can -- I ain't going to stand up here  
14 and tell you all the facts, of, you know -- all the economic  
15 facts and all the environmental facts because you guys are the  
16 professionals. You guys know that. All I want to do is tell  
17 you that I am for breaching the lower four dams of the Salmon  
18 River and us as a community we can stand together and take on  
19 whatever faces us.

20       We need to look to the future. If we look to the future  
21 back to the days, those dams would never have been put in their  
22 place. Because of the negligence of our people in the past,  
23 that's what we have facing us. That's why we have to face this  
24 today. If we don't neglect this, then our ancestors and the  
25 people who will follow us don't have to face this. We have to

1 face it on right now so that it will be taken care of.

2 I guess some other things I would like to say is, gees, I  
3 don't know, just would like to thank everybody for coming out  
4 here today. And I know there is a lot of conflicts and there's  
5 a lot of different viewpoints going around right here, but as  
6 together as a community, as a community of us as Lewiston and  
7 tribal people, both of us have neglected.

8 The people of Potlatch -- the people of this Valley have  
9 neglected to save the salmon because it hurts their financial  
10 needs. The people of the Reservation have neglected to take  
11 this -- to push the salmon fight on and on and on until today.  
12 But, is it too late? Not yet, but it's going to be.

13 And so, I sit here today and I think of what my ancestors  
14 must think looking at us, thinking -- hoping, like my mom says,  
15 well, they are proud, you know, they are proud of you coming  
16 out here and trying to save the salmon, but are they? We  
17 should have done this a long time ago before this even come  
18 about, close to their extinction. Thank you.

19 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Thomas. Okay, Pete Ellsworth,  
20 Neil Toothaker, and then Phil Hughes is in the wings. Go  
21 ahead.

22 MR. ELLSWORTH: I am Pete Ellsworth. I wish to speak on  
23 the draft EIS. I am a married resident of this Valley, and I  
24 have five children, five grandchildren. For 50 plus years I  
25 have been a resident of Idaho. I'm an avid sportsman, and

1 that's been for almost 50 years. Over a dozen sports members I  
2 represent. Because of my interest in natural resources my  
3 union has appointed me as their representative for natural  
4 resources. That was six years ago.

5 I am still the Natural Resource Representative with the  
6 largest Union Local in the State of Idaho; that is, IAM,  
7 International Association of Machinist Aerospace Workers Lodge  
8 364. After much careful and thoughtful study I, and my union  
9 membership, are convinced that removing the four lower Snake  
10 River dams is not a responsible solution to restoring the  
11 salmon and steelhead runs.

12 We talked about the All-H Paper. One of the things that  
13 we talked about was not having humans in that factor. One  
14 thing that the tribal member Sam Penney mentioned is that there  
15 was another H left out, honor. I believe that it is your job  
16 to honor the commitment that was made to the people in this  
17 area to not leave a stone unturned in finding solutions to  
18 these problems, even if that means no turn unstoned.

19 I support the comments of the following speakers: Joe  
20 Stegner, J.D. Williams, Bruce Newcomb, Jerry Ausman, Dave  
21 Behrens, Ralph Hodge, Dave Beuke, Darci Daniels. Thank you for  
22 your time. I appreciate the opportunity to speak before you  
23 on behalf of myself, my family, my children, my grandchildren,  
24 and my union members.

25 MR. COLLIS: Thank you. Thank you, Pete. Okay. Neil is

1 up next and then after Neil, Phil Hughes, and on deck is Wade  
2 Gruell.

3 MR. TOOTHAKER: My name is Neil Toothaker. I am a  
4 resident here in Clarkston, Washington. A couple of things.  
5 I've had a presentation. I have changed this three different  
6 times and put it in the folder. Some of the concerns I heard  
7 here is different opinions, D-Day. D-Day is D-Day here in  
8 Lewiston, Idaho. When I look at the 13 different areas that  
9 you are going to hold your hearings at, we, at Lewiston, Idaho,  
10 feel this is D-Day. There are several different things.

11 General, I'll addresses this to you, and no dishonor  
12 because I know that you were a fine leading officer in the  
13 Vietnam War because I have a good mutual friend who was one of  
14 your commanding officers, but the Corps of Engineers, I feel,  
15 has totally let this community down. It's not that many years  
16 ago when you came to this Valley and sold us on these four  
17 dams. Sold us on the opportunities of what it's going to  
18 provide for us: recreation, irrigation, and the flow of  
19 traffic down river. Basically use the discussion earlier, it's  
20 our Highway I-5. That's about all we have here.

21 And I feel -- I'm concerned that we are going to be let  
22 down again. I feel it's the responsibility of the Corps of  
23 Engineers to protect these dams for us. You sold them to us.  
24 We haven't paid them off yet. Now we are wanting to tear them  
25 down. There's someplace along the line, finance has got to

1 come into this as well as the common sense of supporting this  
2 community.

3 Lewiston, Idaho is going to be sold by politicians if we  
4 don't stand up and support this community and support this  
5 issue and support the three other issues that are involved in  
6 returning salmon without having to breach the dams.

7 So, I ask for the support from you people to support this  
8 community, the people of this community, and do a proper job  
9 and do something about saving the salmon, which we all agree is  
10 a need. But we have to do it without breaching the dams.  
11 Thank you.

12 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Neil. Okay. Phil Hughes. After  
13 Phil, Wade and after Wade, Ray Thayer.

14 MR. HUGHES: Good afternoon. First off I want to say  
15 thank you for allowing us to come out here to this public  
16 hearing and comment on this. I'm here on behalf of --

17 MS. COLLIS: Can you give your name for the record,  
18 please, Phil?

19 MR. HUGHES: Yes.

20 MS. COLLIS: Thanks.

21 MR. HUGHES: Phil Hughes, and I'm here representing the  
22 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 73BA  
23 members in Lewiston. I'm also here representing myself, my  
24 family, and my grandkids. First off, being an electrician I  
25 have an analytical mind. It's, you know, something that just

1 is natural because I'm an electrician.

2           Let's talk science, PATH, Plan for Analyzing and Testing  
3 Hypotheses, which is assumptions, hypotheses. And people are  
4 using that saying it's proven that that's the only way we can  
5 save the fish. You haven't shown me that yet because it's  
6 hypotheses. Okay, assumptions. Let's get to the proven  
7 results. We have proven barging. You said it here earlier, 98  
8 percent of the fish make it to the ocean. And I believe  
9 there's between 5 or 10 percent of them go out to the ocean  
10 make it back. Now, being this analytical mind, to me I don't  
11 think it's the dams' problem. We need to find out what's going  
12 on in the ocean. I mean, if 98 percent of those are going out  
13 and 5 percent are coming back, to me that's a little more  
14 problem than, you know, the dams. If that was -- if the dams  
15 were the only problem, barge everything down, take care of that  
16 problem.

17           Then you get down to studying the real problems. To my  
18 knowledge they haven't done any studies in the ocean yet.  
19 That's where we really need to fix the problem. Brings me to  
20 the next point: We need to spend our money in the right  
21 places. We've got proven things such as barging, improving the  
22 dams. And these don't have to be in any special order.  
23 Controlling predators, limiting fishing. I mean not totally  
24 cut it off, but limit it. And especially study the ocean. To  
25 me, if you think about it logically that's where the biggest

1 problem I see is.

2           As far as breaching the dams, to me that is very  
3 extreme. I'll give you my analogy of this. Let's say you're  
4 standing on a 100 foot cliff and you have to get down to the  
5 river. Yep, you could jump off that cliff. You could hope you  
6 survive. To me that's breaching the dams. Taking out the dams  
7 might work, might not. Otherwise, me, I say let's take the  
8 long road, take the path that we know. If you climb down the  
9 cliff, you'll make it there in one piece.

10           I'm a proadvocate for salmon, but I'm also a proadvocate  
11 for using, you know, logic. To me the logical to do is to fix  
12 the things we know can be fixed, and don't jump off the cliff.  
13 Thank you.

14           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Phil. Okay. Wade Gruell is next  
15 and then Ray Thayer and after Ray is Roger Koller.

16           MR. GRUELL: I'm Wade Gruell. I live in Moscow, Idaho.  
17 I don't know who to attribute this to, but someone said one  
18 time: Only when all the buffalo are gone from the plains and  
19 all the salmon are gone from the streams will the white man  
20 understand that he cannot eat money. Well, I hope to prove  
21 that person wrong. But, are there any mechanics or Mr. Fix-its  
22 in the audience here? I quote Aldo Leopold: To keep every cog  
23 and wheel is the first precaution of intelligent tinkering.  
24 Makes sense doesn't it.

25           What does it have to do with salmon or dams? Well, wild

1 salmon are a very essential cog to our ecosystem, our machine,  
2 if you want to call it that. We've been tinkering very  
3 unintelligently with our ecosystem ever since Lewis and Clark  
4 got here, but more recently we built a bunch of dams and then  
5 realized that it was making the fish go away. And we tried to  
6 have some hatcheries, and we tried barging. And the last  
7 speaker said that it works. It doesn't. Ask any fish  
8 biologist.

9         Then we did some studies, studies, and more studies, and  
10 we are still here studying today and all the while the fish are  
11 almost gone. But the dam stands today mainly, frankly, because  
12 of cultural existence and a fear of change. There's a lot of  
13 fear in this room. A lot of people are afraid of change. And  
14 change can be scary, indeed, and it's coming to be sure. But  
15 change can also present an opportunity, in this case a golden  
16 opportunity. For example, salmon related tourism is a pillar  
17 of Alaska's vibrant economy. It could be here, too, and we  
18 would be fools not to cash in on this.

19         Let's look forward and not backward. Instead of fearing  
20 change, let's embrace it. Let's remove the damn dams and  
21 welcome wild salmon back into our community and more  
22 importantly our economy.

23         But let's talk about community. How do we define  
24 community? Is it just a resource of workers in this Valley or  
25 does it include the tribal members or all six billion people in

1 the planet or does it include the plants and animals too?

2           Again, Aldo Leopold speaks of: The land ethic simply  
3 enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils,  
4 waters, plants, and animals, or collectively: the land.  
5 Embracing such a land ethic, Leopold states, changes the role  
6 of Homo Sapiens from conqueror of the land-community to plain  
7 member and citizen of it.

8           The Natives understood this. Contemporaneous society  
9 apparently does not. The dams represents man as conqueror.  
10 This land-community to be a good citizen for this community,  
11 let's take action to restore the salmon runs and quite clearly  
12 the only realistic chance we have of doing that is to remove  
13 the dams.

14           The land ethic cannot prevent the alteration and  
15 management and use of these resources, but it does confirm the  
16 right to a continued existence and at least in some places, in  
17 a natural state. Dam the Corps of Engineers, not the river.  
18 Thank you.

19           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Wade. And next is Ray Thayer and  
20 then Roger Koller and then Mary Aegerter, I think it is. Go  
21 ahead.

22           MR. THAYER: Good afternoon. My name is Ray Thayer. I'm  
23 the General Manager of Clearwater Power Company in Lewiston.  
24 And we are a rural electric co-op. We serve parts of Idaho,  
25 Washington and Oregon. My comments today relate to both the

1 draft EIS and the All-H Paper.

2           Because we are so closely tied to these rural areas we  
3 care deeply about the issues before us today. We feel strongly  
4 that the region should come together behind a plan to recover  
5 these salmon and steelhead runs.

6           The real issue here is recovering salmon. Something we  
7 all want. Focusing only on dam breaching just doesn't make  
8 sense. One reason this focus on dams doesn't make sense is  
9 that the hydro part of this complex problem has seen great  
10 improvements. These improvements that our customers have paid  
11 dearly for to achieve. And according to recent data they have  
12 been very successful.

13           Around 95 percent of juvenile salmon successfully pass  
14 each dam. And according to studies and your All-H Paper and  
15 river survival the spring migrants through these projects is  
16 higher than ever, similar to that before the dams were built on  
17 the Snake River.

18           There are many methods used to achieve these results.  
19 However, one questionable method that needs more review is a  
20 program of spilling water. At places where this is not  
21 effective, those -- you should evaluate those spills and use  
22 that foregone revenue to better uses. Ways that are really  
23 going to do something for us.

24           Also we need to clarify what our goals are here. Clear  
25 goals and accurate measurement of progress towards those goals

1 is the only manner in which accountability takes place with any  
2 complex project. The draft performance measures and standards  
3 outlined in the All-H document and in the biological assessment  
4 are a first step in this much needed direction.

5           This won't be easy, but creating measurements and  
6 integrating them among all ages is a task well worth the  
7 effort. With all of the current gaps in science we still have  
8 a lot to learn. Because of the complexity of this problem, we  
9 are hopeful that you, the federal decision makers, will resist  
10 the temptation to act in a dramatic, irreversible manner with  
11 no assurance of success.

12           You should not ask the region to jump off a cliff without  
13 knowing whether we will be greeted at the bottom by more fish  
14 or merely broken dams. Thank you for the opportunity to  
15 comment.

16           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Ray. Roger? Thank you, Roger.  
17 And after Roger is Mary, I think it's Aegerter, and then Allen  
18 Slickpoo, Sr.

19           MR. KOLLER: Good afternoon. My name is Roger Koller.  
20 I'm a wheat producer in Garfield County. I represent the  
21 Washington Association of Wheat Growers and the Washington  
22 Wheat Commission.

23           I recognize that the salmon issue is very emotional, and  
24 while emotions can drive public policy it does not always  
25 result in sound public policy. The National Marine Fisheries

1 Service has openly stated that the salmon issue is the basis in  
2 a coastal-wide problem.

3         The emotional rhetoric, however, would have people  
4 believing that breaching four dams in the middle of the river  
5 system would somehow magically recover salmon and provide for  
6 sustainable harvests for generations to come. Yet, admit only  
7 evaluation as the study is unfolding has progressively  
8 discounted the assumed adverse impacts of these dams on salmon  
9 survival. Today more juvenile Snake River salmon are surviving  
10 immigration to the Pacific than in the early 1960s before the  
11 dams were constructed.

12         Washington Wheat Growers support Alternatives 2 and 3.  
13 The Corps has clearly documented that barging works. Also  
14 major system improvements show great promise for passing smolt  
15 through dams at the minimum level of harm.

16         We oppose Alternative 4. Dam removal will not hasten  
17 recovery, but will create tremendous economic disruption. We  
18 appreciate NMFS beginning to study all the Hs, in particular  
19 harvest and habitat must be addressed.

20         Since 1977 ocean conditions have not been favorable to  
21 salmon. Salmon are a cold water fish. In the North Pacific  
22 it's more noticeable.

23         Commercial ocean fishing has doubled since the early  
24 1970s, and net fishing is still allowed on the Columbia. Gill  
25 netting an endangered species is no way to save fish and

1 provide for a future sustainable harvest. Predators such as  
2 Caspian terns and sea lions snare millions of fish each year.

3 Even if the dams are breached, much of the spawning  
4 grounds these fish once used is now under water behind dams  
5 without fish ladders in Idaho. Yet, there's been no focus on  
6 breaching any of these dams.

7 We support the multiuse function of the river system  
8 authorized by Congress. We support an All-H approach to salmon  
9 recovery to the following measurers: Continue the progress of  
10 improving survival through the dams and reservoirs; maximize  
11 salmon and steelhead transportation; improve the quality of  
12 hatchery salmon; eliminate mixed stock commercial harvests and  
13 adopt selective practices; develop the watershed based  
14 incentive programs for landowners and managers.

15 In conclusion, as the Governor stated, the salmon  
16 fisheries of this state have, in the past, been wonderfully  
17 productive. Of late, however, evidence of a decrease in the  
18 run is apparent and all are agreed that something has to be  
19 done to prevent the final extinction of a great industry.  
20 These words were spoken by Governor John R. Rodgers in 1899.  
21 Thank you.

22 MS. COLLIS: Thank you. Mary and after Mary is Allen  
23 Slickpoo, Sr., and after Allen is Ron McMurray. Go ahead,  
24 Mary.

25 MS. AEGERTER: My name is Mary Aegerter, and I'm from

1 Uniontown. I wish I could tell you that I lived here as a kid  
2 and I had seen the salmon in the rivers, but I didn't. I moved  
3 here too late, but it doesn't, I guess, make -- let me have any  
4 less ownership of the salmon or how I feel about their return.

5       If we are going to save our wild salmon, we have to  
6 bypass the lower four Snake River dams. There's no question  
7 about that. Independent scientists tell us that, and they tell  
8 us that if we do that, we have an 80 to 100 percent chance of  
9 having the runs recover in 25 years. Those are pretty good  
10 percentages from my point of view.

11       I also think that we all know that the dams are the  
12 problem. I think we are just kidding ourselves if we are  
13 saying differently. No. 1, since the dams were built the  
14 salmon runs have diminished by over 90 percent, even though we  
15 have reduced harvest. So it's not harvest. No. 2, we have  
16 really fine salmon spawning habitats like Marsh Creek and Frank  
17 Church. And no salmon return there to spawn because they can't  
18 get there. No. 3, the runs on Hanford Reach. Those runs go  
19 through the same dams on the Columbia. Those runs spend time  
20 in the same ocean as our runs of salmon. They meet the same  
21 predators there. They meet the same gulls, same sea lions,  
22 same otters. They meet the same ocean temperatures there.

23       Those runs are doing fine. They also pass the same gill  
24 nets, the same harvesters, whether from here or there. Those  
25 runs are doing fine. Our salmon runs aren't doing fine. They

1 have four more dams, and that's about the only difference.

2           Independent scientists also tell us that fish barging  
3 doesn't work. As I understand it, for every 100 fish, 100  
4 juveniles that are barged down the rivers as juveniles, one  
5 quarter of a fish comes back. That's not a very good return.  
6 Maybe 98 percent make it down there, but only one quarter of a  
7 fish comes back to spawn. That's not enough. We need at least  
8 two fish back to do anything. Six, if we are going to  
9 recover. Basically, we need to bypass the dams if we are going  
10 to save the fish.

11           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Mary. Allen Slickpoo? Go ahead.

12           MS. TALL BULL: Good afternoon. My name is Mary Tall  
13 Bull. I'm the daughter of Allen Slickpoo. Many of you people  
14 in this room know and recognize my father. He was a member of  
15 the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Community for more than 26  
16 years. He served the Nez Perce Tribe for at least 35.

17           This is an issue that he has worked on for years and  
18 years. Probably more years than some of the people sitting in  
19 this audience today. I'm not an elected official so I had to  
20 wait in line. I didn't have any place more important to go  
21 because I think this is an important place to be right now.

22           My father has always taught my family the importance  
23 about our history and our culture and what the way that our  
24 people lived in years long ago. And to show that the interest  
25 that my family has in this we do have a stake, yes, we do

1 because what we decide on, what you decide on, affects four  
2 generations of our family and each of the generations are  
3 here: my father, myself, my niece, and my father's great  
4 grandchild.

5           But I have a prepared statement here for you. This is  
6 from my dad: Tahts mey wey, enim hinyuma, kay lautewanim.  
7 Enim wehnakissa "Wey yookh te ma ninh," soyapoe timptke Allen  
8 Slickpoo, Sr. It is indeed an honor to be here with you  
9 today. I appreciate the opportunity to speak out on this very  
10 controversial and critical issue.

11           Many of you here know me. I have served in the Ni Mii Pu  
12 people for more than 35 years as a tribal leader and  
13 historian. My work efforts and loyalty has always been for the  
14 benefit of my people and the preservation of our traditional Ni  
15 Mii Pu religion and culture. What I have come to say I say  
16 from my heart, and I will speak with a straight tongue.

17           Salmon is a staple and traditional food of the Nez Perce  
18 people and a highly respected part of their culture. The once  
19 great salmon runs were celebrated through and by great ceremony  
20 each time they returned. For the survival of our people depend  
21 upon on these great river beings to nurture and to provide them  
22 food during the harsh winters. This is supported by the  
23 journals of the northwest explorers, Lewis and Clark who  
24 recognized the Nez Perce people rescued their starving party  
25 and shared their food (including salmon) with them. As we are

1 all aware the Lewis and Clark Expeditions opened the doors to  
2 the great Northwest and it's a documented fact that "salmon"  
3 played a key part of its success.

4           Recently the Native American Indian people have  
5 experienced alarming increase in the numbers, of family and  
6 loved ones, who have contracted cancer. Sadly, their most  
7 notable and common sources of diet were salmon and traditional  
8 foods found near the water. Can we attribute the cause of the  
9 influx in chemicals and the imbalance of the river's ecosystem?  
10 I strongly believe we can. Despite the intent of the laws to  
11 protect the air and water quality, special interest groups  
12 continue to "buy" their way passed the inspections and  
13 regulations that otherwise might stop the pollution.

14           These man-made dams --

15           MS. COLLIS: I need you to wrap up, please. Thank you.

16           MS. TALL BULL: These man-made dams undoubtedly,  
17 contribute to the damage of the rivers and continue to destroy  
18 not only the salmon but the birds, fish, plants and other  
19 wildlife and, yes, man himself. I as a Ni Mii Pu, I feel great  
20 sadness for the loss of a valuable part of my culture and my  
21 brother the salmon.

22           MS. COLLIS: Can you close now?

23           MS. TALL BULL: Yes, I will. I hate that light. For the  
24 sake of our children and their grandchildren, let's not satisfy  
25 today's wants by continuing to implement tomorrow's

1 destruction. The legacy we will leave behind for our future  
2 generations will be determined by the decisions and actions we  
3 take today. Thank you.

4 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Mary. Okay, Ron McMurray was  
5 next and then Christy Bing and after Christy is Don Coombs.

6 MR. MCMURRAY: Thank you, members of the Caucus. Welcome  
7 to Lewis and Clark Valley. It's nice to have you here. My  
8 name is Ron McMurray, and I'm a native of Lewiston, Idaho.

9 In 1991 I stood with one finger in the dike, so to speak,  
10 and another hand on the gate to try to prevent you from doing  
11 the drawdown that took place in March of 1992 as the Executive  
12 Director of Idaho Seaports. Now maybe you don't remember  
13 that. We've had three Colonels since then. We have had five  
14 different Governors since then, but the people sitting out here  
15 remember the stench. Remember the killing of the native fish.  
16 We remember the damage that was done to this community, to the  
17 dike systems, to the railroad systems, to the port facilities.  
18 We remember that.

19 And the point we have to do here as they said, why are we  
20 doing this? They say, it's an experiment. Just like an  
21 experimental dam breaching is an experiment. I said, why?  
22 They said, if we don't get the little ones down, we can't get  
23 the little ones back and there's only 10 to 30 percent of the  
24 little ones are passing this dam system.

25 Well, you know, it's amazing what a couple billion

1 dollars will do because today, today, National Marine Fisheries  
2 Service says with survival passed this dam system is as good as  
3 it was in 1960 before we had the dams. So what's happened?  
4 This is tearing this community apart because fish are no longer  
5 the issue. It's running rivers versus dam groups. And you  
6 have to make a decision, and the decision has to be easy. An  
7 experimental breaching of the dams, get it off the table. You  
8 get that out of here and take the energy that's in this room  
9 and the energy that's there and the people who report to you  
10 and work with you to sit down and say, now, folks, this is it,  
11 let's bring the fish back.

12         The science is there. We can do it, and we can do it  
13 together. And we can do it locally. We don't have to have  
14 somebody from Washington D.C. telling us that. We can do it  
15 locally, but you got to make a decision. We make a decision  
16 every day in what we do in our community.

17         You have to make a decision because, folks, you tear them  
18 out, I don't think I'm going to see you anymore. But my  
19 children and grandchildren are living here and they are growing  
20 up here and educated here. You are not treating them right,  
21 and you are not treating these people right. Do it. Make the  
22 decision. Throw this experimental dam breaching off the table  
23 and start talking about bringing fish back and building the  
24 community if you can do it without extra spills and more water  
25 and you can do it without destroying our economy. Please.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Ron. Okay. Let's see, Christy  
3 is next, Bing, and Don Coombs and after Don I think it's Patty  
4 Joseph. Tom, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

5 MS. BING: Hi. My name is Christy Bing, and I was born,  
6 raised, worked, recreate and raised my family in Lewiston, as  
7 did my father and my grandfather before me. I would like to  
8 say for the record that I want to save the salmon. I also want  
9 to live in a viable economically sound community with natural  
10 resources available for everyone to enjoy, including our  
11 children.

12 As we all know the salmon issue is very complex.  
13 Therefore, the solution will also be complex. I am not  
14 satisfied that any one single solution is the answer. I am  
15 unwilling to risk salmon survival with one solution, dam  
16 breaching. The solution lies in a multifaceted solution that  
17 should be shared by everyone because we all have to at one way  
18 or another to get to the point where we are at now.

19 President Clinton recently proposed a permanent  
20 conservation fund for the Pacific Northwest in the amount of  
21 290 million dollars for salmon recovery issues. 91 million for  
22 the Army Corps of Engineers for projects in the Columbia and  
23 Snake River systems. 39 million will go to the National Marine  
24 Fisheries for the salmon recovery efforts.

25 With the advancement of technology improvements and as we

1 become more educated in these efforts, coupled with using more  
2 current statistical data such as information from pit tags and  
3 the money allotted to these studies and improvement I believe  
4 on a more secure path for recovery. I feel we should continue  
5 on this path and not invest millions of dollars on breaching as  
6 a sole solution for salmon recovery.

7 I challenge you to look at more comprehensive solution  
8 not breaching dams as a save-all approach. I would also like  
9 to thank you for holding these hearings and giving everyone an  
10 opportunity to offer their thoughts on these important issues.  
11 Thank you.

12 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Christy. Okay, Don Coombs.  
13 After Don is Paul McPoland. Go ahead.

14 MR. COOMBS: My name is Don Coombs, and I appreciate the  
15 opportunity to speak here as a resident of Idaho. Not one of  
16 us wouldn't want to see the river filled with salmon again.  
17 Not one of us but would want to keep good people working at  
18 good jobs. All of the questions raised by those who oppose dam  
19 bypassing, all those questions are valid questions. And yet,  
20 we should bypass the dams because the answers to those  
21 questions have become apparent.

22 Relatively little power is generated by those dams. Few  
23 farms are irrigated from the pools behind those dams, and those  
24 few could be supplied with water even after bypassing. The  
25 dams are not flood control dams. And yes, bypassing the dams

1 offers an excellent chance of saving the salmon.

2           Item as discussed previously, the Chinook deal well in  
3 the Hanford Reach. Those fish face all the perils that our  
4 fish up here face. The terns of the coast, the commercial  
5 fishing, and so on. They face all the perils but the four  
6 Snake River dams.

7           The question about jobs is more complicated because no  
8 matter what is done, some jobs will be affected. Some jobs  
9 already have been lost at the coast because of the decline of  
10 the salmon, and more jobs will be lost there unless the dams  
11 are bypassed. It's not surprising that bypassing the dams is  
12 not met with enthusiasm in Lewiston. Jobs connected with  
13 shipping here will be affected, but jobs connected with milling  
14 timber and producing pulp and paper products will not be  
15 affected because Potlatch is not dependent on barging. There  
16 may even be some additional jobs as has been pointed out here  
17 earlier because of the boost in the successful salmon fishery.  
18 But that's not why the dams should be bypassed.

19           The dams should be bypassed not because fish are more  
20 important than people, but because all of us need to take care  
21 of all of us. And the fish are part of the picture. You can  
22 make a case for bypassing the dams on a purely economic basis  
23 if you look at the Pacific Northwest and not just Lewiston.  
24 And you can make a case for bypassing because the salmon were  
25 here before us, and we will all be the poorer if we write them

1 off for personal gain.

2           Some have turned to religion to support leaving the dams  
3 in place. We have said that man and woman were placed on earth  
4 to have domain over the animals.

5           MS. COLLIS: You need to wrap up, please.

6           MR. COOMBS: The birds, the fish, to use them. Even to  
7 use them up. I urge you that if you believe that you've been  
8 placed here to use up the animals, to listen again. Thank you  
9 very much.

10           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Don. Tom Joseph and Paul  
11 McPoland and after Paul is Emily L-o-e-b, I think. Go ahead,  
12 Tom.

13           MR. JOSEPH: Thank you. My name is Tom Joseph. I reside  
14 at Kooskia, Idaho on the Clearwater River. I am a human  
15 being. I say that because the National Park Service still has  
16 our people listed under -- what's the word? I forget. I  
17 forget how they have us listed, but we are not considered human  
18 beings by the Park Service.

19           MS. COLLIS: Can you speak a little louder?

20           MR. JOSEPH: Like us --

21           MS. COLLIS: A little closer to the mic. Thank you, Tom.

22           MR. JOSEPH: Beg your pardon? Like us, the salmon have a  
23 right to life. Even under our laws today, they have a legal  
24 right to, under treaty law. I know it's hard to change. We  
25 know we have made mistakes, but need we continue? Fish is a

1 grain food. We need to eat more fish. It's past time. We  
2 need to further develop the mechanism to save and develop the  
3 fishery. Who came first? The salmon or the aborigine?

4       There's a story among some of our people and that is:  
5 The salmon is an indicator as to where we stand as a people.  
6 If the salmon goes, we will be not far behind. It's my  
7 belief. It's my way. I sometimes measure the wealth of my  
8 family by how much fish we have in our home. I am a wealthy  
9 man if we have fish that my family is able to eat, fish,  
10 salmon. We have had fish this winter. Fish is medicinal to  
11 me. We cannot have to preserve the fishery. I would not want  
12 all the fish mad at me.

13       There needs to be more talk about what's going on in the  
14 commercial industry as far as it relates to the fishery.  
15 There's a lot of commercial fishery that takes place on the  
16 outside that is not accounted for. What we need to do is  
17 enforce the laws that we have on the books. It is the  
18 international fishery that depletes the fishery that is mind  
19 boggling. It needs to be some kind of control put on them, and  
20 they also need to be held responsible for the development of  
21 the fishery itself. Thank you.

22       MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Tom. Paul McPoland and then  
23 Emily Loeb, I think, and then Lilisa Moses. Go ahead.

24       MR. MCPOLAND: Thank you for allowing this forum. My  
25 name is Paul McPoland. I was born in the Northwest and have

1 been a resident of Idaho for over 20 years.

2           When my father was young Snake River salmon thrived. Now  
3 less than two generations later they are in danger of  
4 extinction. Salmon have been an integral part of the culture  
5 and history of the Pacific Northwest for thousands of years.  
6 Should we lose the salmon, the price would be insurmountable.

7           Laws and treaties mandate that Snake River salmon be  
8 saved. Letting the fish go extinct would be the most expensive  
9 option of all, potentially costing taxpayers billions of  
10 dollars in reparations to Columbia Basin Indian Tribes.

11           This forum is being held because it is no longer possible  
12 to deny the danger of extinction that the Snake River salmon  
13 face.

14           It is true that there are scientists on all sides of the  
15 issue. Some say there are ways of restoring the salmon short  
16 of breaching the four lower Snake River dams, and they have  
17 tried a variety of methods such as fish ladders and barging  
18 which have proven to be unsuccessful and a tremendous waste of  
19 taxpayer money. The decline in salmon numbers came with the  
20 construction of the dams.

21           Breaching the dams may not bring the salmon back and  
22 scientists have admitted that it would take nearly 20 years to  
23 restore the numbers to pre-dam levels. However, it has become  
24 clear that salmon and the dams cannot continue to coexist.  
25 State, tribal, federal and independent scientists say that dam

1 removal is the best and probably the only option for restoring  
2 Idaho's wild salmon and steelhead. These dams just don't make  
3 sense.

4       Bypassing the dams will create over 1,000 jobs in  
5 Northern Idaho. A restored salmon and steelhead fishery would  
6 be worth over \$170 million dollars a year to communities like  
7 Riggins, Orofino, Salmon and Stanley. A redirection of federal  
8 money will quickly improve railway and highway transportation,  
9 creating even more jobs in the region and facilitating  
10 convenient shipping for area farmers.

11       The extinction of the Snake River salmon population is  
12 not acceptable. Breaching the dams is a win-win scenario for  
13 everybody. I support bypassing the lower Snake River dams.  
14 Thank you.

15       MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Paul. Emily and then Lilisa  
16 Moses and then Jerry Scoggins.

17       MS. LOEB: My name is Emily Loeb, and I'm from Moscow.  
18 And I'm representing myself and Friends of the Clearwater.  
19 I've spent a lot of time in Idaho camping and hiking the wild  
20 lands and floating the rivers. My experiences have taught me a  
21 lot about how we interact with our environment and the impacts  
22 we have on them.

23       I am here today to speak my peace about how I feel about  
24 dam breaching. The issue of dam breaching is a huge debate in  
25 Idaho. People discuss the pros and cons of removing the dams,

1 and instantly change the topic from saving salmon to saving  
2 dams.

3           There's all kinds of studies and scientific evidence  
4 showing that dam breaching will eventually save money, create  
5 jobs and most importantly help restore salmon populations.  
6 There is evidence that we will allow the salmon -- there is  
7 evidence that as we allow the salmon populations to dwindle we  
8 are breaking our own laws; that's the Endangered Species Act.  
9 And we are violating treaties that we are obliged to keep with  
10 Native American communities, including the Nez Perce Tribe and  
11 with Canada.

12           With the plethora of correlations between existence of  
13 dams and decrease of salmon population makes dam breaching the  
14 best answer to help us restore salmon population. We need  
15 salmon. Therefore, the four lower Snake dams don't make  
16 sense.

17           Economic and political rhetoric are not the only things  
18 that we should be discussing today. The salmon are part of the  
19 culture of the Northwest. With the salmon gone, what will  
20 happen to us? How will the disappearance of the salmon affect  
21 family relations as fathers and sons will no longer go fishing  
22 together over the weekend? What will happen to the bear  
23 populations when they no longer have salmon to eat? And no  
24 matter what Helen Chenoweth says, salmon can be endangered even  
25 though you can buy a canned salmon in the grocery store.

1           One of the things that Chenoweth does not understand is  
2 that maybe you can buy salmon, but these salmon are not coho  
3 and they are not a Chinook. Steelhead and Chinook and coho are  
4 found in the Columbia, Snake and Salmon Rivers, swimming out to  
5 sea when they are young and making their way back and die.

6           Right now the dams are the greatest hindrance to this  
7 process. If we do not breach these dams, we are not only  
8 taking ourselves one step closer to ridding the Northwest of  
9 wild salmon. We owe it not only to the salmon but to ourselves  
10 and our children to do what we can now to help restore the  
11 salmon populations. Our own survival is linked to the survival  
12 of the salmon. If they go down, we will eventually go down  
13 with them.

14           Whether or not we humans like it, the dams are going to  
15 eventually crumble. The dams will be brought down by either  
16 natural, geological processes of erosion or by the breaching of  
17 them now which we can attempt to control the effects of the  
18 transition. The decision is ours, and it's obvious. We need  
19 salmon. Therefore, the four lower Snake dams don't make  
20 sense.

21           And I'm an environmentalist, and I don't get paid for my  
22 work. I guess in my pagan ways I can say that I'm being used  
23 by mother earth. And she pays me back in many ways, every time  
24 I go out to the forest, go to the river or drink out of her  
25 streams. Thank you.

1 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Emily. Lilisa Moses and Mr.  
2 Scoggins and after him, Bill Johnson.

3 MS. MOSES: I'm Lilisa Moses. I would like to start off  
4 with PFI and the liquid release with them saying that's not  
5 hazardous. And they say if it is hazardous, they will clean it  
6 up. Well, why don't they do a survey and put it into their own  
7 water system and let them cook with it and bathe with it and  
8 see how it makes them feel. And compare them to the fish. You  
9 know, there's a good survey right there.

10 We don't need white paper. They don't need to use as  
11 much bleach. And then on the economic side of things, on  
12 Alternative 4 we would get 911 million, \$300,000 in  
13 construction. Any D average annual benefit totaling 246  
14 million 474,000. Any D cost are implementation cost with fish  
15 related to improvement, cost increase associated with  
16 replacement of lost hydropower, transportation cost increase  
17 associated with the shift of barge and transported commodities  
18 to more costly truck and rail systems.

19 Cost incurred as a result of the impact users presently  
20 withdrawn from the water of the lower Snake River reservoirs.  
21 Any D benefits are cost incurred under the other alternatives,  
22 the reason for the operation of maintenance, repair and  
23 replacement costs and other costs associated with  
24 rehabilitation of existing infrastructure, recreation benefits  
25 from increased fish runs, and a shift to a free flowing river,

1 commercial fishing benefits from increased fish runs.

2 Breaching would bring 2,000 or 20,790 temporary jobs down  
3 in the lower Snake River area, an increase in personal income  
4 of 677 million or an average of annual 32,548 per job.

5 Construction in replacement power facilities, 5,572 jobs; new  
6 grain elevators, 6,982 jobs; in addition, 2,786 power plant  
7 construction jobs outside of this region. And in the long run,  
8 the lower Snake River region would gain 2,277 thousand jobs.

9 With greater returns of fish more will become available  
10 to other wildlife, plants, and trees. If the dams are not  
11 breached more water from Idaho will be required to flush salmon  
12 back to sea. If the dams are not breached there will be an  
13 increase in attempts to further reduce tribal harvest. We need  
14 to honor our treaty rights. Thank you.

15 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Lelisa. Okay, Mr. Scoggin and  
16 then Bill Johnson and after Bill is Levi Holt.

17 MR. SCOGGIN: I'm from Pomeroy, the smallest county in  
18 the state, in the home of the Lower Monumental Dam and Lower  
19 Granite. See when you get to be 85 you can't remember what in  
20 the hell you are talking about. Now listen! You're head will  
21 only absorb about half of what your hind in is. And we've sat  
22 here all day, and I've reached a point where I don't know  
23 whether for the dams or opposite.

24 But listen! The Colonel over there said the decision  
25 will be made by the American voters and with awesome power

1 that's you in this room have got when you step behind the body  
2 with the short lead pencil. What you said here today will not  
3 mean a dam thing, but what you vote will.

4 Now, for what that's worth, you can call your Congressman  
5 or Senator today for 30 seconds. And if that's for three  
6 minutes, and the lady that's got the whips up there, I don't  
7 trust her! And Kathy over here, I tell her -- you know, I have  
8 been to a lot of these meetings.

9 I've been a Caterpillar, John Deere Dealer for 54 years  
10 and I've done everything from dogcatcher to county  
11 commissioner. I don't give a damn what it is. I've been it,  
12 but she's the one I'm afraid of. I was telling her, I lie a  
13 lot. And just as the MC, he was doing a good job of  
14 controlling things, just like she is. And he said, now, folks,  
15 you are not going to sleep at this meeting! And I went to  
16 sleep. And he pulled an old 45 revolver out of the podium and  
17 shot it up in the air and I fell off and broke my arm.

18 MS. COLLIS: Thanks for the idea.

19 MR. SCROGGIN: All seriousness, I am the guy that built  
20 the dams. I was born in 1918 or 14. I built the Grand Coulee  
21 for three years under President Roosevelt, and here's the story  
22 that I haven't heard today: When the government decided to put  
23 the Tri-Cities, the atomic energy down there, they decided that  
24 the Columbia Basin was the only place in the United States that  
25 we had cheap power. We had water. We had millions of acres of

1 land. And went far enough from the ocean the draft couldn't  
2 hit us then. But listen, to this day that's still true. We  
3 have thousands and thousands of cheap land down there. We got  
4 water. We got electricity and we are talking about railroads.

5 I rode an amount of boxcars in my time. You know, you  
6 pull the barges off of the Snake River, competition is what  
7 makes this country go. And by golly -- want me to stop, do  
8 you?

9 MS. COLLIS: Yeah, your time is up.

10 MR. SCROGGIN: Well, that's enough said.

11 MS. COLLIS: Thank you very much. Okay, Bill Johnson,  
12 and Levi Holt and after Levi is Gary MacFarlane.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. My name is Bill Johnson. I  
14 have lived in Lewiston for 20 years. Thank you for having us.  
15 I commend your stamina. I don't have a personal stake in  
16 either slack water or the free-running river, but I do have a  
17 stake in the long-term economic and spiritual element of man  
18 and community. For that reason I support breaching the four  
19 dams.

20 The subject has been studied to death. There are  
21 literally hundreds of studies out there. You know them. I  
22 know them. The indisputable facts seem to me to be two. One  
23 is that dams are fish killers, an unprecedented decision. The  
24 other is that we cannot have both dams and salmon.

25 In terms of navigation and hydroelectric power, the dams

1 have never paid for themselves. When you add to this the 300  
2 million per year the BPA spends on barging studies and  
3 tinkering with the dams and locks in the name of salmon  
4 recovery, you have a monumental taxpayer subsidy that has  
5 resulted in disaster for the salmon.

6 The real radical step was, I think, was building the dams  
7 in the first place, not the idea of taking them out. The real  
8 disaster would be the loss of the salmon, not the scenario of  
9 the devastated economy, which is really a myth perpetuated by  
10 interest for the status quo.

11 The independent studies by Ken Casavant and others  
12 indicate that the region can sustain a transportation  
13 infrastructure without ruining navigation. Despite the risks  
14 and yes, the absence of guarantees, we must make every effort  
15 to bring back the single most important species of wildlife  
16 this region has ever known. Salmon represent the miraculous  
17 ability of the natural world to survive against the greatest  
18 obstacle. Right now we are the overwhelming obstacle.

19 Unless the dams are removed, the salmon in our native  
20 drainages will vanish forever and we will not only be  
21 lawbreakers, but we will be spiritually diminished human  
22 beings. Thank you.

23 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Bill. Levi Holt, Gary  
24 MacFarlane, and Mike Vernon.

25 MR. HOLT: Thank you. My name is Levi Holt, also known

1 as black beaver, in Nez Perce Country. Today I would like to  
2 speak on behalf of the salmon. Since man is doing a good job  
3 of speaking for itself, it seems like, the air, the water, and  
4 the land, and the salmon haven't a voice. And, yes, I would  
5 agree that there is much at stake here as far as the economics  
6 go for us humans.

7 But, too, what was that statement as the first stones  
8 were being laid in the Columbia and along the Snake River  
9 drainage? There were a lot of changes that were taking place  
10 at that time. Industry and life-styles were being displaced,  
11 and it seems that today's cry for many here are, of course,  
12 valid. What will become of our life-style for the future?

13 I think mitigation is something as well as I'm hearing  
14 throughout today that should be applied and considered by the  
15 Federal entities. But, too, since that first stone was laid  
16 into the river system, tears have been shed by Indian people.  
17 Life-styles, our life-styles, have changed greatly. Our  
18 ceremonies, ceremonies that dealt with death, with marriage,  
19 with young adulthood. These are all life-styles that are  
20 fading and, yet, we are still graveling over the dollar here.

21 It's time that the local citizen look at this in the way  
22 that it involves and it impacts all of us. And we must become  
23 neighbors in a much stronger way.

24 21 counties undermining a sovereignty. A state  
25 government that's not willing to share in the water quantity

1 throughout the state that comes from elsewhere. Forced manage  
2 practices that are starving and killing out the salmon  
3 habitat. Cattle grazing that are trampling the tributaries of  
4 those rivers, and for the salmon.

5 I speak for dam breaching, and I speak for the people who  
6 aren't here today. I hope that we will look at the four H  
7 paper and realize that much more is coming behind this  
8 process. The enforcement of the four H paper is going to be  
9 far, far, far greater in my mind than breaching the dams and  
10 accepting the consequence and the challenge today.

11 And I just hope and pray that as the Federal Agencies  
12 gather their testimony, that they will bear this in mind. That  
13 American Society, heritage and prestige and honor, they've all  
14 evolved over dissensions. And we'll survive this as well, but  
15 will the salmon? We need to bring this important species along  
16 with us into the new millennium. Kats-ee-yow-yow.

17 MS. COLLIS: Thank you. Okay, Gary MacFarlane, Mike  
18 Vernon, Sally Fredericks. Let me just say that's probably  
19 going to be it for today with those names. I want to remind  
20 you that if you want to testify tonight, you need to sign up  
21 again. And we do that purposely so that the people who  
22 couldn't be here during the day today, have a chance to speak  
23 tonight. And, of course, there's still your avenue next door  
24 to record your comments on tape or get them in in writing.  
25 Okay. Thanks, Gary.

1           MR. MACFARLANE: I'm Gary MacFarlane, Moscow, Troy or  
2 thereabouts. My Celtic ancestors caught anadromous they  
3 thought they were a pack of salmon which spawned Atlantic  
4 streams. They came up the rivers and people fished through  
5 them until the industrial revolution what we call the English  
6 implant is the same thing. And that destroyed both the fish  
7 and the navy people.

8           Luckily today some salmon still make the journey upstream  
9 from Scotland, Ireland, and amazingly even in the dirty river  
10 channels in England because people changed their habits. Here  
11 in the Northwest we should have thriving salmon stocks for our  
12 way of life and economy. People need salmon. The great bear  
13 needs salmon, and the forest needs salmon. Yet, we are on the  
14 threshold of cultural and biological extinction. We must  
15 change and learn to live with the other species that call this  
16 planet home.

17          First, the lower Snake River dams don't make sense. Tear  
18 them out and leave the cement structures as monuments to our  
19 stupidity. They are a huge form of corporate welfare, a  
20 socialism that bleeds us dry. Only the government could  
21 concoct the crazy scheme to make use of Idaho a seaport.  
22 Subsidizing Alaskan farmers with giant heaters and fuel so as  
23 they can grow oranges makes about as much sense as these dams.

24          Second, we must look at other ways to help the salmon  
25 recover. Research has shown that Dworshak's Dam is largely

1 responsible for the collapse of steelhead through the loss of  
2 habitat. Hells Canyon dam also blocked millions of acres of  
3 prime habitat and McNary dams and reservoir overheats the water  
4 to which smolts must pass.

5           An alternative look should at removing all the main  
6 Columbia River dams, plus the two I just mentioned above.  
7 Habitat perfection, drastic changes in hatchery programs and  
8 harvest must be addressed. None of the alternatives presented  
9 by the Governments approach all of the issues. Thus, the best  
10 components of each alternative must be combined for real  
11 recovery. If we do our part we can have salmon for us and  
12 salmon for the future. Maybe some day before I die the salmon  
13 will once again leap over Selway Falls and feed grizzlies on  
14 the banks of that wild river.

15           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Gary. Before we lose any more  
16 people, let me say that the General and the panel have agreed  
17 to give up a half an hour of their dinner break to accommodate  
18 about -- I think we can probably accommodate maybe ten more in  
19 the next half hour so we will go on to 5:30. Thank you.

20           GEN. STROCK: Let me just briefly explain that. We had a  
21 little chat during the break, and it occurred to us that we --  
22 in giving our elected leaders and officials a chance to speak  
23 first, which I think at the time was a good decision. They are  
24 very busy people. Have our business they had to go about and  
25 do -- it occurred to me that this is really about hearing from

1 the people and what you have to say.

2           And had I to do it again, I would have told them you are  
3 more than welcome to have time to speak, but after we've heard  
4 from the people and then, perhaps, you can reflect on what you  
5 heard here. So, that's the reason, I think, we'll give you  
6 back those 30 minutes we gave to your elected officials. Thank  
7 you.

8           MS. COLLIS: Thank you. Okay, great. I would like just  
9 one more thing before we start. We still have a woman up front  
10 who needs a ride tonight to, is it, Kamiah? So if anyone can  
11 accommodate her, please let me know. Thank you. Okay. Mike.

12           MR. VERNON: Thank you. I am Mike Vernon. I have lived  
13 in the Valley for 15 years. I am a Professor in natural  
14 science division of Lewis-Clark State College. In the  
15 early '90s I had the privilege of organizing several public  
16 forums on the diminishing salmon.

17           The scientific studies and data presented at these forums  
18 are now -- much of it is part of the All-H Paper so my comments  
19 are in regard to the All-H Paper.

20           Even then the problem was utterly obvious, as was the  
21 solution. Probably the best presentation was by Ted Youren of  
22 the University of Idaho. His studies show an extremely high  
23 negative correlation between smolt and adult survivability  
24 rates and the installation of each succeeding federal dam.  
25 Including in the comparative analysis, this data on undammed

1 rivers.

2           Since then we have new studies and new research  
3 methodologies. PATH and the CRI are very complex risk analysis  
4 molds. PATH, in particular, indicates that the probability of  
5 recovery if the four lower Snake dams are breached is twice  
6 that of employing all the other alternatives.

7           Therefore, I support intergraded Alternative D, breaching  
8 -- which includes breaching the four lower Snake River dams.  
9 I'm not minimizing the extent of economic harm to certain  
10 individuals who live in the Valley. When I say that, the dams  
11 were built on a failed promise, salmon runs would not be  
12 affected.

13           But the people who are now dependent upon this very  
14 heavily subsidized transport system are just as much victims of  
15 failed promises as the salmon and steelhead are. For that  
16 reason I would urge our elected officials who spoke earlier  
17 today to seek fair and just compensation for the individuals  
18 who are adversely affected, instead of repeating the phrase:  
19 We can have both fish and dams. Yes, we can have both fish and  
20 dams, but they won't be salmon.

21           True -- well, my final comment regarding the All-H Paper  
22 is that it should include mitigation options and analysis of  
23 strategies that would help ease this region through the  
24 difficult transition.

25           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Mike. Sally Fredericks and after

1 Sally is Bennett Barr, and then Marc Lawrence.

2 MS. FREDERICKS: I'm Sally Fredericks from Moscow,  
3 Idaho. I would like to thank you all for being here. I don't  
4 envy the rest of your evening. I was born and raised in north  
5 Idaho, and I've lived here most of my life. I have testified  
6 at this sort of hearing on a number of occasions on bringing  
7 back the salmon runs into the Idaho rivers.

8 The previous hearings have not come close to encompassing  
9 the high levels of emotion that the issue has at this time. At  
10 times like this I -- it's easy to see where my values and views  
11 differ from others, but I also try to look and see where we  
12 have things in common. And we do share many things, those of  
13 us on both sides of the issues.

14 None of us likes to lose something that's important to  
15 us. We may share a sense of powerlessness, unfairness,  
16 betrayal. We may fear financial uncertainty and critical  
17 dislocation. These experiences were part of the dams being  
18 built, and are now part of contemplating the possible removal  
19 of the dams in order to restore the runs.

20 I have a strong wish to bring back our salmon runs, and I  
21 believe the information saying that the most sure way of doing  
22 this is to reestablish a free-running river.

23 I believe that the public money we spend to maintain the  
24 navigation channels, operate the locks, and barge the fish can  
25 be better spent helping to develop adjustments in

1 transportation, irrigation jobs in the other areas.

2 I stand in awe of these magnificent fish. Some of them  
3 traveling as far as 900 miles to spawn and send their progeny  
4 back from the ocean. For me we need these fish in our state.  
5 They are a part of our heritage. They were here long before  
6 settlers came to Idaho, and most likely long before native  
7 peoples called these mountains, valleys, rivers and lakes their  
8 home.

9 We need these fish for our rivers, for our economy, for  
10 our whole healthy ethological system. We need these wondrous  
11 fish for our children, our grandchildren and their children. I  
12 don't want my grandchildren or their children asking the adults  
13 in their lives why? Why did you let them all get killed? Why  
14 didn't you save them?

15 Let us make a determined and honest effort to keep the  
16 fish with us and get back to a free-flowing river and help each  
17 other adjust to this. Thank you very much.

18 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Sally. Bennett Barr and Marc  
19 Lawrence and after Marc is Jerry Klemm.

20 MR. BARR: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Bennett  
21 Barr, and I would like to thank the panel for extending this  
22 time in order that those of us who have waited all day can  
23 actually speak. It gives me great pleasure for the chance to  
24 speak on behalf of the salmon and the Snake River dams and  
25 people that actually inhabit this place prior to European

1 settlement.

2           Part of this pleasure stems from the fact that my  
3 ancestors, having followed the Atlantic salmon and cod over to  
4 North America roughly 400 years before Christopher Columbus,  
5 and in essence I'm of Scandinavian descent. My people actually  
6 have been fishing for salmon in Northern Europe and the coastal  
7 waters of the Atlantic for nearly 10,000 years, much like the  
8 Ni Mii Pu of this area. It is a way of life. It was the way  
9 of life, and we would like to see that -- it continue to be a  
10 way of life.

11           And I think as we look back at history, we know that  
12 another group of people have been fishing for similar salmon  
13 right here in the Northwest, many thousands of years, the Ni  
14 Mii Pu, the various Columbia River Tribes. With their fishing  
15 the Pacific salmon have been one and always will be.

16           And when we discuss the issue of dam breaching, today's  
17 matters little about biology or economics, but I think what  
18 really matters most is another 5th H, if you will, which is  
19 humanity. To deny the American Indian tribes and their future  
20 generations of children the opportunity to live amongst the  
21 salmon is but a crime against humanity.

22           In order to avoid such a humiliating consequence, a  
23 complete salmon extinction and continued disgrace against the  
24 American Indian tribes, I plead for the National Marine  
25 Fisheries Service to recommend to bypass the four lower Snake

1 River dams.

2           You know, I often wonder what it would be like to catch  
3 an Atlantic salmon. My grandparents home territory of  
4 Scandinavia. You know, the Atlantic salmon are much like the  
5 Pacific salmon are, also threatened to the point of  
6 extinction.

7           At the time Lewis and Clark actually were making their  
8 expedition through this area, my grandfather's great  
9 grandfather was the archbishop of Sweden. And at that time it  
10 was through the church that the actual Swedish country would  
11 send natural historians over to this continent actually to make  
12 matters of conservation.

13           And this is one of the things that, for me, has been  
14 difficult to research and understand. But the issue of dam  
15 breaching to save the salmon is essential, and in my Swedish  
16 language we say, tack sa mycket.

17           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Bennett. Marc Lawrence, Jerry  
18 Klemm, and after Jerry on deck is Richard Fredericks.

19           MR. LAWRENCE: My name is Marc Lawrence. I'm a citizen  
20 of Potlatch, Idaho. I'm here to testify in support of any and  
21 all measurers that can help restore the endangered fish. I've  
22 read facts and figures until I'm sick --

23           MS. COLLIS: Marc, can you speak just a little closer?  
24 Thank you.

25           MR. LAWRENCE: I'm sick of excuses and delays and billions

1 of wasted taxpayer's dollars. Bureaucracy is indeed the  
2 process of converting energy into solid waste. Our friends,  
3 the Nez Perce, shared their salmon and saved the Lewis and  
4 Clark expedition from starvation, according to ancient Nez  
5 Perce necrology. Not far up the river from here, ant and  
6 yellow jacket fallow were eating the salmon at the side of the  
7 river. It came to blows and even after coyote ordered them to  
8 stop, they kept on struggling.

9           Angered at their behavior and disregard for his warnings,  
10 coyote turned them to stones while their backs were arched and  
11 their jaws locked together. You can still see them up there.

12           If we do not undue this mess we have made and help these  
13 fish, who have helped every people who have ever visited this  
14 land, if we do not heed the learnings of wise people, we will  
15 deserve the fate of the ant and the yellow jacket.

16           It is time for us to grow up and act like responsible  
17 adults. Karma is a simple concept. We reap what we sow. Do  
18 unto others as you would have them do unto you. Noah saved two  
19 of every creature that God put here for good reason. Shame on  
20 us for refusing to abide the good lessons most of us learned as  
21 children.

22           We have a solemn obligation to pass along to future  
23 generations the bounty which we have all been fortunate to have  
24 inherited. Only adults could make this more complicated than  
25 it really is. Maybe our children should be in charge.

1           A friend of mine told me his kids don't listen to a damn  
2 thing that he tells them, but they don't miss a single thing  
3 that he does. And believe me, our children are watching. Talk  
4 is cheap, but in the end our actions are all that count. It is  
5 time to take action and quite trying to hide from our  
6 responsibilities.

7           One day my UPS man cut through the crap, and to put it in  
8 a nutshell when he said, if we don't save these fish, we are  
9 going to regret it. Pretty damn simple. Most of us have a  
10 heartbreaking regard to that we wish we could somehow undue.  
11 If we all listen to our hearts I think we can agree that  
12 regrets are one of the things that nobody can afford.

13           We have decisions to make, all of which sound like they  
14 are going to cost us some money. But down one path lie  
15 regrets, shame, sorrow and extinction. Down the other is  
16 pride, hope, and heroic action, actions that we will never,  
17 ever regret. Actions that our children can be proud of us for  
18 taking.

19           We need to make the commitment and then save the fish.  
20 We need to roll up our sleeves and get busy. Let's bypass  
21 these four dams and take the other actions that will help the  
22 fish recover. We will never, ever regret it. Thank you.

23           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Marc. Jerry Klemm, Richard  
24 Fredericks, and then after Richard, David Willard.

25           MR. KLEMM: Thank you, panel, for your agreeing to extend

1 the comment period. Greatly appreciated. We all owe our  
2 gratitude for that. We all get hungry at the appropriate  
3 times, and thank you again.

4 I'm Jerry Klemm. I recently retired from Potlatch  
5 Corporation after 39 years. I have no job. Right now I'm not  
6 looking for one. I have no treaty. The closest thing I have  
7 is my marriage license, and that's about as close as you can  
8 get to a binding agreement. But I am here today to talk about  
9 my experience in the things that I learned in my 39 years as  
10 being a union leader and a spokesman for my Local in a  
11 leadership capacity. All them years you can't help but have a  
12 little bit of something rub off on you after spending that many  
13 years talking with people and doing what people would like to  
14 have you do.

15 One of the things that we did was join the Research  
16 Council, an organization that's nationwide. I served in the  
17 leadership -- excuse me, a leadership capacity of that for many  
18 years. And our motto is seek and a balance. And I hope that's  
19 what we can do here today.

20 In the beginning before dams were built and they were  
21 just a gleam in the government's eye, you came to us with  
22 proposals about putting the dams in on the Snake and the  
23 Clearwater River. Some of the proposals were good. Some of  
24 them were bad. We voiced our opinions there.

25 If the dams were built you said you would promise us many

1 things. You promised us jobs, you promised economic stability  
2 that we so long needed in this area. You promised cheaper  
3 electrical power and a whole multitude of things, expanded  
4 recreations. We prospered. We are thankful for that.

5           We now have a low cost water highway to the world  
6 commerce or all across the world. We talk about mitigation and  
7 how do you mitigate a 30-year home mortgage and wages of young  
8 missionaries seeking the American dream of home ownership and  
9 job security? I don't believe that can be done. Not on the  
10 level that you are talking about mitigation on.

11           What we need to do is to go back to our common sense  
12 approach. It doesn't make sense to tear down dams on the hope  
13 that it might help to recover salmon a half a century after the  
14 dams are removed. It doesn't make sense to let that  
15 destruction continue while we pursue dam breaching. It doesn't  
16 make sense to let that destruction continue while we race to  
17 breach dams when researchers continue to show that smolt  
18 survival through dams is much higher than previously thought.

19           It also doesn't make sense to wreck or destroy dams with  
20 new technology if the dams show the promise of improving  
21 survival is even more.

22           MS. COLLIS: I need you to wrap up, please, Jerry.

23           MR. KLEMM: People in this community that testify here  
24 today for the most part are private citizens expressing their  
25 opinions. They are not famous. Some are infamous locally,

1 though. What we hear today from everybody that comes from the  
2 heart is that it also comes from the head. It will be ground  
3 and common sense. I hope you will listen in the same spirit.  
4 Thank you.

5 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Jerry. Richard Fredericks, David  
6 Willard, and after David is John McCarthy.

7 MR. FREDERICKS: My name is Richard Fredericks. I  
8 appreciate the opportunity to be able to state my opinion on  
9 the issue of our Columbia Basin salmon and steelhead. My  
10 family and I have lived in the Northwest all of our lives. A  
11 major reason being the outdoor recreation, including fishing  
12 and hunting that make this such a wonderful place to live.

13 We now have three grandchildren, and they too are  
14 learning to love the outdoor life-style that has been so  
15 compelling to us.

16 When I first came to the Pacific Northwest from my  
17 Montana childhood I soon learned of the magnificence of the  
18 type of fish I had never seen in the wild, salmon and  
19 steelhead, and the rivers and even the small streams. I soon  
20 learned to fish for them, and became probably my most enjoyable  
21 recreation, as well as that of my two sons and countless other  
22 people.

23 But in the last 25 years we have seen a steady decline in  
24 the numbers of those fish and along with it our enthusiasm for  
25 fishing with them -- for them. We are told that this decline

1 appears to be continuing and will soon approach the point of  
2 extinction of some of the runs of our wild fish, and eventually  
3 all of them, unless we take major corrective measures to  
4 remedy the damage that man has inflicted.

5         Studies carried out over many years now and reported by  
6 many reputable scientists and groups have shown conclusively  
7 that the four lower Snake River dams have had the biggest  
8 negative impact on the fish and that the barging program has  
9 failed. There has been a growing consensus that only restoring  
10 the free-flowing river can reduce this type of extinction.

11         I really want us to do what it takes to recover these  
12 fish runs, even though it will undoubtedly have some cost.  
13 More to some than to others, certainly. But this has been the  
14 case regardless of whatever enterprise that we have undertaken  
15 in the name of progress. I feel strongly that we should bite  
16 the bullet before it is too late and bypass the four lower  
17 Snake River dams.

18         We need to restore these magnificent fish back to  
19 healthy, sustainable, harvestable runs for the sake of our  
20 heritage, our environment and, yes, our economy. Salmon  
21 extinction is not an acceptable alternative. If the fish go  
22 extinct, the cost of litigation and of mitigation and the  
23 payment of reparations will exceed, by many times, the cost of  
24 bypassing the dams. Thank you.

25         MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Richard. Okay, David Willard and

1 John McCarthy, and after John is Janice Miller.

2 MR. WILLARD: Thank you for taking the extra time in  
3 letting me speak. My name is David Miller, and I'm from  
4 Moscow, Idaho. Many people here may find my views radical.  
5 Personally, I find nothing radical about wanting to protect and  
6 preserve the environment for our children. I find such views  
7 are conservative, not radical. Radical is something to do with  
8 an obstacle in the middle of the ocean or the river so that the  
9 inhabitants of that river can't move through it anymore.

10 I could talk about the science, but I only have three  
11 minutes so I'll just point out the vast majority of scientists  
12 agree that we must remove these dams if we are to have any hope  
13 of salmon surviving in Idaho, especially if you include the  
14 industry funded junk science.

15 It's essential for the salmon to survive. They are quite  
16 literally the lifeblood of the Northwest ecosystem. See a  
17 quicker and more rapid decline of all species that rely upon  
18 them, and that includes us. I could talk about the economics,  
19 but we all know how politics use these numbers. The plain fact  
20 is that without federal subsidies, taxes and other federal  
21 corporate welfare these dams wouldn't make economic sense in  
22 the first place, regardless of the economic cost.

23 I could talk about the law. I mentioned that we have  
24 treaties with sovereign nations to maintain these stocks of  
25 salmon, even though our country has a very poor track record of

1 actually following through on these treaties, I beseech you to  
2 do so in this case. During, back to economics, I understand  
3 that our nation could be liable for billions of dollars in  
4 lawsuits if we fail to do so.

5 I could talk about a lot of things, but all I want you to  
6 do is imagine how you would feel when, excuse me -- is how you  
7 would feel when your grandchild asks you: Why aren't there any  
8 salmon in the Salmon River?

9 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, David. John McCarthy and then  
10 Janice Miller.

11 MR. MCCARTHY: Thank you all for staying late. I really  
12 appreciate it. My name is John McCarthy, and I'm the  
13 Conservation Director for the Idaho Conservation League, who I  
14 represent today. Change is coming to the Snake River and to  
15 Idaho. Change can mean elimination of salmon and steelhead.  
16 People can choose extinction after thousands of years of  
17 evolution that produced runs of hundreds of thousands of fish.  
18 People have that awesome power.

19 Change can mean recovery of the Snake River salmon and  
20 steelhead to regain the cornerstone of an ecological system of  
21 life critical to all of the Northwest. Some people are  
22 resistant to change. Some people want to continue the failed  
23 formulas of the past: the continued barging, hatcheries, and  
24 minor habitat improvements to continue down into towards  
25 extinction.

1           But it's obvious that the most significant change people  
2 can choose to lead towards sustainable salmon and steelhead  
3 fishery in the entire Snake, Salmon, Clearwater, Selway,  
4 Lochsa, all the rivers that matter so much to us, is to bypass  
5 the four lower Snake River dams.

6           Dam removal is not a perfect, immediate cure for all the  
7 problems the fish face, but it will avert the slide to  
8 extinction. It's the closest thing to a sure thing,  
9 ecologically and economically to restore a complex life-forms  
10 to its past glory.

11           I believe the fish biologists who have studied these  
12 options presented before us here today who say something but  
13 bypassing the dams will lead toward recovery. I believe anyone  
14 who supports some other half measure or failed program or bogus  
15 techno-fixes, what they are really saying is extinction is an  
16 okay risk or even a preferred option.

17           I don't believe people who say, no one wants extinction,  
18 but then promote failed programs or bogus fixes. If someone  
19 wants extinction, say it. Don't hide behind plans with no  
20 possibility of success. Fish are resilient. People are  
21 resilient. Rivers are resilient. Communities are resilient.

22           The question here today ought to be: How do we make sure  
23 fish, rivers, people, and communities bounce back and thrive  
24 after making the necessary changes to salmon and steelhead so  
25 they survive?

1           The sure roots of survival to the fish is a free-flowing  
2 river. Take out the dams and then come up with a plan for  
3 people and communities to also make changes so people in the  
4 communities also survive and thrive.

5           Sockeye salmon will effectively be extinct in Idaho's  
6 Salmon River at the end of the stick end if we don't do  
7 anything. We can choose to change that doom direction or we  
8 can let our resistance to change speak for eternity.

9           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, John. Janice Miller and after  
10 Janice is Randy Bostrum.

11           MS. MILLER: My name is Janice Miller. My husband and I  
12 are retirees, citizens of Pullman. We can't afford to take out  
13 whole page ads, but we can come here to express our strong  
14 approval for the partial removal of the Snake River dams and  
15 taking all necessary steps to address the other issues of  
16 hydropower, hatcheries, habitat and harvest to provide the  
17 maximum protection for the salmon and steelhead runs. Barging  
18 and other efforts have not worked.

19           The best science available indicates that all these  
20 measures together will be necessary to save the salmon from  
21 extinction and bring back the salmon and steelhead runs. We  
22 are obligated by agreements with Canada and with the Indian  
23 tribes to accomplish this. And the region and the nation will  
24 reap great social, economic and ecological benefits over time.

25           Very credible proposals have been put forward as to how

1 to mitigate the effects of dam removal on transportation and  
2 irrigation. These are available to you on the internet if you  
3 want to read them. These expenses should be shared by all  
4 citizens, through government action.

5 Further, we are firmly convinced that the pollution which  
6 poisons the salmon will eventually have equally adverse effects  
7 on humans. Clean air and clean water are essential to us all.  
8 Pollution is forbidden by law. And no person and no  
9 corporation should be above the law.

10 Just as I believe the old adage that you don't put the  
11 fox in charge of guarding the hen house, I also believe that  
12 you can't be sure of reliable science based on the data  
13 provided by a very self-interested party. Certainly we all  
14 agree that it would be a serious matter if large numbers of  
15 people were to lose their jobs. Potlatch is an important part  
16 of the industrial structure in this area, but I'm inclined not  
17 to take it face value, Potlatch's threat that if they have to  
18 pay 25 million dollars to comply with the law, that they will  
19 have to fire workers.

20 Corporations are not in business for their health, and  
21 anyone who pollutes our rivers is certainly not in business for  
22 the health of salmon or of people. We are running out of  
23 time. We must begin now to breach the dams and improve our  
24 approach to hatcheries, hydropower, harvest, and habitat.

25 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Janice. Randy Bostrum and after

1 Randy is James Palmersheim.

2 MR. BOSTRUM: Thank you. Randy Bostrum. I live in  
3 Colfax. I'm here representing myself and my family. I have  
4 recently resigned from the Port of Whitman County. I'm no  
5 longer involved directly in this debate, but I have enjoyed  
6 working with Ric and General Strock in past panel discussions.

7 Let me give you a little background. I'm the third  
8 generation transportation person having graduated with a degree  
9 in business and logistics in transportation. So I want to  
10 focus a little bit on the transportation issues that are  
11 involved in this study.

12 They do not address a few things. First of all, if you  
13 were to hold this meeting in Portland and be discussing taking  
14 out the bridges across Interstate 5, I think you would have to  
15 hold it in something like the Kingdome, which is now surplus.  
16 And you would have a pretty heated debate. That's essentially  
17 what we are talking about. Our Interstate 5 is the river  
18 system as it exists today and as it could be for our future  
19 generations. We've only had the system in place for about 20  
20 years.

21 And to realize the potential of this system in the  
22 future, I'm currently working on a project that would bring  
23 about 250,000 jobs to Colfax. If that comes together, one of  
24 the main reasons we will locate there is because the  
25 availability of low cost transportation on the river system to

1 reach the world. The product would benefit all of this region  
2 because it's agricultural based, but uses a residue or a waste  
3 product and would be able to be utilized throughout the world.

4 Without the ability to compete in that product by having  
5 low cost transportation on the river system, we likely will not  
6 be able to compete with our producers throughout the world, and  
7 that opportunity would be lost.

8 If you are about 25 years in the future in terms of  
9 transportation and the ability to use transportation, this  
10 system is a key and vital part of that outlook. If we are  
11 looking for our grandchildren's future, we need to address  
12 that.

13 If you look at the cost and take this out and try to  
14 replace it, the Washington Department of Transportation  
15 recently did a study which estimated it would take a billion  
16 dollars every ten years to maintain the system, highway system  
17 would have to be built. That's a 100 million dollars a year.  
18 If you are familiar with Washington politics, I695 just  
19 eliminated the excise tax in Washington State. It would take  
20 more than what was eliminated, a 100 million dollars to be able  
21 to maintain the system that would have to be built to cover  
22 what the barges take.

23 Each barge toll on the river is equivalent of about 50  
24 miles of trucks on an interstate highway. Essentially the  
25 barge system as it exists today makes the interstate to

1 Portland a one-lane highway because there would be so many  
2 trucks on it.

3 The other thing that hasn't been addressed is the number  
4 of deaths that will be resulting from increased traffic. There  
5 will be 7 to 9 deaths per year based on the volume of traffic  
6 increase that would occur on those highways. And the pollution  
7 from that will be equivalent to a million cars per year.

8 These things are part of the environmental cost that has  
9 to be addressed, in just looking at the transportation, not  
10 even looking at the hydrosystem. And one thing I do have to  
11 say is I've been involved in this issue for four and a half  
12 years, to get only three minutes is kind of a limitation, but I  
13 really appreciate the panel giving us the extra time. Thank  
14 you.

15 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Randy. Okay, James Palmersheim  
16 and Jeremy Five Crows.

17 MR. PALMERSHEIM: Hi.

18 MS. COLLIS: Hi.

19 MR. PALMERSHEIM: I'm Jim Palmersheim from Moscow, Idaho,  
20 and thank you for this opportunity to comment on the salmon and  
21 the Snake River for -- for the Snake River dams. I live in a  
22 town that does not have a river running through it, only a  
23 small creek. I have been told that once upon a time steelhead  
24 used to make a run up there at that creek. It still makes me  
25 wonder what the landscape and the creek were like back then and

1 why they named it paradise.

2 I've heard stories like, well, back in the gold ol' days  
3 we used to catch fish as long as your arm and we could ride a  
4 horse a half a day without seeing a fence or camp for a week  
5 without seeing a soul. I've been told residents of Salmon  
6 Basin that the Salmon River would turn red from the returning  
7 sockeye. Back in the good ol' days.

8 Well, I believe these are the good ol' days. Today we  
9 can learn from past mistakes, and today we have the  
10 responsibility and knowledge to make a change like putting the  
11 stop to ground pollution, acid rain, now saving the river for  
12 the salmon and as a healthy productive fishery. And I truly  
13 believe that similar to the dead canary in a mine shaft, where  
14 cats can enter the big troll to come, the disappearing salmon  
15 and steelhead should also be warning us about the condition of  
16 our environment. Let Idaho be known for protecting our lands  
17 and rivers for our good ol' days. Thank you.

18 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, James. Is Jeremy here? Great.

19 MR. FIVE CROWS: Hi. I'm Jeremy Five Crows. I'm a  
20 member of the Nez Perce Tribe.

21 MS. COLLIS: A little closer, please, Jeremy.

22 MR. FIVE CROWS: Oh.

23 MS. COLLIS: Thank you.

24 MR. FIVE CROWS: Historically the Northwest was defined  
25 as anywhere the salmon could go. The abundant salmon resources

1 supported vibrant native cultures all along every major river  
2 in the region. It is a unifying factor that tied the region  
3 together. Today as the salmon disappear, it is ripping the  
4 region apart. Soon, if nothing is done, the Snake and  
5 Clearwater Basin won't even be a part of the Northwest by its  
6 whole definition. Not being somewhere the salmon can go.

7           This is a future I hope I never see. I hope my  
8 children's future isn't devoid of salmon, and that our legacy  
9 isn't a series of silt-filled reservoirs that end in waterfalls  
10 at each of these four dams. The future I hope to see is one  
11 which we as residents of the Snake River Basin made the hard  
12 decisions and chose to take the path of preservation:  
13 preservation of the salmon, of the river, of our identities.

14           As a Nez Perce, this remarkable fish is part of who I  
15 am. It is a part of my flesh, for I've eaten it my entire  
16 life. It is part of my culture, one that centered around the  
17 various salmon runs throughout the year. It is part of my  
18 soul. For in this creature I maintain a link with my past.  
19 When I walk along the Snake, Clearwater, Lochsa and all the  
20 other rivers and tributaries of this basin, I am walking the  
21 paths my forefathers have walked.

22           I marvel the beauty of the landscapes they saw, and I eat  
23 the salmon that they ate. I hold this place to be the most  
24 beautiful, inspiring, important place in the world. I would  
25 hope that those of you who have lived here long enough feel the

1 same way. Because only something that we hold dear will make  
2 us willing to sacrifice for it. If what you hold dear is a  
3 vibrant salmon population, a healthy river in which they can  
4 exist, and the opportunity to catch one of these marvelous  
5 creatures from the bank of the wild river it is clear that we  
6 must remove the four lower Snake River dams. Our children, the  
7 salmon, and the rivers depend on it. Thank you.

8 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Jeremy. Okay, folks, we are  
9 going to take an hour for dinner. If you want to speak  
10 tonight, you can sign up as early as 6:00. And it's been my  
11 pleasure being your moderator. Gentlemen, do you want to say  
12 anything?

13 GEN. STROCK: Thank you all for coming.

14 (Whereupon a recess was held.)

15 (Reconvened at 6:40 p.m.)

16 MS. COLLIS: Thank you. Good evening, everyone. Let's  
17 just, if we can, get these folks seated. Do we have any other  
18 open seats in the area? There's a couple here. There's 175  
19 chairs in the open house area, and you can hear the proceedings  
20 in there as well. And, so, for those of you who want to move  
21 around, you may want to try that avenue as well. Thank for  
22 coming to tonight's public meeting on issues related to the  
23 Columbia Basin.

24 My name is Cathryn Collis. I am a professional mediator  
25 and facilitator. And I was asked by the Federal Agencies to be

1 the moderator for tonight's meeting.

2 With me is my colleague, Stacey Williams, who is also a  
3 professional mediator and facilitator, and she will help me out  
4 tonight.

5 Neither Stacey nor myself are staff members of any of the  
6 involved agencies. We were asked to moderate to assure that a  
7 fair and impartial hearing of the issues and concerns may  
8 occur.

9 Before we go any further, I want to make mention of the  
10 facility. We changed the facility in order to accommodate the  
11 increased number of people who were interested in being here.  
12 And unfortunately, at the late date we were not able to get  
13 anything larger than this, and I know it's uncomfortable and  
14 it's going to get warm. And we are all going to be close in  
15 here with a lot of different opinions, so it's going to require  
16 you to be extra respectful of your neighbors in your  
17 community. I appreciate that.

18 My guess is that all of you have important points that  
19 you would like to have heard by your government officials, and  
20 they are here to listen to what you have to say. This is an  
21 important opportunity for all of you that will require respect  
22 for both the process and each other.

23 I need your help in order to let as many of you have an  
24 opportunity to say what you want as possible, but before I  
25 discuss any further ground rules, I just want to make certain

1 that you are in the right place.

2           The purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide the public  
3 with an opportunity for both written and oral comments on the  
4 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Draft Lower Snake River Juvenile  
5 Salmon Migration Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact  
6 Statement, or the FREIS as some of you may have heard about it,  
7 or even EIS.

8           We also welcome comments on the Federal Caucus report on  
9 the Conservation of the Columbia Basin Fish, known to many of  
10 you as the All-H Paper.

11           We are holding public meetings on these issues throughout  
12 the region, in Oregon, Montana, Idaho, Washington and Alaska.  
13 We are doing this because any future regional decisions require  
14 the region to have spoken and be heard.

15           The time you have taken here to be here tonight to make  
16 your comments heard and give feedback is very important and  
17 greatly appreciated.

18           To this end we have provided multiple ways for you to  
19 make your thoughts and feelings known, either through testimony  
20 in this room this evening, through testimony in a tape recorder  
21 in the next room, Room 103, through written comments and  
22 through comment cards. All comments are treated equally no  
23 matter how you make them.

24           Before we begin, I would like to go over the agenda for  
25 tonight. We have a lot to do, and a lot of you who want to

1 speak, so let me go over a few of the administrative details.

2           We are going to start tonight with a couple of very short  
3 presentations about the documents that are under consideration  
4 by -- from our regional executives on our panel.

5           In other meetings we have followed that with a short  
6 question and answer period, but because so many of you want to  
7 speak and we want to hear from you, we are taking that portion  
8 out.

9           If through the presentations or even just in general you  
10 have questions about the documents under consideration, please  
11 be sure and visit the open house where staff members should be  
12 able to answer your questions there.

13           We are going to have three or so hours for oral  
14 testimony; although we may stay longer than that, depending on  
15 how many people still want to speak. Each person is given  
16 three minutes to testify. All of the oral testimony will be  
17 recorded for the public record.

18           If you have your comments in written form, we would  
19 appreciate a copy of those as well. Please note that there is  
20 a drop off area for your comments right here. Dawn will take  
21 your comments in writing. And again, just a reminder that  
22 there is a booth next door for you to make your comments into a  
23 tape recorder, if you are uncomfortable doing it in this room  
24 in front of a crowd or if you just don't want to hang out until  
25 your name shows up. You're welcome to make your comments over

1 there.

2           So, let's talk a little bit about ground rules for  
3 tonight. First, let me note that we want to have a safe and  
4 respectful meeting tonight, and we need all of your help to  
5 make that happen. We do have police and security on site if  
6 that's necessary, and of course we hope that it won't be. But  
7 given the controversial nature of the issues that we are going  
8 to be discussing tonight, I want to make a special plea to all  
9 of you to treat one another and the panelists with respect.

10           You may not agree with what your neighbor or the  
11 panelists are saying, but everyone in the room has a right to  
12 their views and the right to express them. And indeed, that's  
13 why we are here tonight.

14           So we ask that you show respect for that. And to be  
15 specific I'm going to ask that you please hold clapping,  
16 clearing, booing, signs, intimidating gestures, all that stuff,  
17 please, and we'll get through this. Not only will that make it  
18 a lot less intimidating environment for everybody to voice  
19 their opinions, but we will also be able to hear from more  
20 people.

21           Also we would ask that you keep side conversations down  
22 to a minimum. If you need to have a conversation, if you could  
23 exit the room that would be helpful. Our court reporter has to  
24 be able to hear fairly clearly what's being said, and that's  
25 difficult if there's a lot of background noise.

1           Help me to help you testify by being at the microphone  
2 and ready to speak when I've called your name. What I usually  
3 do is get three or four names. The person who is going to  
4 speak, the next person, and then the person on deck, so you  
5 have some warning about when you are up. Please be up and  
6 ready at the mic so that we don't lose time that way.

7           Be courteous to others and stop speaking when your time  
8 is up, please. If your question or comment has already been  
9 stated, please don't say it again, so that many -- we can hear  
10 as many views as possible tonight.

11           Tonight's meeting is not an attempt at reaching a  
12 consensus or a vote. It's an opportunity for members of the  
13 audience to have their thoughts heard and considered by the  
14 Federal Officials. And we ask that you please not disrupt that  
15 opportunity.

16           So, if you follow my instructions, we should be able to  
17 hear from as many of you as possible and hopefully learn  
18 something from one another as well.

19           We've ended the meetings in the past at 10:30 or so.  
20 We'll check in at 10:30 and see where we are. If it's  
21 everyone's idea that we should continue on, we will continue  
22 on.

23           I just want to follow up on some procedural rules. You  
24 can provide written comments on the Corps' Draft EIS or the  
25 Federal Caucus All-H Paper and related reports such as the

1 Corps' John Day drawdown study at any time during the public  
2 comment period. You can hand in written comments today or send  
3 your comments in via mail or email. Comment forms and  
4 addresses are provided in your packet.

5         Additionally, you will find information about where to  
6 get any and all of the reports that are going to be discussed  
7 tonight in those same packets.

8         So what happens to your comments? The Corps will review  
9 all comments submitted in writing and the transcripts from  
10 public testimony like this tonight. They will consider the  
11 issues you raise that are related to the Draft FREIS in their  
12 preparation of the revised draft FREIS.

13         The following comment periods are noted in your packet,  
14 but I just want to repeat them for you here tonight. The  
15 comment period for the lower Snake report is March 31st, 2000.  
16 The Federal Caucus will issue a summary report and responses to  
17 comments as part of the final All-H Paper. Comments are due on  
18 that process by March 17th, 2000.

19         The Corps' final John Day drawdown phase I report will be  
20 submitted to Congress in the summer of 2000, this summer.  
21 Written comments will be forwarded with the report. Comments  
22 are due on that study by March 31st, 2000.

23         Again, if you need to leave before we get to your oral  
24 testimony tonight, we hope you can provide us with written  
25 comments or stop by and tape your comments next door. And once

1 again, all comments are treated equally, whether you make them  
2 here or in some other forum.

3       Finally, just a couple of administrative details, we have  
4 a very large crowd tonight. I want to point out the exits  
5 there and in the back of the room. And bathrooms around the  
6 side are out through these doors, the bathrooms are there.  
7 That's the first time I ever had a chance to be a stewardess or  
8 a flight attendant. It felt kind of fun.

9       Okay, I would like to introduce our panel members  
10 tonight. With us from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is  
11 Bill Shake. And for those of you who don't know, the U.S. Fish  
12 and Wildlife Service is the organization that has endangered  
13 species jurisdiction over plants, wildlife, and resident fish.

14       Ric Ilgenfritz -- the General isn't the only one that has  
15 a struggle with that name -- is from the National Marine  
16 Fisheries Service. And, of course, the National Marine  
17 Fisheries Service has ESA, or Endangered Species Act,  
18 jurisdiction over anadromous fish, and they also regulate  
19 commercial and tribal harvest.

20       General Carl Strock from the Corps of Engineers. The  
21 Corps operates the federal dams and the locks for multiple  
22 use.

23       Sarah McNary from BPA. BPA markets electricity from  
24 federal dams and funds the fish and wildlife mitigation.

25       And Mike Crouse from BLM. They manage the public forest

1 and range lands.

2           What I would like to do now is turn the time over to  
3 General Strock and for a couple of very brief presentations,  
4 and then we'll move on to our public comment period. Thank  
5 you.

6           (Overview presentations were given but not reported.)

7           (Back on for public comment session at 7:30 p.m.)

8           MS. COLLIS: Please, again, treat one another with  
9 respect. Refrain from any clapping, cheering, booing,  
10 gestures, posters, all that kind of stuff. Thank you very  
11 much.

12           Okay, how this is going to work is: I'm going to call  
13 your name, and you need to come up to one of the two  
14 microphones in the room. I have four sign-in sheets. You will  
15 recall that you formed four lines outside, and I have those  
16 four sign-in sheets. And I'm going to take them across, number  
17 1, all the way across; number two, all the way across,  
18 etcetera, down the sheet.

19           When I get -- I'll call the name of the person who is up  
20 to speak next, the person who follows, and a third person who  
21 is on deck. So, if you can get close to the mic as you hear  
22 your name and if you are in the other room, if you can pay  
23 attention and move into this room as you hear your name. I'm  
24 going to try and remember to keep three names ahead so we don't  
25 lose any time that way. Please be ready to speak and let me

1 know if you need me to bring the mic to you. I have a remote  
2 here if you need me to bring the mic to you.

3       Okay, you need to watch the lights in front of you. The  
4 green light means speak. The yellow light indicates that you  
5 have one minute left, and the red means stop. And if you have  
6 trouble with that, I'll help you out.

7       GEN. STROCK: And I'll add my comment, too: We stop  
8 listening when the red light goes on, too.

9       MS. COLLIS: What you may want to do, actually, is three  
10 minutes isn't very long. And I know it's frustrating but,  
11 believe me, I've been doing this for a long time and I just  
12 don't know any other way to accommodate the numbers of people  
13 who want to speak. So, we are going to stick to that. And I'm  
14 pretty hard nosed about it.

15       You might want to take a look at your comments, and make  
16 sure that you make the points that you want to make. And by  
17 the way, the three minutes doesn't mean that you have to talk  
18 for three minutes either. You can stop before that if you so  
19 choose. So, take a look at your comments and make sure you get  
20 a chance to say the things you really want to say in your three  
21 minutes. And by the way, the three minutes hold for everyone,  
22 including politicians.

23       Okay. Then after you're through, just leave the mic so  
24 the next person can begin, and we hope to accommodate 50 or 60;  
25 although, we'll revisit this issue after that period. We will

1 probably take a quick break about 9:00 to give the court  
2 reporter a chance to change the paper and the reporter and our  
3 panel a chance to stretch their legs and have a bathroom  
4 break.

5           Please remember that the meeting is being transcribed,  
6 and so you need to indicate, if you can, whether you are  
7 commenting on the Corps' EIS or on the Federal Caucus All-H  
8 Paper or on the John Day Drawdown Study or all of them. If you  
9 are not sure, we will do our best to get your comments to the  
10 appropriate agency. Please be sure and state your name and if  
11 you're representing an organization or an agency also state  
12 that. So, I think that's it.

13           We'll get started with our elected officials, elected and  
14 appointed officials, and then we'll start on our sign-in  
15 sheets. So, let's begin. Junior VanTassel, please, from the  
16 Nez Perce Community Tribe. Okay. Did I pronounce it wrong?  
17 There are periods. J.R. There you go.

18           MR. VANTASSEL: I would like to thank you for being here  
19 tonight. I am glad I don't have to talk for three minutes  
20 because the General's five minutes let my mouth get dry.

21           I am J.R. VanTassel, Chairman of the Board of Nez Perce  
22 County Commissioners, and I would just like to say that the  
23 Board of County Commissioners of Nez Perce County is totally  
24 opposed to breaching the dams.

25           We believe that breaching would cause far-reaching and

1 disastrous effects on our commerce, economy, residents, and  
2 taxpayers. We further believe that the science that supports  
3 breaching cannot be precise enough to take that risk.  
4 Unfortunately, the lack of -- lack of precision has transformed  
5 this into an emotional and, subsequently, political issue.

6 We are very confident that our position is reflective of  
7 the vast majority of the people of Nez Perce County and people  
8 of the region. Thank you.

9 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, J.R. Appreciate it. Dale  
10 Aldrich and next is Charles Cuddy, an Idaho State  
11 Representative, and following Charles is Tom Prior, the Mayor  
12 of Asotin.

13 MR. ALDRICH: Good evening. I'm Dale Aldrich, one of the  
14 three Commissioners for the Port of Lewiston. On behalf of the  
15 Commissioners of the Port of Lewiston I want to thank you for  
16 the opportunity to provide comments on this important issue.

17 Salmon recovery is clearly one of the most significant  
18 issues to confront the Port, our community, and the region in  
19 the last ten years. Over this period the Port has been an  
20 active participant in regional discussions aimed at finding and  
21 implementing a solution for our endangered salmon.

22 In addition to my comments tonight, the Port of Lewiston  
23 will provide detailed, technical comments. Tonight my comments  
24 will focus on all the reports regarding the lower Snake River.

25 First and foremost, the Port of Lewiston reiterates its

1 support for regional efforts to aid salmon recovery. Although  
2 our salmon runs are clearly up to stress levels, we believe  
3 that as federal agencies charge both operations of our river  
4 and Fish and Wildlife Resources, you have aggressively pursued  
5 actions to enhance salmon.

6         Since the construction of the lower Snake River dams,  
7 hundreds of millions have been spent -- have been invested to  
8 aid salmon in those projects. And based on your latest  
9 scientific data, these actions have had a magical positive  
10 effect on survival.

11         While the four lower Snake River dams were successfully  
12 passing salmon, possibly the highest of any dams in the Pacific  
13 Northwest, fishery agencies are predicting a very large return  
14 of adult salmon to Idaho this spring. That's a great sign and  
15 should provide the proper encouragement for future  
16 salmon-saving initiatives.

17         In addition to the continued passage improvements at the  
18 dams, the Port believes hatchery harvest reforms are necessary,  
19 too. We are not advocating harvest moratorium, but believe  
20 selective fishing methods should be adopted to allow more  
21 endangered Idaho salmon to spawn.

22         We are opposed to breaching the lower Snake River dams.  
23 According to your feasibility study, the dam breaching  
24 alternatives result in higher downstream passage mortality for  
25 salmon than the other three alternatives when the loss of

1 transport is considered.

2           Based on your report, there has not been a scientific  
3 case made that breaching will help recover salmon runs as  
4 compared to the current program. As one of the principal  
5 economic development entities for our community, we are also  
6 very concerned with the likely detrimental economic  
7 consequences for Lewiston and area industries.

8           It is amazing to us that after five years of study,  
9 spending millions of public dollars, your Draft Feasibility  
10 Study concludes that dam breaching would result in a projected  
11 net gain of employment for Lewiston.

12           By comparison, we provided you with Port Commission  
13 University of Idaho study which indicated that 1580 jobs were  
14 directly tied to water commerce by the three ports. By  
15 removing the dams, those jobs and many more were at risk.

16           If dam breaching were not a significant issue in our  
17 community tonight, why are thousands of people from our Valley  
18 here attending these hearings.

19           Since the March 1992 drawdown test, our community has  
20 been living under the prospect of losing our waterway. While  
21 the advocates have been unable to make a credible scientific  
22 case to support dam breaching, it is time for you to  
23 demonstrate the leadership and abandon this proposal and pursue  
24 meaningful salmon recovery actions. Thank you for the  
25 opportunity to comment.

1 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Dale. Charles Cuddy, Tom Prior,  
2 and then Dick Sherwin.

3 MR. CUDDY: Thank you, Panel. It's a pleasure to be here  
4 this evening, but yet it isn't. I represent an area when you  
5 get eleven miles up river that covers the rest of the  
6 Clearwater drainage, and most of those people in there are  
7 quite fearful of what your actions will be. And for too many  
8 years in North Central Idaho we've sacrificed our water, we  
9 reluctantly accepted diminishment of land use and land  
10 management in the name of endangered and threatened salmon  
11 recovery.

12 We've endured these losses and restrictions while  
13 commercial fishing for these salmon continue. Upon perusal of  
14 the 4H proposal, I see nothing but more impact being bestowed  
15 on North Central Idaho, nor do I see any proposal that  
16 guarantees fish recovery to the point of enlisting.

17 The most drastic approach, breaching appears to me to  
18 have a fiscal impact approaching one -- impact approaching one  
19 billion dollars without a lot of other added things, the buy  
20 out of grain elevator stocks except for what's been built by  
21 private money.

22 That does not coincide either with your statement on page  
23 3, bullet point five, of the introduction of the All-H Paper.  
24 In fact, this option means devastation to the Clearwater Basin  
25 when economic impacts are considered. I believe it's only fair

1 to comply my response on habitat, harvest options as I believe  
2 they are closely related and will continue to be that way.

3 Past experience tells me that the land management of the  
4 Clearwater Basin will be further restricted to attempt to  
5 provide down river and saltwater harvest at the sole and  
6 separate expense of jobs and industry in our area while 90 to  
7 95 percent of our natural spawning areas will probably remain  
8 unused.

9 The statement from a legislature friend in Montana I  
10 think put it best: You people have the best motels in the  
11 world, and there's nobody home.

12 Hatcheries, as a sports fisherman, it's become obvious to  
13 me that hatcheries have been the only success in regarding  
14 hazardous fish that I have observed. I see seasons for  
15 steelhead and often times other salmonid, but only for hatchery  
16 fish. In many cases these runs appear to be on increase, while  
17 natural spawning decrease in population.

18 Obviously, all these fish have to make their way upstream  
19 through the same weirs and obstructions. When one looks at the  
20 increase in shad and other native salmon fish populate and now  
21 inhabiting the Columbia River Basin, it seems to me that they  
22 provide the same amount of fish they historically did, but  
23 there is nothing left but the smolt going downstream that are  
24 unaided to eat.

25 I recently read an article in a west coast newspaper that

1 covered satellite detection of a probable nomadic change in  
2 Pacific coast temperatures along the north coast. This article  
3 raised the possibility that lasting -- the change for lasting  
4 decades will bring healthier salmon runs to the Northwest  
5 because the temperatures are supposedly going to cool.

6 Scientists believe these terms have been long cycles and  
7 long occurring. I don't think there's anything out there in  
8 the way of current science that tells you you're on the road to  
9 recovery for salmonids that last in our area. I think all we  
10 are going to do is get another impact for our working people  
11 people and the industry in our area. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Charles. Tom Prior, Dick Sherwin  
13 and John Currin, please.

14 MR. PRIOR: Thank you. First of all, I'm not a  
15 politician. They got me in here to speak before everybody  
16 else. My name is Tom Prior, and I'm the Mayor of Asotin. At  
17 our last council meeting we passed a Resolution, 00-290, to  
18 gain a resolution declaring opposition to the breaching of the  
19 lower Snake River dams.

20 The lower Snake River dams are essential to the economic  
21 well-being of Asotin and neighboring communities and whereas  
22 the City of Asotin, Mayor, and City Council members feel the  
23 removal of the dams would constitute a grave danger to the  
24 economic viability of our region destroying jobs,  
25 transportation, routes, irrigation, and hydroelectricity

1 production; and whereas, proposals to breach the dams are based  
2 on incomplete, inconclusive information and unproven theories.

3 As the elected officials of this City it is our duty to  
4 speak out loud and clear to protect the security and economic  
5 well-being of our community.

6 Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the City Council of the  
7 City of Asotin at a regular meeting assembled do hereby  
8 officially declare their opposition to the breaching of the  
9 lower Snake River dams, dated the 7th day of February, the year  
10 2000. Thank you.

11 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Tom. Dick Sherwin, John Currin,  
12 and Marguerite McLaughlin.

13 MR. SHERWIN: Hello. Good to see you again, General. My  
14 name is Dick Sherwin. I am a Commissioner of the Port of  
15 Clarkston, and like Tom, I'm not much of a politician either.  
16 But I am pretty controversial, so I'm going to listen to you.

17 I spent a lot of time preparing testimony for this, and  
18 when I got down here and listened to everybody else's  
19 testimony, like every time, I threw it right out the window.  
20 And so, just a few things I would like to say.

21 First of all, what happened to common sense? Here we  
22 are. We are sitting here talking about people's jobs,  
23 livelihoods, the future of salmon, and we are still killing  
24 them. I don't care what anybody else has to say, I don't think  
25 there is a person in this room who wouldn't agree with me that

1 before we mess with people's livelihoods and jobs and the  
2 economy of this whole region, we need to quit sanctioning the  
3 killing of salmon. Whether it be commercial, tribal or sport  
4 fishing, there's no other endangered species on this planet  
5 that is sanctioned to be legally taken for harvest and killed.  
6 It's ridiculous to be here talking about this issue, until this  
7 problem has been solved.

8 I respect the Tribe's rights to fish. I respect their  
9 treaty rights, but if they are as concerned with returning the  
10 salmon as they tell us they are, they should voluntarily give  
11 these salmon moratorium.

12 We talk about mitigating jobs. How many fishermen's jobs  
13 are going to be mitigated versus all the jobs in the Pacific  
14 Northwest that need to be mitigated? Let's mitigate the fewer  
15 number of jobs and not the greater number.

16 I've heard a lot about subsidies. I've heard a lot of  
17 people saying, oh, these dams are subsidized. Everything is  
18 subsidized. It's a great thing. It's a catchall phrase. We  
19 all hear it all the time.

20 I contend that these entities that are killing the fish  
21 are being subsidized with our jobs. We are subsidizing all  
22 this fishing, right now, the commercial, the tribal, and the  
23 recreational harvest is being subsidized with the jobs of the  
24 good men and women in this room.

25 We talk about the jobs that will be lost and the jobs

1 that will be created, but nobody ever talks about the average  
2 income of those jobs that will be created. We have living wage  
3 jobs. Jobs that have all kinds of benefits. Jobs we've worked  
4 for all our lives, and that is not the same as flipping burgers  
5 at McDonald's, ladies and gentlemen.

6           We need to talk about the gross income generated for the  
7 jobs for a change instead of just the numbers gained and lost.  
8 If you have twice as many jobs, you get half as much income, it  
9 doesn't make a lot of sense. But everybody conveniently avoids  
10 that issue.

11           If the people in Boise think that the water budget is  
12 going to change if the dams are breached, you're wrong. The  
13 PATH people will tell you that. You're still be using your  
14 water down water to flush fish. It's not going to make any  
15 difference. That budget is not going to change, so I don't  
16 know where your bandwagon is. Your dams are next.

17           I see I got the red light and I have probably been  
18 controversial enough so thank you for your time.

19           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Dick.

20           MR. SHERWIN: Thank you.

21           MS. COLLIS: John Currin, Marguerite McLaughlin. Please  
22 hold your applause. Can I ask you to please hold your  
23 applause. Thank you. I appreciate you sticking to the ground  
24 rules for me, thanks. John Currin, Marguerite McLaughlin and  
25 then Frank Bruneel. Go ahead. Thanks.

1 MR. CURRIN: Thank you. My name is John Currin. I'm a  
2 member of the Lewiston City Council. I want to welcome you and  
3 all the rest of our visitors to beautiful Lewiston and  
4 Clarkston and the Clearwater Valley.

5 Remember the Corps' mandated Monongahela decision in the  
6 mid-1970s? This decision limited the size of the Forest  
7 Service clear-cuts. The environmentalists said that it was not  
8 their objective to stop clear-cuts, but rather limit their size  
9 to a reasonable area. It was not long, however, they, in fact,  
10 they accomplished the banning of clear-cuts on the Forest  
11 Service.

12 In 1991 the spotted owl decision started a process of  
13 emasculating the Forest Service in terms of commercial Forest  
14 management. First an old growth filing on all Forest Service  
15 lands. Recent attempts to control an insect epidemic adjacent  
16 to rural residential property were fought. Arguments that not  
17 treating these lands would lead to damage to adjacent private  
18 property had no sway with the environmentalists. Their  
19 long-term objective is to depopulate these rural residential  
20 areas.

21 Remember that spotted owl? The environmentalists'  
22 argument, based on their science, was that the spotted owl  
23 cannot survive and could become extinct without old growth.  
24 The spotted owl can exist only in old growth was their claim.  
25 Now we know the environmentalists were wrong. Spotted owls

1 thrive very well in second growth forests, even in areas  
2 adjacent to rural residential development.

3         Now the Forest Service no longer manages any of its lands  
4 to long-term commercial forest production. In fact, many  
5 ranger districts do not even have a forester on its staff.  
6 They do, however, have plenty of archeologists, fish and  
7 wildlife biologists and hydrologists.

8         A new field of study has developed at our natural  
9 resource colleges devoted to writing environmental assessments  
10 and environmental impact statements. Having created a Forest  
11 Service that has nothing to do regarding managing forest,  
12 actually manages nothing but report writers, environmentalists  
13 have turned their attention to eliminating agriculture industry  
14 and private commercial forest management from the Inland  
15 Northwest.

16         Again, their long-term goal is to depopulate the rural  
17 Inland Northwest and create an elites part of the country. And  
18 they are succeeding. Breaching the four lower Snake River dams  
19 is a major step in their overall strategy. Now I know that  
20 many of you will call this a whacko conspiracy theory, but the  
21 shutting down of the Forest Service Timber Management of the  
22 Northwest after the Monongahela decision 25 years ago would  
23 have also been considered a whacko conspiracy theory. All you  
24 need to do is consider who their leaders are.

25         There is no science existing showing that breaching the

1 four lower Snake River dams would save the salmon and steelhead  
2 from extinction. Mark Reisner, author of Cadillac desert,  
3 calls breaching these dams a crapshoot. In fact, we do not  
4 know what will happen to the fish should the dams be breached.  
5 But we do know what will happen if the dams are breached here  
6 in this lovely Clearwater Valley and Lewiston and Clarkston.

7 The ports of Lewiston, Clarkston and Wilma and their  
8 contributions to the area would disappear.

9 MS. COLLIS: I need to ask you to wrap up, please, John.  
10 Thank you.

11 MR. CURRIN: Okay. We are currently working with the  
12 process that's been proven to get 95 percent of the smolts  
13 below the dam. Is the next five percent worth all the  
14 destruction and disruption in the Inland Northwest? Thank  
15 you.

16 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, John. Marguerite McLaughlin and  
17 then Frank Bruneel and then Senator Geddes.

18 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: I'm Senator Marguerite McLaughlin, and I  
19 live up the river in the Clearwater right below that  
20 magnificent structure that was built called Dworshak which  
21 isn't included in your report, but I'm sure it's in some of  
22 them that you will have to use when you look at saving salmon.

23 I would like to begin my remarks by stating the obvious:  
24 The issue of salmon recovery dam breaching and water allocation  
25 are tremendous importance to the men and women who live in this

1 region and state. It is these men and women who's been  
2 experiencing the daily basis of impact of any decisions  
3 regarding salmon recovery.

4 My comments are based on discussions with my  
5 constituencies and my evaluation of the information presented  
6 in the Lower Snake River Juvenile Salmon Mitigation Feasibility  
7 Report. In the section outlining the Effects on Water Supply  
8 and Irrigation on page 32 of the summary document, the analysis  
9 outlines the economic cost of modifying pumps and pump  
10 intakes.

11 What the analysis fails to offer is the impact on  
12 available water for use by either irrigators or municipal  
13 users. Focusing solely on the cost of pump modifications does  
14 not capture fully the economic impact of crop failure resulting  
15 from inadequate water supplies. Presenting the cost associated  
16 with the loss of irrigation lands simply shows that this  
17 alternative is not really feasibility.

18 If dam removal is a feasible alternative, then dam  
19 removal and a reliable supply of irrigation water cannot be  
20 mutually exclusive. I would like to know what analysis the  
21 Corps has completed on hydrology. Has the Corps assumed that  
22 flows during dry periods will be augmented by drawdowns from  
23 Dworshak reservoir?

24 I have here some other information on economic analysis,  
25 but I won't go into it because my time will probably be up

1 before I got through it.

2           One could make quite a good argument that the costs for  
3 the water withdrawal modifications are more economical than the  
4 status quo expenditures that have yet to yield measurable  
5 benefit.

6           My point here is that the economic analysis simply looks  
7 at pump modifications or changing land values associated with  
8 loss of water, but nothing in between these two extremes.  
9 Therefore, in my opinion, the cost analysis and evaluation do  
10 not represent a complete alternative for breaching the dams.

11           This concludes my comments on that area. I oppose the  
12 breaching of dams because of the impact the dam breaching will  
13 have on those of us who rely on your present infrastructure for  
14 our livelihood. This entire region's economic base is built  
15 upon a system -- river system.

16           The economic ripples of dam removal have not been fully  
17 captured by your economic analysis. No comeback of the salmon  
18 will happen until mother nature changes her ways with respect  
19 to the ocean conditions.

20           And another disparity is the manner in which these  
21 species are treated. With most endangered species, the taking  
22 of the species is strictly prohibited. The recovery of salmon  
23 is considered a strict prohibition of taking prior  
24 consideration of habitat preservation. And is this harsh?  
25 Yes, it is, but it's no more harsh than what's going to happen

1 to the people in this area who have to make changes to their  
2 life-style. Thank you.

3 MS. COLLIS: Thank you. Frank Bruneel and then Senator  
4 Bob Geddes and Dan Mader is next. Go ahead.

5 MR. BRUNEEL: My name is Frank Bruneel. General, I'm  
6 already scared. I'm a local resident, an Idaho State  
7 Representative from District 6 of Lewiston.

8 This issue is so important to all of Idaho that the  
9 leadership of both the House and Senate have made an effort to  
10 be in attendance at this session and the early one. Senator  
11 Bob Geddes, Pro-Tem of the Idaho Senate, living in the  
12 southeast part of the state, along with Speaker of the House  
13 Bruce Newcomb have made the effort to present testimony today  
14 to represent the importance of maintaining these dams for the  
15 well-being of all Idaho.

16 I'm here to testify on behalf of the quality of  
17 socioeconomic and environmental quality of life that I, my  
18 family, and the 35,000 constituents I represent enjoy.

19 Having lived in this Valley for 35 years and operated a  
20 small business, I strenuously oppose removal or breaching of  
21 our lower Snake River dams. Our economy and life-style are  
22 being threatened and endangered. Not because there's any sound  
23 biological or scientific data that supports the alleged impact  
24 on migratory fish, but because dams are an easy sitting  
25 target.

1 I submit that from my District we want the same scrutiny  
2 that is being focused on these dams for salmon recovery or fish  
3 recovery to be applied to all of the other factors impacting  
4 salmon such as oceanic conditions, ocean harvest, Columbia and  
5 down river harvest, terns and sea lions.

6 As a pilot I can tell you that if I have an engine  
7 failure because one fuel tank appears to be empty, most likely  
8 I will certainly check the other fuel cells for fuel before I  
9 think about bailing out.

10 I urge you: don't bail out on us. Examine all the other  
11 alternatives before considering such a disastrous course as dam  
12 breaching or removal. It's irresponsible and being promoted by  
13 those who have no real dog in this fight.

14 We care about salmon, fish, and our environment, but they  
15 are no more valuable to us than our jobs, economy, families,  
16 and life-style. We live in fear from the influence of those  
17 that live far away from us and drive policies that are and can  
18 have devastating impacts on our Valley, area, and our state.

19 This is our backyard where we live, work, and recreate.  
20 We are willing as locals to bare the responsibilities of our  
21 actions and ask others downstream to participate with us. It's  
22 inconceivable to trash the years of planning work that have  
23 gone into this system that we now enjoy. It's just irrational  
24 and insane in my opinion.

25 I urge evaluating the local testimony given and weighing

1 heavily against that testimony that comes from outsiders whose  
2 lives will not be traumatized by dam removal. Regionally we  
3 have willingly submitted to and supported local efforts to aid  
4 restoration efforts by complying with restricted fishing  
5 seasons, regulated license limits, in addition to the countless  
6 hours of private and business donated dollars being donated and  
7 extended in habitat hatchery projects.

8 I ask the same effort and expenditures be put forth that  
9 have been put forth by our local community, workers, and  
10 industry be matched by those downstream before you consider  
11 pulling the plug on our jobs, economy, and life-style. Thank  
12 you.

13 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Frank. By the way, for those of  
14 you who -- please hold your applause. Thank you. Let me tell  
15 you what that's about. Obviously I couldn't allow booing to  
16 happen because that would establish an atmosphere of  
17 intimidation, and so it just seems fair to me that I also  
18 cannot have a lot of clapping going on. It's one -- the same  
19 thing, just a different message. So, I just ask you to please  
20 abide by the ground rules and hold your applause. If you agree  
21 with someone, you'll get a chance to say so in your testimony.

22 And I also want to say for those of you who are speaking  
23 very quickly to get your testimony in under three minutes, if  
24 you do have it in writing and can give it to the court  
25 reporter, then she can make sure she didn't miss something as

1 you went really fast. Senator Geddes, go ahead.

2           SENATOR GEDDES: Thank you. My name is Robert L.  
3 Geddes. I am the President Pro-Tem of the Idaho State Senate,  
4 and I am also a licensed professional geologist. I worked as  
5 an environmental engineer, and I lived in Southeast Idaho near  
6 one of the headwater streams of the Snake River.

7           I have had significant experience and involvement working  
8 on remediation projects. One premise that I have always  
9 strived for is a scientific concept that is, or at least should  
10 be, paramount as a solution to this issue as developed. That  
11 premise is, do more good than harm.

12           In June of 1976 a large dam in Eastern Idaho was  
13 breached. This was not planned or an intentional act, but  
14 rather an accident caused by unstable geologic structure and an  
15 inadequate design. This was the Teton dam, or perhaps you have  
16 heard of it.

17           Now over 20 years later chronic high sediment levels and  
18 excessive spring sediment flush still is occurring. The Teton  
19 dam was very new when the dam failed, and only a small amount  
20 of sediment had been accumulated behind this structure. To  
21 this date, rainfall and snowmelt events continue to load  
22 significant levels of sediment into the Teton River water.

23           Only time can heal this condition. Obviously, the  
24 fishery, both above and below the dam, have been impacted as a  
25 result of the unintended consequences from the breaching of the

1 Teton dam.

2           This is a real science model that can be comparable to  
3 what will occur if any of the lower Snake River dams are  
4 breached. Years and decades of sediment had accumulated behind  
5 these structures. Suspended sediments resulting from dam  
6 breaching obviously will have an adverse effect on all aquatic  
7 organisms present in the river system.

8           How critical is the suspended sediment to any fish living  
9 and migrating through the river system? The sediment loading  
10 in the spring and during the winter storm events will produce  
11 increase sedimentation for weeks at a time. Any salmon exposed  
12 during those times will be at great risk.

13           The impact of the millions of cubic yards of sediment  
14 that will be released for years will cause severe adverse  
15 impacts to every class of salmon. Existing reports have even  
16 stated that the amount of sediments held behind the dams have  
17 been grossly underestimated, even as much as 70 percent.

18           If models that have been developed are not accurate and  
19 founded on scientifically reliable data, they provide little  
20 value to project the consequences and long-term effects from an  
21 ill-advised dam breaching effort.

22           Based on the information under the reports that I have  
23 reviewed, the science is not conclusive, and this proposed fix  
24 to the salmon issue will only further jeopardize the efforts of  
25 a stable and healthy salmon population.

1 Remember, any and all efforts must do more good than  
2 harm. These dams must not be breached. Thank you.

3 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Bob. Dan Mader and then Golden  
4 Linford.

5 MR. MADER: Good evening. My name is Dan Mader, and I am  
6 a State Representative from the Lewiston District 6 area just  
7 across the river. I want to thank you for the opportunity to  
8 comment tonight, and I want to begin my comments by thanking  
9 you, the Corps in particular, for bringing us and building a  
10 dam system or a system of dams that has brought us many, many  
11 benefits for many years.

12 We have additional recreation today. We have an improved  
13 warm water fishery. We have a transportation system that is  
14 quiet. It's efficient. It's environmentally clean. We have  
15 low cost power, and because of all of these things we have an  
16 economy that is competitive as a result.

17 I think we would all admit that early in the life of this  
18 system there were some things that were done that were harmful  
19 to the fish because of our lack of knowledge. There were high  
20 dissolved gas levels. We didn't have flip whips on the dam.

21 There was a nonexistent and then an ineffective  
22 transportation system. There were no intake screen and  
23 diversion systems in those days, and the list could go on. But  
24 today it is a much, much different situation. We have made  
25 huge improvements in the system in the last 20 years.

1           The operations today we find give us much lower dissolved  
2 gas levels, turbine intake screens and diversion systems that  
3 are now in their third generation and a vastly improved  
4 transportation system. And now, as a result of all of that  
5 work, money, and investment we find that the survival of the  
6 smolt outgoing is much, much higher than we were originally  
7 told.

8           The last few years of our own science says that survival  
9 is between 50 and 60 percent and sometimes as high as 70, and  
10 that, on average, is as high as natural river conditions.

11           What do we do now? There's a lot more that we can do.  
12 There are, at a minimum, we can replace gill nets if they are  
13 not bought out, we can replace them with ones that are much  
14 more selective and let listed fish pass.

15           We are implementing the Clean Water Act and the TMBL  
16 process in Idaho which will be very costly to communities, but  
17 it will improve water quality. We have many more bypass and  
18 diversion systems that will benefit the system.

19           In Idaho just two weeks ago we heard about new improved  
20 technology for fish guiding systems that has tremendous  
21 promise. We have hatchery boxed technologies with an agreement  
22 between the tribal fishery managers and our own department of  
23 Fish and Game in Idaho to rebuild runs on streams that are very  
24 low in numbers.

25           In conclusion, we cannot bring back these fish by simply

1 breaching the dams. I want to thank you for not choosing a dam  
2 breaching alternative. Dam breaching and flow augmentation are  
3 not the right alternatives. We built a good system. We spent  
4 20 years improving it, and now we need to finish the job and  
5 bring back the fish. We can do that.

6 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Dan.

7 MR. MADER: Thank you.

8 MS. COLLIS: Golden Linford, Mr. Wyatt and Barb Fry.

9 MR. LINFORD: Thank you, panel, for this opportunity to  
10 address you. My name is Golden Linford. I live in Rexburg,  
11 Idaho, on the other side of the state, Southeastern Idaho. I  
12 am a State Representative in the Idaho Legislature and Chairman  
13 of the House Resource and Conservation Committee.

14 I believe I can say with accuracy that it was almost  
15 unanimous opinion of the Legislature of the State of Idaho that  
16 the dams -- the proposals to breach the dams and also to  
17 release additional Idaho water for flow augmentation not be  
18 implemented.

19 We believe that the support and science for either of  
20 these concepts is not the sole remedy. However, my primary  
21 point that I would like to make this evening is to report, that  
22 is a resident of Eastern Idaho, that I join with those of you  
23 here and that I represent an area of the state that most think  
24 would not have a dog in this fight. However, we do. And we,  
25 even though it might be assumed that we haven't because we are

1 not here, I also live on the banks of the Henry's Ford of the  
2 Snake River.

3         And our interest, perhaps, is a little different than  
4 this issue. In Eastern Idaho we believe that the hydroelectric  
5 system is important to our survival as well as it is to many of  
6 the other places in the state. Over the years Eastern Idaho  
7 residents have, through Congressional action, have shared in  
8 the benefits of the hydroelectric system of the Snake and  
9 Columbia River.

10         That is being changed now, and we are going to receive  
11 less of that hydroelectric benefit, but we want to make sure  
12 that these dams remain in place because there will be,  
13 according to reports, there will be a shortage of power in the  
14 next few years. And that will change the reliability and  
15 accessibility of power of inexpensive power, and so we want to  
16 add our voice to those of you here who are opposed to the  
17 breaching of the dams and to removing a major important  
18 component in the production of electric power. Thank you.

19         MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Golden. Mr. Wyatt and then Barb  
20 Fry.

21         MR. WYATT: Thank you, Cathryn. Members of the panel, my  
22 name is Mr. Wyatt. I'm from Boise, Idaho. I'm here tonight to  
23 represent Idaho State Controller, J.D. Williams. J.D. Williams  
24 could not be here tonight; however, wanted me to deliver to you  
25 a position paper that I will not, rather than read tonight,

1 take up other people's time, I will deliver to you.

2 In addition to the comments that are included here, J.D.  
3 would like to very strongly state that he's opposed to dam  
4 breaching, in excessive use of Idaho water, and any resolution  
5 to this situation.

6 In addition to that, I would like to reiterate a lot of  
7 what Senator Geddes said in terms of that there is no proven  
8 technology in dam breaching because it's never been done  
9 before. The closest thing that we have had to dam breaching is  
10 the Teton dam, and 20 years after the disaster -- 24 years  
11 after the disaster, it's still a problem. The sediments are  
12 still going into the stream. There's hundreds of millions of  
13 cubic yards of sediments that will go down the river if dam  
14 breaching is taken into account.

15 Why is this important? Even for those people who  
16 consider fish more important than working families, I think  
17 those people have to look at the holistic impact to the  
18 environment in terms of not only the loss of habitat that will  
19 be where the reservoir was, but also the loss of habitat that's  
20 created by the farms that use the water for irrigation.

21 And they'll also have to look at the loss of habitat or  
22 the risk of the habitat by the replacement of that hydrological  
23 electricity. It will have to be replaced eventually by gas,  
24 coal, or nuclear.

25 So, with that in mind I'll submit these comments to you.

1 Controller Williams could not avoid not being here tonight, but  
2 he did send me here to listen to you. I appreciate the input  
3 from the panel, and I'll be listening to the other comments.  
4 Thank you.

5 MS. COLLIS: Thank you. Barbara Fry, Susan Fagan and  
6 then David Dorensfeld.

7 MS. FRY: Good evening. My name is Barbara Fry. I'm a  
8 Nez Perce County Treasurer, and as treasurer I know the amount  
9 of money needed just to operate in Nez Perce County. This  
10 revenue is derived from the value of each business, farm and  
11 resident in Nez Perce County.

12 If the dams were to be removed all the port facilities  
13 would probably become vacant and probably require maintenance  
14 or worse, demolition at county expense. Each farm would be  
15 devalued due to added shipping costs, businesses and houses  
16 would be devalued also. When this occurs, jobs would also be  
17 lost and wages reduced on the remaining jobs to compensate for  
18 higher shipping costs. The end result being a devastated  
19 community paying higher taxes and the possibility of still no  
20 salmon. So breaching is not the answer. Thank you for the  
21 opportunity.

22 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Barbara. Susan Fagan, David  
23 Dorensfeld then Mark Benson.

24 MS. FAGAN: I thank you. It's been a long wait, but I'm  
25 glad to be here and have an opportunity to speak. I am

1 speaking tonight on behalf of my employers, Ed and Mary  
2 Switzer. Ed and Mary -- and I'm speaking for them -- our names  
3 are Ed and Mary Switzer. We live in Pullman, Washington.

4 In 1982 we founded Switzer Engineering Laboratories in  
5 the basement of our home. We had one employee. Today SEL has  
6 over 440 employees. The company serves electric power  
7 utilities and industrial companies worldwide through the  
8 design, manufacture and supply of protected relays. Safe  
9 operation of electric power systems depend on our products and  
10 services.

11 Over 300 utilities and 62 countries on 6 continents use  
12 SEL relays. They protect millions of industrial, commercial,  
13 and residential consumers of electric power. To say that we  
14 know and understand the importance of reliable electrical  
15 service in our daily lives is an understatement. We are proud  
16 of our contribution to science and the practical application of  
17 our inventions. They continue to improve the quality of life  
18 for millions of people around the world by making electric  
19 power safer, more reliable, and more economical.

20 It is our belief that any discussion of destroying the  
21 four lower Snake River dam is premature at best. The Phase I  
22 Report from the Northwest Power Planning Council staff states  
23 that over each of the next five years if no additional  
24 resources are added to the system, the probability of being  
25 unable to fully serve the load; in other words, the demands for

1 electricity, during winter months is relatively high reaching  
2 24 percent in 2003. This is a one in four chance that outages  
3 of some kind could occur.

4         In good conscience our federal agencies cannot risk the  
5 loss of the power these dams generate. Hydroelectric power is  
6 a renewable resource. It's clean. It's safe, and we are not  
7 going to replace it with solar panels or windmills. That can't  
8 be done at any cost. Unless we forget those who have come to  
9 depend on us, the people at the end of the line. They expect  
10 to turn on their light switch or run their washing machine or  
11 plug in their vaporizer to help a sick child or turn on their  
12 computer, what do we tell these people?

13         That in our infinite wisdom in early 2000 we thought it  
14 would be a nifty idea to destroy dams to save fish without  
15 clear, scientific proof that it would successfully bring fish  
16 back? We are not willing to risk that.

17         The power system in the United States is already under  
18 great stress due to deregulation. Between June 7th and August  
19 12th last year significant electric power outages and other  
20 disturbances occurred in the Midwest and the Eastern seaboard.  
21 You saw the footage on the news each night. People were dying  
22 from the heat. Power systems unable to keep up with demand.

23         MS. COLLIS: I need to wrap up, please.

24         MS. FAGAN: I will do that. So the Department of Energy  
25 has sought to figure out why that happened and not make it

1 happen again. And we are here talking about taking out sources  
2 of power. So, the Switzers ask that dam breaching be taken  
3 completely off the table. And they said, we believe that our  
4 government must do a better job of solving this problem. We  
5 pledge to work along side reasonable, thoughtful people to find  
6 a better solution.

7 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Susan. David Dorensfeld and then  
8 Mark Benson and then Stan Genoway.

9 MR. DORENSFELD: Good evening. My name is David  
10 Dorensfeld. As manager of the Port of Lewiston I would like to  
11 welcome you to ground zero of the salmon recovery. We  
12 appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the draft EIS  
13 and All-H Paper. These reports will determine the future of  
14 our fish runs and our economy.

15 First of all, we implore you to hold a second round of  
16 hearings in Lewiston. Thousands of people have been locked out  
17 of this building. These are the people, the families, that  
18 will be most affected by this issue. Please provide them the  
19 opportunity to be heard.

20 General, I'm disturbed by today's hearings fairly  
21 representing public opinion. The deck was unfairly stacked  
22 this afternoon favoring pro-breaching advocates. Please check  
23 the afternoon sign-up sheet, and you will find one person's  
24 handwriting signing in six people. They are all in a row.  
25 That's pretty easy to do. I don't know how many times this

1 happened, but pro-breaching advocates should be embarrassed by  
2 these actions.

3         The Port of Lewiston is opposed to Alternative 4, the  
4 destruction of the four lower Snake River dams. We are also  
5 opposed to the use of Idaho water for flow augmentation  
6 purposes. Flow augmentation has never been proven to have any  
7 merital benefit to salmon. Additionally, there has not been a  
8 scientific case made that destroying dams will help recover  
9 fish runs as compared to the current program.

10         Smolt survival through the lower Snake is now the same as  
11 it was before the dams were built. 95 percent of smolts  
12 survived passage through the Snake River dams. 98 percent of  
13 transported smolts survive the trip to the ocean.

14         The incremental benefits of dam breaching cannot be  
15 biologically or economically supported. Fish versus dam offers  
16 the region a false choice. Everyone here tonight supports fish  
17 recovery; however, not at any cost. Not at the cost of  
18 destroying family farms, not at the cost of destroying the  
19 economy of this community and the region.

20         We support an All-H approach to fish recovery. Recovery  
21 efforts must address continued progress of improving survival  
22 through the dams and reservoirs, such as surface collectors and  
23 guidance methods. Improvements of salmon and steelhead  
24 transportation methods. Improve the quality of hatchery  
25 salmon. Eliminate mixed stock harvest practices and dot

1 selected harvest practices. Develop watershed based incentive  
2 programs for landowners. Reduce smolt predation.

3 Focusing on any one recovery measure will be  
4 unsuccessful. As much as some would like to believe that a  
5 silver bullet solution which everyone knows that there is not a  
6 single source of fish mortality. The absurdity of tearing out  
7 dams to see if 50 years later it might help fish is a radical  
8 experiment which cannot be scientifically supported.

9 Our challenge to the federal agencies is to implement an  
10 All-H recovery effort and work towards a coordinated,  
11 comprehensive and scientifically based recovery plan. Thank  
12 you.

13 MS. COLLIS: Thank you. Mark Benson, Stan Genoway and  
14 then Paul Yochum on deck. Thanks. Go ahead, Mark.

15 MR. BENSON: My name is Mark Benson. I would like to  
16 first thank our elected officials for their leadership in this  
17 matter. I am a resident of Lewiston. I love this place. I'm  
18 here on my own behalf, as well as behalf of my family.

19 I am opposed to dam breaching. I am opposed to flow  
20 augmentation from other Idaho reservoirs. I will not spend a  
21 lot of time revisiting the reasons why breaching is clearly not  
22 the right answer to save fish, except for to say, as you said  
23 General, the science is not in.

24 Breaching is the most extreme alternative of several  
25 before us now. It is premature to consider breaching the dams

1 at this time.

2 Now that I have used the word breach, let me comment on  
3 what it means. You either have dams or you don't. There is no  
4 partial about it. If you are hoping that using the word breach  
5 softens the stark reality of destroying the dams forever, then  
6 shame on you.

7 Many here in Idaho don't appreciate the Federal agencies  
8 considering removal of the lower Snake River dams and/or the  
9 call upon Idaho's water as a solution to save salmon. It's far  
10 too easy for bureaucrats in Portland, Seattle, and Washington  
11 D.C. to look for silver bullet solutions in less populated  
12 regions like Idaho.

13 There are no silver bullets, and the people of this  
14 community and this state should not stand for their livelihoods  
15 and quality of life being sacrificed for the political gain of  
16 administration who is out of touch with the people of this  
17 region.

18 I realize there has been discussion of mitigation for  
19 lawsuits associated with decision to remove the dams. Please  
20 take your promise of mitigation to people who don't live here  
21 in the west. Let me remind you, though, of some promises made  
22 by the Federal Government not so very long ago. You, the  
23 Federal Government, promised us if we supported building the  
24 dams, you would help us put them to use. You promised if we  
25 would help with irrigation, you would help us succeed.

1           You did what you promised, and we held up our end of the  
2 bargain, too. We now have an economy that is held together by  
3 this great system of navigational water supply.

4           Now you come here to our Valley to tell us that maybe you  
5 changed your mind. Maybe the dams should come out. Maybe that  
6 will help the fish. But you are not sure. There is simply no  
7 evidence that this system is the sole or even primary reason  
8 for salmon decline.

9           I am here to say it's not okay to ask us to bet the farm  
10 on your uncertainty. Please deliver to us a balanced,  
11 well-reasoned plan to help recover the fish. One that needs  
12 your investments in place and our economy and quality of life  
13 intact. Thank you.

14           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Mark. Stan Genoway, Paul Yochum  
15 and on deck is Dave Whaley.

16           MR. GENOWAY: My name is Stan Genoway. I'm the President  
17 of Pace International Union Local 8-608. I want to go on  
18 record as opposing the breaching of the four lower Snake River  
19 dams. This issue isn't just about fish, dams, and labor. It's  
20 about people, families. Families that will be devastated by  
21 the economic impact breaching will have on their lives. The  
22 small family farmer may cease to exist.

23           They are already greatly impacted by the depressed grain  
24 prices. Increased shipping costs and possible shortage of  
25 water will most likely put them out of business. The same is

1 true for the hundreds that will lose their jobs, and they will  
2 no longer be able to haul products and goods using the  
3 waterways.

4 I personally wouldn't be able to look at myself in the  
5 mirror knowing that my signature may cause many to lose their  
6 homes, the family farm, and spend their children's college fund  
7 trying to survive. Under that sort of economic distress, we  
8 can only be sure that the families will be torn apart and not  
9 guarantee the return of salmon.

10 I would ask those who propose breaching, is that the only  
11 solution? Would you want it to be your family that suffers --  
12 Great -- the turmoil and uncertainty of your future under that  
13 solution? If it doesn't work, are you going to say, oops,  
14 sorry, to those families you so severely impacted?

15 Breaching is not a silver bullet. We need to find good  
16 multipurpose prong and approach based on complete and sound  
17 scientific research.

18 I believe we can have fish, jobs, a strong economy if we  
19 work together to find real solutions that will benefit us all.  
20 Thank you for letting me comment.

21 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Stan. Paul Yochum, Dave Whaley,  
22 and on deck is Karl Knoll.

23 MR. YOCHUM: Paul Yochum. I represent myself and anybody  
24 else in this Valley that believes the way I do. I want to go  
25 on record as being opposed to any dam breaching whatsoever. I

1 supported these dams when they went in, and I have had  
2 relatives and friends that worked on them. And I seen people  
3 die working on them. I think it's stupid and ridiculous to  
4 even think about taking them out.

5         There is no guarantee that the fish are automatically  
6 going to come back just by taking out these dams. I have lived  
7 in this area all my life. I've driven the Columbia River long  
8 even before there was ever a dam, except The Dalles -- the  
9 Bonneville dam down there. I seen the Celilo Falls before they  
10 were ever flooded. And the fish fought dearly to get up over  
11 those Celilo Falls, and believe me, I seen many of them fall  
12 back down the stream trying to migrate up over them falls. And  
13 yet, the Native American Indians stood their and netted them at  
14 this point. Big challenge. You bet.

15         All The Dalles Dam did is come along and make the fish an  
16 easier passage over those rough course in the Columbia River.  
17 Okay. Now, long before -- and I'm telling you from my history  
18 of living in this area all my life, okay -- long before ever a  
19 dam was put on the Snake River system, the fish and the salmon  
20 were declining. The fish were dropping, okay. Long before any  
21 dam was placed on the Snake River. Okay.

22         So, why are we coming back now and saying, we got to take  
23 out these dams because that will automatically bring the fish  
24 back. Bull! It's never going to happen, okay. We got to work  
25 together to come to another solution.

1 I was also glad to see the General touch on the fact that  
2 the amount of the electrical energy that's going to be lost if  
3 these dams are taken out. I have been an electrician all my  
4 adult life. I have some idea of what this is going to do to  
5 the economy of the Northwest, okay.

6 Let's break that down. How many of you really know what  
7 megawatts are? Very few in this room do. Okay. I have done  
8 some checking in. These dams produce enough electrical energy  
9 to supply approximately two million homes a year. Okay. Two  
10 million homes. That's like taking the State of Idaho four  
11 times. Is that a significant amount of energy or is it not?

12 I don't know where some of these people come up with  
13 their notions that that's not a significant amount. It is.  
14 Thank you.

15 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Paul. Dave Whaley, Karl Knoll,  
16 and on deck is Len Ross.

17 MR. WHALEY: Thank you, General, and the panelist for  
18 allowing me to speak here today. My name is Dave Whaley. I'm  
19 the Idaho State AFL-CIO President. We have approximately  
20 42,000 members in the State of Idaho. I can tell you that  
21 these jobs that you are talking about in replacements and loss  
22 are jobs that pay well and pay benefits. Jobs you want to  
23 replace them with, in the tourism, only few people make those  
24 type of wages. Most make minimum wage or below.

25 I've got a Resolution that was passed in '98 by the Labor

1 Movement here in the State of Idaho that I'm going to read to  
2 you: Whereas, the socioeconomical value of lost jobs, tax  
3 dollars, property values, decreased industry contributions to  
4 local economies, recreational loss, increased utility costs,  
5 loss of affordable transportation, and associated jobs have not  
6 been adequately addressed. And, whereas, there are many  
7 factors in the fish decline besides hydro dams. And, whereas,  
8 -- let me find the other one -- whereas, dam breaching will  
9 have an adverse effect on jobs and communities in Idaho.

10 The 40th annual convention of the Idaho State AFL seeks  
11 the support of the environmental community of the National  
12 AFL-CIO, and that the delegates support the proposal that would  
13 restore salmon and steelhead runs, provided, they do not have  
14 an adverse effect on current, future jobs and community  
15 structures.

16 Those are all the things that have to happen. And there  
17 is a Resolution here that I don't hear very often, and  
18 solution, you are asking for solutions, here's a solution:  
19 Let's go out to that ocean. Stop the fishing. Let's come up  
20 that Columbia. Stop the fishing. Stop the netting, and we'll  
21 stop the sports fishing. Stop it all. Stop it for ten years  
22 because that's what is an endangered species. Let's see what  
23 happens there.

24 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Dave. Karl Knoll, Len Ross, and  
25 Jim Baker on deck.

1           MR. KNOLL: Okay. I'm Karl Knoll. I was born and raised  
2 right here in the Valley, in the Lewiston/Clarkston Valley, up  
3 here before the dams were put in and enjoyed all the wild  
4 waters when they ran.

5           First of all I got to say I thank the people because I  
6 appreciate the intent observation that you people are paying  
7 attention when the other people are talking. Don't see this  
8 very often in this Valley, and I really appreciate it.

9           Anyway, I don't have too much -- I don't have anything to  
10 say about statistics because pretty well gone through. I do  
11 agree with what's been said. I have to explain a little bit.  
12 Before the dams came on the Columbia River I was part of the  
13 rural area. I saw when the electricity came in. The farmers  
14 and everything in the outlying districts were real proud  
15 because they finally had a pole planted in their farm yard and  
16 have one light up in the one room in the house before they  
17 wired for the rest of it.

18           Each spring -- I should have wrote this down, but bear  
19 with me. I'm an old man -- each spring without the dams up  
20 river and everything, we used to have a flushing field that  
21 went through and flushed our river banks and cleaned things up  
22 pretty well each spring for several weeks.

23           And we won't have that any longer. You take out our four  
24 lower dams and we'll have sediment there. In the springtime we  
25 won't have the flushing areas because of the dams up river.

1 And this will be real critical.

2           If any of you were around when we had the drawdown and  
3 seen how bad that was at that period of time, and you try to  
4 walk across that. We had the drawdown for six weeks, and try  
5 to walk across that to the river's edge, you sink up to your  
6 knees almost in the silt. And we just don't want to see that  
7 happen here.

8           I was here before the dams came. I remember the  
9 opposition to it. I wasn't too old at the time, but I remember  
10 my father protesting the coming of the dams because they liked  
11 the wild rivers. And we got told, Mr. Knoll, don't worry about  
12 that. Says, we are here to provide jobs. We are the economy  
13 and these dams will provide jobs and will give you a better way  
14 of life too. Give you slack water, recreation like you've  
15 never seen it before, and so we got the dams.

16           But he said, but my fishing, I enjoy what fishing we  
17 have. And they said, don't worry about that, Mr. Knolls.  
18 We'll put hatcheries in. We will give you fish. This has come  
19 about we do have fish, but now it comes down to people aren't  
20 satisfied with the fish that we have. Now it has to come down  
21 to a special species. Comes down to it has to be a wild fish  
22 now. And these people, if you took the wild fish and the  
23 hatchery fish and you laid it on a plate side by side, they  
24 wouldn't be able to tell a difference if that fin wasn't  
25 missing, see. So I don't know.

1 I'm opposed to breaching the dams. Let's keep what we  
2 got. Let's make what we have work. That's all I have. Thank  
3 you.

4 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Karl. Len Ross, Jim Baker, and  
5 Jim Bradford.

6 MR. ROSS: My name is Len Ross, and I'm from Clarkston.  
7 My family is supported by timber dollars, and I eat bread.  
8 First I want to thank the dedicated biologists from the U.S.  
9 Fish and Wildlife, Idaho Fish and Game, Oregon Fish and  
10 Wildlife, Washington Fish and Wildlife, and the Columbia River  
11 Inter-Tribal Fishing Commission. Without their professional  
12 diligence in the past team, the Federal Caucus might have us  
13 here today commenting on new salmon recovery dams upstream on  
14 the Snake River.

15 Since the hydro system is so banana now and  
16 transportation moves smolts better than a natural river, let's  
17 collect the little critters further upstream so we can barge  
18 them longer distances and save more.

19 I also want to thank the Nez Perce Tribe for claiming  
20 their rights today with honor. Their efforts will make this a  
21 better place for all of us.

22 I won't comment on the birth of the salmon and the  
23 steelhead. Others will do that better than I. But I have a  
24 five-year-old son, and I want my son to fly hook a wild Snake  
25 River steelhead, and be awed by the strength of that

1 magnificent creature.

2           Now I want him to see salmon thrash their procreation  
3 dance in the South Fork Salmon or in Naha Rivers. And I want  
4 for him the opportunity to grow up and live in the Northwest,  
5 with an economy sound environment. All of these things won't  
6 be possible if the salmon are allowed to go extinct.

7           The quality of life and economic ramifications for this  
8 region from extinction are potentially extreme. The science  
9 supports breaching the four lower dams as a necessary step to  
10 recover these fish, and I support this action.

11           I don't think that us northwesterners who are benefitting  
12 from the conditions which have bought these fish to this point  
13 should be cast adrift when the dams are breached.

14           Mitigation to make effective citizens whole is necessary,  
15 and in my opinion, justified. I do think it is time for all of  
16 us who benefit from cheap power and commodity freight rates to  
17 pony up and stop the unfounded doomsday predictions, especially  
18 the politicians.

19           When the dams are breached, Potlatch will not shut down.  
20 The Palouse will not go back to nature, but this Valley can  
21 move into the 21 century. If the dams aren't breached, the  
22 potential for ponying measurers that we saw at the 40 hearings  
23 will kick in. Then economies from Pocatello to Kodiak will be  
24 hit very hard.

25           For the salmon and the economy, breach the four lower

1 Snake River dams soon. Thank you.

2 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Len. Jim Baker and Jim Bradford  
3 and on deck is Martin Anderson.

4 MR. BAKER: Good evening. My name -- for the record my  
5 name is Jim Baker. I am a resident of Whitman County,  
6 Washington. I am the Northwest Salmon Campaign Coordinator for  
7 the Sierra Club, and tonight I'm speaking on behalf of our  
8 35,000 members in the Pacific Northwest and our more than  
9 600,000 members across the nation.

10 In all of the thousands of pages in these documents you,  
11 the Federal Agencies, did not answer the three most important  
12 questions. One, what do the fish really need? Two, what are  
13 our legal obligations under law and treaty? Three, how do we  
14 make salmon recovery work for the fish and people?

15 As Federal Agencies you should have answered these  
16 questions first and foremost. You did not. Some here today  
17 claim that we can have dams and salmon. We cannot, according  
18 to the vast majority of biologists. And three out of four  
19 alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the  
20 Corps relies upon juvenile fish barging. Affirming the belief  
21 that the program works. It does not, according to a multiple  
22 number of independent scientific peer reviews.

23 Some here today believe it's all the terns, harvest,  
24 ocean conditions, and so forth fall downstream. It is not. If  
25 you think so, how do you explain the health and abundance of

1 the Hanford Reach Chinook which face all of the same killers as  
2 our Snake River fish, except for the four lower dams? You  
3 cannot.

4 With partial removal of the four lower Snake -- will  
5 partial removal of the four lower Snake dams destroy the local  
6 economy? It need not and it will not, as long as our nation  
7 makes investments, this Clearwater Palouse region where I live  
8 would actually have a stronger economy in the 21st century  
9 without those investments our economic outlook is gloomy,  
10 according to the expert economist.

11 Do we conservationists care more about fish than  
12 people? We do not. Our conservationists are trying to tear  
13 down all the dams, destroy the economy and depopulate the west?  
14 We are not. It is raising paranoia to say so.

15 Finally, some here today believe that if you, the Federal  
16 Agencies, ignore us long enough, and if they bash, bully, and  
17 bad-mouth us hard enough, we conservationists will stop  
18 speaking out for the Snake Basin salmon and steelhead and for  
19 partial removal of the four lower Snake dams.

20 You dare not. They cannot. And we will not. Thank  
21 you.

22 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Jim. Please hold your applause.  
23 Thank you very much. Jim Bradford is next and then we go to  
24 Martin Anderson and Bill, I think it is, Sedovy. Go ahead.

25 MR. BRADFORD: I am Jim Bradford. I live in Lewiston. I

1 think the question is when, not what we need to do to save  
2 Idaho salmon. The overwhelming body of evidence says that  
3 action most likely to save the salmon and bring them back in  
4 into a harvestable quantity is to bypass the four lower Snake  
5 River dams.

6           The past studies have said that. The independent  
7 scientific analysis board has said that. The Idaho Fish and  
8 Game Department has said that. United States Fish and Wildlife  
9 Services have said that. Even the National Marine Fisheries  
10 said that. So I think we know what needs to be done. We have  
11 to partially remove the four lower Snake River dams. That's  
12 the only choice likely to bring the fish back because of  
13 timing.

14           The time line most often quoted before salmon are extinct  
15 is 17 to 20 years. That's a terribly short period of time,  
16 considering the lead time required to do the planning and  
17 implementation of breaching once that decision has been made.

18           We simply can't go on studying the possible results of  
19 every conceivable option other than breaching. We are out of  
20 time. We have to act soon while there are still some fish.  
21 Thank you very much.

22           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Jim. Just be a second here for  
23 us to change paper. We've got Martin Anderson and Bill Sedovy  
24 and then Dave Statler is on deck. Okay. We are ready.  
25 Martin?

1           MR. ANDERSON: My name is Martin Anderson. I have been  
2 involved in agriculture in this area all my life. I was raised  
3 on a wheat and cattle ranch about 60 miles north of here. So I  
4 know firsthand how critical efficient transportation is to the  
5 ability of farm families to survive and thrive in Idaho and the  
6 entire Pacific Northwest.

7           Today I work for Cargill Incorporated, one of the leading  
8 grain marketing and exporting companies in the Pacific  
9 Northwest. Our role is to link local producers to the best  
10 markets around the world. Asia has become the most important  
11 export market for American farmers representing about 40  
12 percent of the total U.S. grain and exports.

13           Our farmer customers in this region are ideally situated  
14 to serve that market, but make no mistake, this is an intensely  
15 competitive global market. Over sea buyers don't care, really  
16 care, who produces the wheat and other products they buy. They  
17 don't care whether the wheat is produced by farmers in Idaho,  
18 Alberta, Australia or Argentina. What they do care about is  
19 cost and quality and transportation costs make the difference  
20 between getting the business and standing on the sidelines.

21           River transportation on the Columbia, Snake River system  
22 is a critical asset to this region. Removal of the lower Snake  
23 River dams would cause severe economic stress for Idaho,  
24 Montana, Eastern Washington and Eastern Oregon farm families  
25 who rely on efficient barge transportation to deliver their

1 products to market.

2           If this important transportation channel is closed, it  
3 could very well signal the end of the globally competitive  
4 agricultural production in this area, forcing many farm  
5 families to the heartbreak decision of whether to leave the  
6 land their families have farmed for generations.

7           Unfortunately for Idaho farmers, there are very few  
8 alternatives. The rail system has been effectively dismantled  
9 in this region, and road transportation is inadequate. Today's  
10 barge transportation saves farmers about 25 to 30 cents per  
11 bushel over other modes of transportation. That may not mean  
12 much to you, but it can mean the difference between profit and  
13 loss for local farmers.

14           In the global marketplace it will not be possible to pass  
15 on an additional 25 to 30 cents along to the foreign buyers.  
16 Buyers can go elsewhere. So it is our Idaho farmers who will  
17 bare the economic burden. But even if Idaho farmers could bear  
18 the additional cost, they even face a more fundamental  
19 challenge. Without barge transportation we don't have adequate  
20 transportation capacity in any other mode. It simply does not  
21 exist.

22           Taxpayers will be asked to invest an estimated half a  
23 billion dollars to create the infrastructure needed to replace  
24 the barge system.

25           Let me make our position absolutely clear: Cargill

1 favors a valid solution that addresses the need for salmon  
2 recovery, the environment, farmers, commercial navigation, and  
3 local businesses. We support improving conditions for safer  
4 fish passage and Alternative 2 which maximizes barging of  
5 juvenile salmon. We also support downstream and ocean salmon  
6 recovery solutions that address salmon mortality due to  
7 predation and over fishing.

8           A proposal to breach the dams is simply too extreme. The  
9 cost of this region and farm families in particular is too high  
10 for a proposal that is unlikely to be a panacea for the  
11 recovery of salmon. This is not an either or proposition. Our  
12 choice is not between maintaining a healthy agriculture or a  
13 healthy salmon population. We can and we must strive for  
14 both. Thank you.

15           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Martin. Bill and then Dave  
16 Statler and then Scott, I think it's Bosse.

17           MR. SEDOVY: Good evening. My name is Bill Sedovy, and  
18 I'm the Executive Director of Idaho Rivers United, a river  
19 conservation group with 1800 members living throughout the  
20 State of Idaho.

21           We are here tonight because in the late 1950s the U.S.  
22 Government and the people of this region made a grave mistake.  
23 Despite warnings from sportsmen and scientists, despite the  
24 concerns of Columbia Basin Indian Tribes, leaders at the time,  
25 chose to proceed with construction of four dams on the lower

1 Snake River.

2 Today the error of that decision is crystal clear. Every  
3 species of Snake River salmon and steelhead has been listed  
4 under the federal Endangered Species Act. Snake River coho are  
5 extinct. Annual returns of salmon to Idaho have dropped from  
6 over 100,000 fish per year to about 10,000 per year.

7 Snake River sockeye, which once returned to spawning  
8 grounds in the Sawtooth Mountains by the tens of thousands,  
9 have been reduced to a couple of brood stock populations  
10 managed by hatchery scientists. This is CPR for species.

11 Time is running out for Snake River salmon and steelhead,  
12 but we still have a chance to save them. With bold action we  
13 can restore salmon and steelhead to the Snake, Salmon, and  
14 Clearwater Rivers.

15 On the issue of recovery, the science is clear. Removing  
16 the four lower Snake River dams and restoring more natural  
17 river is our best and perhaps only option. 206 scientists who  
18 wrote President Clinton last March know that this is true. The  
19 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service knows that this is true. The  
20 Army Corps of Engineers and the National Marine Fisheries  
21 Service knows that this is true. And deep down, I suspect,  
22 many opponents of dam removal know that this is true.

23 Of course, saving salmon and steelhead is not as simple  
24 as taking out the dams. The science of saving salmon is  
25 muddied by human and economic factors. Farmers of the area are

1 afraid that they will lose access to markets. Irrigators are  
2 afraid that they'll lose access to water, and industrial  
3 shippers like Potlatch Corporation are afraid that the loss of  
4 barge transport will affect their ability to compete.

5 In closing, saving Snake River salmon and steelhead can  
6 best be achieved by removing the four lower Snake River dams.  
7 And to address the fears of the people of this region, the  
8 members of Idaho Rivers United believe that as we save the fish  
9 that saved Lewis and Clark, we must also do everything in our  
10 power for the people of Lewiston and Clarkston.

11 And for those folks who are here tonight who don't think  
12 that dam removal works, I would point them to Edwards Dam which  
13 was breached in July. Already anadromous runs of straight bass  
14 are returning to that river. Thank you.

15 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Bill. Dave Statler, Scott Bosse,  
16 and then Frank Carroll.

17 MR. STATLER: Good evening, Panel. My name is Dave  
18 Statler. I am a fishery scientist. I reside in Orofino,  
19 Idaho. I think that qualifies as local. And I would like to  
20 say that my comments apply to everything.

21 In trying to determine the most prudent course of action  
22 to prevent extinction of Snake River salmon and steelhead, the  
23 Federal decision makers have been doing a lot of gambling about  
24 risk and uncertainty.

25 Quantification of risk has been attempted by complex

1 modeling the various what-if scenarios, involving optimistic  
2 and pessimistic survivalist functions for fish that have been  
3 barged or trucked versus those that have been allowed to  
4 migrate on their own accord and so forth.

5         The end result of most of this modeling is that if one is  
6 looking for a particular answer, you can find the model to spit  
7 it out by carefully choosing the assumptions that you put in  
8 it.

9         While the region has been caught up in this never ending  
10 battle of the models, critical decisions have not been made.  
11 And the extinction clock has been ticking.

12         The ultimate direction for decision makers will not come  
13 from conflicting and complexed black box models that they  
14 poorly understand. The answer must come from basic biologic  
15 principals and common sense.

16         Basic biological principal that applies to the lower  
17 Snake configurations decision is that native species persist  
18 and thrive in an environment under which they have adapted and  
19 evolved.

20         In view of this basic principal, it is not surprising  
21 that the independent scientific group concluded in its 1996  
22 return to the river document that salmon need a more natural  
23 river to survive.

24         In summary, basic biologic principals lead to the  
25 conclusion that a lower Snake River return to a free-flowing

1 environment offers the least risk, best chance option for  
2 recovering and restoring native Snake River salmon and  
3 steelhead. The greatest risk is indecision. If extinction is,  
4 in fact, not an option, the time to act is now. Thank you.

5 MS. COLLIS: Thank you Dave. Scott, go ahead and then  
6 after Scott is Frank Carroll and then Chuck Poesheski. Thank  
7 you.

8 MR. BOSSE: Thank you. My name is Scott Bosse. I am a  
9 biologist for Idaho Rivers United. For over the past decade  
10 I've also been a sport fishing guide. I've been a commercial  
11 salmon fisherman in Alaska, and I've worked professionally as a  
12 fishery biologist in Idaho, Washington, and Oregon.

13 Your job is certainly not easy. It's not easy for any of  
14 us. But I think some things are pretty clear, and they are  
15 pretty clear objectives that I see. First of all, we have to  
16 do something that's going to get salmon and steelhead back to  
17 fishable levels as we were promised 30 years ago when the dams  
18 were built. We don't need to just avoid extinction. We need  
19 to get fish back to fishable levels.

20 We need to comply with laws and treaties that we made  
21 with the American people; that we made with the Native American  
22 Tribes a century and half ago.

23 As we have seen today from all sides, I think we need to  
24 attend to the needs of people. And people mean Potlatch  
25 employees, Palouse farmers, Tribal members of the Nez Perce

1 Tribe, commercial fishermen, steelhead guides from Riggins.  
2 There are a lot of people from Alaska to Eastern Idaho that  
3 will be affected by the decisions that you make.

4 For 30 years as a region we had a dream that we could  
5 have both fish and dams. We've spent billions of dollars, by  
6 some estimates over three billion dollars, trying virtually  
7 everything possible to achieve that dream.

8 We put fish ladders at the dams. We put juvenile bypass  
9 systems at the dams. We've put screens over the turbines. We  
10 took the fish out of the river because it was so deadly. We  
11 put them in barges and trucks and transported them around the  
12 dams. We built hatcheries. We cut harvest to the bone. But  
13 over that 30 years these fish runs have declined by 90  
14 percent. That's not refutable. The runs have declined by 90  
15 percent at the very same time that harvest has been cut by 90  
16 percent.

17 Returning salmon to the Snake River can be compared to  
18 rebuilding an old truck, I think. We can spend all our time,  
19 energy, and money focusing on the little things: The hood  
20 ornament, the rearview mirror, the hubcaps, but if we don't  
21 rebuild that engine that car is never going to run.

22 The Snake River is the engine for Snake River salmon. If  
23 we continue to focus on the little things: the Caspian terns,  
24 fish friendly turbines, cutting what little harvest remains,  
25 that car is not going to run. We got to fix the engine, and

1 it's time to pop the hood.

2           Now is there 100 percent certainty that if we do that we  
3 are going to get our fish back? Of course not. There is not.  
4 Science doesn't deal with certainty. Science deals with  
5 probability. If you ask me right now if I could guarantee you  
6 with 100 percent certainty that if when you leave this building  
7 tonight you won't be struck dead by lightning, I cannot assure  
8 you with 100 percent certainty. But if you spend the rest of  
9 your life in this building because you're afraid of that  
10 lightning, that's not a rational decision. Let's get on with  
11 the decision. Breach these dams. Get these fish back.

12           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Scott. Frank Carroll. Please  
13 hold your applause. Thanks. Frank Carroll and then Chuck.

14           MR. CARROLL: I'm grateful tonight to speak for Mary Dye  
15 who is a Pomeroy farmer. Nature is neither just nor  
16 compassionate. Justice and compassion are uniquely human and  
17 between the two lies the salvation of fish and community.

18           The fate of a fish should not depend upon the vagaries of  
19 a cruel and often unpredictable natural path. As stewards, we  
20 would be negligent.

21           Our community, with our entire future weighed in the  
22 balance, begs you to look with both justice and compassion.

23           Our history is rich in communion with this vast deep  
24 prairie and our souls have developed the austere tenacity that  
25 shapes the fabric of our tightly woven culture.

1           The solution to rebuilding a larger number of fish cannot  
2 turn back the hands of time to a time before human hands broke  
3 the sod covered loess and discovered its rich secrets.  
4 Communities of honest, simple people have committed generations  
5 to the stewarding of this fragile, precious land, and all of  
6 society has benefitted, from the poorest in Pakistan to the  
7 richest in Japan.

8           It is the dry land farmers with their unique stewardship  
9 ethic that recognized the best hope for the fish is to nurture  
10 the rural culture that the salmon bearing watersheds depend  
11 upon. The weathered hands that care for a damp sticky newborn  
12 calf in the chill winds of February understand the care  
13 required to nurture the life of a fragile smolt and will use his  
14 ingenuity to make life and survival most likely.

15           To cast the die on nature and her cruel ways is to  
16 condemn the fish to an uncertain future. While romantic to  
17 think that a pristine environ, untouched by the hands of man to  
18 be the optimum chance for the return, farmers know that without  
19 his vigilance, the sticky new calf more likely will fall victim  
20 to predation or disease. And so, too, the fish.

21           We have created a world, a community where human survival  
22 is not in question. The dams have turned a vast arid desert  
23 into a place where people can provide freely and wealth for  
24 their families. The question now is how we consider the worth  
25 of the human community. Does the survival of fish require the

1 extinction of the little town of Pomeroy, with its community of  
2 farmers and teachers, merchants and retirees?

3 Does the solution require that the farmers here be  
4 condemned to a livelihood based on subsidies to replace a once  
5 efficient infrastructure?

6 Reality must speak to the facts: We are well fed, well  
7 educated, free, and fairly enlightened, and the fish have hope  
8 for survival because people in our society have the health, the  
9 intellect and the luxury of time and money to care. But it  
10 cannot be done by devastating the communities that have  
11 developed to depend upon the same resource. We must apply the  
12 solution that restores both to viability and vitality. Those  
13 are Mary Dye's words. Thank you.

14 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Frank. Chuck.

15 MR. POESHESKI: Hi. For the record my name is Chuck  
16 Poesheski. I'm here tonight representing myself. For the  
17 record tonight I support Alternative 4 of the All-H Paper dam  
18 breach to save the salmon.

19 Quite frankly, the years have clouded my memory, and I  
20 can't quite remember the day I first came out for dam  
21 breaching. I believe it was 1995, and I was with friend Wade  
22 Gruel. We were the only ones that night who came out for dam  
23 breaching and, needless to say, the world has changed since  
24 then.

25 Radio ads have called this D-Day. I have some news for

1 you folks, this is not D-Day. A day that some of us lost  
2 uncles and maybe some brothers too, nor does it even closely  
3 resemble my family's D-Day when my uncle landed on Okinawa and  
4 a Japanese soldier jumped on his back and he was cut off by a  
5 knife by his friend. This is not D-Day. These people have  
6 D-Day so that we could meet as a civilized society and change  
7 the status quo without war.

8         We live, it seems, in a millennial apocalyptic vision  
9 society. Removing dams is ostensibly going to destroy Lewiston  
10 and our way of life. But building the dams did not build  
11 Lewiston or Nez Perce County. Nez Perce County had 30,000  
12 people in 1973, and in 1997 the total came only to 34,000.  
13 Taking them down will not cause revolution, revolutionary  
14 change either. Not with a bang, but a whimper the universe of  
15 '98 said. Probably true for the universe. So has been true  
16 for the salmon.

17         Salmon runs have declined constantly since the dams were  
18 put in in 1961. The dams are the problem, and they need to  
19 go.

20         For the cost of a B-2 Bomber, a plan that is essentially  
21 buried in the ground until that final apocalyptic day or until  
22 we finally get some sense, we can fix this problem. We can  
23 take a step back from extinction, from the brink from the fish,  
24 and for ourselves. We can regain a beautiful flowing river,  
25 and we can do this without violent wrenching social change.

1           My message, in sum, is simple: Save the salmon. Breach  
2 the dams. Mitigate the various economic losses and stand in  
3 wonder of the magnificence of a beautiful natural system as  
4 well as the strength of our democracy. Thank you.

5           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Chuck. Okay. First, let me  
6 commend you all for listening respectfully to one another. And  
7 also, I want to personally thank you for adhering to our ground  
8 rules. We are going to take about a ten-minute break. When we  
9 come back, we are going to have Aaron Penney up and Rich  
10 Eichstaedt, I think it is, second, and we will be back at  
11 exactly ten after 9:00. We'll roll then. So, please, be here,  
12 Aaron. Thanks.

13           (Recess was then taken at 9:00 p.m.)

14           (Reconvened at 9:15 p.m.)

15           MS. COLLIS: Okay. We are ready to go. Is Aaron at our  
16 mic? Aaron Penney is next up. After Aaron was Rich  
17 Eichstaedt. Thank you, Rich. I appreciate that. And then  
18 after that we have on deck Stuart, I think it's R-a-s-p-o-r-e.  
19 Thank you. Go ahead, Aaron.

20           MR. PENNEY: Good evening. My name is Aaron Penney. I  
21 am a fishery biologist, a Nez Perce Tribal member, and a  
22 fisherman. In Nez Perce my name is Tah-Hee-Wits Wachumyos  
23 which means "Rainbow that comes to you." It is a name that I  
24 received from my great grandfather when I was very young. The  
25 name belonged to a relative long passed, and he was revered as

1 a great fisherman.

2           When I was young my father used to take me to Selway  
3 Falls to fish for steelhead in the winter. I remember watching  
4 the fish jump one after another. That was back in the  
5 early '70s, over 20 years ago. Today when I return to fish in  
6 the same rocks my grandfather used to fish from, very rarely  
7 now do you see a single fish jump.

8           It was this experience in life and that for the love of  
9 fishing that prompted me to become a fish biologist.

10           These four modelists in the lower Snake River are the  
11 cause of the mortality of 90 percent of the fish that navigate  
12 this body of water. I think they should serve as headstones  
13 for the salmon.

14           There are several causes that you could name down river  
15 for their demise, but look at the Hanford Reach Chinook. They  
16 only have four dams to navigate, and they are doing fine. Yes,  
17 there are the same terns, the same ocean dangers, the same gill  
18 nets on the river that our Snake River Chinook have to avoid.  
19 But they have eight dams, not four, and they are losing.

20           A local politician in the earlier session mentioned the  
21 drawdown of '92 and mentioned the death of Native fish around  
22 Lewiston and Clarkston. Carp, bass, crappie, blue gill,  
23 catfish in the lower Columbia walleye shad are not native to  
24 this region. With the exception of carp, all others are in  
25 deed predators that were introduced.

1           The June hogs, Chinook salmon that used to come up the  
2 Snake River and exceeded over 50 pounds no longer exists. Yes,  
3 Idaho once had fishery like Alaska at one time, but those fish  
4 no longer exist. Coho are extinct in the Clearwater, Salmon  
5 and Grande Ronde Rivers. I bet many of you probably never knew  
6 coho existed here. As well as sockeye and others in Red Fish  
7 Lake, but you don't hear about them.

8           Sturgeon are separated from others in the river causing  
9 their genetics to become bottlenecked. Lamprey eels called  
10 Hasu, a name for which the town of Asotin is named for. They  
11 were utilized by the Nez Perce people, and they, too, are few  
12 in number. Won't be long before they, too, are listed.

13           Earlier a gentleman in the earlier session called  
14 breaching the dams as an act of war. What happens when one  
15 nation violates a treaty made with another? Could this be  
16 considered an act of war? If this is, this will be a problem  
17 for the courts.

18           What is the legacy we wish to leave our children? We  
19 have the chance to save not one, but several species from  
20 vanishing off the face of this earth.

21           It is not junk science to breach the lower Snake River  
22 dams. Over 200 scientists and several government agencies have  
23 confirmed the best alternative to restore salmon is to remove  
24 the earthen portion of these dams.

25           The fears of the community are known, and I believe the

1 impact economically would be short-lived. What did the area  
2 farmers and Potlatch and community do 30 years ago before all  
3 the dams were in place?

4 MS. COLLIS: I need you to wrap up, please, Aaron.

5 MR. PENNEY: I speak not only for myself, but for those  
6 of my people not able to make it here, and for those not yet  
7 born, mine and yours.

8 In conclusion, for over 10,000 years my people have  
9 depended on salmon. It is an important part of my life,  
10 culture and religion. The salmon were here before the first  
11 human beings were placed here by the Creator.

12 The salmon have been here for a very long time. It is  
13 too much of a travesty to wipe them out in just a few decades.

14 Once again, once they are gone, they are gone forever.  
15 Please bypass the dams. Kats-ee-yow-yow. Yox Ka lo.

16 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Aaron. Rich, Stuart and then  
17 Ashley Martens is an deck.

18 MR. EICHSTAEDT: Good evening. My name is Rich  
19 Eichstaedt. I am here to speak as a resident of the City of  
20 Lewiston. I strongly support Alternative 4 of the Draft EIS  
21 and any of the options within the All-H Paper that incorporate  
22 breaching the four lower Snake River dams.

23 I support these alternatives because the science is  
24 clear. PATH, a detailed independent peer reviewed,  
25 collaborative scientific study concluded that breaching the

1 four lower Snake River dams had the highest probability of  
2 restoring healthy and harvestable runs of salmon to our  
3 community.

4 PATH, however, is not alone. Idaho Fish and Game, the  
5 Western Division of the American Fisheries Society, the  
6 National American Fisheries Society, as well as the four  
7 Columbia River treaty tribes have identified dam breaching as  
8 the most viable salmon recovery option. In fact, both the  
9 United States Fish and Wildlife Service, which is here and the  
10 Governor of Oregon have stated that Snake River dam removal is  
11 a scientific and biological no brainer.

12 It is time to stop arguing about whether or not there is  
13 enough science, and face the reality of this situation. Do we  
14 really want to save salmon? And are we willing to face change  
15 to do so? I believe the answer to these questions is yes. The  
16 facts are clear. Potlatch will not shut down. The citizens in  
17 this region will not let that happen.

18 Any dam reaching proposal must include mitigation to  
19 upgrade alternative transportation systems, such as rail and  
20 roads and protect all aspects of breaching to ensure that jobs  
21 in this Valley are protected, at the same time restoring  
22 salmon.

23 Regardless of mitigation, according to the Idaho  
24 Statesman, dam breaching will result in a savings of 183  
25 million dollars a year to the taxpayers of the Northwest. This

1 is more than enough to cover any type of mitigation package.

2 Continued operation of the Snake River dams results in  
3 degradation of water quality and shifts the focus of recovery  
4 to other areas which are far more economically vulnerable.

5 Snake River dams elevate water temperature, forcing  
6 upstream farmers, ranchers and even industry such as Potlatch  
7 to bare an extreme burden to reduce the impact of their  
8 activities. If dams are not breached, more restrictive land  
9 use practices will be implemented on struggling farmers and  
10 ranchers, restrictions placed on timber activities, and greater  
11 dependency placed on irrigation water from Southern Idaho  
12 farmers.

13 These measures -- the costs of these measures greatly  
14 outweighs the cost of dam removal. The benefits to salmon from  
15 further restricting land uses and taking additional water from  
16 Southern Idaho is small compared to that of removing dams. Dam  
17 removal is the only option that ensures that Federal laws, such  
18 as the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act are met  
19 and that treaty obligations made to tribal members of our  
20 community are honored.

21 It is time for us to realize that dams and salmon do not  
22 work. We have tried it for almost 30 years. It's time to face  
23 scientific facts and decide if we are willing to make change,  
24 like we did when the gates of Lower Granite were closed 25  
25 years ago.

1           It is for these reasons I hope the Corps and the other  
2 Federal Agencies comply with their obligations to protect  
3 endangered species, preserve clean water, and honor promises to  
4 the tribes by breaching the four lower Snake River dams.

5 Thank you.

6           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Rich. Stuart, then Ashley and on  
7 deck is Kent Eberhardt.

8           MR. RASPORE: I'm Stuart Raspore. I live in Clarkston,  
9 Washington. First of all, let me say that I realize that this  
10 panel up here had nothing to do with putting in the dams, and  
11 probably not going to have anything to do with taking them out  
12 if that becomes necessary. But I've heard a lot of people who,  
13 including the last speaker, talk about clear science.

14           I think science is as clear as the mud that's going to be  
15 running through the areas where we take the dams out if we do  
16 that. Because I can remember many nights years ago when we  
17 were talking about putting the dams in the Corps showed up to  
18 give these hearings like this. They brought their fish  
19 biologists and all these experts that had clear science in  
20 those times, and they told us that we were going to have a  
21 wonderful thing happen here.

22           And we talk about -- and I heard the General talk about  
23 our treaty obligations. We have treaty obligations. And I  
24 agree with that. A treaty obligation is an agreement -- it's a  
25 promise that was made. I think we need to follow through with

1 those. But I think that the Federal Government made a treaty  
2 with the remainder of the people living in this Valley at that  
3 time.

4       They said, if you will go along with this dam, we will  
5 provide you with: irrigation downstream; we will provide you  
6 with power; we will provide you with transportation. That's a  
7 treaty, an obligation, a promise that was made. And I think  
8 that the Federal Government owes the people of this community  
9 an obligation to follow through with that treaty just like they  
10 do with Native Americans. Thank you.

11       MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Stuart. Ashley, Kent Eberhardt,  
12 and then on deck is Dan Skinner.

13       MS. MARTENS: All right. My name is Ashley Martens.

14       MS. COLLIS: Could you speak a little closer to the mic?  
15 Thanks, Ashley.

16       MS. MARTENS: Is that better?

17       MS. COLLIS: Yeah. Much better.

18       MS. MARTENS: Salmon and steelhead runs have always been  
19 an integral part of Idaho's culture and river ecosystem. These  
20 fish are now facing extinction, an irreversible fate. We have  
21 the power to prevent extinction by bypassing the four lower  
22 Snake River dams.

23       Down river stocks of salmon and steelhead which do not  
24 have to pass the four lower Snake River dams have held steady  
25 since 1950. These fish are threatened by the same predators,

1 commercial fishermen and lower Columbia River dams as Idaho's  
2 runs, minus four additional dams surpassed before reaching  
3 their spawning grounds.

4 Populations of salmon and steelhead which have to  
5 struggle to pass the lower Snake River dams have declined  
6 dramatically in past decades.

7 I fully support Alternative 4 in the All-H Paper.  
8 Arguments to save dams and not salmon are unjustified. These  
9 dams are only responsible for four to five percent of the  
10 Northwest electricity, which we could easily get from other  
11 sources.

12 Barge related jobs can be replaced by rail and roadway  
13 jobs. I am a teacher, and it always amazes me to see the  
14 fascination that children have with wild salmon in their  
15 incredible journeys from spawning grounds through rivers, to  
16 the sea and back again.

17 If we rely only on barging to save wild salmon, we've  
18 destroyed this nature phenomenon that the salmon possess. I  
19 want to children to have the opportunity to experience the  
20 wonders of nature and wild salmon. This is one reason why the  
21 four lower Snake River dams don't make sense.

22 A woman friend of mine who was about my mother's age and  
23 I were talking a while ago. We were talking about salmon. She  
24 looked at me with a sorrowful look on her face and said, You  
25 know, when I was your age, there used to be salmon in these

1 streams. It brought tears to our eyes.

2 Wild salmon numbers are declining at such a rapid rate  
3 that if we don't take action soon, it will be too late. We  
4 have pushed these salmon runs too far. They will not make it  
5 without our support.

6 It all boils down to respect. Respect for ourselves.  
7 Respect for our fellow people. Respect for all other species.  
8 We can overcome obstacles much more easily than salmon.

9 Scientists agree that dam removal will push salmon and  
10 steelhead further away from extinction. We have run out of  
11 options. Will we learn to respect other species before it's  
12 too late? Thank you.

13 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Ashley. Okay. We have Kent and  
14 then Dan and on deck this time is Marvin, I think it's Dugger.

15 MR. EBERHARDT: My name is Kent Eberhardt. I have lived  
16 here all my life before and after the dams. My family and I  
17 love the new recreation area that we have now. Taking the dams  
18 out now would be a great loss to everyone. If nature  
19 cooperates, every major river in the Pacific Northwest could be  
20 running with salmon. We have the hatcheries to do it, if we  
21 can allow them to work. But if the climate gets warmer and  
22 warmer, it's just not realistic to expect to maintain large  
23 populations of cold water fish.

24 It's true that what would be best for salmon would be a  
25 Pacific Northwest without humanity at all. But with humanity,

1 and with dams to provide safe and clean electric power,  
2 conditions can still be good for salmon if we choose to use  
3 technology to improve conditions for salmon and the salmon  
4 themselves.

5         So far, the best has been the enemy of the good, with  
6 those pursuing the best, destroying the good and achieving  
7 nothing. In truth, none of the several biological species of  
8 salmon in the Columbia Basin are in any immediate dangers of  
9 extinction. A "species" is defined by biologists in the common  
10 sense way: If you lose the last two members of it, the species  
11 will disappear from the face of the earth forever.

12         The Endangered Species Act was intended to provide a  
13 Noah's ark for species in such dire straits and enjoy  
14 widespread support because that is what the ordinary citizens  
15 think that Act is doing. In fact, law and biology have  
16 diverged.

17         The Endangered Species Act protects not merely species,  
18 but also "distinct population segments" of salmon, a concept  
19 that can mean a salmon run in a single stream or lake.

20         So defined, there are thousands of "distinct population  
21 segments" of just one biological species: Chinook salmon.

22         There is no scientific evidence that any particular  
23 population segment of salmon will threaten the survival of  
24 salmon species. To the contrary, in nature, smaller  
25 subpopulations ebb and flow, while the larger species

1 continues.

2           Quests for greater diversity in salmon populations are  
3 political quests, pushed by a new, politically-active group  
4 known as "Conservation biologists." We can have plenty of  
5 salmon without having hundreds of viable subpopulations, just  
6 as we can have plenty of cattle without having hundreds of  
7 breeds of cows. No one worries that the cow population will  
8 collapse if farmers discontinue some breeds.

9           So, I feel that taking out the dams will not bring back  
10 the big salmon runs of the past. We all need to try different  
11 avenues before we lay blame on just one thing.

12           Why are the people of Idaho and Eastern Washington being  
13 held back from fishing for salmon up here and in the Pacific  
14 Ocean and the lower Columbia river? They are being harvested  
15 by the thousands.

16           We, the people, of the Northwest need to band together  
17 and stop the harvesting of salmon so the salmon can regenerate  
18 back to the numbers that will satisfy all people of this land.  
19 Also their size for better stock. So all people can do  
20 something for the salmon, not just us in this one area. Thank  
21 you.

22           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Kent. Dan Skinner. And then  
23 Marvin and then on deck is Mark Hitchcox.

24           MR. SKINNER: Hi. My name is Dan Skinner. I work for  
25 Idaho Rivers United out of Boise. I would like this testimony

1 to apply to the EIS and the All-H Paper, if you would.

2 I do support Alternative 4 of the Draft Environmental  
3 Impact Statement and any option under the All-H Paper that will  
4 include breaching the dams.

5 As a fourth generation Idahoan, salmon and steelhead are  
6 one of the very foundations of my home here in the Northwest.  
7 My family values a very basic connection to the land. It  
8 includes keeping all of the pieces.

9 Today I stand before you with two very simple messages:  
10 One is for and from the salmon and one is from tens of  
11 thousands of Idahoans who support my work and millions of  
12 Americans who do the same.

13 The most important message is from the salmon. I sat in  
14 the Middle Fork of the Salmon River mesmerized for a few hours  
15 by the leaping salmon a few years back. It was at Dagger  
16 Falls. Just above there on Marsh Creek, prime salmon habitat  
17 as many of you know, there were no reds found this year. This  
18 is a spot where the Idaho Fish and Game takes their rookies out  
19 and teaches them how to find salmon nests, basically. This is  
20 how you survey for them. Not one was found this year.  
21 Extinction is already happening.

22 Though this is a national issue in scope, it is important  
23 to remember there is a ton of support for breaching dams coming  
24 from Idaho. There were a number of folks up here earlier today  
25 who said that that was not the case. I am here to say

1 otherwise.

2           The most recent polls split the issue right down the  
3 middle. There may be no political support around here but  
4 those of you who were here earlier today know 36 people spoke  
5 in support of breaching dams, while only 27 spoke against.  
6 Needless to say, we are happy to see that we are getting strong  
7 support from this community.

8           More the 95,000 people nationwide have weighed in, on  
9 petitions, signing postcards, sending e-mail with exactly the  
10 same message: If we are going to have salmon and steelhead in  
11 the Snake River Basin, we need to breach the four lower Snake  
12 River dams.

13           Down south of here the issue is as clear to the public as  
14 biology is to those of us who look into it. We can either send  
15 our irrigation economy down river and sustain a skeletal museum  
16 fishery or we can invest in a transportation system up here and  
17 restore our salmon and steelhead to levels where we can all  
18 enjoy.

19           The options on the table to keep the dams either will  
20 lead to extinction or drain Southern Idaho. This is a fairly  
21 easy choice. Taking the million acre feet that is often  
22 suggested in these studies, would dry up over 600,000 acres of  
23 farmland in Southern Idaho, and cost us about 400 million  
24 dollars a year in lost goods.

25           As a conservation community it makes perfect sense to

1 us. We would like to breach the dams, and we want to pay for  
2 the increased costs in transporting goods. We would like to  
3 ship the subsidy and save money in the long run.

4 We have blown three billion dollars in the last 15 years,  
5 and have sent that down river in barges and technology with  
6 nothing to return. It hasn't worked. It won't work.

7 Many will point anywhere but the dams. Look no further  
8 than the Yakima River. As far as I understand in the last year  
9 the fish down there have returned at rates ten times higher  
10 than the fish in our area. How about a little bit of equity.  
11 Breach the dams. Restore our fishery. Restore our  
12 free-flowing river. Thank you.

13 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Dan. Marvin and Mark Hitchcox  
14 and on deck is Nicole Cordan.

15 MR. DUGGER: My name is Marvin Dugger. I am with the  
16 Pulp and Paper Worker's Resource Council. I live and work in  
17 Lewiston, Idaho.

18 And, first of all, I would like to kind of register a  
19 complaint about the way that this meeting has been run. The  
20 way that this is set up, first come, first serve, you know,  
21 first speak. I stood outside -- I was out here, and I was  
22 setting up the booth out here.

23 Well, first of all, I would like to say I'm glad that our  
24 local officials got to speak first because they represent the  
25 mood of this Valley. They are elected. And I think you got a

1 real flavor from that.

2           Anyway, we were outside and all these buses showed up,  
3 people showed up, and it was quite obvious to me that this  
4 wasn't a cross-section of the people that I live with in this  
5 Valley. Some of them were from Boise, Spokane, Moscow,  
6 Pullman, out of the Valley. Well, later -- and so, they are  
7 the ones that are going to speak first.

8           Well, then, I went out later and I recognized tons of  
9 people that I work with around this Valley are working people  
10 and they were in the end of the line because they couldn't come  
11 here during the day to speak, so they are not going to get to  
12 speak. And I really think that is a miscarriage.

13           You need to put all the names in a hat, shake them up,  
14 start drawing out names. You will get an actual representation  
15 of the mood of the area. If two-thirds, three-fourths of the  
16 area is against it, two-thirds, three-fourths of the names are  
17 going to get pulled out. That's my complaint.

18           If this issue tomorrow, the Congress of the United States  
19 decided that these dams should be breached, it would probably  
20 be tied up in the courts for decades. The lawyers will get  
21 rich. Nothing would be done.

22           Why haven't we done something about the Caspian terns at  
23 the mouth of the Columbia that are killing 30, maybe 40 percent  
24 of the smolts. That's a big chunk. Okay. The seals and the  
25 sea lions. They are sitting at the mouth and the locks killing

1 tens of thousands of fish. 30 percent of the fish that go  
2 through the dams have seals and sea lion bites on them. Some  
3 of them are so mangled that you know they are going to die.

4 Offshore fishing. I know people -- I talk -- I stand in  
5 these booths all the time and have people come to me that are  
6 telling me about going -- seeing all these people fishing, all  
7 the Japanese and the Russians offshore fishing.

8 One fellow told me about getting up on the mast and  
9 looking all around him seeing Japanese trollers as far as he  
10 could see catching salmon. We have by catch. The National  
11 Marine Fisheries let's these companies go out and catch other  
12 fish and there's tens of thousands of fish killed as by catch  
13 catching other fish.

14 MS. COLLIS: I need you to wrap up, now, please.

15 MR. DUGGER: Okay. Three-quarters of a life of the  
16 salmon is in the ocean. We need to study that more. We can't  
17 make a -- take a tiny minute part of the salmon's life and make  
18 all these decisions. Flow augmentation, I used to swim in this  
19 river.

20 MS. COLLIS: Marvin, I'm going to have to cut you off.

21 MR. DUGGER: Thank you very much. I'm against dam  
22 breaching.

23 MS. COLLIS: Thank you very much. Mark Hitchcox, Nicole  
24 Cordan and on deck is Kristin Ruether.

25 MR. HITCHCOX: Thank you. My name is Mark Hitchcox, and

1 I would like to thank you for the chance to express my thoughts  
2 on this issue.

3       It's true that this is a multilayered problem, and it has  
4 to deal with before station and over-harvesting and  
5 urbanization and it has to do with dams.

6       The time comes when we have to acknowledge our heritage  
7 and acknowledge our ancestors and the hard working people that  
8 came before us and established the dams and the hydroelectric  
9 system that created the opportunity for us to build the  
10 communities that we live in; to create our schools and our  
11 churches; and the Universities. Everything that's created a  
12 standard of living that we now live in and appreciate with our  
13 families and our loved ones.

14       But it's now clear that if salmon and steelhead are going  
15 to recover on the Snake and Clearwater Rivers, that the dams  
16 must be bypassed. And living in the Northwest we have enjoyed  
17 the clean and cheap energy that the hydroelectric dams have  
18 generated. But the truth of the matter is, in our prosperity  
19 we have destroyed a vital resource in our region, the wild  
20 salmon. This is indeed a crisis and must be remedied now.

21       I will not comment on the economic effects due to the  
22 loss of salmon versus a loss of dams, but I will speak on other  
23 values.

24       Our recovered salmon population would also restore the  
25 spirit, hope and pride that these animals represent in our

1 region.

2           One of my best memories is watching the salmon return to  
3 spawn. Standing in the stream and watching the thrashing males  
4 return and spar with each other and watching the females  
5 turning on their sides as they dig their reds and flashing  
6 silver of their sides of the scales, and to me that is  
7 reminiscent of fireworks.

8           These are the values and the memories that also maintain  
9 our quality of life. So, I say to you: Bypass the four lower  
10 Snake dams. This will mean changes in our community, but we  
11 are adaptive species. We are an adaptive species.

12           The barging will be affected, but we can reestablish  
13 railroad. There will be energy loss, but we can explore  
14 alternatives to substitute that: wind, solar.

15           We can also absorb the costs and adapt at the same time  
16 and make this critical gesture to stop the decline towards  
17 extinction because extinction is forever. It's now or never,  
18 so we must bypass. Thank you.

19           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Mark. Nicole Cordan and Kristin  
20 Ruether and on the deck is Noel Palmer.

21           MS. CORDAN: Good evening. My name is Nicole Cordan, and  
22 I'm here representing National Wildlife Federation and Save Our  
23 Wild Salmon Coalition. My comments tonight go to both the  
24 Corps' EIS DIS and the Federal Caucus All-H Paper.

25           And I want to thank you tonight for the opportunity to

1 comment and for sitting through all day today. We truly  
2 appreciate it, and I know it's been a long day because I've  
3 been here all day, too.

4         The National Wildlife Federation and Save our Wild Salmon  
5 Coalition together represent more than six million members and  
6 supporters. These members and supporters include a broad array  
7 of interests: commercial fishers, recreational fishers, sports  
8 fishers, fake communities, groups interested in energy  
9 conservation environmental groups, and even electric utility.

10         And while we all come here from slightly different  
11 perspectives, we come here with the same message, and for the  
12 same purpose. And that's to tell you that this region and this  
13 nation need salmon. We need salmon for our jobs, for our  
14 future, for our children, for our communities, for our  
15 economies, and for our moral and legal obligations to the  
16 Native people who live in this region.

17         In order to restore these salmon science is telling us  
18 that those four lower Snake River dams must be bypassed. Those  
19 dams just don't make sense.

20         I have been listening here today, as you have, to the  
21 folks here that are worried about their jobs in their  
22 communities if the dams are breached. And I believe their  
23 fears and concerns are real. But your failure to complete a  
24 full analysis of the costs if these dams stay, I think, has led  
25 to some of the concerns and to some of the misunderstandings we

1 have heard here today.

2 Let me give you a couple of quick examples of where I  
3 think those failures exist. I only have three minutes, so I  
4 won't go through everything.

5 MS. COLLIS: One minute, actually.

6 MS. CORDAN: See! First, the Federal documents  
7 completely ignore the social impacts to the coastal and tribal  
8 communities. If the salmon continue to decline, not to mention  
9 the price loss of a culture and religion that require these  
10 magnificent fish, or the 25,000 jobs that have already been  
11 lost in these communities because of the decline in salmon.

12 Second, the federal analysis completely ignores the cost  
13 of the dam's compliance of the Clean Water Act requirements. A  
14 cost that federal analyses have shown could be as much as 900  
15 million dollars.

16 And third, none of the documents completely explains what  
17 would really be required from all those other agents if the  
18 dams stay in place. We heard today a number of times that  
19 there was no -- we wouldn't see Idaho water and see no dam  
20 breaching. Well, you and I both know that we can't recover  
21 these fish and have both of those things be true.

22 And it's incumbent on you to do the analysis; to tell the  
23 public that that's the case. And I call on you to do that.  
24 I'm finishing up, Cathryn, I promise.

25 There's no question that a decision to breach these dams

1 will have consequences for this community and other communities  
2 like it. That's why the National Wildlife Federation and Save  
3 our Wild Salmon Coalition have always supported a transition  
4 package that would invest in these communities and others like  
5 it.

6           It's time for us to do the right thing for people and for  
7 the salmon and to show that our nation stands by our promises  
8 and complies with our own treaties and our own laws. It's time  
9 to breach these dams and for all affected communities with  
10 invested savings to make this difficult transition. Thank  
11 you.

12           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Nicole. Kristin and then Noel  
13 Palmer and on deck Cindy Eccles.

14           MS. RUETHER: My name is Kristin Ruether. I'm here to  
15 testify that we need to save the salmon, and that the four  
16 lower Snake dams don't make sense.

17           One of the most important reasons why I live in the  
18 Pacific Northwest is because of the rich and largely intact  
19 natural environment that exists. You can't find that in a lot  
20 of other places these days. We are very fortunate.

21           Salmon are a keystone species for the natural world.  
22 Everything from insects to the grizzly bear rely on them.

23           The dams are making them go extinct. On that point there  
24 is no debate. Their extinction would be a tragedy beyond  
25 comprehension. It would change the natural world in ways we

1 don't even understand. It would affect everything.

2 Yes, breaching the dams would cost some money, but not as  
3 much as reparations for extinction. Besides, there are some  
4 things in this world that you can't put a price on.

5 Can you imagine the shame, sorrow, and guilt of  
6 explaining to the future generations that we let the salmon go  
7 extinct because it cost too much money?

8 Speaking of money, as a taxpayer I'm tired of wasting  
9 money on worthless solutions. We've spent billions on  
10 desperate recovery measures like barging, and what has it  
11 accomplished? Nothing. The fish are still plummeting towards  
12 extinction. I want my money used for something that's going to  
13 work. And according to the best science, breaching is the only  
14 solution that has a prayer. Success isn't guaranteed, but  
15 extinction is virtually guaranteed if we maintain the status  
16 quo.

17 Finally, we have to save the salmon because we owe it to  
18 the Native Americans. Our government has lied to, stolen from,  
19 and cheated the Native Americans for far too long. Our  
20 government signed a treaty with them guaranteeing them salmon.  
21 Eliminating fishing is not a recovery option. It is our solemn  
22 responsibility to follow that treaty by choosing the recovery  
23 option with the highest likelihood of success, and choosing it  
24 soon, because we are running out of time.

25 If we don't save the salmon, we are going to regret it.

1 We need salmon, and the four lower Snake dams don't make  
2 sense. Thank you.

3 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Kristin. Noel Palmer, Cindy  
4 Eccles and on deck is Tom Seaman.

5 MR. PALMER: Thank you for hearing my testimony. I would  
6 like my comments to apply to the EIS and the 4H proposal. I am  
7 in favor of breaching the four --

8 MS. COLLIS: Excuse me. Could you state your name for  
9 the record, please? Thanks.

10 MR. PALMER: I'm Noel Palmer. I am in favor of breaching  
11 the four lower Snake River dams in order to help restore salmon  
12 runs that once naturally existed in this region. I emphasize  
13 the word help. I am convinced that there is no cure-all  
14 remedy, and breaching the lower Snake River dams alone will not  
15 completely restore salmon runs to acceptable levels. This is  
16 why I am also in favor of severely limiting commercial harvest  
17 of salmon, both in the ocean and in the rivers, and restoring  
18 salmon habitat by restricting destructive behavior to these  
19 aquatic ecosystems (such as mining effluent, road creations too  
20 close to the rivers, industrial pollution, and also  
21 clear-cutting too close to rivers.)

22 All of these elements combined, if managed well, after  
23 time will restore a healthy and sustainable salmon run to these  
24 rivers.

25 I would like to say something about the word

1 sustainable. I heard you talk a lot tonight about barging  
2 salmon up and down the river to help them. That is about as  
3 far away from sustainable system as I can even imagine. That's  
4 us putting our hand in a little bit too heavy, I believe. Just  
5 doesn't seem sustainable to me.

6 But without breaching these four dams, a recovery of the  
7 salmon runs will not be catalyzed soon enough, and we will lose  
8 one of the most intriguing and remarkable natural wonders to  
9 this region. We must act now.

10 Arguments against breaching, the dams include the loss of  
11 140 miles of deep sea barging capabilities, loss of  
12 hydroelectric power to this region, and loss of irrigation for  
13 a large amount of ranch land. These arguments are reasonable  
14 for they will affect many barging and ranching jobs to this  
15 area.

16 This is exactly why the Army Corps and all Federal  
17 Agencies should recommend and Congress should vote to remove  
18 the dams as well as voting to fund the improvement of rail and  
19 highway transportation to supplement the loss of barging and  
20 fund the extension of irrigation capabilities for all the  
21 ranchers reliant on the reservoirs created by these dams.

22 This is a minimal amount, and I'm willing to pay 5-10  
23 extra dollars a month in electricity to help restore the salmon  
24 runs. I think this is a small price to pay for all of us  
25 living in the Northwest.

1           We must act now if we intend on helping recover the  
2 already devastated salmon runs of these rivers. This means  
3 breaching the lower four Snake River dams. But we must try to  
4 consider both the environment and the people who rely on a  
5 healthy environment to live.

6           We must assure to minimize the immediate negative  
7 economic impact breaching these dams will have to the people of  
8 this region. In the long run for generations to come these  
9 dams don't make sense. Having a healthy and thriving ecosystem  
10 in which salmon and humans can coexist does make sense. Thank  
11 you.

12           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Noel. Cindy Eccles, Tom Seaman,  
13 and on deck is James, it looks like it must be Lucas, maybe.  
14 Go ahead.

15           MS. ECCLES: My name is Cindy Eccles. I'm a taxpaying  
16 citizen of the City of Lewiston. I am also a Potlatch  
17 employee. I'm here tonight to comment on your DEIS, your EIS  
18 and your BS, that's biological science, of dam breaching.

19           First of all, it equally disappoints me that Federal  
20 agencies have spent millions of taxpayers' dollars to talk  
21 about the livelihood of extinction of a fish. What have you  
22 accomplished? Absolutely nothing.

23           Maybe we should do a study on the likelihood and possible  
24 extinction of our taxpaying mill workers, paper workers,  
25 agricultural farmers of our areas for the next five years.

1           The National Marine Fisheries Service has some new data  
2 out that states that the survival of fish through each dam is  
3 at least 95 percent. All of the Federal agencies have  
4 recognized that the biological effects of breaching the dams  
5 are not adequate to recover fish.

6           Yes, we must save fish to ensure sustainable  
7 communities. In fact, sustainable fisheries are not possible  
8 without sustainable communities. People do matter.

9           Some people have discussed power. Dam breaching the four  
10 dams will cut more than 3,000 megawatts of power out of the  
11 Pacific Northwest power supply. That's enough electricity to  
12 annually power 1.9 million homes.

13          In closing, what it comes down to is the bottom line is a  
14 lot more research, good science, and a comprehensive plan needs  
15 to be made before we can make decisions about what we are going  
16 to do for our fish.

17          In making these decisions, please note, all Native  
18 Americans, white, red, or otherwise, must be treated equally in  
19 all decisions made. Thank you.

20          MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Cindy. Tom Seaman and James and  
21 then after that on deck is Maia Genaux. Go ahead.

22          MR. SEAMAN: Hello. My name is Tom Seaman. I was born  
23 in Moscow, Idaho. Spent most of my life in this area. And I  
24 really appreciate you all coming down here to listen. You're  
25 not faced with an easy decision.

1           Everything I've heard so far has just been so many people  
2 saying different things that all sound like if you believed  
3 them all, there's no way that you can find truth. I mean,  
4 people quote statistics on both sides of it. It's just insane,  
5 you know.

6           What that leads me to is, you know, science -- if you get  
7 politics and emotion involved, you don't have science, you got  
8 science as a tool of emotions instead of a tool of looking at  
9 this clearly. And I'm sad that people get so attached that way  
10 and usually when we get attached to something that way it's  
11 because of some fear.

12           In this case I see a lot of fear. People losing what  
13 they call their life-style and their jobs. Well, I look at all  
14 the Indians here who lost their life-style and their jobs.

15           So, I also know that one of the things that humans do a  
16 lot is very innovative. I don't think we are lacking in  
17 ingenuity that we can't find other good things to do here that  
18 will create money for us and a good way of life.

19           For instance, you talk about shipping. How about helium  
20 balloons? I know that might sound weird, but there was  
21 somebody in Montana that was contemplating using that to ship  
22 grain in the middle of Montana down to the port.

23           Such things as that and other innovative things that we  
24 will come up with when people are forced to the wall instead of  
25 saying, oh, my God, you're going to change us. What are we

1 going to do? Well, you're going to do something. You'll find  
2 it. It just takes a little bit of opening your minds, just  
3 like I want you to open the rivers. Because what happens when  
4 you put a dam in something is you stop the flow.

5           We have an ecosystem here -- we had an ecosystem that was  
6 very complete. We have one that is incomplete because there's  
7 no flow in it. I personally believe that if you breach the  
8 dams you're likely -- more likely to get the salmon run back in  
9 a complete way. I don't see any way around that. It's a  
10 cycle. Life is a cycle, and God follows that.

11           And that with economics as a bottom line, pretty soon  
12 you're going to have people with too much fear who are afraid  
13 they are going to lose it all, they're going to kill us all by  
14 losing it all, by hoarding it, instead of letting it flow.  
15 We've got to keep moving. Got to change.

16           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Tom. James -- I am just not  
17 able to clearly read this so let me give you a phone number  
18 because I really can't read the last name. It's 882-7374. Any  
19 James here with that phone number? Okay. Sorry. Go ahead.

20           MS. GENAUX: My name is Maia Genaux. I live here in  
21 Clarkston, which is on Nez Perce traditional land. This is  
22 good land.

23           On Tuesday evening this week the KLEW evening news from  
24 Lewiston reporting on the local anti-breaching parade that day  
25 said no one could be found for comment who supported

1 breaching. I support breaching. By which I mean a  
2 free-flowing river. I saw the parade, and I turned away.  
3 Sometimes it hurts too much to feel the tension caused by this  
4 issue here in this community.

5 I have good friends on both sides, or at least I did  
6 before tonight. I am sad for this division. I do not like  
7 it. Nonetheless, I must speak up, and I appreciate this  
8 respectful opportunity. I believe we humans have the moral  
9 obligation and the responsibility to use our extensive adaptive  
10 skills so that species less adaptive than ourselves may  
11 continue to exist.

12 I believe we need to make adjustments in all the Hs, all  
13 of which unfortunately mean humans. These four Hs are all  
14 problems for the salmon brought about by humans. We humans can  
15 build a dam and take it down. We can breach a dam and later  
16 resurrect it if need be. A wild salmon run cannot resurrect  
17 itself from extinction.

18 If we humans lose a job our life is not in danger. We  
19 can go collect unemployment, get food stamps, create new jobs,  
20 find jobs elsewhere, change costs, humans time, money,  
21 inconvenience and effort and we survive. Often coming out of  
22 the change even better off than before.

23 A wild salmon has only one job, and that is to  
24 reproduce. These fish don't have 20 to 80 years to repeatedly  
25 breed as we do. They have the opportunity to procreate once.

1 This is their only job. A fish cannot go collect unemployment  
2 or get food stamps if it loses its job. A fish cannot move its  
3 family to Spokane, or Kansas or Georgia or Nevada to take a new  
4 job. The best the salmon can hope to do is get a free bus ride  
5 part way into the ocean. Salmon have only one job. Without  
6 it, they die.

7 We humans have enormous adaptive resources. Fish do  
8 not. If a salmon had been able to sign up and come speak here  
9 tonight, I am sure it would speak more eloquently and more  
10 persuasively than any one of us.

11 It is the one that has the most to lose in this debate.  
12 It is fighting for its very life. We humans are not. Thank  
13 you.

14 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Maia. Okay. Garrett, I think  
15 it's Clevenger, and Wiley Hollingsworth is up after that, and  
16 Wes Bascom.

17 MR. CLEVINGER: My name is Garrett Clevenger. I am a  
18 research scientist at WSU. I live in Moscow, Idaho. This is  
19 great. I'm so excited to comment on this historic ecological  
20 survey. I support breaching of the four lower Snake River  
21 dams. No one wants clogged arteries. We all know how  
22 important our own circulatory system is in nourishing ourselves  
23 with nutrients. Well, let me remind you all of a fact: Salmon  
24 have been nourishing our land with vital nutrients for  
25 countless generations. No other creature brings nutrients from

1 the sea to the land in quantities like the salmon.

2           These fish are swimming protein packets. They spend  
3 their lives in the ocean soaking up nutrients. They swim up  
4 the river to their birthplace to spawn.

5           Over the years, billions of fish have made this journey,  
6 providing a vital food source for all kinds of land dwellers,  
7 including humans and trees.

8           Their bodies are eaten and digested, releasing what they  
9 have soaked from the sea back to the land. What a simple yet  
10 elegant way to circulate nutrients. The rivers are the  
11 lifeblood for this process. And we've damned them by building  
12 dams.

13           We had good intentions, but they are short-sided and  
14 selfish. Who knows what damage we've done by clogging the  
15 river's arteries. We do know that salmon are going extinct on  
16 the Snake River for all sorts of reasons. Obviously, the dams  
17 are a major obstacle to the salmon's journey. Like any health  
18 conscious person would, it's time to heal the rivers.

19           No one claims that bypass surgery is painless, but in the  
20 long run, we'll all be better off if we restore the salmon  
21 runs. We'll also save money by no longer having to subsidize  
22 the dams, salmon restoration, navigation and irrigation.

23           In fact, it's been estimated by the Oregon Natural  
24 Resource Council that we'll save 85 million dollars a year if  
25 we return the lower Snake River to its free-flowing state.

1           We've gone for thousands of years without our unnecessary  
2 electronic gadgets. How long are we going to continue to  
3 develop these toys at the detriment of our environment? We  
4 have to stop growing at some point. Let's do it before we lose  
5 the salmon on the Snake River.

6           Perhaps this is the time for Potlatch to shift its tree  
7 pulp processing to hemp or other crop pulp processing. This  
8 would not only help our forests but benefit our farmers by  
9 providing them with a profitable alternative crop. Perhaps  
10 farmers will process the wheat we grow here regionally instead  
11 of selling a raw product.

12           I would love for my grandchildren to enjoy wild salmon.  
13 I would love to be part of a generation which had enough  
14 compassion to plan for the long-term. Let's do the right thing  
15 and remove the four lower Snake River dams. Thank you.

16           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Garrett. Wiley Hollingsworth, is  
17 that right? Yes. Okay. Great. And then Wes and then next up  
18 is Clyde Nicely. Go ahead. Thank you.

19           MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you. My name is Wiley  
20 Hollingsworth. I'm a Pullman, Washington boy. I will just  
21 read snippets from the paper. We should breach the dams as  
22 part of a 4H effort. Part one, the economic value of salmon:

23           Over the long run, salmon may provide more economic value  
24 than the jobs at the Potlatch mills in Lewiston, Idaho. One  
25 risk factor is the fickle nature of big business, they open and

1 close mills as suits their own interests, not the interest of  
2 the individual mill towns.

3         The other risk factor is the dirty nature of the sulfuric  
4 acid process. If the fiber varieties of hemp are legalized,  
5 Potlatch might set up mills to process that clean source of  
6 fiber, and it might close a corresponding number of its dirtier  
7 mills.

8         Potlatch Corporation makes an undependable sort of base  
9 for our state's economy, but if we give the salmon what they  
10 need to thrive, the salmon will provide an economic base for  
11 thousands of years.

12         Our cheapest option: Because breaching the dams appears  
13 to be the keystone in the arch of salmon recovery, it might be  
14 the least cost option. Since it would boost the salmon  
15 population, other measures wouldn't have to be as extensive as  
16 they would without that boost. For example is irrigation in on  
17 open fisheries and hatcheries. So, breaching the dams will  
18 benefit irrigation and all natural resource extraction  
19 industries.

20         If we let the salmon go extinct, the U.S. will owe,  
21 perhaps, tens of billions of dollars. Sunk costs? If New  
22 England, California, et al, have to see tens of billions of  
23 federal dollars be spent on treaty reparations, they might quit  
24 supporting federal money for the annual subsidies for Columbia  
25 River barging and hydropower. To the extent that we might lose

1 those subsidies, whether or not we breach the dams, they are  
2 sunk costs, and are irrelevant to the decision.

3       Let's give full weight to biologists whose jobs depend on  
4 a continued flow of salmon. Here's what they say. That  
5 breaching the dams is the keystone in the archway of salmon  
6 recovery, and that without breaching, there is probably no  
7 recovery.

8       Part two, the moral value of salmon: The heroics and  
9 self-sacrifice of the salmon runs have always spoken to the  
10 depths of me. Previous generations of Americans held similar  
11 views, but we have become parasites. We have taken \$5-6  
12 trillion from our young, to support sumptuous consumerism. We  
13 are abandoning our young. An increasing number of grandparents  
14 hide from their young in 55-and-older housing developments.

15       Given the undependability of jobs provided by big  
16 business, I applaud those Potlatch employees who have not  
17 bought big houses, RVs, boats, second cars, etcetera. But who  
18 have chosen to live below their means, who save and invest in  
19 appreciating assets, with a goal of becoming self-financed. No  
20 longer dependent on big business. They contribute to the  
21 economic stability of their community.

22       And I applaud those families who value people, not  
23 according to their possessions, but according to the time they  
24 spend learning and practicing social skills, like listening and  
25 resolving conflicts, and according to the effort they put into

1 learning and practicing parenting skills. They contribute to  
2 the safety of their community. I applaud those families  
3 because they exemplify the moral teachings of the salmon.

4 I invite all parties to join with me, and do their part  
5 in providing the conditions that the salmon need to survive.  
6 Thank you all.

7 MS. COLLIS: Thank you. Okay, Wes, please, and after Wes  
8 we have Clyde, and after Clyde we have Scott Levy. How are you  
9 doing, folks? Okay. All right. Just checking. Go ahead.

10 MR. BASCOM: My name is Wes Bascom, and I appreciate  
11 you're all doing a very hard job. Life is not easy, as my  
12 father told me when I was that tall. If it is, you know  
13 something is wrong.

14 Jobs and money are two concerns here. They are two human  
15 creations. Value is whatever we give them. We are a very  
16 inventive and adaptable species. As we heard mentioned several  
17 times this evening, most of us are capable of doing many more  
18 than one thing in a lifetime and, in fact, might enjoy doing  
19 so.

20 We have choices, and we have the ability to adapt to a  
21 changing world. Jobs and money come in many forms that are  
22 amorphous with the times.

23 People did not, however, create the salmon. They are not  
24 as easy. Salmon had far more to do with creating the people.  
25 The areas first people became strong feeding on the salmon.

1 But not just them, the salmon also fed the bear, whose rich  
2 spoon nourished the great trees, the same trees which afforded  
3 the next waive of people their existence.

4       You don't see knolls like this in places that didn't have  
5 salmon. We have a great industry here that has made this  
6 Valley very rich, and we need to acknowledge where it came  
7 from.

8       Ocean biomass in the form of anadromous fish is made  
9 possible much of the industry the Northwest is famous for, and  
10 we are trying to protect it. But we need to give something  
11 back to the salmon. Beyond life, what else is there?

12       The chain of life and prosperity is broken now and  
13 replaced with a chain of artificial lakes. There is no  
14 downstream to carry them to the ocean. There is no stream. We  
15 have lakes. Think about that word artificial, and what it  
16 means to our lives.

17       The salmon are going, and with them the biology depends  
18 on them. The biology that we depend on. Money is nothing  
19 without life. We need salmon, and the dams are killing them.

20       Predators have been around as long as the salmon. They  
21 cannot be held accountable for doing their role. We can also  
22 not justify throwing away more money in regulations that do not  
23 work when the solution is right in front of us.

24       Our creations of jobs and money will adapt. I know. I  
25 am the work force of Idaho. I will spend many years working,

1 and I'm willing to pay a price to protect the salmon.

2 Salmon need free-flowing rivers. Breach the dams now. I  
3 support Alternative 4. Thank you.

4 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Wes. Okay. Clyde, and then  
5 Scott and then Larry Etter.

6 MR. NICELY: My name is Clyde Nicely, and I'm a 25 year  
7 resident of the Valley. And I work with a number of area  
8 businesses and labor groups. And I would like to say, Maia, if  
9 you are still here I do love ya. Still love ya. We agree on a  
10 lot of things. We don't agree on this one. And I would say  
11 that I'm trying to do my best to respect everybody's opinions  
12 on this issue. It's a very complex one. You people sitting in  
13 front of me, it's not an easy task ahead of you.

14 I'd like my comments to apply to this whole mess we are  
15 in. I believe that every one here wants to see abundant runs  
16 of anadromous fish in the Northwest. What we differ in is our  
17 belief on how this is to be done.

18 I believe this will only be accomplished if we can arrive  
19 at a balanced solution, one that spreads the benefits and  
20 sacrifice necessary to accomplish it.

21 I can guarantee that Alternative 4 will not work as this  
22 solution. It will not work because it is not a balanced  
23 solution. It will not work because it's based on flawed  
24 science and computer models. It will not work because it is  
25 politically impossible to complete in a time frame that will

1 help these fish.

2 I believe that if it is the preferred alternative  
3 selected in the final EIS and record of decision that it will  
4 be tied up in litigation and challenged in Congress for a  
5 minimum of 20 years. It will create a grid lock that will  
6 benefit no one or nothing but lawyers and posturing  
7 politicians.

8 If we truly want to save the anadromous fish, we will  
9 address all the Hs, including the human H.

10 We will do all we can to improve the dams, fish  
11 friendliness. We'll honor the scarcity of these fish and  
12 control the bird and marine mammal predators that are  
13 devastating juvenile and adult fish.

14 We will do all we can to maximize available habitat.  
15 We'll use hatcheries more wisely. We'll manage harvest more  
16 wisely.

17 We will quit fighting, and we'll quit having these  
18 meetings. We'll roll up our sleeves and do the common sense  
19 things that will restore fish runs. I have some doubts that we  
20 can do this, but I hope and pray that we can because it's the  
21 only way that we can help these fish. It's the only hope for  
22 them.

23 I support a balanced approach, and I oppose dam breaching  
24 as a single silver bullet solution.

25 Lastly, I strongly condemn you in the Federal agencies in

1 how you have disrespected this community. You originally  
2 scheduled this meeting in a room that would hold approximately  
3 100 people. We found you a venue, the Nez Perce County Fair  
4 Pavilion, which would hold over 2,000 people so everyone could  
5 be here and hear every one speak. You refused to use it. Now  
6 you brag that you've found a place that holds a mere 375.

7 You have dishonored this community and the public  
8 process. I hope you feel some shame in that.

9 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Clyde. Scott Levy, Larry Etter  
10 and then Dennis Elder.

11 MR. LEVY: Howdy. My name is Scott Levy. I created this  
12 film called red fish blue fish and also the bluefish.org which  
13 I encourage you all to take a look at. I appreciate your  
14 attention for the next three minutes.

15 Tonight, I would like to propose a solution that  
16 addresses the concerns of the shippers that ship about four  
17 million tons of commodities through the lower Snake River  
18 corridor.

19 Currently, the 139 mile trip from Lewiston to Pasco costs  
20 \$1.48 per ton. This is the cost that shippers are asking to  
21 protect. \$148 per ton.

22 The true cost of shipping by barge, of course, is much  
23 higher.

24 Averaging 20 years of ACOE data which includes channel  
25 dredging, lock repairs, operations and maintenance, amounts to

1 a little under four million dollars per year. Divide this by 4  
2 million tons of commodities shipped per year, amounts to a  
3 little under \$1 per ton. This is a cost not paid by shippers.

4 Another cost is hydropower revenue that is lost when  
5 water is used to move a ship through the locks rather than  
6 producing hydroelectricity. This amounts to about 14.5 cents  
7 per ton.

8 Combine these subsidies amount to about \$1.11 per ton.

9 For the moment let's also consider the \$435 million  
10 dollars per year that BPA ratepayers currently pay for salmon  
11 recovery efforts. Let's recall that Congress authorized these  
12 dam projects based on a 1930's ACOE report which assigned  
13 navigation with 18.5 percent of the "cost-carrying abilities."

14 18.5 percent of \$435 million dollars is about \$80 million  
15 dollars. Divide this by 4 million tons per year amounts to  
16 another \$20 per ton that shippers do not pay.

17 Let's ignore this \$20 per ton for now, and focus on the  
18 \$1.11 per ton costs of dredging, repairs, operation and  
19 maintenance and forgone power revenues.

20 If shippers were asked to pay this additional \$1.11 per  
21 ton, I am quite certain they would shift their commodities to  
22 rail, an alternative that currently exists and is very  
23 competitive with the \$1.48 per ton that the shippers wish to  
24 protect.

25 From listening to the shipper's valid concerns and the

1 goal of causing no economic effect, I propose that along with  
2 the dam breach alternative, shippers be guaranteed this \$1.48  
3 per ton rate. Any rail costs in excess of \$1.48 would be  
4 rebated to the shippers. Estimates that I have seen suggest  
5 this amount will be on the order of 5 to 10 cents per ton.

6 Remember, the current subsidy is \$1.11 per ton. A 5 to  
7 10 cent per ton rebate would represent a substantial savings,  
8 and shippers would continue to receive the \$1.48 per ton cost  
9 that they are striving to protect.

10 Additionally, I would also encourage the extension of  
11 Washington State's very successful "Grain Train" program. The  
12 program was designed to alleviate the shortage of hoppers in  
13 Washington that occurs at peak times when hoppers tend to  
14 congregate in the Midwest.

15 To quote from the June Wall Street Journal report about  
16 the "Grain Train" program: "For most Washington farmers and  
17 grain elevators, the lack of hoppers means they must rely on  
18 trucks and barges to move their wheat, a more expensive option:

19 A 1996 Washington State University study of the grain  
20 trains first year, said that rail rates, on average, were about  
21 6.6 cents a bushel lower than the truck/barge mode."

22 An extension of the "Grain Train" program would ensure  
23 hopper availability for shippers. Thank you very much. No  
24 economic effect need be felt. Thank you for your time.

25 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Scott. Larry Etter, Dennis

1 Elder, and then Doug Zenner.

2 MR. ETTER: Thank you. My name is Larry Etter. I have  
3 been a resident of this area for the last 40 years. I was here  
4 before the dams. And I really had my concerns when they went  
5 in, but I'm just tickled to death with at least with the  
6 recreation and all the programs with the work the Corps has  
7 done as far as beautification and such. I believe they got  
8 some awards for that.

9 I am really concerned more with those dams being breached  
10 what it's going to do with all the silt and such going down the  
11 river. And people say, well, this is going to be the -- got to  
12 take these dams out, just these four. Well, I think as soon as  
13 these are out, if they ever come out, it's going to be some  
14 other ones.

15 Somewhere around -- the Northwest is going to have to  
16 survive. It's doing well. If we start losing all our power,  
17 it's going to be something else. And then we are going to have  
18 to find -- the United States has done unGodly things as far as  
19 technology and such, and I can't believe this country can't put  
20 the money together and figure out how to do this and have the  
21 dams and the fish. So I'm opposed to dam breaching at this  
22 time.

23 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Larry. Okay. Dennis Elder and  
24 Doug and after Doug is Sean Cassidy.

25 MR. ELDER: Good evening. My name is Dennis Elder. I

1 work at Potlatch, and I would like to say I'm damn proud of  
2 it. I keep hearing there's no scientific evidence, and there's  
3 no silver bullet. Well, where I think we ought to start with  
4 is we ought to go down to the mouth of the Columbia River out  
5 to International waters and bring one of those big fishing  
6 crawlers in. Take it up to Bonneville Dam and let's start  
7 dipping these salmon out when they're running. I think people  
8 would get the picture that that's part of the problem. I think  
9 that's where we need to start. Thank you.

10 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Dennis. Doug Zenner, Sean  
11 Cassidy, and on deck is Dean Stewart.

12 MR. CASSIDY: I'm not Doug.

13 MS. COLLIS: Nope, you are not. Okay, is Doug still  
14 here? Doug Zenner, are you still with us? Okay.

15 MR. CASSIDY: Hi. I'm Sean Cassidy, and I'm just a  
16 citizen. And I want to comment about the way the meeting is  
17 being run. I can't believe you sat there for as long as you've  
18 sat there, and I appreciate it very much. I would like to  
19 thank you and -- the only people that I saw that really had a  
20 privileged seat at this hearing were the politicians. I would  
21 like to thank them for staying -- wait a minute. I would have  
22 liked to, if they would have stayed here and listened to the  
23 citizens.

24 I think the main idea isn't a bad idea. Throw all the  
25 names in a hat and do it that way. That does seem like that

1 may be fairer, as a way to do it. But I also resent the fact  
2 that the implication that the people of this Valley don't  
3 represent the idea or want the idea of taking down some of the  
4 dams.

5 I have deep roots in salmon country. My grandmother was  
6 born in Keuterville, which is not too far from here. My father  
7 was born in Pendleton. Raised in Pendleton. I've lived and  
8 worked in Lewiston/Clarkston Valley for the last six years, and  
9 I love this county. And I also have great respect for the hard  
10 working people that work in this Valley. They are my  
11 neighbors. They are my co-workers. They are my friends.

12 I do remember the first time that I saw one of the big  
13 dams, and I was very impressed. They are huge. They are  
14 enormous. They are fantastic undertakings of human time, but I  
15 think their time has past.

16 I also remember the first time I saw a salmon struggling  
17 up a small stream overcoming every obstacle. Soon passed  
18 fishing nets, passed predators of all kinds. I remember these  
19 powerful creatures leaping up against the waterfall. Falling  
20 back into a pool and keep coming back again and again and  
21 again, sort of like this issue it seems like.

22 It was one of the most amazing sights of my entire life.  
23 I remember another trip I took to the heart of Idaho to Red  
24 Fish Lake. It used to be one of the ultimate destinations of  
25 the salmon. I remember the old timers taking about massive

1 runs of salmon to the lake. It must have been something to  
2 watch. The year that I was there one salmon made the trek. No  
3 more memories for the children of Idaho.

4 Open the dams and give the salmon a fighting chance.  
5 Take care of my neighbors when you move the millions of tons of  
6 silt from the dams, make sure that you hire people from our  
7 area.

8 As the depths of the river highly drops, use locals to  
9 fix the roads and railroads to help local businesses. As the  
10 lakes disappear, create the finest strips of camping, biking,  
11 boating, and other recreation in the park areas in the  
12 Northwest.

13 As the salmon begins to return give the Tribes the  
14 opportunity we promised them in treaties. As the fish begin to  
15 return to Red Fish Lake, take your children and grandchildren  
16 to see a magnificent sight. Let them have their own memories,  
17 of salmon returning home, salmon returning to Idaho.

18 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Sean. Dean Stewart, and on deck  
19 is Rocky Smith.

20 MR. STEWART: My name is Dean Stewart. I speak for  
21 myself. I want to thank you all for being here and taking your  
22 notes and paying careful attention to who's speaking. And all  
23 the people have spoken from their hearts and from their  
24 experience and their hopes and their fears. In fact, spoken so  
25 articulately because I think it's real important.

1           There are some things I would like to say. I do believe  
2 that we, as a people and our culture and our country are kind  
3 of caught in the crossroads of sustainable and nonsustainable  
4 technologies. And the dams, I believe, are not the only things  
5 that are the train wrecks at the crossroads.

6           Two generations ago we built these giant dams without  
7 knowing they would have, for example, such a devastating effect  
8 on the salmon and much of the ecosystem. Not knowing that our  
9 dependents on the dams for our livelihood and recreation and  
10 for our way of life that our dependents would encourage us to  
11 keep prompting them up beyond their time.

12           I believe through the work of good and faithful and  
13 sincere scientists I'm convinced personally that the dams have  
14 run their course; that that technology is no longer sustainable  
15 for this area, specifically, and somebody has to bite the  
16 bullet. It's going to be us or it's going to be our  
17 grandkids. I would propose that we have the courage to do it  
18 so that our grandkids can be on some firmer ground with a  
19 brighter future and for our rivers. Thank you.

20           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Dean. Rocky is on and then after  
21 that, Matt, and after Matt is Steve Evans. Go ahead.

22           MR. SMITH: My name is Rocky Smith. I'm here on behalf  
23 of my family and children. Several years ago dams were built  
24 along the Snake and Columbia Rivers. I doubt that there were  
25 any Environmental Impact Studies or protesting

1 environmentalists. Just people, hard working men and women  
2 trying to make a living for their families.

3         After years of having the dams in place, these men,  
4 women, and families have grown dependent upon the four lower  
5 Snake River dams for their livelihood.

6         Barges transport commodities such as grain from family  
7 farms on the Palouse, prairie, and even as far away as Montana  
8 as well as wood products from local companies to Portland and  
9 beyond. This is inexpensive transportation which helps these  
10 honest hard working families and companies compete in global  
11 markets that didn't exist a few years ago.

12         The environmentalists are not hard working men and women,  
13 but slothful people who receive charitable contributions or  
14 handouts from the rich to fund their projects that take away  
15 from the American dream. These people have no idea what it  
16 takes to survive in today's global market. If they knew the  
17 truth, they would realize how absurd their notions and ideas  
18 are.

19         As for the salmon, too many fishermen with vast nets  
20 trolling the ocean, too many sea lions, and too many gill nets  
21 lining the rivers have obviously taken their toll on salmon  
22 populations. With increasing fishermen, sea lions, and gill  
23 nets it's a no brainer to figure out why the salmon aren't  
24 returning.

25         Breaching the dams will not help the fish return in

1 larger numbers, but will create more problems which the dam  
2 breachers choose to ignore. The four lower Snake River dams  
3 generate 1,230 megawatts of electrical energy each year. This  
4 loss in power will be generated by burning coal and gas.

5         Yearly emissions from these plants would be over  
6 28,000,000,000 pounds of carbon dioxide plus vast quantities of  
7 other greenhouse gases.

8         For each four tow barge lost on the river, 536 tractor  
9 trailers would be needed to haul the commodities up and down  
10 Highway 12 belching out more carbon dioxide and NOx.

11         Area tourism would fail. No one will want to see or  
12 smell the mud flats of Washington and Idaho. I could go on,  
13 but it just does not make any sense or logic to breach the  
14 dams. There is just too much at take for using a method that  
15 is not scientifically proven. You will destroy the lives of  
16 many families by breaching the dams only in an attempt to try  
17 to save a few salmon.

18         We have no guarantee to any federal money to help us when  
19 dams are breached. Our only guarantees are death and taxes.

20         When the dams are breached and the salmon do not return,  
21 will you then plot to breach the remaining dams? When and  
22 where will this all end?

23         This great country was founded on sound religious  
24 principals. In Genesis, Chapter 1:28, God tells Adam or man  
25 that he has dominion over the fish, the fowl, and every living

1 thing that moves upon the earth.

2           Let's use our dominion wisely and quit wasting millions  
3 of dollars fighting against each other. Let's sit down  
4 together at a table, put our money together, and find a real  
5 solution. Dam breaching is not the answer.

6           MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Rocky. Matt, Steve Evans, and  
7 after Steve, Dave Kauffman.

8           MR. PICHA: My name is Matt Picha. I am an animal  
9 science student at Washington State University. For myself  
10 intrigue sense of awe that salmon continue to inspire been  
11 rooted during childhood while fishing with my grandfather.

12           COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Can you speak up into the  
13 mic, please?

14           MR. PICHA: Hours of bonding, anticipation and excitement  
15 resulted from fishing trips in a humble boat motoring through  
16 the Pudget Sound. The overwhelming strength and beauty of the  
17 Chinook's chrome body apparent at an early age. I was also  
18 fortunate enough to live next to the Samish River which yielded  
19 an opportunity to watch Chinook spawn and carry out the last  
20 portion of their magnificent life cycle.

21           Classes pertaining to salmonid physiology, anatomy, and  
22 ecology continue to take this appreciation to entirely new  
23 dimensions. This fascination; however, is intricately entwined  
24 into a much broader picture. We can't think of salmon without  
25 considering the nitrogen and phosphorus, their carcasses

1 contribute to the immense trees and flora surrounding the  
2 river's edge. The protein that enables eagles and bears to  
3 flourish. Just about every organism in the ecosystem being  
4 connected to these nutrients one way or another.

5         Unfortunately, this captivation is coupled with  
6 frustration. I'm continually frustrated with the tension  
7 dwindling salmon numbers have caused between commercial  
8 fishermen, sports fishermen, and Native Americans. Frustrated  
9 when I drive over Lower Granite Dam and see a brown stagnant  
10 reservoir polluted with carp and squawfish.

11         Frustrated with Senators focusing on the political  
12 ramifications associated with dam breaching instead of the  
13 science.

14         And finally, frustrated with claims of how breaching will  
15 compromise the way of life without consideration of the  
16 implications outside of this immediate area. Without thought  
17 of the economic benefits salmon recovery entails.

18         Substantial numbers of jobs will be created with the  
19 construction of railways to transport grain through additional  
20 trucking and with a multitude of recreational opportunities on  
21 a natural free-flowing river.

22         Most importantly, we will see the return of one of the  
23 world's most preeminent sport fisheries. Don't forget that the  
24 economic structure correlated with dams came at the expensive  
25 of the Nez Perce, in towns such as Orofino, Stanley, Salmon and

1 Riggins. People whose livelihoods and incomes once revolved  
2 around these unequal creatures.

3 People are so afraid of change but look at the change  
4 we've inflicted with these four lower dams. Thousands of years  
5 of genetic selection and evolution should have secured the  
6 Chinook and steelhead's future in this area. Yet, within 30  
7 years we've compromised this foundation by altering the river's  
8 temperature, flow and gravel beds.

9 Smolt become disorientated in stale water that caters to  
10 predators. All before they traverse through a virulent set of  
11 turbines. The effects are obvious the disturbing decline of  
12 smolt that actually reach saltwater parallels the construction  
13 of the dams.

14 Most insulting, though, is how we try to find solutions  
15 which cost taxpayers billions, while ignoring the inherent  
16 cause of decline.

17 The breaching of Lower Granite, Little Goose, Lower  
18 Monumental and Ice Harbor dams aren't the only issue that needs  
19 to be resolved, but it's by far the most crucial and urgent if  
20 we are to preserve this economic, social, and spiritual  
21 cornerstone of the Pacific Northwest. Thank you.

22 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Matt. Steve Evans, Dave Kauffman  
23 after Steve, and Mike Holder.

24 MR. EVANS: My name is Steve Evans, and I've heard a lot  
25 of concerns here tonight. And I really respect the opinions

1 that have been made, especially the ones on the good paying  
2 jobs.

3 I have worked 20 years as a laborer and through a labor  
4 union and make good money. I'm currently a school teacher so I  
5 know the difference between a good paying job and just a  
6 regular job. Believe me.

7 Anyway, there's been a lot of concern for the small  
8 farmer. As a history teacher currently, I want to tell you  
9 that's been going on for a long time. 100 years ago they  
10 formed the populous party because they were concerned about the  
11 small farmer. The historical truth is, it doesn't matter if  
12 you are in this area or not in this area, if you are a small  
13 farmer you get in trouble, you've been in trouble for about the  
14 time of Andrew Jackson.

15 Now, I would also like to address the silt problem. Karl  
16 was here and Karl said he waded out in the silt and sunk up to  
17 his knees. Well, doggone it, Karl, you should have waited  
18 until it died up. My horse pasture is the same doggone way in  
19 the spring. Silt dries up, and then you get rid of it.

20 Now they say if you're against the silt, then you're for  
21 the dams. Well, the silt is there anyway. The silt is already  
22 there.

23 I was here 30 plus years ago when they had the hearing  
24 about the creation of the dam in the hotel Lewis Clark. I  
25 remember the Corps of Engineers was asked about silting, and

1 they said, Don't worry. It's not going to silt. And then they  
2 said, But if it does silt, we will dredge it, but it isn't  
3 going to be dredged until at least 2,000. Well, I think we've  
4 all lost track of how much dredging has already taken place  
5 down there.

6 I was raised with kerosine lamps and lots of fish. I  
7 don't want to go back to kerosine lamps, I guarantee you that.  
8 But I think we have gone too far. I don't agree with Charles  
9 Posheski who said that the D-Day analogy wasn't a good  
10 analogy. I think a World War II analogy is a good analogy, but  
11 it's not the D-Day analogy, it's the other one. A bridge too  
12 far, except you've got to change the word bridge to dam. We  
13 got too many.

14 I think looking at John Day, looking at the Yakima River,  
15 there's four dams, not eight. We've got eight dams. We've got  
16 too many of them. We need a balance. Float down river and  
17 take four out, that would be perfect. It's sad because it's a  
18 bitter pill.

19 I was born in Walla Walla. I've lived my entire life  
20 within the confines of salmon country, Eastern Washington and  
21 so on.

22 I'm running out of time. Oh, well. What are we going to  
23 call the Salmon River? I'll skip a paragraph. Are we going to  
24 call it the Unsalmon River? Or Wish-there-was-salmon River?  
25 Or shall we call it the Used-to-be-salmon River?

1 I have a chart. Every time a chart shows a dam is built  
2 it shows the fish go into a decline. Well, this is isn't  
3 science, but it tells me something. We hear a lot about common  
4 sense. The dams come, the fish go.

5 I've got a lot of friends and neighbors and some family  
6 that work at Potlatch. I called every agency, every individual  
7 to cooperate in doing whatever it takes to bring the salmon  
8 back from the brink back to vitality and power.

9 In the same breath I call upon every faction and salmon  
10 supporter to energize your efforts to stand loyal and honestly  
11 with local business and industry.

12 If we can fly to the moon and back, we can surely  
13 guarantee that our friends and relatives do not lose their  
14 livelihoods, their homes, and their rich lives.

15 Breaching is a bitter pill, but I believe if we take it  
16 in the evening, late into the next morning we'll likely begin  
17 to feel -- feel whole again. Thank you.

18 MS. COLLIS: Dave Kauffman and then Mike Holden.

19 MR. KAUFFMAN: Good evening. My name is Dave Kauffman.

20 COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, please. I need to change  
21 paper.

22 MS. COLLIS: We've got to change paper. Let me clarify  
23 one thing. Before we do that, though, let me just tell you  
24 where we are. Mike? We have to change paper every time. Let  
25 me tell you where we are. We've got about 70 more people

1 signed up, which translates to about four hours, depending on  
2 how everything goes.

3 (Whereupon court reporter is changing paper.)

4 GEN. STROCK: (Discussion by Brigadier General Strock.)

5 (Public comment session continues:)

6 MS. COLLIS: And, Panel, before we take a break, let's  
7 jut take Dave's comments since he was up at the mic.

8 MR. KAUFFMAN: My name is Dave Kauffman. I'm here for  
9 myself and my union brothers and sisters that I work with. I  
10 have lived in Idaho for 40 years. I'm also a committee member  
11 on the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation. I have fished all around  
12 the region, and one of the best places I ever found is right  
13 out here. My friends and I have caught well over 100 fish this  
14 year out here.

15 I think we should keep the dams. The U.S. Army Corps of  
16 Engineers' annual fish passage data indicates more than 4,000  
17 spring and summer salmon were counted and passed the Lower  
18 Granite Dam in 1999. This is ten times more than what was  
19 counted in 1998 and 40 times more than in '94.

20 At Bonneville Dam the news is just as good. The counts  
21 there are the highest since the '90s when biologists first  
22 started keeping track. The National Marine Fisheries Service  
23 is projecting runs of 140,000 this year.

24 Let's quit looking for a single solution that does  
25 nothing more than divide the region. Let's figure out what we

1 really need to restore the fish runs. Let's get good, credible  
2 information, and then have a meaningful discussion on what  
3 should be done. Thank you.

4 MS. COLLIS: Thank you, Dave. Okay, when we come back  
5 from our break Mike Holder will be up. Stacey Williams is  
6 going to be here in my place. It's been my pleasure being your  
7 moderator today. I've really enjoyed getting to know about  
8 your community. Thank you very much.

9 (Whereupon a recess was taken.)

10 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay, just in case you don't remember me  
11 from hours ago, my name is Stacey Williams. And I'm also a  
12 facilitator and moderator, and I'll be taking over for  
13 Cathryn. And I'll be helping all of you get over the hurdles  
14 in the next few hours.

15 I had one request from the people that are doing the  
16 television transmission, they would appreciate it if some of  
17 you would move forward because right now it looks as if nobody  
18 is here except for voices up in the darkness.

19 So don't be scared. Come on up, please. Let everybody  
20 out there know that you are here and you are up. And you are  
21 speaking for them. Thank you.

22 All right. The next person up is Mike Holder, and after  
23 Mike Holder we have Gretchen Stewart and then Steve Watkins.

24 MR. HOLDER: My name is Mike Holder. I live in Lewiston,  
25 Idaho. Been here for 17 years. I'm a Native Montanan. And I

1 just wanted to say again, thank you. And for all the people  
2 that have spoke out, one thing I get excited about is the way  
3 this thing was ran from the outside. You have people voicing  
4 their opinion, showing their opinions. Yet, it is done in a  
5 way that makes you proud to be an American, I believe. And I  
6 really respect what you guys are doing.

7 I think that we live in a great country. We have a great  
8 area, and it's a great Northwest. And I think everybody wants  
9 the same thing. We express our opinions. We have our  
10 concerns. We have ideas. We agree and we disagree on a lot of  
11 things.

12 I respect the opinion of the person, a friend of mine,  
13 who was telling me he has lived here for a number of years and  
14 how he thinks the dams should be removed. And we agree on many  
15 things, but we disagreed on that thing.

16 But he stated in such a way that he respected what I had  
17 to say and he listened to me, and I did the same to him. And  
18 when we left we were still friends.

19 I respect the opinion of the person who belongs to the  
20 Sierra Club. And they have their opinion about what things  
21 have to be, but when they come here and they sit in the shoes  
22 of the person who works for Potlatch Corporation, trying to  
23 feed their family, and the reality of it is, it's a concern of  
24 that individual, whether it be a man or a woman. And one of  
25 her concerns has to be that same thing.

1 I do not work for Potlatch. I don't have any connection  
2 to it, but I have a lot of friends there. We can't say because  
3 we want this to happen, this is best, we can't disregard that.  
4 It's still a true element.

5 Now will there be other jobs? Yes, there is. But first,  
6 put yourselves in their shoes before you say how easy it is to  
7 make a living doing something else. Most the people saying  
8 that, I believe, are not really putting themselves in those  
9 shoes.

10 Lastly, what I would like to say is that representing the  
11 people for this area, you just about have to have been in the  
12 area for a while. And if we bus in a bunch of people, that's  
13 okay, but if you want to get the flavor, the politicians hold  
14 the flavor for the area. Not everybody's opinion, but they  
15 hold the flavor of the area. Appreciate all your time. Thank  
16 you.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mike, and we are ready for  
18 Gretchen.

19 MS. STEWART: I am Gretchen Stewart, and I just want to  
20 say half humorously, I'm not really too intimidated by the  
21 implication that only new information is relevant tonight.

22 I think a major crossroads throughout history, it wasn't  
23 just new information that caused change, it was the next person  
24 or the next snowflake, if you will, that fell on the branch  
25 that finally made the branch brake.

1           For many people this question of what to do about the  
2 dams and the salmon seems to be mainly an economic one. I can  
3 understand that, even though that is not the most burning issue  
4 for me.

5           I think it is dangerous to reduce everything to economics  
6 and/or science, and I think just looking back in our own U.S.  
7 history to the period of 1820 to 1860 might shed some insight  
8 on that. We might learn from our past, ways of life and  
9 systems that were in place that were threatened with change.

10           But I will address that economic issue, that concern, and  
11 would like to say many of us have come to believe the true and  
12 lasting economic health for a particular place is found only  
13 when the natural beauty of a place and the diversity of plants  
14 and animal life of that place is protected.

15           Nowadays, the strongest long-term local and regional  
16 economies are found in healthy and whole places to live.  
17 That's what's desirable. Salmon living in rivers is a big part  
18 of making this place a healthy and whole place.

19           Without healthy fish and healthy free-flowing rivers this  
20 area will be a less desirable place to live and work. Our part  
21 of the Northwest will suffer economically with the salmon  
22 gone.

23           I'm convinced that breaching the four lower Snake dams  
24 will serve our best economic interest. And I point to -- this  
25 is new information, I think -- Thomas Michael Powers research

1 and book called Lost Landscapes and Failed Economies for  
2 supporting facts and case studies.

3       But for me, of at least equal importance to the economic  
4 concerns are the spiritual and ethical issues. My Christian  
5 faith, like many other faiths, celebrates both the Creator and  
6 all creation. It does matter to me that many parts of the  
7 creation are being wiped out, lost forever by human decisions.  
8 This is happening due to many well-intentioned actions in the  
9 least, as well as many shortsighted or selfish reasons. I  
10 believe all the non-human parts of the natural world belong  
11 here, as much as I do.

12       Furthermore, I find no joy in a domesticated, unnatural  
13 world without wild fish and animals. Sterile rivers are not  
14 what God intended, because we now know about the harm we humans  
15 have inflicted on the mighty fish and rivers.

16       We have an obligation to admit our past mistakes.  
17 Grown-ups admit their mistakes and learn from them. We need to  
18 work quickly to restore the salmon to their rightful place in  
19 our regions' rivers.

20       And we also have a legal and moral and ethical  
21 obligations to honor the laws and treaties. Skipping down  
22 here. One sentence here: I would just like to imagine myself  
23 as a really older woman in the year 2025 or 2030 with my grown  
24 grandchildren on the banks of the Snake River, telling them the  
25 story of the salmon that was written in my lifetime.

1           No matter how the rest of that story is written from now  
2 until then, I know I want to be able to answer them. What did  
3 you do or say in those days, grandma? And I want to say, I  
4 spoke and worked for maximum protection for the wild fish.  
5 Thank you.

6           MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Gretchen. Next up is Steve  
7 Watkins and after Steve is Heather Stout. And after Heather is  
8 Jack Carpenter. All right, do we have Steve Watkins here?  
9 Heather Stout? Great.

10          MS. STOUT: Hi. My name is Heather Stout. And before I  
11 get started this evening, I want you all to know, those elected  
12 officials that came and spoke this evening, I did not elect  
13 them. And I do not agree with them.

14          My husband and I farm up on the hill, and we are  
15 concerned about the future of the Salmon River and the Snake  
16 River. The final decision on whether to breach the four dams  
17 will greatly affect our livelihood. Both my husband and I have  
18 always tried to be good stewards of our land and have taught  
19 our children that we all must take responsibility for our  
20 actions. And that is why I come to speak tonight.

21          What is our responsibility in this matter? Do we, the  
22 human species, have the right, ethically, to condemn another  
23 species to extinction? That's the crucial question this  
24 evening.

25          The time the dams were built they served a purpose. They

1 provided cheap electricity to this area. At that time they  
2 were the right thing to do. We did not see the effect these  
3 structures would have on our magnificent fish runs, but now we  
4 do.

5         Six years ago in 1994 only one adult sockeye returned to  
6 the Snake River Basin. Six years ago we knew that our original  
7 decision had been in error. We have an obligation to correct  
8 that error. Saving our salmon runs now are the right thing to  
9 do.

10         Tonight, and over the past months and years, you and I  
11 have repeatedly been told that economically this Valley and the  
12 surrounding area cannot succeed without the dams; that we  
13 cannot afford to change. How can we afford not to change!

14         Years ago southern cotton farmers said they couldn't live  
15 without slaves. They would go bankrupt. But slavery was  
16 abolished. Changes were implemented and cotton is still  
17 growing and harvested for a profit in the south.

18         The turn of the century, industrial barons said they  
19 couldn't make a profit without sweatshops using child labor.  
20 Child labor was wrong, and changes were implemented and profits  
21 marched on.

22         Dams are also wrong, and we can live without them. Right  
23 now we are in a technological revolution that provides us with  
24 many different alternatives. Alternatives that enable us to  
25 hold down our jobs, provide for our families, have a good

1 quality of life while still enjoying the benefits of a  
2 free-flowing river.

3         If we have the courage to march forward we will have a  
4 self-renewing resource that will provide thousands of jobs in  
5 tourism, sport and commercial fishing, and a host of other  
6 industries.

7         On top of this, it will still leave the Northwest with  
8 the cheapest electricity in the nation. But we must stand up  
9 and demand a better quality of life for this area. We must  
10 tell the commercial interests in the Valley and surrounding  
11 areas that we can, and will, lead productive lives with a clean  
12 free-flowing river.

13         Change is inevitable, but all of us can handle the  
14 change. We must do this for our children and their children's  
15 children. The Iroquois nation believe that before a decision  
16 is made, one must consider how that decision will affect the  
17 next seven generations. We must do the same tonight.

18         We must restore our river enabling both the salmon and  
19 our communities to both prosper and grow. Thank you very  
20 much.

21         MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Heather. Jack Carpenter, and  
22 after Jack we have Chris Norden, and after Chris Norden we have  
23 Joshua Burnim.

24         MR. CARPENTER: Good evening. My name is Jack  
25 Carpenter. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on salmon

1 in the Snake River dams this evening.

2 We need salmon for our economy, for our children, and for  
3 our way of life, as do the Native Americans. We promised they  
4 would be able to catch fish forever. We signed treaties with  
5 them. I believe we are legally and morally obligated by those  
6 treaties.

7 The vast majority of scientists agree that bypassing the  
8 four lower Snake River dams is essential for saving endangered  
9 salmon and steelhead. The wild fish need protection and  
10 restoration of habitat throughout the Columbia basin.

11 We must restore the fish numbers. Further delay is not  
12 an option. We have a responsibility to care for our valuable  
13 natural resources and recover salmon and steelhead for our kids  
14 and to fulfill our promise to Native Americans.

15 Sorry, I don't have a magic bullet. I ask the National  
16 Marine Fisheries Service to recommend bypass of the four lower  
17 Snake River dams. We need to work together to restore the  
18 habitat and to protect the fish. We can have a clean -- a  
19 clean and thriving environment and a strong economy without  
20 having to choose one over the other, but we cannot have salmon  
21 and dams. We must choose salmon over dams for our future.

22 I would like to close with these quotes: The bottom line  
23 biological conclusion is really a no brainer, for native fish  
24 and wildlife a free-flowing river is better than a dammed  
25 river. And that should be obvious to anyone, U.S. Fish and

1 Wildlife Service, 1999. And the natural river option bypassing  
2 dams is the only option that can provide recovery, Idaho Fish  
3 and Game, 1998. Thank you.

4 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Jack. Is Chris here?

5 MR. NORDEN: Hi. I would like my comments to apply to  
6 the All-H Paper and EIS and everything else that you guys are  
7 doing.

8 I live in Latah County, Idaho. I work in Lewiston. I  
9 didn't arrive here from the big city. I'm not rich. I didn't  
10 come on a bus. I walked here after an 11-hour workday. I got  
11 here at 6:30, and I stuck it out. I want to speak.

12 Salmon have been the cornerstone of this region's economy  
13 for thousands of years. In the 19th Century the right to  
14 harvest salmon in perpetuity was guaranteed to the Nez Perce  
15 and other tribes in exchange for most of the land which we now  
16 consider our resource base.

17 In a very real sense, this right to harvest salmon and  
18 steelhead is the fundamental property right in this region  
19 enshrined in treaties with the U.S. Government dated to 1855  
20 and affirmed by the 1969 So Happy and 1974 Bolt decisions.

21 I am an environmentalist in the sense that I am an  
22 American citizen demanding that the Federal Government enforce  
23 existing law, specifically the 1973 Endangered Species Act and  
24 upholding existing treaties with the region's Indian tribes.

25 I support Alternative 4, bypass the dams. We've already

1 wasted literally billions of taxpayer dollars in failed bargaining  
2 efforts, hatcheries, ladders, screens, and other gold plating.

3         This wasted money will pale, however, in comparison to  
4 the bill taxpayers will be required to foot, should we fail to  
5 meet our treaty obligations with the Northwest tribes. Have to  
6 pay damages and compensation for lost rights and resources.

7         In addition to deliberately allowing extinction of the  
8 salmon by neglecting the root problems, the dams themselves  
9 would be unfavorably to the extreme.

10         Salmon represent not just a key food and protein source  
11 for the original people of the Inland Northwest, but also  
12 represent a key cultural and spiritual value as well.

13         I suggest those making the final recommendation  
14 familiarize themselves with Dan Landeen and Pinkham's book,  
15 Salmon and His People, Fishing in Nez Perce Culture, which was  
16 published right here in Lewiston, Idaho by Confluence Press.

17         Those are the biggest economic stakes in preserving the  
18 four lower Snake dams. Happen also to be the most vocal  
19 critics of scientific evidence supportive of a pro-breaching  
20 position.

21         I would point out that most of our industry-funded  
22 politicians left after giving their speeches. They,  
23 apparently, did not want to hear their pro-breaching  
24 constituents, and there were many of us.

25         These dams have only been in place for a little over 20

1 years. If we can put man on the moon, build skyscrapers to the  
2 stars, rehabilitate paralyzed spinal cord victims and bring  
3 back life to the great lakes, if we can do all these marvelous  
4 things, then surely we can bypass four new and relatively  
5 unproductive hydro dams in order to prevent the extinction of  
6 one of the most valued and ecologically important species in  
7 the entire nation.

8           A healthy intact ecosystem is this region's greatest  
9 capital, certainly representing a greater ecological, cultural,  
10 and yes, economic value over the long-run than nonsustainable  
11 boom industries and the high wages that temporarily give rise  
12 to.

13           If there's anything -- if we've learn anything during our  
14 brief occupation of this part of the world it's that  
15 technologies and economies are temporary and that change is  
16 inevitable. Even business leaders embrace change. It is human  
17 nature to do so.

18           Are we prepared to tell our grandkids that we let the  
19 salmon go extinct because we were unwilling to change? No.

20           MS. WILLIAMS: Good. All right. Is Joshua here? All  
21 right. How about Halalia? How about Chris Johnson?

22           UNKNOWN MALE: He's not here.

23           MS. WILLIAMS: All right. Is Al here? Al Poplawsky?  
24 Robert Hoffmann?

25           MR. HOFFMANN: I am Robert Hoffmann, and I would like to

1 thank everybody on the Board up there for coming, particularly  
2 the representative from the Fish and Wildlife Service whose  
3 colleagues wrote the first two paragraphs of my talk here. I  
4 received this press release yesterday. (Reading, parts  
5 inaudible to the reporter.) First known reproduction of the  
6 Pallid Sturgeon in the river in at least 50 years has been  
7 confirmed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife biologists who point to  
8 the startling discovery and evidence that the fish whose  
9 ancestors date to the days of dinosaurs may have a better  
10 chance of recovery than previously believed. This remarkable  
11 news is more than just testimony to the need to conserve  
12 habitat in order to pull an endangered species back from the  
13 brink of extinction, Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt  
14 said. And it speaks eloquently for the need to restore some  
15 natural flows to rivers so they are more than just dammed and  
16 channelized flood control rapids exclusive to the fresh water  
17 towards the sea.

18           When the Edwards Dam was removed from the River in Maine  
19 Atlantic salmon were seen back in that stretch of river almost  
20 immediately. When we left the big money suddenly one of  
21 American's most endangered fish started spawning in nature once  
22 again.

23           People who say there isn't any science to support dam  
24 breaching to bring back endangered species hasn't studied other  
25 examples. In fact, nothing else seems to recover fish.

1 I'm a member of Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, and one  
2 thing the Elk Foundation holds very true is that the most  
3 important element for restoring elk is habitat.

4 I have been a member of the Nature Conservancy. Been a  
5 volunteer steward, and the most important thing to say to the  
6 endangered species is habitat. Ducks Unlimited, Trout  
7 Unlimited, Pheasants Forever, it's all think habitat. And this  
8 may be new to you.

9 This may be one of those things that all your science is  
10 pointless if it doesn't think habitat. And you know what, if  
11 those dams are on the river, the habitat is not there. You can  
12 have 90 percent of the young fish surviving those dams. You  
13 have can have 110 percent surviving the dams, but if you don't  
14 have the habitat, that doesn't matter because they are just not  
15 going to recover without it. That's why I support Alternative  
16 4 to tear up the dams.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Robert. Is Hyla Dickson here?  
18 How about Gloria Fischer? Sam Mace? Randy Vancycle?

19 MR. VANCYCLE: Good evening. My name is Randy Vancycle.  
20 I'm here to represent two people who cannot be here with me.  
21 It's past their bedtime. They are my five-year-old daughters.

22 Those who wish to breach the dams are not considering the  
23 real people, like my daughters, who will be hurt by this. Are  
24 salmon important? Yes.

25 The dam breachers would like us to believe that it is a

1 fact that the dams kill 90 percent of all fish. It's not as a  
2 theory. I'll give you a fact: Fishing kills fish. I've been  
3 there. I have seen it. The fish actually die when you pull  
4 them out of the water. Here's another fact: Predators kill  
5 fish, like the Caspian terns out at Rice Island. And why do  
6 sea lions hang out at the mouth of the Columbia? Fishing is  
7 great!

8 Over the years we as a country have made remarkable  
9 strides in saving endangered species from extinction. The  
10 common factor in our success is to reduce harvest. There is no  
11 doubt the buffalo would be extinct now if we decided to  
12 eliminate all farming in the midwest because it destroys the  
13 buffalo's habitat. They still allow them to be hunted. That  
14 is the kind of sense removing the dams make.

15 Before we destroy the economy of an entire region on the  
16 assumption of unproven theory, let's use tried and true methods  
17 and restrict the harvest to all and help reduce losses due to  
18 predators.

19 I've spent 14 years of my life supporting and defending  
20 the Constitution that allows people to meet and express views  
21 on issues like this. Thank you for allowing me to exercise  
22 that right. I ask you to take my daughters, two beautiful  
23 little five-year-olds, and do the right thing by them. Choose  
24 Alternative B. Thank you.

25 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Randy. Is Antone Holmquist

1 here? How about Johnny Floch?

2 MR. FLOCH: Are you going to give me a green when you are  
3 ready? Okay. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is  
4 Johnny Floch. I'm a third generation here. My grandfather  
5 homesteaded in this country up on the ten mile, and there was  
6 Chinook spawning up there. And I got a great big speech here,  
7 but it's not going to do any good because we got to come to a  
8 solution. That's what you right there General said.

9 Now Mr. Penny over here stated, look at the salmon on the  
10 Yakima. If I'm not wrong about year ago I watched a PBS show,  
11 and it showed how they built a culvert up around that dam. And  
12 maybe I'm wrong here, but 161 million dollars, let's put some  
13 people to work and put them culverts around.

14 And this fellow over here talking about habitat, he's  
15 absolutely right. But why should the people of this Valley  
16 right here have to suffer when the Federal Government put the  
17 dams in that nobody in this building wanted in the first  
18 place?

19 When I was 17 years old I petitioned against those dams,  
20 door to door. Now I'm here saying: Do not take something  
21 out. You cannot look in the past. You've got to go to the  
22 future. So if they can do it on the Yakima, and if I'm wrong,  
23 I'll stand corrected -- if they can do it on the Yakima with  
24 all the Engineers, the technology that we have today and the  
25 people that need jobs out here and damn good jobs they be, then

1 let's build some culverts. And let's let them fish flow.

2 And again, I'll say I've packed in every damn spot in  
3 this blue mountain this is. There ain't a place I ain't put a  
4 horse on or a footprint on. And I remember when the salmon  
5 were up on Wannaha and you couldn't even throw a line out there  
6 to catch your bobber, and it's extinct anymore. And the reason  
7 is is because of the dams. I won't say it isn't, but don't  
8 take our livelihood away that the Federal Government took  
9 away. Do not breach those dams. Build them culverts. And put  
10 some people to work, all these people!

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Johnny. Is Tom here? How  
12 about Tony? Doug Litchfield?

13 MR. LITCHFIELD: Thank you for sticking with us tonight.  
14 My name is Doug Litchfield. I've been a Valley resident for 47  
15 years here. I just don't want -- I want to go on record  
16 opposing the breaching of any of the lower Snake River dams.

17 Albert Einstein once said his nearest the best friend was  
18 his garbage can. Many different groups can't seem to agree on  
19 what theory might work best for these fish. Well, I'm not  
20 willing to risk future employment on someone's theory.

21 Let's not be rushed into this so-called fast fix. There  
22 are other less costly solutions than breaching these dams.  
23 Thank you for your time.

24 MS. WILLIAMS: Keba Fitzgerald?

25 MS. FITZGERALD: My name is Keba Fitzgerald, and I want

1 to thank you for your commitment to hear our voices tonight and  
2 staying for the long haul.

3 I am a wildlife biologist and conservationist ecologist  
4 who has worked throughout the Pacific Northwest on numerous  
5 endangered species projects within the last seven years. And I  
6 can't believe I get to witness this phenomenal time where we  
7 have this opportunity to really turn -- turn the world around  
8 and really come back and protect the species and give it life  
9 again.

10 We live in phenomenal times, and that we are finally  
11 courageous enough to consider a project so bold as to breach  
12 the four lower Snake River dams. Bypassing these dams offers  
13 our threatened endangered salmon species 80 to 99 percent  
14 probability of recovery. And we have come to realize that the  
15 current practices of barging fish around the dams is not  
16 working. It has not offered the salmon species a chance of  
17 recovering from the brink of extinction.

18 The decline of the salmon equates to the loss of a  
19 precious symbol for the Northwest, the erosion of environmental  
20 quality and serious economic loss for the region. We have  
21 invested billions of dollars in salmon recovery efforts for the  
22 last 20 years, and these efforts have not been successful in  
23 preventing a steady decline in the salmon populations.

24 It is excessively expensive to try to stimulate nature.  
25 These efforts have not worked, and it is time to move on to

1 something that will.

2           The Federal, State, Tribal industry and independent  
3 scientists all agree that partial removal of these dams is the  
4 only way to save the salmon. And this is the best biological  
5 option for the fish.

6           Fish belong in the river, not in trucks, not in barges.  
7 They belong in the river. Let nature take care of that.

8           Salmon are keystone species of the Northwest. It's time  
9 for us to see sustaining the plants and animals and ecosystem  
10 of the humans by their very presence. They will do well only  
11 if the ecological systems that they are a part of are working.  
12 Technology, no matter how ingenious it is, is no substitute for  
13 a healthy ecosystem.

14           Salmon will recover only to the extent that restore the  
15 ecological conditions in which the fish involved as a species.  
16 We must begin a critical look of healing our watersheds and  
17 restoring the river ecosystems.

18           Columbia Basin's salmon recovery legal obligation and a  
19 duty of the United States under several Legislative acts and  
20 treaties signed the basis of the American Indian tribes. The  
21 Endangered Species Act provides that the endangered species,  
22 like the Snake River salmon, be protected in their natural  
23 habitat.

24           MS. WILLIAMS: I need you to wrap it up, please.

25           MS. FITZGERALD: All right. My point is that we can have

1 a clean and providing environment and strong economy without  
2 having to choose one over the other. And this requires that we  
3 act on the courage of our times to restore the lower Snake  
4 River to the vibrant ecosystem it once was. Thank you.

5 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is Brett Flodin here? How  
6 about Phil? How about Theresa Kunch? I can't read the next  
7 name from the Potlatch Corporation? Okay. How about Paul  
8 Simpson? How about Randy Hammond? How about Lizabeth Edlund?

9 MS. EDLUND: I'm here. Finally. My name is Lizabeth  
10 Edlund, and I am a citizen of Idaho. I am also a state  
11 employee of Idaho, but I'm not speaking for Idaho. But I do  
12 want to say I am a hard working, taxpaying, relatively  
13 law-abiding citizen. I did come down on a bus because my  
14 meager salary from the state I cannot afford my own car.

15 But I was born and raised here in the Pacific Northwest,  
16 and I love it here. I was raised in single parent family, and  
17 I watched my mother struggle to keep her family together while  
18 her good paying job with a good company was replaced by a  
19 computer. So I certainly understand the struggles of hard  
20 working families who are afraid of the changes that this could  
21 possibly bring. But I also understand that humans are  
22 adaptable, and we adapted. And we are still here, and we still  
23 love this area very deeply, my entire family.

24 I love the people here, the natural beauty. I love the  
25 wildlife, and I believe that anybody who chooses to live here

1 feels similarly. And I believe that we all want to preserve  
2 our ways of life and our region's natural beauty so that we can  
3 take our children hiking and fishing and hunting and teach them  
4 about the beauty of the places that we love.

5         And because of this I feel that four lower Snake River  
6 dams do not make sense. I feel that they do not make sense  
7 ecologically or economically costing us vibrant fish runs as  
8 well as over three billion dollars in failed recovery  
9 measures. That doesn't make sense. These dams don't make  
10 sense for the people of the Pacific Northwest either.

11         They have destroyed our heritage, and they have deprived  
12 future generations of a natural treasure. Future generations  
13 that I work with every day. I am dedicated. I am dedicated to  
14 the children, to our children, to your children, and the life  
15 that they can have in this region.

16         This region, its ecosystems and the people who live here  
17 need wild freely migrating salmon, but beyond that, this  
18 region's ecosystems and people need wild free-flowing rivers.

19         And a point I would like to bring up I haven't heard  
20 mentioned yet is regarding the silt. People worry about the  
21 silt being washed down. Well, that silt is trapped because  
22 it's supposed to go down river and the estuaries the salmon  
23 need and the beaches of the coast are eroding severely.

24         What will happen when that silt is released? Will that  
25 benefit those ecosystems that are downstream that here in Idaho

1 we don't have much connection with? We don't see the ocean.  
2 But I know people who live out there, and the ecosystem that  
3 they love so dearly are being washed away into the sea because  
4 our sediments are not reaching them. Will this help them?  
5 Because it is a connected system, and nobody has mentioned  
6 that. And I would like to see that discussed.

7           So, basically, I would like to summarize by asking you to  
8 take action now to restore our natural heritage. Restore our  
9 salmon, and restore our rivers. Bypass the dams. Thank you.

10           MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is Greg Barnes here?

11           MR. BARNES: Hi. My name is Greg Barnes. I'm a third  
12 generation Idahoan. I have lived 40 years in this valley.  
13 First, I guess, my first thing to say, General, are you the one  
14 in charge of this mess?

15           GEN. STROCK: Sort of.

16           MR. BARNES: Well, being an ex-Marine, I know how the  
17 Army operates. But this whole thing is screwed up because you  
18 guys made sure you got the smallest venue you could. There was  
19 2,000 people here tonight. There's only 400 seats and the  
20 environmentalists beat us coming down here because we had to  
21 work. We got to work for a living. I've got to feed my kids.  
22 I got to pay my bills. Are they going to pay them for me? I  
23 don't think so.

24           You know, you guys sit up there and say, well, yeah, we  
25 are going to have this meeting no matter what, but what about

1 the rest of the people that didn't get to come? I stuck it  
2 out. I got to go to work in four hours. I have been up 20  
3 hours.

4 Now, you going to help me out later on when you guys pull  
5 these dams out? I doubt it. Because it will be just like  
6 everything else around here. You're on your own, bud. Well,  
7 that's about all I got to say.

8 I just want to say I don't support pulling the dams out.  
9 I don't support you guys for one thing. I think you guys are  
10 all selling this country down the tubes. Thank you.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is Wayne Wood, Sr. here? How  
12 about Tom Parkman?

13 MR. PARKMAN: Woke me up. Okay, I'm going to go. Turn  
14 on the green light. I am Tom Parkman. I am speaking directly  
15 about dam breaching. I am a Valley resident, and I recreate  
16 and fish in the local rivers. If reducing or even stopping my  
17 fishing is necessary to benefit the fish, I'm willing to do  
18 this. I'm going to jump around a little bit.

19 I know the Corps are smart people. I know you've already  
20 discussed every issue that I will mention, but I'm going to  
21 mention it anyway. I know the politics enter the final  
22 decision. As a sideline, I believe we are all related from one  
23 seed, whether we are classified as Nez Perce, black or white.  
24 That's not the issue. It's what's the right decision.

25 I am a staunch environmentalist, not one blind the falls

1 whoever happens to have a popular vote at the time. I listen  
2 to the facts and opinions available, and I use common sense to  
3 reach a decision. And I ask the Corps to do the same thing. I  
4 ask they use their common sense. Stand up and support a good,  
5 reasonable and fact-based decision.

6 At this time I say this because I'm always open to new  
7 information. I am opposed to any proposal to remove the dams  
8 from the Snake or Columbia Rivers. There is simply no facts  
9 that show salmon recovery will be significantly improved by  
10 this action. There are facts that show that many people in the  
11 industry would be adversely affected. The word adversely packs  
12 quite a wallop when you consider all the recreation, farming,  
13 transportation, paper, power, flood control, many others too  
14 numerous to mention in a short talk.

15 In fact, covering any one of these take weeks to come  
16 anywhere near understanding the negative effects brought about  
17 by removal of the dams.

18 I have heard people say that the government will mitigate  
19 the financial impacts of possible dam removal. I have news for  
20 you guys. We are the government. The government is not a  
21 provider. What you are basically saying is I'm going to have  
22 to help myself. I already know that. You didn't have to tell  
23 me that.

24 The removal of these dams would be a huge ecological  
25 mistake. There is no doubt that the ecology of these river

1 systems have changed since these dams were installed, as there  
2 are changes that happen with any natural occurring event. The  
3 unavoidable fact is that nature has found a new balance and any  
4 change may have unanticipated and possibly disastrous effects  
5 on the system as it now stands.

6           There are facts and statistics showing the measurable  
7 benefits of many salmon recovery methods. These include dam  
8 modifications, hatcheries, barging, fishing limitations, just  
9 to name a few.

10           There are no facts of measurable benefits behind dam  
11 removal only conflicting studies, estimates, and educated and  
12 many times uneducated guesses. Just one of the many negative  
13 effects of dam removal would be the loss of the clean, cheap,  
14 renewable power generated by these dams.

15           This power would unnecessarily be generated by the only  
16 viable method -- the only present viable method which would be  
17 nonrenewable fossil fuel: coal, oil, and gas. Nuclear power  
18 has been forced out by government regulations. Dams are the  
19 same way.

20           There are no new clean commercially viable technologies  
21 to make up for our loss. These plants would spew out huge  
22 amounts of additional air pollution and greenhouse acids which  
23 will adversely affect our climate. They would also --

24           MS. WILLIAMS: I need you to wrap it up, Tom.

25           MR. PARKMAN: Okay. I'll just summarize, then. In

1 summary, I think we all believe that helping salmon is a good  
2 thing. There are many known and probably many yet to be  
3 discovered methods to aid us in doing this. Maybe get into  
4 this with our government. Don't be lead down a path with no  
5 factual or guaranteed benefits, and so many factual known  
6 devastating effects to the environment and to business and to  
7 the economy which relates to we, the people. Thank you.

8 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is Don Spence here? How about  
9 Gary McKenna? How about Eric Ewert? Going down the list.  
10 Phil Brown? Jody Forgey? Elwin Hutchins? Left, okay. Paul  
11 Hirt? Chris Cavanaugh? Carrol Lobotz? Bill Mulligan? Eric  
12 Jensen? Sara Ewert? Denise Metz? Nick Johnson? Mike Munden?  
13 All right.

14 MR. MUNDEN: Yes. My name is Mike Munden. I have lived  
15 in this Valley all my life. I was born and raised, and I live  
16 here. I went to college for two years on the coast and came  
17 back. I am married. My lovely wife comes from the coast. She  
18 was supported by timber dollars in her education. My daughter  
19 goes to school here at LC. She wishes to be a counselor and  
20 wants to work with young kids which I can say is an honorable  
21 profession and she is able to do that because she is supported  
22 by timber dollars as well.

23 I'm not going to bore you with lots of statistics.  
24 General, I can't say that I'm going to come at you with  
25 anything new because I'm a passionate man. I love people, and

1 I think what gets lost in all this is people.

2 I've only heard one person here tonight when he mentioned  
3 the All-H, that there was no H there for humans being. Well, I  
4 want somebody to consider me when they sit down in their office  
5 back in Washington, back in Boise, you know, over in Seattle,  
6 wherever this is based on, and I want somebody to really sit  
7 down and think about the impact that this will have on human  
8 beings when this is done.

9 If you're going to make this kind of decision with the  
10 stroke of a pen because it's some kind of government regulation  
11 then I'm sorry, you need to remove yourself and find some other  
12 profession to be in because you are definitely impacting human  
13 beings.

14 I cannot support dam breaching or augmentation because I  
15 can't take 49 million dollars, I believe, a year for 100 years  
16 on something that might help fish. If we are going to do a  
17 might, then take some of the money and please try to, you know,  
18 prevent salmon elimination. But then, you know, for me, take  
19 the rest of the money because I find the sanctity of human life  
20 for more precious than fish.

21 So take the money and use it on Aids research, on cancer  
22 research, on, you know, help for unwed mothers, for, you know,  
23 alcoholism and drug abuse. The sanctity of human life has to  
24 rise above fish.

25 Someone here earlier said: Do we have the right to

1 eliminate a fish? God no. I don't want to eliminate a fish.  
2 It's a magnificent animal, but when it comes time for that  
3 tough decision does saving that fish rise above the sanctity of  
4 human life? No, it does not. And that's when people have to  
5 have the character and the wherewithal when it comes for that  
6 tough decision to say: I have to save human beings.

7 I have been out fishing. I've seen those salmon go  
8 through the water. I have caught some salmon. I have caught  
9 many a steelhead. It's a wonderful experience, but why?  
10 Because I spent that time with another human being when I  
11 caught it. No fish I have ever caught, no animal that I have  
12 been able to shoot, no bird I have been able to capture has  
13 ever given me the thrill of spending time with human beings.  
14 Seeing my child warm. Spending time with my dad when he had a  
15 stroke and taking care of him. Spending time with my father  
16 when he was actually dying.

17 Time with human beings, the sanctity of human life we  
18 seem to have lost when we make these type of decisions.  
19 Please, when you go home and you spend time, I know for some of  
20 you in prayer, do not forget about human life. When you spend  
21 time in contemplation, real quick, please do not forget about  
22 human life.

23 I want to save fish. I will help you. My name is on the  
24 list. Send me what you want me to do. I will help. I do not  
25 want to get rid of fish, but I also want to save human life.

1 Thank you very much.

2 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is Barney Metz here? How  
3 about Uno Johnson?

4 MR. JOHNSON: My name is Uno Johnson. I'm a lifelong  
5 resident of the State of Idaho, except for two years with the  
6 military in '52 and '54. I have a book here that says  
7 Controversy, Conflict, Compromise, the history of the lower  
8 Snake River Development. I will read a few words from it:  
9 Attempts to preserve the fishing resources began in 1877, not  
10 1977. This is before the dams were here. There was a problem  
11 long before the dams were put in. When Washington territory  
12 imposed a salmon season on the Columbia Oregon followed the  
13 similar regulations the next years.

14 Both states passed laws regulating the type of gear  
15 fishers could use, eventually outlawing fish wheels, traps and  
16 screens. Concerns over the faith of the salmon and steelhead  
17 also spawned a patchwork of conservation groups.

18 I am not for removing the dams at this present time. I  
19 may later on, if I feel the salmon cannot be saved by any other  
20 means. But if you remove the dams now you are going to have  
21 one problem, you're going to have the silt that goes down and  
22 that will probably kill a lot of them. If it don't, you have  
23 the wrong science.

24 The way they are doing in the forest now you can't drive  
25 across the creek, you can't drive across the wet part because

1 it will harm the fish. They are putting in process a  
2 regulation that will impose a \$50,000 fine and a one-year jail  
3 sentence on the small timber owner.

4 Now this is not going to help the fish. It's going to  
5 change the ownership of the land in this part of the country.  
6 And I didn't serve two years in the Army for that. Thank you.

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is Lyle Maynard here?

8 MR. MAYNARD: Yes. Thank you. My name is Lyle Maynard,  
9 and I live here in Lewiston. Work in Lewiston. And I would  
10 like to associate my remarks with those of Mike Munden who  
11 spoke eloquently for remembering humans in this equation.

12 I would like to go on record as being opposed to  
13 breaching dams because that nature or that approach would not  
14 also be good for humans. It would be harmful to the human  
15 beings.

16 Even if you could convince me that destroying dams gave  
17 the salmon their best chance, I would still reject it because  
18 that measure is not kind to humans. We must find measures that  
19 will be good for humans. Fortunately, I believe there are some  
20 measures out there that would work.

21 Some people have spoken about predation and human  
22 harvest. It's amazing to me that you have come before us  
23 asking us to breach the dams, quit our jobs and put our  
24 livelihoods at risk when we still take, harvest, capture fish  
25 for endangered species. It's the only endangered species that

1 we can take. You shoot a bear, shoot a spotted owl you'll be  
2 fined, maybe jailed. Here, we harvest the fish. We protect  
3 the predators. We protect the terns. We protect the sea lions  
4 and the seals. We just allow them to feed away.

5           The National Marine Fisheries and I believe the Oregon  
6 State University studies and others have shown that the terns  
7 and birds will eat up to 20 to 25 percent of the smolts. If  
8 there's 100 million smolts running through our river systems,  
9 that's 20, 25 million smolt that the birds are eating. If just  
10 five percent of those could survive the ocean stay and return  
11 to our river, you know, that's what, a million fish. Just that  
12 alone, I doubt that we would even be meeting here tonight.

13           National Marine Fisheries said if we could eliminate ten  
14 percent of the fish that are killed by sea lions and seals, we  
15 could probably recover, you know, the spring summer Chinook  
16 run. If we reduce the harvest of the fall Chinook by 50  
17 percent, according to the National Marine Fisheries Service, we  
18 could probably recover that run.

19           I would encourage you to try everything you could to get  
20 Congress to give you a legal take permit on these creatures to  
21 put a bounty on them. We do that with northern pike now. Just  
22 need to put a bounty on other predators. And let's give that a  
23 try, and then come back and we'll talk about breaching later if  
24 that doesn't work. But it seems to me that would be a common  
25 sense solution to try before we ask people to risk their

1 livelihoods and their economic social welfare. Thanks very  
2 much.

3 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is Richard Langstaff here?

4 MR. LANGSTAFF: I appreciate this opportunity to address  
5 your assembly. I think that it bears -- that we need to bear  
6 in mind what we are seeing is the results of causes and  
7 conditions that were sanctioned by a culture which, for better  
8 or worse, over the period of our history has done pretty much  
9 what we want to at the expense of anything that gets in our  
10 way.

11 And even if we do end up with data -- I see data coming  
12 from both sides, and a lot of it very convincing. But when we  
13 get down to it, whether the dams are breached or not there is a  
14 cultural -- a pattern of cultural resource exploration that  
15 needs to be addressed and needs to be shifted to a more  
16 sustainable means of extracting what we need to live.

17 As a civilization United States of America has led the  
18 world in industrial development. That very spirit we put out  
19 there, the fossil fuel subsidy to produce agricultural products  
20 to expect the resources including fisheries has been used to  
21 desecrate fisheries around the world, and those people are  
22 coming and plundering our fisheries today.

23 Whether it's dams, I don't know. But there are an awful  
24 lot of foreign fleets off our shores, and I see billions of  
25 dollars being spent down on the southern border of the United

1 States to stop immigrant laborers from taking jobs that  
2 Americans won't do.

3       But there's very little that's being done to stop the  
4 plundering of resource which we treasure not as our personal  
5 property, but the fact that we should protect it. These  
6 beings, for lack of a better analogy, are American citizens,  
7 and we enjoy the fruits there. And the people we have is also  
8 the Canadians, other people on our shores, not people coming in  
9 from 2,000 miles away add a huge fossil fuel subsidy, I might  
10 add, plunder this resource and take it back over.

11       If we endeavor to help these societies sustain --  
12 establish a sustainable aquaculture that make it more  
13 economically feasible for them to stay in their own waters and  
14 farm what they need, we know the ocean is the next exploding  
15 cornucopia as it were. I mean, if people would eat krill we'd  
16 probably have enough for everybody's full.

17       To the economic factors, the government didn't address it  
18 when they started going for cutting back on timber harvest.  
19 There wasn't enough effort, and they are trying to get people  
20 into other ways of pursuing a living. It isn't going to be  
21 easy, but the fact is the pattern has to change. The pattern  
22 will change. It changed from when the dams went in to now.  
23 It's going to change from now until the salmon are gone or  
24 they're restored. But it's up to us, the citizens, to put  
25 together the most coherent picture we can and make decisions

1 that, much like the Iroquois nation, make a decision -- when  
2 they made a decision to council five nations they thought that  
3 they had to be culpable for their decision to the 7th  
4 generation in the future.

5 That's sustainable, and we can reach out to the rest of  
6 the world and show them how civilization can go from being an  
7 exploiter to get to where they are at, to maybe showing them  
8 ways that they can sustainably develop their counties.

9 What we are doing here is going to set a precedent  
10 because these other systems that follow us in building dam  
11 systems are going to be confronted with very similar problems.  
12 Sorry to run over a little bit, but the fact is we can set  
13 precedent on how these problems can be handled. Thank you very  
14 much for your time.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is Paula Elskamp here?

16 MS. ELSKAMP: My name is Paula Elskamp, and I have been a  
17 resident of this Valley for pretty much my entire life. I  
18 begin, like everybody else, I really thank you for your time.  
19 And you have my deepest sympathy for your situation and the  
20 hours you are putting in.

21 I just want to go on record as saying that I oppose the  
22 breaching of the dams, and I oppose Alternative 4. I believe  
23 that in making this decision to spend almost a billion dollars,  
24 if the facts that I was given are correct, which are  
25 disputable, I suppose, by anyone. You know, that's a huge

1 amount of money, and that decision can't be made and can't be  
2 taken any lighter than any corporation in America who would be  
3 spending that kind of money on a capital project.

4       When you make an investment of that kind you will get  
5 three main things: The first thing that you is you make sure  
6 you've exhausted all the gimmies. By eliminating all those  
7 things that are really easy to do that are low risk and that  
8 will have a possible impact quickly. Have you really done  
9 that?

10       I mean, I agree with some of the comments that were  
11 made. You know, we are in a technological revolution. We have  
12 enormous capabilities. We can send people to the moon. Are  
13 you telling me we can't have dams and have salmon at the same  
14 time? You know. I'm astounded that argument has been used to  
15 say that we can survive as people if we breach the dams because  
16 we have the technology we can find alternative methods to  
17 transport our goods. I agree, but can't we also have a dam and  
18 also have a salmon too? I believe we can find a way.

19       The second thing that you need to consider, obviously, is  
20 in the benefit. What is the benefit of what it is we are  
21 proposing to do relative to breaching the dams? You know, I  
22 walked around and listened to now four hours of people going  
23 back and fourth. And I agree with -- I'm going to plagiarize  
24 this gentleman's comments. Probably poorly. If I do, I  
25 apologize. But he basically said scientist have become slaves

1 for our emotions and our personal preferences, and I believe  
2 that.

3 Another thing, you can look at the science any way you  
4 want. You can say that it's for or it's against, and I don't  
5 know. I really don't at this point, you know. After listening  
6 to everybody and after talking to people, I don't really know.  
7 But I'm not convinced that it is there. To spend a billion  
8 dollars I want to be convinced that it is there, and it is  
9 going to do something.

10 The third thing you have to do is look at the risk. I  
11 won't talk about the risk. You know what the risk is. You  
12 know what the impact is on transportation. You know what the  
13 impact is on people's lives and you know what the impact is on  
14 the salmon.

15 You know, I want to make it very clear that I'm an  
16 environmentalist, and I believe that. You know, I care very  
17 much about the environment. I care very much about what  
18 happens to our habitat. I love the environment as much as  
19 anybody. I would give anything to be able to spend my life out  
20 in the forest, just that. I would love to do that. The  
21 serenity and the solitude that it provides. But, you know, I  
22 think that sometimes we believe that we can turn the world to  
23 where it was before we came here. And we can't do that because  
24 we are here, and we are going to have an impact. But we have  
25 to minimize that impact.

1 I believe we can do that, and I believe we have the  
2 technology to do it. I believe we can have both the dams and  
3 we can have salmon recovery. So let's take the one million  
4 dollars and let's put it on that. And let's get some people to  
5 really solve that problem.

6 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is Ann Williams here? How  
7 about Bill Daily? I absolutely can't read this. I apologize.  
8 Somebody from Potlatch, and the phone number is 208-743-5626.  
9 Does that ring a bell? You'll call them? Thank you. Is Anna  
10 Sherwood here? How about Jerry Wischmeier? Bill Slempe?

11 MR. SLEMP: Right here. First off, I would like to say  
12 you guys have been great sitting here and going through the  
13 pros and cons of this whole debate.

14 Next, I don't work for Potlatch. I don't have anything  
15 to do with sports, but I can't imagine that you want to rip the  
16 dams out. It seems amazing to me that if we have the  
17 technology to put man in space and have him survive in space,  
18 that we can't work something to get the fish to survive with  
19 the dams. I don't know. That's about all I have to say.  
20 Thank you.

21 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is Raynelle George here? How  
22 about Bayles Brancher, Sr.? Senator McLaughlin? Dale Berg?  
23 Wayne Myers? Tim Cavileer? Are you Tim?

24 MR. CAVILEER: Yes.

25 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Great.

1           MR. CAVILEER: Thank you. My name is Tim Cavileer, and I  
2 speak only for myself. And I am here for selfish reasons. My  
3 day started by delivering two of my daughters to school and  
4 then go to work and come back. And I have to deliver a third  
5 one to preschool. Pick her up. Go back to work. Do some more  
6 stuff. Work until about 6:00, and then get down here about  
7 8:30. So I appreciate your being here and also listening to my  
8 testimony.

9           I would like to say that I am a part of this community.  
10 I work. I play. I pay taxes, and I support my community. I  
11 am here, and I have stayed late because I think it's  
12 important. And I want to go on record saying that I support  
13 breaching the dams and recovering the salmon and steelhead.

14           I'm a research scientist. I give my life, my time, my  
15 efforts in support of the ag-community. Science, I know from  
16 experience, can say whatever you want it to say, and so I won't  
17 bore you with scientific details. You probably have had enough  
18 of that already.

19           I write grants. I do research. I make bigger and better  
20 and healthier peas and lentils for the ag-community. Every  
21 year I wonder whether I'll have a job for the next year. So I  
22 know job insecurity. I also know that it can depend on the  
23 fickle nature of the politicians and commodity groups.

24           However, I do want to say that I support breaching the  
25 dams and recovering the salmon.

1 I'm also a fisher, politically correct. A husband, a  
2 father. Have three daughters, one that has a severe  
3 disability. Five years ago I stood in a room up at St. Joe  
4 Medical Center wondering whether she was going to live or die.  
5 I looked out on the community or on the landscape, and I just  
6 tried to imagine what life would be like. And I just tried to  
7 relax and to get my mind off of the crisis at hand. And I  
8 really couldn't.

9 It wasn't until about two weeks later that -- after I had  
10 released my third fish kneeling in a stream that I realized  
11 that the fish, the streams were connected, and that they were  
12 my support group. And so, to you, I would say I don't want to  
13 lose that support group. I don't want to lose that therapeutic  
14 effect. And I am here for selfish reasons: my sanity, my  
15 therapy, my restoration, and my support group again.

16 So, with that I would like to say that I support  
17 breaching the dams and also restoring the salmon and steelhead  
18 runs. Thank you.

19 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. How's everybody doing? Okay?  
20 As you can tell we are kind of going through this kind of  
21 quickly so we are definitely going to get to everyone pretty  
22 soon. We are down to about five people now. So, well done for  
23 sticking with us. Is Roy Kinder here?

24 MR. KINDER: My name is Roy Kinder, and I am also an  
25 endangered species. But I got the history to prove it. About

1 six years ago I got a letter from Larry LaRocco. And I wrote  
2 this letter to him and I want to read it to you.

3 I have been here 12 years, I feel, anyway. I was raised  
4 in Wyoming. Spent four years in the Navy, two and a half years  
5 in Vietnam, one and a half years on Kodiak Island in Alaska. I  
6 know about salmon there, but that's not the point. The point  
7 is the people.

8 I graduated from the University of Wyoming. I went back  
9 on the GI Bill. I got an education. I went to teach school,  
10 and I was not a good teacher. Two years later I was in a  
11 little town called Dubois, Wyoming. That town had -- you could  
12 teach school, you could work at the grocery store or you could  
13 work in the local cannery. That started, the timber died.

14 I left the timber industry. I went down to the booming  
15 uranium industry. Three Mile Island happened. I moved from  
16 the uranium industry to the oil industry, about the time OPEC  
17 was in their biggest days. You will remember that.

18 Three years later the oil industry died. I see I'm going  
19 to have to hurry. When the oil industry died, I started  
20 looking. My brother-in-law told me, well, why don't you go buy  
21 a job. I bought a shop in Lewiston, Idaho where I -- a welding  
22 shop. That welding shop I was in for ten years.

23 I am here, and I want to read this last statement. I had  
24 to go through this very quickly, but I want to read the last  
25 statement. This is what I wrote to Larry LaRocco at the time:

1 I love the western way of life, but we must use the natural  
2 resources available. We must not abuse our forest, our  
3 minerals and our water. Water is our greatest source of cheap  
4 energy. Our dams and energy, irrigation they provide have made  
5 the Northwest food production the envy of the world. We cannot  
6 flush into the sea the fish. If in doing so we lose jobs and  
7 the income and our very way of life.

8 MS. WILLIAMS: I need you to wrap it up.

9 MR. KINDER: Okay. I've got just a little bit. I know  
10 that from the time I spent in the wild and beautiful deserts of  
11 Wyoming and Idaho that we will miss very much, but I also know  
12 that we must move on to bring back the grizzly and the wolf and  
13 the buffalo would be great. But we must learn to mourn the  
14 loss as the Indians mourned the loss of the buffalo on the  
15 Great Plains. We must move into the future with greater care  
16 than we have in the past, but we cannot look back. I will not  
17 keep -- I will not keep going down.

18 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

19 MR. KINDER: Our jobs are important to save those dams.

20 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

21 COURT REPORTER: Can I change paper, please?

22 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Next one coming up is Dick Walker,  
23 is he here? How about Terry Frank? How about Alan Prout? All  
24 right. How about Steve Paulson? As soon as we get the paper  
25 changed we'll be ready.

1           MR. PAULSON: I'm Steve Paulson. I'm a board member of  
2 the Friends of Clearwater. I would like to thank you for this  
3 opportunity to speak. If I get the opportunity, I'll be able  
4 to tell my grandkids that I spoke for natural ecosystems, fish,  
5 and natural rivers.

6           I just got off work a little bit ago. Have to work again  
7 tomorrow. I'm a 4th generation Idahoan. My ancestors taught  
8 me to respect people, different ideas, fish and animals.

9           When I was young we couldn't imagine there would be a day  
10 like this when there were no fish in the river. They are an  
11 important part of our lives. I haven't caught a Chinook in ten  
12 years. Probably about seven years on a steelhead.

13          The industry took that away from me. Took it away from  
14 my family. Took it away from my children and grandkids. Drift  
15 nets, the dams, the logging and the grazing. If there's only  
16 the best opportunity to bring that back is to remove the dams,  
17 I'm totally in favor of taking all those dams up.

18          I think that that's probably not going to be enough,  
19 though. I think probably realistically you should consider  
20 taking out at least Browning, Dworshak, and Tuskaluska because  
21 those dams -- we built more fish ladders and a tremendous  
22 amount of habitat behind those dams. Probably needs to be  
23 rehabilitated, too.

24          I think that the ocean harvest should be severely limited  
25 and the habitat, the spawning habitat, needs to be put back in

1 order. The gravel needs to be back there. The temperature  
2 needs to be there. And I would like to point out that's going  
3 to take a lot of jobs. There's going to be a lot of jobs made  
4 by that. I don't see any loss in things to do for people  
5 around here just because we don't have dams. The people are  
6 adaptable. The fish aren't. Thanks a lot.

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Rich?

8 MR. EAGLESTON: My name is Rich Eagleston, and I  
9 appreciate you being here. However, I'm not quite as  
10 sympathetic as some of the people mentioned. I presume you are  
11 doing something you love. I think the problem is still on the  
12 payrolls. It can't be too bad.

13 Two things: One, I'm sure has been addressed by the  
14 various biologists, and I haven't been able to follow the  
15 techniques used with moving the smolts down the river. But if  
16 a same barge has not been employed it would assimilate more of  
17 a natural environment of the fish and move them more quickly  
18 without the confines of the regular steal barge that may assist  
19 some of the efforts.

20 I am actually trying to not -- I understand you are not  
21 here to give votes to the people pros and cons and looking for  
22 suggestions. One suggestion I would have, it seems that most  
23 of the concern from the individuals certainly in this community  
24 is with regard to what will happen. How will things be  
25 mitigated. And it appears that the dollars spent in the

1 previous studies haven't specifically addressed that.

2 I think in order to address that, I think individual  
3 industries in this community and others affected, and even  
4 individual people that if they don't feel they fit a particular  
5 industry, if I don't feel I'm part of Potlatch or I'm part of  
6 Lewiston Grain Growers or whatever, should actually put  
7 together a study of what do I think it will cost me,  
8 particularly, specifically, in how many dollars, how many  
9 years.

10 And when those numbers are on the table, then we can  
11 start to make decisions about can we do it, is it smart to do  
12 it. But a lot of numbers are thrown out. I agree with  
13 everybody who says, whose scientists are you going to follow,  
14 whose numbers are you going to follow. I don't think that's  
15 the way to go, but specifically go to the individual industries  
16 and individual people. Find out how much it costs. What they  
17 project it will cost, and use that as your starting point.  
18 Thank you.

19 MS. WILLIAMS: General?

20 GEN. STROCK: Do any of the panel members want to say  
21 anything? Bill, you haven't had a chance to say anything about  
22 Fish and Wildlife or BPA or --

23 MS. WILLIAMS: Do you have a question? Do you want to  
24 talk?

25 MR. FOUSE: I'll listen first.

1           GEN. STROCK: Go ahead. I'm going to say goodnight.

2           MS. WILLIAMS: Can you give me your name?

3           MR. FOUSE: Yes. My name is Robert Fouse. I'm a native  
4 son of Asotin County. I've spent a large part of my life not  
5 living in this county, but I was raised along this river. And  
6 I have returned to it, and there is some things that bother me  
7 about what's going on here.

8           I was kind of raised with some common sense, and I think  
9 we have lost it. I was catching on television two days ago on  
10 PBS they were telling us we are going to get 10,000 jobs  
11 created once the salmon came back.

12           Couple days before that I was reading in the paper that  
13 says people in the City of Portland greatly support removal of  
14 the dams on the lower Snake River. Never said they supported  
15 removing Bonneville Dam or the John Day or The Dalles or the  
16 McNary or the Grand Coulee. They are talking about these  
17 little dams down here on the Snake.

18           30 years ago almost this month I was president of the  
19 Clarkston Jr. Chamber of Commerce, and I held several public  
20 forums here and pleaded with the people in this town not to  
21 allow the Corps of Engineers to build Lower Granite Dam. Not  
22 because of the dam, not because of the reservoir, but the  
23 impact that this would have on this community in the future.

24           You've lost the town of Asotin. Lost a lot of our  
25 property and our homes along this river. This is what we have

1 now. Now we are being asked to drain this reservoir and turn  
2 what was once our homes into a muddy silt bank that's going to  
3 create a great ecological disaster with no proof of what it is  
4 going to do with the salmon.

5           And, yes, I have seen the cycle of the salmon. Raised  
6 along the Grande Ronde and Snake River. I can remember in the  
7 '50s when there were salmon and as the dams in the Columbia  
8 were built they dwindled. They dwindled not when the dams in  
9 the Snake were built, they dwindled with the dams in the  
10 Columbia were built.

11           We have -- as everybody has mentioned, the salmon on the  
12 plates in the restaurant and everybody's freezer, if you want  
13 to do something for the salmon, let's use some common sense.  
14 We put a man on the moon in '68. We can figure out how to get  
15 salmon around these dams. I support that these dams stay.  
16 Thank you.

17           MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Do you want to let however  
18 more people --

19           GEN. STROCK: Yeah. How many more people want to speak?  
20 Sure. I think we can have a couple more.

21           MS. WILLIAMS: Can you give me your name, please, as you  
22 step up.

23           MR. FESCHER: My name is Dirk Fescher. I live in  
24 Lewiston, Idaho. My bias will be pretty obvious. I'm an ag  
25 exporter. I ship especially crops out of here, but I have two

1 comments to the group that I think are maybe a little different  
2 than what some other people have said.

3       Industry in this area has been in limbo since this topic  
4 came up about ten years ago. We've talked about economic  
5 impact. We've had economic impact because we do not invest in  
6 this community in infrastructure until this issue is settled.

7       So, I get real emotional about this, but I would really  
8 like each of you to try and streamline this process and to  
9 reach a decision and tell us where we are headed.

10       We all have opinions. I'm not a scientist. I'm not a  
11 biologist. I love fishing. That's why I live here, but I also  
12 need to make a living and until we solve this, we can't  
13 proceed.

14       I would also like everybody around this issue to be  
15 honest with their objective. I mean, so if their objective is  
16 to put salmon in Jackson Hole Wyoming, then say it. If their  
17 objective is to have salmon come all the way back into Montana,  
18 then say it. If their objective is to leave it as it is, and  
19 don't worry about the fish, say it because we've wasted a lot  
20 of time so far. We haven't saved any fish, and we haven't  
21 built the jobs we might have in this community because of  
22 fish. Thanks.

23       MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Your name, please?

24       MR. DALE: Do I get a green light? Hi. My name is Brian  
25 Dale. I speak for myself. I didn't really have any prepared

1 comments tonight. But I got your book, and it confused me  
2 somewhat. So maybe I'll just use it tonight.

3       As I read through the book and a friend of mine paging  
4 through it and listening to people talk here, it was  
5 interesting because -- it's interesting how we were confused,  
6 and maybe I'll read a bit here. Says turbines: Some juvenile  
7 fish may enter the intake openings of the powerhouse, move with  
8 water through the turbines and exit on the other side. The  
9 fish may experience trauma from pressure changes, turbulent  
10 water conditions, or striking the machinery; however, about 90  
11 to 95 percent of the fish entering the turbines survive past  
12 the dam. So what's the problem?

13       Then I moved on through. Obviously I didn't have a very  
14 good handle on the situation so I used your book. So, I will  
15 take a look at the four alternatives thing, that will help  
16 me. And I looked at that, and I said, well, Alternative 1 -  
17 Existing Conditions, and it says, Action: No reservoir  
18 drawdowns; no major changes to fish passage systems. Effects:  
19 Slight reduction in extinction risks for listed stocks. That's  
20 not very good. So I went to No. 2. That's got to be better.

21       Maximum Transport, it says: No reservoir drawdowns,  
22 maximization of juvenile fish transport. Slight reduction in  
23 extinction risks. That doesn't sound very good to me, so I  
24 moved on down.

25       Major System Improvements. Somebody's got more money

1 here. No reservoir drawdowns; installation of surface  
2 collectors; optimized voluntary spill. And again, a slight  
3 reduction in extinction risks.

4 I guess the last one is going to be to some benefit to  
5 help us. Dam breaching. That one's going to have some meaning  
6 after I read it, I figured. Removal of dam embankment, here we  
7 go, elimination of reservoirs; shut down of navigation lock;  
8 bunch of stuff. So I figured, by God, we are going to get  
9 somewhere. Moderate reduction in extinction risks for fall  
10 Chinook and steelhead, slight reduction in extinction risks for  
11 spring summer Chinook. Sounds like four ideas that don't do  
12 it.

13 So I moved on to. Something is wrong here. So I look  
14 now, and I said, well, here, this one, page 22, CRI analysis  
15 suggests that this alternative is likely to be sufficient for  
16 recovery of fall Chinook and steelhead, but only if the  
17 survival below Bonneville Dam, as result of this action,  
18 increases by at least 20 percent.

19 So I guess my point that I am making by reading through  
20 all this stuff is that it's really -- obviously, this ain't  
21 complete, and the whole thing isn't considered here because  
22 let's look a little further. We'll go to Effects on Vegetation  
23 and Wildlife and talk about and make people that have mentioned  
24 the problem with silting on the sidewalk. Well, we all know  
25 what's going to happen.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Brian, I need you to wrap it up.

2 MR. DALE: All right. Star thistle is my concern. Heck  
3 of a problem with star thistle. We haven't been able to get  
4 rid of it, and we never will. Thank you for your time.

5 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

6 GEN. STROCK: By the way, the fellow back there, raise  
7 your hand, Greg, that guy can answer all your questions right  
8 back there. Listen, I want to thank a number of people here:  
9 the moderator, Stacey. Kristi Evans, I think this is the real  
10 hero tonight over here. (Applause.) She signed up for a  
11 10:30, and she's been thriving on here. She might be one of  
12 the Marines we were looking for earlier. She is actually  
13 catching every word that's been said tonight.

14 I was actually sitting up here thinking about the L.A.  
15 Rams moving to St. Louis. She has really been wonderful, so  
16 thank you very much. And my fellow panel members, I really  
17 appreciate you all being here and helping this process.

18 But most of all for you people, I want to sort of retract  
19 something I said earlier because I really feel we came back in  
20 that last session. I kind of dampened some things here, and  
21 this has three purposes as we started out:

22 One is to pick up new stuff we might have missed in our  
23 study. That's a piece of it. The other is to clarify your  
24 questions, and the third is to hear your views and listen to  
25 you. That is a very important element of this thing to

1 understand your values, in addition to the little hard bits of  
2 science. So, I really did overstate that.

3 I just want to make sure that everybody that was  
4 concerned about the people's voices being heard here, that we  
5 have different ways of looking at it and considering all the  
6 input. So if I did dampen anybody's passion or gave the  
7 impression we're not really listening to what you are saying,  
8 we really are.

9 The last point, we are not here to answer questions and  
10 all that stuff in this process, but the business of the 95  
11 percent, if you get 95 percent through one dam, 95 percent of  
12 those through the second, 95 and so on, you'll be down to 60  
13 percent by the time you get through eight dams. So that's how  
14 that works. And we don't have a conclusion there, and the  
15 answer, slight and moderate results shows us, we think, that  
16 there is no silver bullet. Dams alone will not do this. It's  
17 got to be habitat. It's got to be harvest and hatcheries.  
18 They are components of all these things.

19 UNKNOWN MALE: I agree, but your book doesn't say much  
20 more than the four options.

21 GEN. STROCK: That's because we were stuck at -- we were  
22 supposed to figure out passages through the hydrosystem as the  
23 passage. This is where it comes in, the All-H Paper.  
24 (Unknown laughing.) That's why we are doing this process, and  
25 that's why I really welcome having the All-H Paper here to set

1 the context. This really, I think, is where that passion and  
2 your opinion and values come in because what this is going to  
3 take, the All-H Process, is a mix of all those measures.

4         And we are getting a sense tonight on just how far you  
5 are willing to go in each of these things because they are all  
6 going to be a bit painful. We know what profit folks think  
7 about harvest limitation. We know what you nonprofit folks  
8 think about harvest limitation. So we are beginning to frame  
9 sort of a sense of the possibilities here as we search  
10 different people's lives all this framework. So, everything  
11 that was said tonight is very, very, valuable to us.

12         UNKNOWN MALE: In terms of your final recommendation are  
13 you going to be able to and are you allowed to and then,  
14 secondly, are you willing to make, if you see that this is the  
15 appropriate thing to do, make a recommendation for the kind of  
16 economic mitigation if you choose an option, either breaching  
17 or something else, what it's going to cost this region?

18         I mean, would you be willing to go out on a limb and say,  
19 really, this region needs mitigation to the point where there's  
20 no net loss of jobs, and that those jobs that do make a  
21 transition from one thing to another stay at a certain wage  
22 level, living wage or thereabouts?

23         GEN. STROCK: I don't know how specific we can get on  
24 that. Greg, do we have a mechanism when we send our  
25 recommendation over to Congress do we propose a mitigation

1 package or do we let Congress sort of let that light come on?

2 UNKNOWN MALE: I don't know if anybody can hear me, but  
3 in --

4 UNKNOWN FEMALE: Microphone please. Microphone! Please  
5 use the microphone!

6 GEN. STROCK: Please use the microphone, we couldn't hear  
7 you.

8 GREG: That's been an issue, and we tried to address that  
9 from a very conceptual level in the EIS. There's 4300 pages  
10 and a lot of effects on all kinds of different resources and  
11 users of the system. So what we tried to do, for this draft  
12 EIS, is capture the conceptual economic mitigations and maybe  
13 more appropriately economic compensation measures that could be  
14 applied. It's drawn out and recommended as the preferred  
15 alternative. We would like to go a little bit further and dive  
16 into some of the conceptual ideas and measures in a little more  
17 depth.

18 But I'll tell you right now, we have no authority to  
19 implement any of those kind of things. That will have to come  
20 from Congress.

21 UNKNOWN MALE: And the other quick point I would like to  
22 make would simply be, replacement transportation system both  
23 passenger and commercial where a couple of people have spoke  
24 earlier this evening along the lines that really what would  
25 suit this region would be no net loss in terms of cost to

1 commercial shipper in terms of sophistication of the system.

2           You know, I could imagine high speed rail as an  
3 alternative, but it will only sell in this region provided it  
4 represents no net loss to the commercial shippers existing --

5           GEN. STROCK: The goal of both the EIS and the All-H  
6 Paper, one of the sacred goals of the All-H is to minimize the  
7 impacts on the humans in this area. So, we first try to  
8 minimize the impacts. I'm certain that whatever studies we  
9 take, as they do have impacts, there's going to be a tremendous  
10 move to mitigate those people who suffer as a result of that.  
11 I think that will be a component of what the alternate solution  
12 is.

13           UNKNOWN MALE: (Inaudible comments from the back of the  
14 room.)

15           COURT REPORTER: Excuse me --

16           UNKNOWN MALE: (Inaudible.)

17           COURT REPORTER: None of that was on the record.

18           GEN. STROCK: Listen, I think for the benefit of our  
19 court reporter, we better let her get some rest. Personally, I  
20 have to stick around and talk to you guys. I don't want to  
21 speak for my fellows here, but if anyone wants to talk to me  
22 one-on-one, I am certainly up here. Thank you again very much  
23 for complying with this process.

24           (Whereupon the comment session ended at 12:30 a.m.)

25                           - - - - -

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION

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

I, KRISTI LYNN EVANS, CSR NO. 661, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certifies;

That the foregoing proceedings were reported stenographically and recorded electronically;

That the proceedings were then transcribed and typed from the foregoing hearing which was held on the 10th day of February, 2000, to the best of my ability and;

That I am not associated with such hearing in any manner.

Dated this 26th day of February, 2000.

Kristi Lynn Evans, Court Reporter, RPR, CSR  
K & K REPORTING