

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"

SHILO CONFERENCE HOTEL
YELLOWSTONE ROOM
780 LINDSAY AVENUE
IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO 83402

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION
MARCH 7, 2000
6:30 p.m.

REPORTER: KATHERINE McCOY, CSR

CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS
P. O. BOX 51020
IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO 83405
208-529-5491

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

PANEL: CAROLYN WHITNEY
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

BOB RUESINK
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

LT. COL. BILL BULEN
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

MARY LOU SOSCIA
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PAUL WAGNER
NATIONAL FISHERY SERVICE

I N D E X

1			
2	WITNESSES:		
3	#1 -- CLAUDIO BRONCHO	10	
4	#2 -- LARRY BAGLEY	12	
5	#3 -- LEONARD BECK	14	
6	#4 -- J. J. WADSWORTH	17	
7	#5 -- BRAD ELDRIDGE	19	
8	#6 -- MAXINE EDMO	21	
9	#7 -- RON CARLSON	24	
10	#8 -- JERRY BULLOCK	25	
11	#9 -- MARV HOYT	28	
12	#10 - PAT FORD	31	
13	#11 - JERRY SCHEID	33	
14	#12 - ROB GREGOIRE	35	
15	#13 - SUNSHINE CICCONE	37	
16	#14 - JERRY MYERS	39	
17	#15 - JOHN SCHMIDT	42	
18	#16 - NANCY ESCHIEF MURILLO	44	
19	#17 - JIM BOWER	45	
20	#18 - DELL RAYBOULD	46	
21	#19 - ANN SCHROT	48	
22	#20 - GLEN MUNNS	50	
23	#21 - JEFF RAYBOULD	51	
24	#22 - RULON MARCH	53	
25	#23 - LIONEL BOYER	54	

	I N D E X (CONTINUED)	
1		
2	#24 - ED CLARK	57
3	#25 - PETE LIPOVAC	58
4	#26 - CHAD COLTER	61
5	#27 - NATHAN SMALL	63
6	#28 - LYTTLE DENNY	66
7	#29 - KEITH KUTCHINS	68
8	#30 - LOUISE DIXEY	70
9	#31 - DAVE RYDALCH	73
10	#32 - JOHN McCARTHY	75
11	#33 - MARQUETTE BAGLEY	78
12	#34 - LLOYD HICKS	81
13	#35 - BRENT BARRUS	83
14	#36 - LAVERN M. BRONCHO, SR.	85
15	#37 - DALE ROCKWOOD	87
16	#38 - RYAN KEARSLEY	88
17	#38 - MARGERY FULTON	90
18	#40 - LARRY KERBS	90
19	#41 - BOB VESSER	92
20	#42 - DOUG SCHWIEDER	95
21	#43 - DON HALE	96
22	#44 - LANE HANSEN	98
23	#45 - JERRY RIGBY	100
24	#46 - DARREN HUNTSMAN	103
25	#47 - LARRY FULLMER	106

	I N D E X (CONTINUED)	
1		
2	#48 - MATT DARRINGTON	109
3	#49 - KEN RETALLIC	110
4	#50 - KEITH ESPLIN	111
5	#51 - GARTH TOWERSAP	114
6	#52 - TED CHU	116
7	#53 - STEVEN MURDOCK	119
8	#54 - ROB VAN KIRK	121
9	#55 - JEFF BARNEY	124
10	#56 - LYN BENJAMIN	125
11	#57 - PAUL BERGGREN	128
12	#58 - FRED DAVIES	130
13	#59 - LONNIE RACEHORSE	133
14	#60 - JEFF ANDERSON	135
15	#61 - SALLE ENGELHARDT	137
16	#62 - JIM MATHIAS	139
17	#63 - LAWRENCE FORD	142
18	#64 - ROGER BRAY	144
19	#65 - STAN LATIMER	146
20	#66 - JACKIE MAUGHAN	147
21	#67 - CHRIS HAYS	148
22	#68 - RICK EIKE	149
23	#69 - RALPH MAUGHAN	152
24	#70 - CHARLES PACE	154
25	#71 - MITCH POPA	156

	I N D E X (CONTINUED)	
1		
2	#72 - RONALD HOVER	159
3	#73 - SUE HOLBROOK	160
4	#74 - JEB BLAKELEY	162
5	#75 - MIKE SETTELL	164
6	#76 - DINO LOWREY	167
7	#77 - SCOTT LEVY	170
8	#78 - GERALD JAYNE	173
9	#79 - JON OCHI	175
10	#80 - PETER YOUNG	178
11	#81 - WYNONA BOYER	180
12	#82 - JON BURRUP	182
13	#83 - DOUGLAS COFFMAN	184
14	#84 - CLAIRE ASHTON HECKATHORN	187
15	#85 - KARL AMONSON	190
16	#86 - KIRK PETERSON	192
17	#87 - DOUG NILSON	194
18	#88 - DACIA SOULLIERN	196
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 March 7, 2000 6:30 p.m.

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

3 (Government Panel presentation not reported.

4 Starting time 6:30 p.m.)

5 (Public Comment Session start time: 7:15 p.m.)

6 THE MODERATOR: We're going to start our oral
7 testimony now. And I'd like to remind you of our ground
8 rules. And for those of you who have entered the room since
9 then --

10 Diana, do you want to break now?

11 Apparently, we have all the chairs out that there
12 are, so, but those of you standing, I'm sorry. Maybe you
13 can get someone to switch with you halfway. There are still
14 a few chairs up here.

15 And we did, again, for those of you who didn't
16 hear, we moved the taped testimony out into the lobby. So
17 if you want to give your testimony by tape, you can do that
18 out in the lobby. Here's a couple of chairs up here as well
19 and a few others here (indicating).

20 So as we get started, let me remind you of our
21 ground rules. We want to have a respectful exchange of
22 ideas here this evening and we need everybody's help to do
23 that. We're going to try to cut out that feedback that
24 you're getting.

25 I'm not going to -- I'm going to encourage you to

1 please, no clapping, no booing, cheering, gestures, anything
2 like that as the testimony unfolds.

3 I'm going to call your name to come to the
4 microphone, and that's based on the sign-up sheets. And the
5 sign-up sheets were numbered so you have a pretty good idea
6 of where you are. The numbers went across the three sheets
7 but, so, the number that you saw accommodates that order.
8 So that should pretty much be how you come up, unless people
9 pull out. So, although we will take a few minutes for
10 testimony from elected and tribal officials to begin.

11 I'm going to call the name of the person who is
12 up, and then next who is up after that, and then the third
13 person on deck. So, please be ready to speak and let me
14 know of if you need a mike brought to you. We have a
15 portable we can bring to you if you need that.

16 We're going to use this light system in front of
17 you, and it's right here (indicating). For those of you in
18 the back, I don't know if you can see it or not. If you are
19 up at the two mikes, there is no problem seeing it. So
20 watch the lights in front of you. The green light means
21 speak, the yellow indicates that you have 60 seconds
22 remaining, and the red means stop. And I'll help you with
23 that if you can't see it.

24 At the end of your time, please leave the
25 microphone so the next speaker may begin. We hope to

1 accommodate everyone who wants to speak to the panel
2 tonight. We want to do that.

3 Now, as I said earlier, usually we try and break
4 up about 10:30. Obviously, that's not going to happen
5 tonight. So what we'll do is we'll take a couple of breaks,
6 give people a chance to stretch. And at each break, we'll
7 assess how many people are left and how many people want to
8 stay on the list. And we'll try and give you some sense of
9 what that means in terms of where you are and when you'll be
10 coming up to speak.

11 Because the meeting is being transcribed --

12 LT. COL. BULEN: Our intent is to hear anyone who
13 wants to talk. We're going to stay here to hear you. So,
14 if you really want to speak to this panel and it's 1:00
15 o'clock in the morning, I guarantee you, I'm going to be
16 sitting right here listening to you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Bill.

18 Because the meeting is being transcribed, please
19 indicate whether you're commenting on the Corps' EIS or the
20 federal caucus, All-H paper or both? And if you're not
21 sure, we'll do our best to get your comments to the right
22 agency.

23 Be sure and state your name and the name of the
24 organization or agency you're with, if any.

25 So, okay, is everybody ready? We'll start with

1 Claudio Broncho, and second after that is Larry Bagley and
2 then Leonard Beck is on deck.

3 CLAUDIO BRONCHO,

4 MR. BRONCHO: Good evening. My name is Claudio
5 Broncho. I'm the vice chairman for the Shoshone-Bannock
6 tribes. I'm here this evening to testify on all the 4-H
7 paper and all that applies to this because it's all
8 connected.

9 We from the Shoshone-Bannock tribes, we fall
10 under the 1868 Fort Bridger treaty, which we went into the
11 treaty with the federal government, not the state or Idaho
12 or any other state. And we had a lot of concern in regards
13 to how the EIS applies to the treaty. We still say that it
14 doesn't apply. There is a lot of laws we have to kind of
15 distinguish.

16 The salmon hold a lot of cultural and spiritual
17 value to our people, the Shoshone and the Bannock tribes
18 here that were put on the reservation in southeast Idaho in
19 1868. And those salmon are really dear to our subsistence,
20 in regards to what we call subsistence is we take that fish
21 and we take it home and we eat it. We don't send it to a
22 cannery, we do not do any of that and sell it and then get
23 our loaf of bread or baloney or whatever.

24 We have a big concern because right now what
25 they're doing in regards to barging the smolts around the

1 dam. They're taking the fish and putting them on the
2 highways and they're letting the humans have the float trips
3 and so forth on the waters. That's probably a reason why
4 you can't find out why these fish are dying when you put so
5 big of a percentage of them down below Bonneville and so
6 forth.

7 And we're just studied out. You know, all these
8 different issues that we have here are a big concern to the
9 Shoshone-Bannock tribes in regards to some of our rights
10 that we reserve out there.

11 Also, you know, what are we going to do, wait for
12 the salmon and the steelhead to be extinct? And that's a
13 big concern here. We have one of the largest -- in the
14 state of Idaho, we have one of the largest, unoccupied
15 lands, federal wilderness areas that -- these salmon were
16 here first. It took us 100 years to destroy this place.

17 We have always been environmentalists as Indian
18 people and we hold that really dear to our heart, this land.
19 And those are the things that we hold dear to us. It should
20 be a lot of controls out there on the ocean in regards to
21 the international waters, and so forth. I don't know how we
22 could control that, but a lot of harvest is being taken out
23 there. We do have excess power here. That's not being
24 told.

25 And, so, those are things that the

1 Shoshone-Bannock tribes hold dear within southeast Idaho.
2 And, so, we're asking that we have a stance here that we
3 prefer the natural flow. But if it is breaching the dams,
4 so we prefer that alternative, breached dams. Thank you.

5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Claudio.

6 Larry Bagley and then Leonard Beck and then J.J.
7 Wadsworth.

8 LARRY BAGLEY,

9 MR. BAGLEY: Good afternoon. My name is Larry
10 Bagley. I'm a member of the Shoshone-Bannock tribes on Fort
11 Hall reservation. It's not too far from here.

12 I serve on the Fort Hall business council which
13 is the governing body of the Shoshone-Bannock tribes. For
14 many years prior to this, I was also the fish and game
15 director for the Shoshone-Bannock tribes. My primary
16 responsibility was in law enforcement, dealing with
17 fisheries and hunting issues.

18 The main point of my testimony, since
19 construction of the Ice Harbor dam in 1962, the Lower
20 Monumental dam in 1969, the Little Goose dam in 1970, the
21 Lower Granite dam in 1975, there was no forethought of the
22 impacts on fish passage or the ecosystem itself or at least
23 it took a backseat to power generation, barging and other
24 activities.

25 Studies, experiments, supposed solutions to

1 slowed mortality rates of fish population has been ongoing.
2 The success rate has been disappointing, a downright
3 failure. I think the track record speaks for itself.

4 I heard a comment earlier about the fact that
5 survival rate release the fish below the Bonneville dam has
6 been good. We heard the comment, "returns do not reflect
7 such."

8 I think we looked at the agricultural, quality,
9 et cetera, that are going down the river in barges. And you
10 take a glance over toward the highway system, and you see
11 fish rolling down the highway in trucks; there is definitely
12 something wrong with this scenario.

13 From the Shoshone-Bannock tribe standpoint, the
14 best solution to this situation at hand is breach the dams.
15 Remove the earth filled to the sides of these dams, if
16 needed. Return the earth to its natural as possible river
17 conditions, thereby insuring the safe and swift fish passage
18 up and down the river corridor. Let's try breaching the
19 dams. Return the river to as natural river conditions as
20 possible.

21 Let's try this for sixteen to eighteen years and
22 see what the results are. If it does not cure the problem,
23 we can return to the drawing board. If we take the present
24 track record we have in protecting these fish runs, et
25 cetera, it has been devastating to the fish runs, as well as

1 treaty rights.

2 I think we need to highlight and I think we need
3 the bold print this next little comment I'm about to make
4 here. The federal agencies and other entities that are
5 having an impact on longstanding treaty rights, which are
6 the supreme law of the land, need to be aware of the
7 grievance interference and the possible repercussions.

8 I'll just go ahead and wrap this up. I'd like to
9 thank you for the opportunity to give testimony at this
10 hearing. I'd also like to remind you to keep an open mind
11 to the testimony of other individuals here in this room who
12 are in favor of dam breaching, whether they be Indian tribes
13 or non-Indians in this room.

14 I think we need to remember as we sit in this
15 room and give testimony, the great injustice that has been
16 levied against -- and I say "levied" upon the fisherman in
17 the course of elimination. I thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Larry.

19 Leonard Beck. J.J. Wadsworth and then Brad
20 Eldridge.

21 LEONARD BECK,

22 MR. BECK: I not only represent myself as a Snake
23 River irrigator, but I represent the thousands of Snake
24 River irrigators --

25 THE MODERATOR: Can you give your name, please?

1 MR. BECK: Leonard Beck, I'm sorry.

2 THE MODERATOR: That's okay.

3 MR. BECK: I also represent the thousands of
4 irrigators on the Snake River by being the chairman of the
5 Committee of Nine. I have a prepared statement. The
6 Committee of Nine is the official advisory committee for the
7 Water District One, the largest water district in the state
8 of Idaho.

9 Water District One is responsible for natural
10 flow deliveries from the Snake River and storage deliveries
11 from the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs above
12 Northern dam.

13 The Committee of Nine also operates the local
14 rental pool which supplies water to the bureau to help meet
15 the requirements of the 1995 biological opinion.

16 In reply to the environment and economic reviews
17 for salmon recovery conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of
18 Engineers, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the Natural
19 Marine Fishery Service, the Bonneville Power Administration,
20 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife service. I have a list of 200
21 farmers and irrigators and residents from the Upper Snake
22 River that stand by this statement.

23 In adoption of a fish protection and recovery
24 plan under either the Endangered Species Act or the
25 Northwest Planning Act for either the protection or recovery

1 of our threatened or endangered anadromous fish species, all
2 federal agencies responsible for the protection or recovery
3 of the species must act within the law and that agency's
4 respective authority under the law.

5 When a plan is adopted, that containing
6 reasonable and prudent alternatives to certain actions then
7 occurring or conditions created, such as the hydropower
8 system, to avoid jeopardy to the species and intake of the
9 species, such alternatives by a federal agency or other act
10 must be an action that is clearly authorized by law and
11 based upon sound, scientific data.

12 Any plan or biological opinion adopted for the
13 protection or recovery of endangered or threatened
14 anadromous fish in the Columbia and Snake Rivers of the
15 northwest that includes water acquisition by any method to
16 enhance or augment flows has no scientific justification or
17 biological basis.

18 We supplied between 3900 CFS and 56 CFS from
19 November 1st and April 1st. These flows have always been
20 met as part of the established minimum flows on the Snake
21 River.

22 Flow augmentation with water duly appropriate for
23 other purposes and places that have not been designated as
24 critical habitat for endangered or threatened anadromous
25 fish does not fall within the principle of flow

1 augmentation.

2 These long established beneficial uses of water
3 in the state of Idaho by landowners and others within the
4 state of Idaho constitutes a part of the cultural and
5 historical resource of the Upper Snake River.

6 As previously indicated, this prior appropriation
7 of the waters of the state of Idaho in the state of Idaho
8 for the use in the state of Idaho has not and will not
9 result in the destruction or adverse modification of
10 critical habitat of anadromous fish. Thank you.

11 THE MODERATOR: J.J. Wadsworth, Brad Eldridge and
12 Maxine Edmo.

13 J. J. WADSWORTH,

14 MR. WADSWORTH: I'm J.J. Wadsworth. I'm on the
15 Fort Hall business council for the Shoshone-Bannock tribes.
16 And I'm here to give you my thoughts on this during this
17 hearing. And what we've got here, you know, a lot of people
18 don't think about what the circle of life is when it comes
19 to these fish, the salmon, the steelhead and so forth. You,
20 know we'd better think about things like that.

21 Mother nature has provided ways to protect her
22 salmon, but now she's run out of things -- we've put a lot
23 of barriers in the way of the salmon and the steelhead. Now
24 they talked about earlier there, the things that they've
25 done on these dams to further enhance the recovery of the

1 salmon. Barging. They talked about fish ladders. They
2 talked about other things, spillways and so forth. These
3 things have all been tried.

4 Now think of the salmon, you know, as to what --
5 they're placed on a barge. It's a dark area. Mother nature
6 has provided the salmon with a mechanism there to migrate
7 back up to the same place where they were hatched. And they
8 do that. But you take away that, place them in a dark area,
9 you take them over into barges whether it be by truck or by
10 water barges, that kind of messes up their system.

11 The salmon mean a lot to our people, and it's
12 been said -- not only that, but the salmon should be meaning
13 a lot to you, the future of your children. Are they going
14 to see the salmon? I doubt it if we keep going the way we
15 are. We have an opportunity to save these salmon, save
16 these runs, to bring them back at least to where they have
17 multiplied a little bit more. And that's about breaching
18 the dams.

19 Nature will provide again. Nature will clean up
20 those silts that you talk about. That's what it's all
21 about. That's what the rains are for. That replenishes the
22 land. That replenishes the fish. That replenishes you, the
23 people. That replenishes our people, the Shoshone-Bannock
24 people.

25 And to me, you know, we study the studies, the

1 studies of the studies. Where has that gotten us? Now I
2 read in this article in here that you handed out, you know,
3 you mentioned something about fifteen million to twenty
4 million salmon that has come up the rivers. Well, it's down
5 to five million next, is what they say.

6 You've got to remember the introductory of the
7 dams had started this decline. It was the decline that
8 happened by the dams. Now, they say there is only a million
9 that make it, but there is not that million up there in the
10 headwaters of the Snake or the Columbia. That's where your
11 salmon begin their lives. That's where they end their
12 lives. With the breaching of the dams, we will see them
13 come back.

14 Thank you very much.

15 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

16 Brad Eldridge, Maxine Edmo and then Blaine Edmo.

17 BRAD ELDRIDGE,

18 MR. ELDRIDGE: Good evening.

19 THE MODERATOR: A little closer to the mic.

20 Thanks.

21 MR. ELDRIDGE: My name is Brad Eldridge. I'm
22 here representing the City of Idaho Falls, and I'm a council
23 member for the City of Idaho Falls. By training, I'm a
24 chemical engineer, by vocation, I'm a college professor.
25 Here tonight, I am representing not only the City of Idaho

1 Falls, but also the Idaho Consumer-owned Utilities
2 Association, and the greater Idaho Falls Chamber of
3 Commerce.

4 We've heard many things tonight about dam
5 breaching, about saving fish. I think that we are casting
6 the question improperly. The question is not, do we have
7 dams or fish? The question should be, how can we have dams
8 and fish? How can we maximize the return of salmon to their
9 habitat while preserving the economic and agricultural
10 bounty that this region provides?

11 One of the things that needs to be stressed is
12 the accountability for results. We have spent billions upon
13 billions of dollars in an attempt to bring salmon back, but
14 that has not happened. We need to have a way of making sure
15 that billions upon billions more dollars are not spent in
16 vain.

17 I would suggest that dam breaching is an extreme
18 measure which would cost billions upon billions of dollars
19 with no likely outcome beneficial to fish, wildlife or the
20 environment.

21 Many people have talked about the path model and
22 other scientific studies. I would say that these studies
23 are incomplete and that more data are needed to show what
24 the effect is on the ocean conditions and the harvest and
25 hatchery practices.

1 I would say that there are many other
2 alternatives that could be taken to dam breaching or flow
3 augmentation. We need to remember that in the All-H paper
4 we have forgotten a very important "H." That is the humans
5 who live in this area who have a right to have a vibrant
6 economy, but also have a right to have the fish that their
7 forbearers were able to enjoy.

8 There is no silver bullet. There is no one
9 solution. We need to look at many different solutions and
10 combinations of solutions in order to bring the salmon back
11 and to maintain the economy of this area.

12 Thank you very much.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Brad. Okay. Maxine
14 Edmo and then Blaine Edmo and then Ron Carlson.

15 MAXINE EDMO,

16 MS. EDMO: My name is Maxine Edmo. I'm a member
17 of the Shoshone-Bannock tribes and a member of the Land Use
18 Commission for the tribe.

19 Our tribe currently is located within four
20 counties, Bingham, Bannock, Power and Caribou in this area
21 south of here. Prior to that time, there were no boundaries
22 where our people went.

23 My grandfather was marched to Fort Hall when he
24 was fifteen years old. Prior to that time, they did spear
25 for salmon, fish for salmon and sturgeon in the Snake River

1 below the Shoshone Falls.

2 And, also, my other grandfather, he went to --
3 they hunted all over in the western states. There were no
4 boundaries, no limitations. The streams were free flowing
5 at that time. We could drink water wherever. It was clean.
6 And today it's just the opposite.

7 And I feel that the natural habitat should be
8 brought back the way our people knew this originally. We're
9 poisoning our system.

10 And talk about environmental issues, all of you
11 people should be concerned about what's happening today.
12 Our way of life is being destroyed, our culture, our way of
13 life, our language.

14 Prior to that time, when I went to school, I
15 spoke Bannock and Shoshone. And my grandparents were from
16 all over. There were no boundaries, like I stated before.
17 My grandfather was arrested in Wyoming for killing elk when
18 Wyoming became a state.

19 There are many historical things that were never
20 told to the non-Indian people in this area, or they could
21 care less, I guess. But to me, I feel that our
22 grandchildren should be allowed to see what we saw and like
23 our grandparents.

24 It's not only our fish. It's our plants, our
25 trees, our natural foods, like the camas, all the greens

1 that grow along the creek are not there anymore. We use the
2 peppermint for certain purposes. We used everything for
3 medicinal purposes. It's our way of life, our spiritual way
4 of life. So it's not only these things that you see today.
5 It's affecting all of us, the non-Indians as well as the
6 Indian people.

7 So I really feel that the federal agencies should
8 listen and find out what's happening to everybody. It's not
9 only the Indian people. Our people were marched, like I
10 said, to Fort Hall. And the land was illegally taken, as
11 well as all the waters that discussed before in this state
12 of Idaho.

13 We have many unresolved issues that need to be --
14 that were -- some of them were in ratified treaties and some
15 were unratified treaties that the U.S. government needs to
16 live up to.

17 There is a government-to-government relationship
18 that needs to be considered. And I hope that -- I know the
19 federal agencies have tried. And I like the way you're
20 doing things, lately. But prior to this time --

21 THE MODERATOR: I need to ask you to wrap up,
22 please, Maxine.

23 MS. EDMO: Thank you for your time, and I'm sorry
24 I'm not, you know, I don't have all these fancy words like
25 everybody else, but that's just the way I feel.

1 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Maxine.

2 Blaine Edmo, Ron Carlson, and then we're on our
3 list of Jerry Bullock and Marv Hoyt.

4 Okay. Blaine is not here.

5 Is Ron Carlson here? Ron, are you here?

6 After Ron is Jerry Bullock and then Marv Hoyt.

7 RON CARLSON,

8 MR. CARLSON: Ron Carlson. My name is Ron
9 Carlson. I have been the Snake River water master for the
10 past twenty-two years. I am an engineer and hydrologist.
11 And I would like to just take a look at the things that we
12 know.

13 Number one, no one has a clue how to recover
14 listed salmon species. There is simply faith that removing
15 four dams will be successful.

16 Number two, the science tells us that predators
17 are killing more listed species than any other cause.
18 Predators should be one of the "H's." Unfortunately, the
19 spelling doesn't start with an "H."

20 Number Three, development of water in Idaho has
21 contributed in no way to the decline of listed salmon. The
22 Snake River system was essentially fully appropriated fifty
23 years before we started seeing the major declines in salmon
24 runs. In fact, water development in Idaho has not majorly
25 reduced the total flows of the Lower Snake.

1 Number four, flow augmentation has had no major
2 positive impact on any listed species and, in fact, should
3 be discontinued.

4 Number five, dam removal makes no sense as an
5 alternative. If you had approval today to remove the dams,
6 the best information is that it would take sixty years
7 before you would actually get the job done. I would submit
8 that we don't have sixty years to resolve this issue.

9 Number six, all of the efforts to recover salmon
10 have been based upon the assumption that man can take
11 actions on the river that will cause the return of Snake
12 River salmon. We know the problem, however, is in the
13 oceans but it's too big to be addressed. Thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ron.

15 Jerry Bullock, Marv Hoyt and then Pat Ford.

16 JERRY BULLOCK,

17 MR. BULLOCK: My name is Jerry Bullock. I am a
18 citizen in the state of Idaho. I live in Blackfoot. I'm
19 testifying in favor of Alternative Four in the Corps of
20 Engineers draft EIS. I support either of the federal caucus
21 all-H plan alternatives that include breaching the four
22 lower dams.

23 The salmon runs on the Columbia and Snake Rivers
24 are one of the gems of the northwest. Besides the mountains
25 and the forest, it was the salmon that defined our region.

1 Their return will reconstruct the natural fabric of our area
2 and bring our citizens spiritual, recreational and economic
3 benefits that would pay off many times over in what's needed
4 to facilitate the breaching of four obsolete dams and the
5 economically bankrupt policies that built and sustain them.

6 I want to see what those in the '50s saw, chinook
7 of twenty and thirty pounds crowding the holes of the Upper
8 Lemhi River. Fish running almost level -- up beyond
9 Patterson in May, fish stacked three and four deep like cord
10 wood in pools. There was so many fish, they ran out in
11 irrigation ditches and swam out onto the pastures.

12 And this was after most of the dams on the Lower
13 Columbia were built and before these four dams on the Lower
14 Snake were built.

15 In fact, if you look at the data on salmon
16 declines, they coincide exactly with those four dams being
17 constructed. I want to fish for these wonderful creatures
18 and see them and hear them as masses of them rush through
19 the shallow ripples to the next pool.

20 My friends tell me of standing in the Lemhi,
21 fishing a pool below them holding thirty or forty chinooks
22 when all the fish decided to move upstream. He said they
23 came like a stampede. Their backs bulging around and tails
24 flowing in water ten feet and collisions, almost knocking
25 them down. I'd like to see that. And I'd like to see

1 future generations be able to see it.

2 It's these last four lower Snake dams that broke
3 the back of our salmon runs on the Snake. These barge canal
4 ponds that provide little of the regions power, no water
5 storage and no flood control. These dams that were built
6 for the benefit of a very few at great taxpayer expense.
7 Now there are economically superior alternatives that will
8 save the salmon and jobs.

9 We have deceivers among us. Deceivers have to
10 use stories to frighten and misrepresent to our water users
11 here in Idaho that the removal of these dams will threaten
12 our water. The opposite is true. Dam removal reduces the
13 case for taking Idaho water. Dam removal eliminates over
14 one hundred miles of slack water behind these dams, which is
15 why we have to flush the water through with our water
16 anyway.

17 We have a few politicians who refuse to be
18 statesmen. They appear more interested in the entrenched
19 power structures than in the facts. So they posture and
20 mislead the water users, the conservationists, and the
21 general citizens. They stall, hoping the salmon will all
22 slip into extinction. Ignore them. Look at the irrefutable
23 economic data. Keep our water in Idaho here. Breach the
24 dams. Save the salmon.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jerry.

1 Hold your applause, please. Folks, I'm going to
2 ask you to hold your applause, please. Thank you.

3 MARV HOYT,

4 MS. HOYT: Good evening. My name is Marv Hoyt.
5 I live in Idaho Falls, Idaho. I work for and represent
6 tonight the Greater Yellowstone Coalition. Our comments are
7 directed towards both the Corps' draft EIS and the federal
8 caucus All-H paper.

9 GYC is a regional nonprofit conservation
10 organization based in Bozeman, Montana. We also have
11 offices in Wyoming and Idaho. GYC has approximately 8,000
12 individual members, 100 business corporate sponsors and a 90
13 member organization. Our mission is to conserve and protect
14 the greater Yellowstone ecosystem.

15 The upper Snake River in Idaho, and in Wyoming,
16 is an integral part of the greater Yellowstone ecosystem;
17 therefore, our keen interest in this issue.

18 GYC supports Alternative Four in the Corps' D-EIS
19 and any comprehensive recovery plan put forth by the federal
20 caucus and the All-H paper which includes the protection of
21 southern Idaho water.

22 The only way to ensure the protection of our
23 salmon and steelhead and southern Idaho water is to breach
24 the four Lower Snake River dams.

25 We -- excuse me.

1 We need salmon. These dams make no sense. The
2 four Lower Snake River dams -- if the four Lower Snake River
3 dams are not breached, we will put at risk the resident
4 trout fisheries of the Upper Snake.

5 If the four Lower Snake River dams are not
6 breached, we risk the destruction of the aquatic ecosystems
7 and their dependent wildlife on the Upper Snake River.

8 If the four Lower Snake River dams are not
9 breached, we risk breaking the promises we made in our
10 nation's treaty with Idaho's first people.

11 If the four Lower Snake River dams are not
12 breached, we are putting at risk irrigated agriculture in
13 southern Idaho and the Upper Snake basin. This make no
14 sense. These dams make no sense.

15 We have been told by our elected officials in
16 Idaho that the political reality is, that the dams are here
17 to stay. I submit that is Senator Larry Craig, Senator Mike
18 Crapo, Congressman Mike Simpson and Congresswoman Helen
19 Chenoweth, with the blessing of Idaho's Governor Dirk
20 Kempthorne were to introduce federal legislation that
21 required breaching the four Lower Snake River dams, to
22 restore salmon and steelhead, while justly compensating all
23 injured parties, then the political reality in Idaho and the
24 Northwest would change dramatically.

25 By failing to do this, our political leaders are

1 knowingly condemning our salmon and our water in Idaho.

2 This makes no sense. These dams make no sense.

3 It is time for Idaho's political leaders to do
4 the right thing. It is time for Idaho's political leaders
5 to stand up for salmon. It is time for Idaho's leaders to
6 change political reality. It is time for Idaho's political
7 leaders to call for the breaching of the four Lower Snake
8 River dams so that our salmon and our steelhead are
9 restored.

10 We need salmon in Idaho. These dams make no
11 sense. Thank you.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Marv.

13 Pat Ford.

14 Please hold your applause. Thanks. Can I ask
15 you to hold your applause because let me tell you what
16 that's about.

17 If we start having applause, then it's hard to
18 stop the booing, as well. If I allow one, I have to allow
19 the other. That establishes quite an environment of
20 disrespect.

21 Secondly, when one group claps for an opinion
22 they support, then the opposite viewpoint says to
23 themselves, we need to get our group in here to clap even
24 louder. And before you know it, instead of listening, we
25 have a contest. And that's not the environment we want

1 either.

2 So please, I ask you to abide by the ground rules
3 and hold your clapping and booing and any other gestures.

4 Great. Thanks, I appreciate it. Okay. After
5 that little lecture, Pat, you're on.

6 PAT FORD,

7 MR. FORD: I'm Pat Ford, executive director of
8 the Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition. We have fifty-four
9 member organizations in the Northwest. We represent several
10 hundred thousand northwesterners. And our members support
11 about 7,000 jobs in the region.

12 Though I'm a lifelong Idahoan and I grew up in
13 this state, I was asked by many of our Washington and Oregon
14 member groups to represent them here tonight and talk about
15 water. So I'm not going to speak tonight for our Idaho
16 member groups. They are here to speak for themselves.

17 I'm happiest making the positive case for
18 partially removing the four Lower Snake River dams as the
19 cornerstone, not the only action, of a comprehensive
20 recovery plan for Snake River salmon and steelhead. But the
21 Idaho Water Users Association and some of Idaho's elected
22 leaders have claimed that we, Oregon and Washington members
23 of SOS, want to both remove the dams and take large amounts
24 of Idaho water. So I want to address that claim as clearly
25 as I can tonight in three minutes, which ain't easy.

1 Science, partial removal of the four Lower Snake
2 River dams is in our view the surest and likely only way to
3 restore harvestable populations of Snake River salmon
4 steelhead. We're convinced additional water from Idaho in
5 any amounts cannot do that. But as long as the dams are in
6 place, we regard it as a strong scientific fact backed by a
7 lot of evidence that additional large amounts of water can
8 significantly help salmon and steelhead survive rather than
9 go extinct.

10 We think the claims of Idaho's elected leaders to
11 the contrary are wishful thinking. I know some here tonight
12 will say otherwise. We respectfully, but strongly disagree,
13 and we expect that debate will be engaged in court soon.

14 Law, our Oregon and Washington members believe
15 large amounts can up additional water, can be legally be
16 acquired, purchased, leased and/or provided to help salmon
17 survive.

18 Further, we believe law and treaty will require
19 such provisions if the dams remain in place.

20 Politics. Despite the strong scientific and
21 legal case for providing large additional amounts of water
22 if the dams stay in place, the fact is the Clinton
23 administration has done next to nothing to secure it.

24 The Bureau of Reclamation and Idaho's elected
25 officials -- I congratulate them -- have run rings around

1 the National Marine Fishery Service and the white house on
2 this issue. So our focus is on persuading the
3 administration to find the guts and the smarts to secure
4 additional water, large amounts, if the dams remain in
5 place.

6 The final fact is that if the dams stay, the
7 scientific, legal and political case for acquiring much more
8 Idaho water is strong. If the dams go, that case is weak.
9 We believe all the lawyers of all of the parties know this.

10 I am not going to say that if the dams are
11 removed, our members will promise not to seek additional
12 Idaho water. And I'm not going to do that because in our
13 view, that hands a freebie to the Idaho elected officials
14 who would pocket that and do nothing to help salmon and
15 steelhead.

16 But I will say that the fact is the case is
17 strong if the dams remain in place. The case is weak if
18 they do not. Thank you.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Pat.

20 Jerry Scheid, I think it's S-C-H-E-I-D. I'm not
21 sure which. Then Rob Gregoire and Sunshine C-I-C-C-O-N-E.

22 JERRY SCHEID,

23 MR. SCHEID: I'm Jerry Scheid. I'm involved in a
24 farming and ranching operation west of Idaho Falls. When I
25 think about the salmon issue, my memory takes me back to a

1 summer many years ago when two teenage boys from Jerome,
2 Idaho hauled a horse and mule in a beat up old truck to
3 Decker Flats to go salmon fishing. I was one of those boys.

4 A buddy and I would gather our bedrolls, our
5 groceries and our fishing gear, tie it on our horses and
6 head up the trail to Dagger Falls. We weren't the world
7 greatest fishermen, and we didn't make much of an impact on
8 the salmon population. My memories are not of the great
9 fish that we caught.

10 What I do recall is my tremendous sense of awe
11 when I watched salmon longer than my arm fight their way up
12 the falls to return to the mountain streams where they had
13 been hatched. It was an inspiring sight.

14 As a kid, the fact that these magnificent fish
15 would come from the reaches of the Pacific Ocean up hundreds
16 of miles of river to lay their eggs and die in Idaho seemed
17 to me to be one of the greatest marvels of nature. It still
18 does. I believe Idaho salmon are worth saving.

19 I think we've studied the question long enough.
20 I've come to believe that breaching the dams on the Lower
21 Snake is the most practical and most certain approach to
22 salmon recovery.

23 In addition to bringing back Idaho's natural
24 salmon runs, it will eliminate the need to take additional
25 water from irrigators in Idaho to augment stream flow in

1 drought years.

2 We spent almost three billion dollars on
3 unsuccessful restoration measures. I think it is time to
4 take the step that most scientists believe will work and
5 breach the dams.

6 I, therefore, support Alternative Four in the
7 Army Corps of Engineers EIS, and I also feel that breaching
8 should be included in any plan put forward by the federal
9 caucus. Thank you for this opportunity.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jerry.

11 Okay. Rob Gregoire and then Sunshine.

12 If you can line up at the mike, it helps save a
13 few seconds. Thanks. And Jerry Myers after that.

14 ROB GREGOIRE,

15 MR. GREGOIRE: My name is Rob Gregoire.

16 THE MODERATOR: Sorry, Rob.

17 MR. GREGOIRE: That's okay. You're not the
18 first.

19 I live in Pocatello, Idaho. I'm representing
20 myself. I'm also representing Idaho Rivers United. I'm on
21 the board of directors there. That is not a paid position.
22 My comments apply to both the draft EIS and All-H paper.

23 I think it's pretty obvious after years of
24 studying that we must remove the four Lower Snake River dams
25 in order to save Idaho salmon. In other words, I support

1 Alternative Four of the draft EIS paper and believe that the
2 federal caucus must include dam breaching in any salmon
3 recovery plan.

4 This has not been an easy decision for me. I
5 grew up in Montana. I know what it's like to not be able to
6 find a job near your family. I also have a graduate degree
7 in engineering, and I've listened to facts, and I do not
8 listen to emotional arguments.

9 When I first heard that people were considering
10 removing dams to save fish -- this is four years ago, I
11 thought they must be out of their mind. These fish cannot
12 possibly be worth it.

13 My instincts, and they were led by some
14 politicians, they told me these dams are just enormously
15 important and needed for flood control. One politician said
16 that. Power generation, which they are, irrigation, et
17 cetera. The fact that these dams are mostly needed to barge
18 commodities from Lewiston.

19 Even so, I believed that, hey, we really need
20 these dams. I just couldn't get it through my head. And
21 the only logical way to get goods from Lewiston is from this
22 waterway. I looked on the map, it's about 140 miles. The
23 cost of extension outweighs the cost of driving that short a
24 distance.

25 My instincts also told me that removing the dams

1 would disrupt some traditional way of life. The way people
2 talk, you would think that these jobs go back centuries.
3 This is not true. If we breach the dams, we lose a way of
4 life that is less than twenty-five years old. However, if
5 we don't breach the dams, we will lose jobs and a way of
6 life that goes back hundreds, thousands, maybe ten thousands
7 of years. Shipping jobs are important, but a twenty-five
8 history of working against nature does not give one the
9 right to trump salmon-based industries or the rights of
10 Indians.

11 Finally, I'm so sure that after studying these
12 facts, that I joined Idaho Rivers United. I've been hearing
13 things about how these environmentalists are going to take
14 both the water and the dams. I can't emphasize that that is
15 not the case.

16 If the dams are breached, there will be no need
17 to use this water to save fish. However, if the dams are
18 not breached, our Upper Snake waters will surely be on the
19 table to help flush the salmon downstream. Thank you.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob.

21 Okay. Sunshine. Jerry Myers and John Schmidt is
22 on deck.

23 SUNSHINE CICCONE,

24 MS. CICCONE: Hi. My name is Sunshine Ciccone.

25 You did a pretty good job. This is really short and simple

1 compared to everyone else. I'd just like this testimony to
2 be applied to both documents being counted on today, the
3 draft environmental impact statement put together by the
4 Army Corps of Engineering and the All-H paper written by the
5 federal caucus.

6 I support Alternative Four and, of course, I
7 support a recovery plan that includes breaching the four
8 Lower Snake River dams. I'm not going to talk about
9 anything technical, though I am educated on the subject.
10 I'd rather talk about heritage for just a second.

11 I thought for a while what I wanted to say to you
12 folks here today, and I didn't know how I could possibly
13 express why salmon recovery would be important to me at all.
14 And this is what I came up with.

15 I am a jealous girl. I have never seen a river
16 so full of fish that I could walk across their backs to get
17 to the other side. I've never seen the salmon spawn. I've
18 never seen Red Fish Lake, for why it was named such. In
19 fact, in my lifetime, it's now become a frightful joke and
20 we call it Dead Fish Lake.

21 I can't enjoy eating a salmon fillet without
22 wondering if I'm doing something that is morally wrong. And
23 that is an unfair head trip for something that is so
24 nutritionally good for human beings and for our consumption.

25 So, yes, I'm a jealous girl. I want to see

1 salmon spawn. I want to Red Fish Lake for what it was named
2 that. I want to see the rivers boil with fish like you
3 know, the people talk. I've never seen anything like that
4 and I'd like to.

5 So then I realize this is beyond just me. And
6 more people, besides me, want to see that. And more people
7 live in the Northwest for those reasons, those experiences
8 altogether.

9 So for me, I don't think extinction is an option.
10 And in the world that I want to live in. No, I take it
11 back, in the world I insist on living in.

12 So I think that we should make some decisions to
13 do the right things about these fish. And I appreciate all
14 your time. Thanks for hearing me.

15 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Sunshine.

16 Okay. Jerry Myers, John Schmidt and on deck is
17 Nancy Eschief Murillo.

18 JERRY MYERS,

19 MR. MYERS: My name is Jerry Myers. I have been
20 a fishing guide and river outfitter on the Salmon River for
21 the last twenty-four years. I am here to represent the
22 Idaho Outfitters and Guides Association. The IOGA is an
23 Idaho trade association that represents 260 outfitting
24 businesses in Idaho.

25 I would like to share with you a resolution

1 approved by the association last year. And I'll just read
2 some brief parts of it because it's rather lengthy.

3 "Whereas all runs of Idaho's wild salmon and
4 steelhead are either already extinct or listed under the
5 Endangered Species Act, and whereas, the four Lower Snake
6 River dams are the deadliest to Idaho's wild salmon and
7 steelhead, and whereas, adverse effects of dam bypass can be
8 mitigated, and IOGA supports mitigation for those parties
9 adversely affected by retiring these four dams. And whereas
10 IOGA has supported salmon and steelhead recovery efforts
11 because of the importance of viable anadromous sport fishery
12 to the rural economies of Idaho; therefore, be it resolved
13 that the Idaho Outfitters and Guides Association support
14 retirement of the four Lower Snake River dams in lieu of
15 flow augmentation as the best biological choice for
16 recovering salmon and steelhead in Idaho."

17 I'm from a small community of Salmon north of
18 here. We have thirty-five to forty small businesses in that
19 small community that are directly dependent on sport fishing
20 for steelhead. These include guiding services, sporting
21 goods, motels, restaurants, taxidermists, charter flight
22 services, grocery stores and filling stations.

23 Idaho salmon and steelhead fishermen and the
24 small businesses that support them have shouldered economic
25 devastation that the dams have given us. We don't see these

1 dams as valuable tools but as tragic mistakes and empty
2 promises.

3 In 1978, our industry lost the opportunity to
4 sport fish for salmon. Today we depend on a dwindling
5 steelhead fishery that still infuses an estimated ninety
6 million dollars annually into Idaho's economy.

7 When Idaho politicians speak of protecting those
8 economies dependent on the lower four dams, we ask what
9 about the twenty-seven hundred jobs in Idaho dependent on
10 steelhead and the hundreds and even thousands of jobs that
11 would be created by a recovered salmon fishery. Do these
12 jobs not count?

13 Arguing the economics of dams versus salmon,
14 while legitimate, rings hollow, if we fail to understand
15 ethical and spiritual responsibility we all share as
16 citizens of the Northwest.

17 Those of us who make our livelihoods from these
18 magnificent fish cannot, will not, allow the circle of life
19 to be broken. We owe it to ourselves, our children, our
20 grandchildren, and to the creator who gave us all life to
21 protect these great fish.

22 In regard to the All-H paper, we support a
23 comprehensive solution including dam bypass. In regard to
24 the Army Corps Lower Snake River Juvenile Salmon Migration
25 EIS, we support a dam bypass and a natural river solution.

1 Thank you.

2 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jerry.

3 John Schmidt. Nancy Eschief Murillo and then Jim
4 Bower.

5 JOHN SCHMIDT,

6 MR. SCHMIDT: Hi. My name is John Schmidt.
7 Honored assemblies. We are here today because our Idaho
8 steelhead and salmon populations are in peril. We're here
9 because gimmicks such as barging and fish-friendly turbines
10 have failed. These magnificent fish, the clock is ticking
11 and we are running out of time. Unless we humans act
12 quickly and decisively, their days appear to be numbered.
13 What a tragedy it would be, and what a terrible shame our
14 generation will carry if we were to allow these fish to
15 vanish.

16 Historically, culturally, environmentally and
17 economically these salmon and steelhead are too important to
18 let that happen, yet, four earthen dams stand in their way.

19 As part of our efforts to recover these fish
20 populations, numerous scientific studies have been completed
21 and those in the scientific communities have issued an
22 unanimous recommendation. In order to restore a functioning
23 ecosystem with naturally providing populations of these
24 fish, deconstructing the four Lower Snake River dams is the
25 single most constructive action we can take.

1 Now the public is weighing in on this issue. And
2 in hearing across the region, the majority of the public has
3 testified that they agree with the scientific community.
4 Hearing after hearing, the public is saying do the right
5 thing. Breach these four dams.

6 Alternatives to breaching, specifically flow
7 augmentation, will not be enough to restore these fish and
8 may, indeed, cause more problems than it would solve.

9 If the dams stay and flow augmentation, using
10 water from eastern and southern Idaho, poses a real threat
11 to our river flows and to the world-class fisheries that
12 symbolize our region.

13 Augmentation will take water from the already
14 threatened Yellowstone cutthroat trout and from the
15 endangered trumpeter swan in an attempt to flush salmon
16 smolts through the polluted slack water pools formed on
17 these dams. We would be robbing Peter to pay Paul.
18 Clearly, breaching is the better solution.

19 So now we're at a crossroads. Scientists have
20 done their part and the public supports their findings. No
21 further studies are needed unless we study these amazing
22 creatures to death.

23 The process is soon to be handed over to our
24 elected representatives. They must step up and make some
25 hard decisions. Senator Mike Crapo, Senator Larry Craig,

1 Representative Mike Simpson and Governor Kempthorne have an
2 opportunity to demonstrate leadership and wisdom. They can
3 support legislation to breach these dams. And in doing so,
4 they can prove that they do listen to the public when it
5 says, "These fish are important. These dams don't make
6 sense."

7 Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, John. Nancy Eschief
9 Murillo and then Jim Bower, and after Jim is Dell Raybould.

10 NANCY ESCHIEF MURILLO,

11 MR. MURILLO: Good evening. I appreciate the
12 opportunity to speak to our trustee. I am a native
13 American. I'm an Indian. I'm a member of the
14 Shoshone-Bannock tribes. My name is Nancy Eschief Murillo.
15 I'm currently the chairman of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribal
16 Water Resources Commission. We are the primary agency for
17 the Fort Hall Indian Reservation to manage and enforce water
18 rights on our reservation.

19 The 1868 Fort Bridger treaty is a peace treaty.
20 You, as federal agency, are our trustee. You have
21 obligations to the American Indian people, to tribes with
22 treaties. Article Four of our treaty does include hunting,
23 fishing.

24 I recall as a youngster about three or four
25 decades ago, we used to go to the mountains, spear the fish,

1 smell the air, feel clean. I don't do that anymore. What
2 fish are there?

3 There needs to be a problem solved here. It's up
4 to all of us to do this. All of us are survivors, and we
5 are the leaders. Breach the dams. Thank you.

6 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Nancy.

7 Jim Bower. Dell Raybould and then Ann, I think
8 it's S-C-H-R-O-T.

9 JIM BOWER,

10 MR. BOWER: My name is Jim Bower. I'll be
11 speaking and I'll direct my comments to the All-H paper.
12 I'm not a scientist or a statistician. I came here tonight
13 to tell you what I see and I see on almost a daily basis. I
14 live eleven miles down the Salmon River from North Fork,
15 Idaho. We have two miles of one of the historically most
16 productive salmon streams running through our ranch. We
17 manage this area with a focus on fish.

18 And it is virtually pristine. I can see this.
19 We have participated for the last five years and will
20 participate again in a streamside incubation program for
21 steelhead. We have successfully put fish in the creek. I
22 can see them there.

23 I've seen the statistics and reports on reduced
24 harvest, the tribal, the commercial, the sport fishing
25 reduced. And the one thing I do not see is increasing

1 numbers of returning fish.

2 With efforts to improve the habitat, increased
3 hatchery efforts and reduced harvest, increases in returning
4 fish have not happened.

5 I suggest hydro is the one "H" left out of this
6 equation. I believe that any comprehensive alternative to
7 the All-H paper must include breaching of the four dams on
8 the Lower Snake.

9 Thank you.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jim.

11 Dell Raybould. Ann Schrot and then Glen Munns.

12 DELL RAYBOULD,

13 MR. RAYBOULD: Thank you. My name is Dell
14 Raybould. I farm in Madison and Fremont Counties in
15 southeastern Idaho and I am the immediate past chairman of
16 the Committee of Nine.

17 The Committee of Nine is the advisory committee
18 to Water District One here in southern Idaho representing
19 over 15,000 irrigators, irrigating over one-quarter million
20 acres of irrigated agricultural land.

21 I'm here to testify in opposition to the removal
22 of the dams on the Lower Snake River, but more importantly,
23 to oppose the use of Idaho water for flow augmentation. In
24 the past several years, millions of acre feet of Idaho water
25 has been purchased by the BOR and donated by irrigators for

1 experiments in flow enhancement to move juvenile smolt
2 downstream. This has been a dismal failure in producing
3 increased numbers of returning adult salmon to our rivers.

4 Without a significant change in the climatic
5 conditions in the ocean estuaries, elimination of sport
6 fishing in the Columbia, and control of predators, all of
7 the efforts to enhance salmon recovery will be an exercise
8 in futility.

9 We in Idaho cannot risk the financial losses that
10 these proposals present. Loss of economic value of crops
11 will devastate our local economies, put people out of jobs,
12 and reduce our tax base that supports our education system
13 here in Idaho's agricultural areas.

14 The anticipated results of taking over one and a
15 half million acre feet of water from Idaho is intolerable.
16 The economic loss will far exceed the flawed one million
17 acre foot study recently completed by the BOR. I urge you
18 to carefully review the extensive work done by the Scripps
19 Institute of Oceanography and the British Department of
20 Fisheries and Oceans, to name but two prestigious studies
21 outlining the major causes of salmon declines in the Pacific
22 Northwest.

23 And coincidentally, the Scripps Institute study
24 defines the major regime shift in the Pacific Ocean that
25 raised the sea surface temperature and decimated the food

1 supply for the salmon in the estuaries took place at exactly
2 the same time the four dams were built on the Snake River.

3 Removing dams or taking precious Idaho water will
4 but only attempt the symptoms of the salmon problem. Don't
5 tinker with such a fragile segments of our economy as our
6 agriculture and our rural economies.

7 Don't tinker with my heritage. My great
8 grandfathers came to this country. They dug canals. They
9 removed the sage brush. It's my heritage as well as others
10 here that have testified tonight that is at stake with the
11 decisions that you might make. Thank you.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dell.

13 Ann Schrot and then Glen Munns and then Jeff
14 Raybould.

15 ANN SCHROT,

16 MS. SCHROT: Good evening. My name is Ann
17 Schrot.

18 THE MODERATOR: Ann, I need you to get a little
19 closer.

20 MS. SCHROT: I live in Pocatello, Idaho. My
21 comments are to both documents at issue. When I was about
22 six years old, my family took a long camping trip traveling
23 from central Pennsylvania to Stanley, Idaho where we stayed
24 for two weeks. I can remember seeing huge salmon in the
25 creeks and my parents explaining that they had traveled

1 hundreds of miles from the ocean to spawn.

2 Seeing those giant fish in tiny streams is one of
3 my most vivid childhood memories. There is nothing like it
4 in the mountains of Central Pennsylvania where the
5 anadromous fisheries are gone. We cannot let this happen
6 here.

7 Now I live in Idaho. I spent most of last summer
8 traveling from stream to stream in central Idaho doing
9 monitoring work, and I didn't see a single salmon. I'm only
10 thirty years old.

11 In that short amount of time, the salmon runs in
12 Idaho have been exterminated. It wasn't that long ago and
13 it should be reversed. I am in favor of any recovery plan
14 that entails breaching the four Lower Snake River dams.

15 Removing them is not a radical step backwards in
16 history or an attempt to get back to precolonial times. It
17 is a clean-up method of an ecological mess, just like
18 cleaning up the Hudson River in New York or improving the
19 air quality in southern California.

20 Now is the time to start this clean-up effort,
21 remove those dams. There are many places where our
22 environment is being destroyed and no one knows exactly why
23 or how to stop it, but here the needed course of action is
24 clear. It is wanted by the people. And it is cheaper than
25 continuing with no change.

1 Removing the dams will bring back the salmon,
2 save eastern Idaho water for irrigators, and allow us to
3 stop throwing money away on the barging plan that has proven
4 to be a failure. Thank you.

5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ann.

6 Glen Munns, and Jeff Raybould and Rulon March is
7 on deck.

8 GLEN MUNNS,

9 MR. MUNNS: My name is Glen Munns. I'm a farmer
10 in the Rexburg area. I represent Glen Route Canal
11 (phonetic).

12 I listened to the various statements that have
13 been made here today, tonight, and I wonder are we trying to
14 serve people or fish? Those dams provide every individual
15 in this room, one way or another, with food in milk, meat,
16 potatoes, vegetables, whatever it is. There isn't one
17 individual that doesn't eat some of those products every
18 day.

19 I would submit to you that probably one percent
20 or less of the people who are effected by these dams being
21 removed that there would be less than one percent of the
22 people who actually fish or eat fish, and a good share of
23 those that catch the fish, don't eat them.

24 According to statistics I read in the other room
25 here tonight, by removing the dams, they figure -- this is

1 the figures I read in here -- would improve by 1,700,000 --
2 170 million dollars in increased revenue for the fisheries
3 and for those people. Also, by removing the dams would take
4 out 600,000 acres of farming ground and would cause a 480
5 million dollar loss in economic revenue.

6 Now those figures make a lot more sense to me to
7 keep the dams there and do the best we can, and at least
8 learn why the fish that are going to the ocean are not
9 coming back. We need to know that before we remove any
10 dams. Thank you.

11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Glen.

12 Jeff Raybould, Rulon March and then Lionel Boyer.

13 JEFF RAYBOULD,

14 MR. RAYBOULD: Thank you. My name is Jeff
15 Raybould. I'm the chairman of Fremont Madison Irrigation
16 District. I live in the St. Anthony, Idaho area. I'm a
17 farmer, third generation. And I'm also part of the
18 facilitation team of the Henry's Fork watershed council. In
19 that organization, we try to operate by consensus. While we
20 haven't heard from everybody here tonight, it would appear
21 that we're reaching the consensus that flow augmentation is
22 not the answer. And I'm here to testify that we don't have
23 the water to spare.

24 The water that Fremont Madison administers for
25 our space holders in Island Park and Grassy Lakes is our

1 insurance policy to help us get through a dry year. We need
2 to have that water to make our high value crops, such as
3 potatoes, grow throughout the season so we don't run out mid
4 season and not be able to finish those crops after we put
5 all the inputs into them.

6 You know, I've suspected for a long time that
7 there was a lot of unknowns about how to recover the salmon.
8 And just my own logic tells me perhaps we're not looking
9 hard enough at all the options that are out there. And then
10 I read in this document here tonight that I was handed that
11 said, we don't know the extent of the delayed mortality. We
12 don't know how its effects -- how transportation effects
13 this issue.

14 It would appear that the fish are healthy when
15 they leave the boats, and then we don't know what happens to
16 them. We don't know that what the extent of degrading ocean
17 conditions have to do in the salmon reproduction cycle. And
18 we don't know if that's going to change or not. If it
19 doesn't change, we probably can't save the salmon. But if
20 it does change, maybe we can temporarily save the salmon.
21 There are just too many unknowns at this point to go on a
22 dangerous venture of removing those four dams.

23 Now those four dams may not produce all the power
24 in the world, but they produce an important component of
25 power in the summer when the demand is high. We all need

1 water for our irrigation pumps and our air conditioners and
2 the other things that we have become a part of our lives.

3 I, too, have a history, a social and cultural
4 part of my life is tilling the land and irrigating the land,
5 and hope you'll take that into consideration. This water is
6 an important element to those of us who reside in this
7 valley. Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jeff.

9 Rulon March, Lionel Boyer and then Ed Clark.

10 RULON MARCH,

11 MR. MARCH: Good evening. My name is Rulon
12 March. I'm a Shoshone-Bannock member. I am a Lemhi
13 Shoshone descendant. Let me read this to you.

14 "In the beginning, the creator created mother
15 earth. The creator provided mother earth with the people to
16 watch over the land and the water and the wind. Our people,
17 as you know, have managed to live in harmony for thousands
18 of years. We are products of the great indigenous tribes.
19 We still feel that -- I still feel that blood flow through
20 my veins.

21 In my family, we teach the young ones that we
22 still carry the responsibility to protect our mother earth.

23 The breach is good. In the '50s, when I was a
24 young boy, we traveled to the East Fork to make camp, as did
25 many of our ancestors before us. We lived there for some

1 years.

2 As a boy, I would travel with my mother across
3 the meadows to fishing holes. She would teach us the ways
4 and tell us the stories that her mother and father had
5 taught her. I can remember that she would say to pray for
6 the fish that you are about to take. Give thanks to the
7 creator for what he has provided us with.

8 But now I am ashamed to say that when my little
9 ones ask why we can't make that journey, as did all the
10 people before us, I'm ashamed to say that the fish are
11 burdened with so many obstacles that they can no longer come
12 home to reproduce. The fish are tired of battling with
13 these concrete structures.

14 We must make a decision, an honorable and a wise
15 decision to protect this country's most valued resource for
16 our children and their children's children. We can -- if we
17 all can just put our minds together, it's time to put a stop
18 to the extinction of all of our natural resources. If we
19 don't stand now, then when do we? Thank you.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

21 Lionel Boyer, Ed Clark and then Pete Lipovac.

22 LIONEL BOYER,

23 MR. BOYER: Thank you. My name is Lionel Boyer.
24 I'm the fishery policy representative for the
25 Shoshone-Bannock tribes. I'd like to read a few statements

1 to you.

2 "The policy of the Shoshone-Bannock tribes is to
3 pursue, promote and where necessary, initiate effort to
4 restore the Snake River system and affected, unoccupied
5 lands to a natural condition.

6 "This includes the restoration of component
7 resources to conditions which most closely represents the
8 ecological features associated with a natural riverine
9 ecosystem.

10 "In addition, the Shoshone-Bannock tribes are
11 working to ensure the protection, preservation and where
12 appropriate, the enhancement of rights reserved by the
13 tribes under the Fort Bridger treaty of 1868 and any
14 inherent aboriginal rights.

15 "Natural conditions and natural river ecosystems
16 have always been the position of the Shoshone-Bannock
17 tribes. The tribes were never consulted with, nor did we
18 ask for these dams in the first place.

19 "The Shoshone-Bannock tribes commend the federal
20 agencies for their very recent attempts to work together to
21 start repairing the damage and the divisiveness of over 100
22 years of piecemeal approaches.

23 "However, the Shoshone-Bannock tribes are faced
24 with a real dilemma. The habitat in the Salmon River are
25 still in moderately good condition primarily because of the

1 vast amounts of land that are now contained in wilderness
2 areas. Granted, these conditions are only considered to be
3 in good condition when compared to the thorough devastation
4 of other habitats as has taken place elsewhere in the
5 Columbia River basin and as based on the potential for
6 anadromous fish production. Extensive logging, mining,
7 grazing and irrigation practices have claimed their toll on
8 the Salmon River country like elsewhere in the Columbia
9 River system.

10 "However, there still exists many areas of
11 beautiful, clear, water, massive gravel beds and deep cold
12 pools, yet where the good habitat exists, there is less than
13 ten percent of the salmon that could be supported by such
14 habitat.

15 "The Shoshone-Bannock tribes are involved in the
16 extent possible with effort to reform hatchery practices in
17 order to recover the salmon populations to and from the
18 gravel and deep pools that are now vacant.

19 "We as Indian people look to our brother animals
20 as things of our creator, not as something without a spirit,
21 not as commodities. From the time of the treaties to today
22 is a little over a century and a quarter.

23 Prior to the treaties, this land and its
24 resources were plentiful. The forests with different kinds
25 of trees, the waters in the rivers, streams and lakes were

1 clear, cool and pristine with an abundance of fish,
2 anadromous and resident. Different types of wildlife were
3 also in abundance within this great habitat.

4 "It was this way for thousands of years. Today,
5 less than 140 years after the treaties which promised much,
6 where signed. We have seen the resource, which had plenty
7 for all, become not enough for everybody.

8 "I want to say that the 140 years that our
9 treaties have been in existence, we're looking at a 140 mile
10 stretch of water that has been devastated."

11 Thank you.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

13 Okay. Ed Clark, Pete Lipovac and then we're
14 going to try and take a quick break.

15 ED CLARK,

16 MR. CLARK: My name is Ed Clark. I'm a third
17 generation farmer in the Ashton area and also a member of
18 the Committee of Nine.

19 I appreciate this opportunity of being here.
20 Much of what I had desired to say in relation to the fallacy
21 of breaching the dams and unproductive use of eastern
22 Idaho's water in flow augmentation has already been said. I
23 would like to make a couple of points.

24 Recently, the Bureau of Reclamation and Idaho
25 Fish and Game Department decided it would be prudent to

1 drain Island Park reservoir to river run levels to eliminate
2 the trash fish in the river. At that time we dumped about
3 30,000 tons of sediments into the Henry Fork below the
4 Island Park dam.

5 I heard the statement a few minutes ago that said
6 there had been 150 million cubic yards of sediments that
7 would go into the river that are behind these dams.

8 I would ask the question: Do we want an
9 environmental disaster of that proportion, and do we realize
10 the amount of water that it would take to flush that
11 sediment out?

12 It took us about five years to flush the
13 sediments out of the Henry Fork in just that small area.
14 We're talking about millions and millions of acre feet.
15 Thank you.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ed.

17 Pete, you're on.

18 PETE LIPOVAC,

19 MR. LIPOVAC: Good evening. My name is Pete
20 Lipovac. I'm a property owner along the Salmon River. I'm
21 the president of the River of No Return homeowners
22 association. I'm an irrigator in Teton County. I'm an
23 educator and past superintendent of the Shoshone-Bannock
24 School District.

25 Thirty-five years ago before the four dams, I was

1 fortunate to observe Sho-Ban people subsistence fishing in
2 the mountain streams. Entire families out there spearing
3 fish, communally working together. Yes, even grandmothers
4 and grandfathers and little ones all enjoying this timeless,
5 wholesome activity.

6 I came to understand how the experience is an
7 intricate and inseparable part of the culture of the Indian
8 people; and how, in effect, even their identity was
9 connected to the fish. The water and the rivers themselves,
10 so tied that one of the band's identified themselves as the
11 Salmon Eaters.

12 No dams are worth the destruction of a culture.
13 As a superintendent, I was involved in the construction of a
14 wonderful school at Fort Hall. But no school, no building
15 or compensation will ever begin to fill the void created by
16 the destruction of a culture.

17 But it is not only Indian people who suffer at
18 this loss with the salmon steelhead runs, we all suffer. We
19 all lose. Idaho loses economically and culturally. Idaho
20 statesmen projected 180 million dollar net gain to Idaho by
21 breaching the dams.

22 A man said "Shiny water that moves in the streams
23 and rivers is not just water, the rivers are our brothers.
24 So you must give the rivers the kindness you would give my
25 brother. If we sell you land, you must remember that it is

1 sacred.

2 "Will you teach your children what we have taught
3 ours, that the earth is our mother, that what befalls the
4 earths, befalls the sum of the earth. This we know. The
5 earth does not belong to man. Man belongs to the earth.
6 All things are connected, like the blood which unites us
7 all. Man did not weave the web of life. He is merely a
8 strand in. Whatever he does to the web, he does to
9 himself."

10 I would add that whatever we do to the fish, we
11 do to each other, to ourselves, to our children and to
12 countless generations yet to come.

13 I speak to breach the four Lower Snake River
14 dams. Mothball them, if you will, and to take other
15 additional measures, such as natural river alternative
16 number four, and in the process, reduce the need for flow
17 augmentation, which could use Upper Snake River irrigation
18 water. Thank you.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Pete.

20 Folks, let me bring you up to date on where we
21 are. Pete was Number Eighteen of our sign-up sheet. I have
22 ninety-two. There might be a few more out there. So we're
23 looking about, if you're number ninety-two, you're looking
24 at about 1:00 o'clock in the morning. I just want to give
25 you that update.

1 We're going to take about a ten-minute break and
2 let our panel stretch. Then we'll come back at quarter to.
3 Thank you all for adhering to the ground rules. I really
4 appreciate it.

5 (Off the record.)

6 (Break.)

7 THE MODERATOR: Chad Colter. And after Chad is
8 Nathan Small and then -- I can't read the first name, but I
9 think it's L-Y-T-L-E, Denny.

10 CHAD COLTER,

11 MR. COLTER: Good evening, everyone. My name is
12 Chad Colter. I'm a Shoshone-Bannock tribal member. I'm
13 also a fishery biologist and fish and wildlife coordinator
14 for the Shoshone-Bannock tribes. I think that's about it.

15 First of all, I'd like to thank all of you for
16 being here and allowing us to make our comments here in
17 public. I see a lot of familiar faces up there. I'd just
18 like to say hi again.

19 Natural conditions in the natural river ecosystem
20 have always been the position of the Shoshone-Bannock
21 tribes. Tribal policy to pursue, promote and where
22 necessary, initiate efforts to restore the Snake River
23 system and effect unoccupied land to a natural condition is
24 a driving force in tribal natural resource management.

25 It is this way because natural conditions support

1 the very essence of our culture. The air, the water, the
2 land, all provide for our most basic needs. The use of
3 those resources should not come with an additional cost to
4 our environment. The energy, navigation and irrigation
5 systems provides benefits at costs, and those costs must
6 include fully restoring and protecting fish and wildlife.

7 My comments tonight are directly related to the
8 All-H paper and the 4-H's and the options within those
9 4-H's. But it cannot be separated, really, from the true
10 meaning of my comments, which are to support the breaching
11 of the dams. So with that in mind, it is related to both.

12 The habitat option, options one and two provide
13 the minimum acceptable strategies for the management of
14 habitat issues in the salmon recovery. Without an increase
15 in the federal role to expose the teeth of federal acts,
16 such as the Clean Water Act, we will never reach our goal of
17 restoring deleted salmon runs. Idaho holds hundreds of
18 miles of pristine habitat. The Middle Fork of the Salmon
19 River has areas of undisturbed spawning and rearing habitat.
20 And populations are continuing to decline.

21 By the CRI model definition, these populations
22 are already at a quasi-extinction level. No adults return
23 to spawn in marsh and sulfur creeks in 1999. This indicates
24 that habitat may not be the most detrimental limiting
25 factor.

1 The harvest option. Option three provides the
2 best strategy for critically low stocks. Temporarily
3 curtailing in river mix stock fisheries must be implemented
4 to reduce the risk of incidental take of critically
5 low Snake River stocks.

6 THE MODERATOR: I need you to wrap up, Chad.

7 MR. COLTER: Hatchery options today restore
8 strategies have not been able to stop the decline of
9 populations and have not been demonstrated to rebuild or
10 successfully introduce self-sustaining populations in the
11 Snake River. Option three provides the greatest opportunity
12 for recovery.

13 THE MODERATOR: Chad, I'm going to have to cut
14 you off. Thanks a lot.

15 I want to remind you if you're frustrated by the
16 three-minute time frame, which I know from my own experience
17 is a frustrating experience, if you want to send your
18 comments in writing, you can talk as long as you want. So
19 that's the one way you can make comment where there is no
20 limit on how long you have to talk.

21 Okay. Nathan Small is next, and then I think,
22 I'm not sure how to pronounce it, L-Y-T-L-E, I think Denny.

23 NATHAN SMALL,

24 MR. SMALL: Good evening. My name is Nathan
25 Small. I'm a member of the Shoshone-Bannock tribes. I've

1 been a hunter with a spear for salmon almost all my life.
2 For the past half of my life, I'm fifty now, for the past
3 twenty-five years, it's been a very difficult situation to
4 live through.

5 In my younger years we went up there and we
6 didn't have all those problems. We didn't have problems
7 with the other fisherman. We didn't have problems with the
8 other landowners. We didn't have problems with anything.
9 It was all in a good situation.

10 When the dams started coming through, the fish
11 naturally stopped coming through. And for some reason or
12 another, I had to live through a time period where I and my
13 family were blamed for the loss of the salmon. Idaho, and
14 it residents, and a lot of other people, including the
15 sportsmen, all blamed us for some reason or another. They
16 all pointed at us. I'd think, why are they pointing at us?
17 We didn't do this to the fish.

18 The fish that we take from the rivers that we
19 were in was not a detrimental impact to anything. It was a
20 form of survival, some ceremonial things. That's what it
21 was all about. But I had to live through that, and it was a
22 little bit hairy out there sometimes.

23 Now I hear the landowners, the sportsmen, and
24 other people are now saying, let's do something about our
25 salmon here. Well, we've been saying that all along and we

1 have been telling everybody all along that it's not our
2 fault. And it never was our fault. When the dams come in,
3 that's the fault. That's the dam fault.

4 You got to understand that. Now twenty-five
5 years later, we all understand that. Okay. Let's do
6 something about it now. It has to be breached. People are
7 going to hurt. Well, it hurt us for years. It hurt us for
8 almost a quarter of a century. It hurt us. It took it away
9 from us, a part of our life was disappearing. A lot of that
10 stuff was gone.

11 But now we have a chance to bring it back. And
12 through everybody's help here, it's going to happen. The
13 people that you are sitting up here, you obviously have some
14 input, some way of saying that this is what is needed to
15 bring these fish back.

16 Sure, the irrigators are going to lose some water
17 maybe, but not much. They might lose a little bit of crops,
18 hey, half the people need to lose a little bit of weight.
19 And somebody in the other room there that the kenoway
20 (phonetic) man is a Shoshone. He sells the water for -- and
21 flows it down that way. And that's where I ended up.
22 That's where we're at today. That's how far the Kenoway man
23 was a Shoshone. He was that far down. That's how it should
24 be. He can go further. The fish need to go down and come
25 up.

1 I believe that can happen today with the help of
2 everybody here. And everybody has to give a little.
3 Everybody has to give a little. The people who are going to
4 give up the most is we -- we gave that up already. We've
5 shown we can do that and survived that. And the people
6 that's going to have to lose a little, they're going to
7 survive it. Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Nathan.

9 And is it Lytle Denny?

10 And then after Lytle is Keith Kutchins and then
11 Louise Dixey.

12 LYTLE DENNY,

13 MR. DENNY: My name is Lytle Denny. I am a
14 Shoshone-Bannock tribal member. I work for the Tribal
15 Fisheries Department. I also am a tribal fisherman. I'm
16 going to be commentating on the All-H, the 4-H'S. First,
17 I'd like to talk about the hatcheries.

18 I've had experience with all the hatcheries.
19 I've been around and know how they work. And there is two
20 hatcheries that I know that are successful, and they are the
21 South Fork and the Raft River Hatcheries called South Fork.
22 And the failing fisheries are the East Fork Sam River
23 hatchery and the Sawtooth and the Simmeroy (phonetic).

24 There is something wrong here, and we need to
25 figure out why two are working and the other ones are

1 failing.

2 I'd also like to talk about the habitat
3 improvement. We have a lot of healthy streams up here.
4 This is a pristine wilderness that we're dealing with. We
5 have adequate spawning beds. Habitat is not the problem.
6 They can spawn. The fish can grow there.

7 I believe that we need to return the back to its
8 natural state. We need the fish back up here. I work with
9 the sockeye research program. We have to fertilize the
10 lakes up there because of a lack of nutrients. The salmon
11 are not returning, the dead salmon aren't providing
12 nutrients for the young fish to grow.

13 Again, back with habitat, even the bad streams we
14 have Yanky Fork and Big Bolder Creek on the East Fork Salmon
15 River, the reason these aren't healthy streams is due to
16 mining, we have siltation, sedimentation. The eggs, when
17 they are deposited, are covered with sediment. They cannot
18 breathe; therefore it kills the eggs.

19 And I'd like to talk about tribal harvesting.
20 Tribal harvesting is minimal. When you compare how many
21 fish we take compared to how many the dams are taking, no
22 one seems to realize that we're only taking a few big fish
23 here. They're taking millions of small fish there.

24 And last, I'd like to talk about the hydros, the
25 negative impacts of the dams. We got all those smolts

1 coming down into these dams reaching the slack water.
2 They're lost. They don't know where to go. There is no
3 flow for them to follow.

4 And we have all these people saying, "There is
5 predation out there." Well, of course, there is a lot of
6 predation. You've got these lost fish swimming around
7 getting picked off. Their old migration route used to only
8 take a couple weeks. Now, it takes a few months for them to
9 get out. Of course, there is predation. They're going to
10 deplete all the smolt by the time they get out.

11 Why breach the dams? We need to decrease
12 downstream migration time and that will increase the smolt
13 survival and therefore increase adult survival. There was a
14 comment made earlier made, "How can we have salmon in dams?"
15 We need to find an equilibrium where the number of dams can
16 still operate and the number of fish increase to the point
17 where they are off the ESA, Endangered Species Act.

18 I think we need to free the salmon and breach the
19 dams. Thanks.

20 THE MODERATOR: Keith Kutchins, Louise Dixey and
21 then Dave Rydalch.

22 Keith, are you here?

23 KEITH KUTCHINS,

24 MR. KUTCHINS: Yes. Thank you.

25 I was expecting that we'd have an overhead

1 projector. But anyway, for the comments here, I'll try to
2 walk you through them. I kind of fold the one up from the
3 bottom. What we've got here now is four Lower Snake River
4 dams and the way they're operated now with this cup, is they
5 are fairly full. And they go down a little bit and then
6 back to full and down a little bit each year.

7 You can see a little small smiley face. That's
8 because there is a few people that are smiling. Over on the
9 left-hand side, you see five huge storage reservoirs.
10 Roosevelt, from Grand Coulee, Libby, Hungry Horse, Door Jack
11 (phonetic), Brownlee and the hypothetical pool of the Middle
12 and Upper Snake.

13 Those people's reservoirs start full and go way
14 down low every year and then come way back up, way down low.
15 You see a smiley face there. It's a big one because it's a
16 lot of people and it's not smiling. It's frowning.

17 We breach the four Lower Snake River dams, that
18 little smiley face turns to a frown because one time, notice
19 that I wrote it only has one point on it, you go from
20 relatively full running the river projects and the four
21 Lower Snake reservoirs, it's not a river, and they get drawn
22 down to a natural river level. But lo and behold, this
23 great big face over here from all those huge storage
24 reservoirs they get to keep the storage reservoirs full and
25 stable, they're really happy. And there is a whole bunch of

1 them, so in reference to the Corps' EIS, breaching makes a
2 lot of sense. I support Alternative Four for 4-H paper,
3 All-H paper.

4 Under hatcheries 1912 to 1940. Oregon operated a
5 chinook egg taking station on the Lemhi River from the 1912s
6 to the 1940s. They moved millions of eggs a year down river
7 to Bonneville, Bonneville fish hatchery, Clamouth, Young's
8 Bay. It's time we go downriver and get those eggs, even if
9 we're going have to do aggressive things to put fish out in
10 the gravel.

11 With reference to the All-H paper CRI, the model,
12 this quasi-extinction risk threshold, it's unfortunate it's
13 not a survival benefit threshold instead. You show it on
14 the slides, we're going to meet extinction in ten years.
15 We're already there. We've got zero chinook back in Herb
16 (phonetic) Creek, Yanky Fork, East Fork, Marsh Creek, Sulfur
17 Creek. We're there. Nothing quasi about it. But it is
18 crazy and it makes me queasy. Thank you.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Keith.

20 Okay. Louise Dixey. Dave Rydaloh and then I've
21 got a John, and I can't read the last name at the time.
22 He's from the Idaho Conservation League.

23 LOUISE DIXEY,

24 MS. DIXEY: Thank you. My name is Louise Dixey.
25 I'm a member of the Shoshone-Bannock tribes. I'm also a

1 resident of the Fort Hall Indian reservation thirty-six
2 miles south of here.

3 I want to point out that my husband and I are
4 ranchers. We're landowners and we're irrigators. We meet
5 all the definitions of most of the people that are here.
6 But my comments will address the relationships of the
7 importance of the rivers to the native people of Idaho and
8 why the four Lower Snake dams should be removed.

9 In historic times, Idaho, Shoshone and Bannock
10 speaking people were located at the head waters of the four
11 major river systems in the western United States. They
12 lived along, utilized and traveled the rivers and
13 tributaries of the Salmon and the Snake, which fed the
14 Columbia River drainage system. They spent time on the
15 rivers and tributaries leading to the great basin as well
16 the Colorado River. The majority of these people and their
17 descendents now reside at Fort Hall on the Fort Hall Indian
18 Reservation.

19 It's difficult for anyone to review and
20 understand the numerous studies that have been completed by
21 the federal agencies in an effort to understand why there
22 are declining runs with anadromous fish. But I want to
23 point out that the native people have long known the answer
24 to these stories: That the fish need clean natural rivers
25 to survive, just as we as humans need clean water to

1 replenish our bodies.

2 The Corps of Engineers completed a draft EIS, but
3 it did not include a valuable document. It was called the
4 "Tribal Impacts Report." This was completed in the Drew
5 process. The report was written by Phil Myer, an economist
6 under contract to the Columbia River and Tribal Fish
7 Commission supported by the Corps of Engineers funding.
8 Their report was too devastating to publish, but I want to
9 quote a few of the findings.

10 "The present circumstances of tribes today show
11 that they must cope with the overwhelming levels of poverty,
12 unemployment, and it's usually between three to thirteen
13 times higher than the region lining them.

14 "The personal suffering and tragic lives of the
15 Indian people are not revealed in the reports of tribal and
16 federal governments, but you can see it in the eyes of the
17 Indian people. We have limited access to the ways of the
18 Indian's culture, but we still remember our background.

19 I want to point out that my grandmother told me,
20 "I don't like all this talk about unemployment and poverty.
21 We lived off the land before the white man came. We had no
22 such thing as poverty. We fished. We hunted. We gathered
23 roots and berries. We worked hard all year-round. We had
24 no time for unemployment."

25 Despite the depravation summarized previously

1 today, send a message to the Corps of tribal material and
2 spiritual life. Today the Shoshone-Bannock people have
3 initiated effort with the Snake River sockeye concerning
4 co-managers with such agencies as Idaho Fish and Game, BPA,
5 and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to protect and reserve
6 habitat, develop unique production effort to listed fish
7 species and enhance water quality initiatives.

8 In the words of our ancestors, take care of all
9 the living creatures, the water, the land, the air, the
10 plants. We're only here for a short time. The young ones
11 will follow. Thank you.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Louise.

13 Dave Rydalch and then John -- I can't read the
14 last name, from the Idaho Conservation League.

15 DAVE RYDALCH,

16 MR. RYDALOH: My name is Dave Rydalch. I'm a
17 third generation farmer and a resident of St. Anthony. I'm
18 also an avid outdoors man and fly fisherman. And I'm also
19 the president of the North Fork Reservoir Company. You
20 might ask what in the world is the North Fork Reservoir
21 Company?

22 It was formed in 1960 to have a supplemental
23 water supply for about forty-seven thousand acres in the
24 St. Anthony area. It was formed when Henry's Fork was still
25 called the North Fork of the Snake River. And until Island

1 Park was done in 1939, Henry's Lake was drained on every dry
2 year and several times in the 1930s. It left maybe a
3 thousand acre foot puddle up there. That would be nothing
4 but a bog.

5 Now, in fact, we weren't very -- the people
6 before me weren't very popular up there. And Johnny Sach,
7 one of the few last things he said, he has a cabin right
8 there at Big Springs is the Johnny Sach cabin. "Things have
9 never been the same up here since the dam was built.

10 Well, since the Island Park dam has been built,
11 all the space holders that have -- or the stockholders have
12 stock in the nonprofit North Fork Reservoir Company have not
13 taken one dime of state or federal money for its operations,
14 maintenance and acquisition land underneath the reservoir.

15 We very seldom ever drain it. I think it was
16 1977 to 1988 and 1992 we got down very, very low, but we
17 never did drain. In fact, in 1992 and '88, the only storage
18 water left in the Minidoka project, all the other
19 reservoirs, the Federal Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs was
20 at Henry's Lake.

21 And we've always tried to be good neighbors with
22 everybody up there. We try -- there were tests that we
23 lowered the reservoir down too far. Were tests that we get
24 it too high. We watched and after four years of negotiation
25 with the nature conservancy and John Keys of the Bureau of

1 Reclamation, they entered into a ten-year agreement to
2 transfer water the Bureau of Reclamation had acquired for
3 flow augmentation up through Henry's Lake to take down
4 through the outlet and through the nature conservancy's
5 property and create a minimum flow. And that's the first
6 time that I know that's ever been done in Idaho or in the
7 west.

8 Now, where are we against flow augmentation?
9 Well, if we don't have the water, the flow augmentation
10 would have been going in place during the drought years, we
11 would have had a puddle up there. We would have been sued
12 and everybody would have been unhappy.

13 We created a world-class fishing up there for
14 Yellowstone cutthroat, which are threatened of being listed.
15 We've got brook trout. The brook trout came straight out of
16 there. And it's all done because we operated it.

17 I'd just like to say that the fish and the
18 stockholders of North Fork Reservoir Company have one thing
19 in common. They are both happier with a full reservoir.
20 Thank you.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dave.

22 John, can you help me out?

23 JOHN McCARTHY,

24 MR. McCARTHY: My kids give me a bad time for my
25 terrible handwriting, but it's McCarthy.

1 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

2 MR. McCARTHY: So my name is John McCarthy. And
3 I'm the conservation director for the Idaho Conservation
4 League. I spoke to a similar group. I don't think all of
5 you were on a full tour, but I spoke in Lewiston a month
6 ago. And I'm speaking again because I want to share some of
7 the things I've learned in the last month from listening to
8 the discussion. And some of them will be specific, and some
9 of them will be general.

10 Following this entire process, the main thing I
11 remain convinced is that the only thing that is going to
12 lead to harvestable runs of wild salmon and steelhead is to
13 breach the dams. Of all the things I've heard, many things
14 can help salmon and steelhead recovery, and many of these
15 things should be further explored, but the only thing that
16 is likely to really lead to major change is to breach the
17 dams.

18 So in the "LH" process some version of
19 Alternative "D" with potentially parts of Alternative "A,"
20 which specifically includes dam bypass is necessary. As far
21 as the Army Corps draft EIS. Alternative four is the surest
22 way of recovery.

23 Now, listening to all these people talk tonight
24 and other nights, what I hear is the people who fish, the
25 people who rely on salmon, the people who want to rebuild

1 our ecosystem are overwhelmingly in support of breaching the
2 dams.

3 I think that's a point that comes home time after
4 time. I am not discounting other people's concerns, and I'm
5 not trying to suggest that other people's concerns are not
6 worthy of our consideration. But as we look at what's the
7 real issue here, the real issue is recovery of salmon and
8 steelhead. That's what the law requires, I think,
9 overwhelmingly. That's what the people of Idaho desire.

10 And the people who are really looking at recovery
11 of salmon and steelhead, they keep on coming back to that
12 the surest way to reach harvestable levels of wild salmon
13 and steelhead is to breach the dams.

14 When I spoke in Lewiston, I thought it was really
15 important to suggest a message in support of change, but
16 also in support of community stability. One of the odd
17 things that a person pointed out strongly to me is that many
18 people whose jobs may be affected, may be locked into a
19 long-term union job, and if they switch jobs, they're going
20 to lose all kinds of benefits.

21 I think that's a human problem that's somebody's
22 living their life for fifteen, twenty years and they change
23 the rules on them. Nobody likes the rules changed, but in
24 the incentive programs and the programs that can lead to
25 training, try and be sensitive how you change people's jobs

1 and how you change people's lives.

2 One of the things that's also come up a lot is
3 the reliance on hatcheries. It seems very misguided for all
4 kinds of fish. Disease problems and problems of genetics
5 are inherent in hatcheries and are not a long-term fix, but
6 a short-term fix.

7 The whole issue of silt that keeps on coming up
8 time after time I think is a boogeyman. I think the Corps'
9 own study shows that the silt will get flushed down to the
10 McNary.

11 And in closing since I see the red light, I think
12 -- and you folks getting a grip on all of these comments and
13 getting an understanding on all of these comments, it's
14 really important to really do the best, surest thing for the
15 recovery of salmon and steelhead, which means breach the
16 dams. Thank you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, John.

18 Marquette Bagley. Lloyd Hicks and Brent Barrus.

19 And Lloyd Hicks, if you could be on deck, that
20 would be great.

21 MARQUETTE BAGLEY,

22 MS. BAGLEY: Can you hear me okay? My name is
23 Marquette Bagley. I am the Miss Shoshone-Bannock for THE
24 1999-2000 year. I am also a tribal fisherman. A long time
25 ago there weren't problems like this that would occur.

1 As years went on, there was more and more
2 advancement in technology. This is where we are today.
3 Before the land ran its natural course, leaving everything
4 plentiful and in balance.

5 When the dams were built, the long-term effects
6 were not thought of at the time, and here we are today
7 facing all the problems.

8 What we must think about is the future and its
9 consequences. The decisions are -- decisions that are being
10 made, need to be thought for not only for certain groups but
11 for everyone because it has the most effect on everyone and
12 not just one group.

13 The charge of thinking not only looking for the
14 future about the bringing the past to the future and beyond.
15 Over the years I have seen the salmon population decline.
16 It makes me sad because I know that some day these fish will
17 be gone and we can never get them back.

18 The salmon are not going to come back by
19 themselves. There are too many odds against them right now.
20 I miss practicing our tradition of spear fishing that was
21 taught to me by my father. I have been spear fishing since
22 I was nine, so this is something that I would like to see
23 passed on to younger generations.

24 Being a female, it is important for our
25 generations to pass on traditions to the younger kids.

1 Because I'm concerned with the salmon population decreasing,
2 there is nothing for me to teach my kids if they are extinct
3 and then teach their kids.

4 I speak not only for the concern for the salmon
5 for myself and my tribe, but for all our ancestors and our
6 people. I know they cannot be with us today, but I speak
7 for them, also.

8 The earth is our mother and for decades she
9 provided for us. We have lived off the land for food and
10 shelter for many years, and we can go back to that. It is
11 our way of life and no other way.

12 All other aspects have been tested, and if this
13 is the last step to try to save the salmon. Let's try it
14 because if all else failed, it will fail and then you just
15 go back to something else.

16 But this isn't about money. This is about our
17 land. I mean, this is the last thing we have. We have to
18 take care of it because people out there really care about
19 it, like our tribe. There are a lot of other people out
20 there.

21 And that's all I have to say. Thank you for
22 taking this time and listen to me.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Marquette.

24 Lloyd Hicks, Brent Barrus, and then Lavern M.
25 Broncho, Sr.

1 LLOYD HICKS,

2 MR. HICKS: I'm Lloyd Hicks. I'm a fourth
3 generation irrigator as well as some of the others here. I
4 want to speak to augmentation.

5 What I have is a couple of very general -- on
6 actually what it means at the operating level.

7 Burgess Canal Company (phonetic), I'm the
8 president of the Burgess Canal Company and director of the
9 Great Peterson Company and director of the --

10 I'll get a little closer. I'm the president of
11 the Burgess Canal Company, and director of the Great Feeder
12 and the director of the Self Container Canal Company
13 (phonetic) and combined they have about 116,000 acres worth
14 of farmland. So it's a fairly large farm entity.

15 The Burgess Canal Company. It's been in
16 operation for 114 years, and along the way we helped with
17 the Bureau of Reclamation buy into and then pay for the
18 upper reservoirs, along with a lot of other folks. In doing
19 that, we provided ourselves with a livelihood for that
20 valley.

21 Flow augmentation would reduce our water
22 supplies. There is no question about that. We had marginal
23 water in some of our areas now. I'll give you an example of
24 that.

25 Flow augmentation, what it might actually do at

1 the end of this level -- in 1988, 1990 and 1992 and 1994, we
2 did not finish a season with our water due to drought years.
3 That is four out of twelve. The previous twelve had three.
4 So about a third of the time, our region doesn't have enough
5 water in the current situation to make a full season.

6 Farmers understand that. And in the spring of
7 the year we alternate, let them know. They alternate. They
8 grow less corn, less potatoes, and try to get by with a
9 short season when the water is short.

10 Eight years out of twelve, not in a row, but
11 typically over the last twenty-four years, they do have a
12 good seasons, but four years out of twelve, they don't. So
13 that's the current situation.

14 Augmentation will clearly exacerbate that. We
15 reduce our flows to get through those four years, and ninety
16 percent to seventy percent to fifty percent, in each case
17 and tail out the year in August with no water. We know how
18 to live with that.

19 We have 700 family farms that would fail for lack
20 of water in the scenario I just read to you in a case of one
21 million less acre feet or flow augmentation. 700 family
22 farms that I represent would not exist shortly thereafter.

23 The financially, that's six million dollars.
24 That's what we sell. Take that four from 25,000 acres up to
25 340 or whatever the number was, and you can see it's a

1 tremendous amount of money.

2 The towns are Rigby, Ririe, Lewisville, Grand,
3 Georgetown, Ucon and Idaho Falls. And small ones would be
4 gone. Idaho Falls would clearly be affected. You'd see
5 serious, major, social, economic reality and human suffering
6 which would probably be worse.

7 THE MODERATOR: I need you to wrap up, please.

8 MR. HICKS: Okay. We help build and pay for the
9 reservoirs, and we feel it's unfair to leave us with an
10 augmentation flow situation that leaves us without a
11 livelihood.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lloyd.

13 Brad Barrus, Lavern Broncho and Dale Rockwood.
14 And just for information, Brent is number twenty-eight.

15 BRENT BARRUS,

16 MR. BARRUS: Thank you. I'm Brad Barrus, and I
17 live in Sugar City. My grandparents came in 1917 to this
18 land. We farmed for eighty-three years. I represent the
19 Woodmanson Johnson Canal Company. We have thirty-four water
20 users. I also represent the Wolf -- we have approximately
21 thirteen more water users on that ditch.

22 We have had those dry years as the gentleman just
23 expressed, and if it hadn't been for the dams we have in our
24 area and the reservoirs, we would not have been able to
25 complete the crop year.

1 We cut back. We had to cut back drastically in
2 those drought years. So it's very important to us to have
3 reservoir water. And if we're augmenting the flow of the
4 fish, which I'm all for the recovery of the salmon. I don't
5 want to forget that. I want that point to be clear, but I
6 think it has to be a very equitable decision. It can't just
7 be something that a few groups.

8 I'm grateful for Larry Craig and Mike Crapo and
9 Mike Simpson and Governor Kempthorne. They represent us as
10 citizens of this great state. We have had lot of interests
11 that come from out of state with a lot of money, and we as
12 irrigators don't have the money to match them. And it's
13 nice to be represented by someone who will at least stick up
14 for us.

15 It's also grateful to be in this great nation.
16 And I lived in Cincinnati and Cleveland for a couple years,
17 and I wish there were more deer back then. I wish there
18 were more wildlife when I lived there, but there is a lot of
19 streets. There is a lot of pavement. There is a lot of
20 cement and so forth.

21 I know here fishing, I love to fish. I hope -- I
22 don't think it's just a dam problem with the fish. It's a
23 people problem. I don't know how many of these people when
24 they go to fish jump in a car instead of jump on a horse.
25 And when they take their horses, they put them in the horse

1 trailer instead of riding them from their homes to where
2 they fish.

3 And, so, our system has changed over the years.
4 There is more politicians in Washington, D.C. than there are
5 wild game, I'm sure. And, so, I think we have to be very
6 careful when we come to make these decisions, that we're not
7 going against where they are right now.

8 I know the problem can be solved. We have the
9 technology. We have the brain power, and we can do it, but
10 I think it has to be a very careful decision that as this
11 young lady, Native American expressed, it doesn't -- it
12 benefits all groups and not just a few.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Brad.

14 Lavern Broncho. Dale Rockwood and then Glenn
15 Davis.

16 Since Glenn is not there, we move on to Ryan
17 Kearsley.

18 LAVERN M. BRONCHO, SR.,

19 MR. BRONCHO: Evening. Lavern Broncho, Sr.
20 Natural Resource liaison for the Shoshone-Bannock tribes.
21 And in the junior senior high school, I'm a mentor, a
22 father, and a great grandfather, and proud of it.

23 There is something happening. It's the culture,
24 the tradition that's been handed down to me, and handed down
25 to my dad from his father, and his father's father.

1 The decline is coming down. How am I going to
2 pass this on to my children. The traditions, the cultures,
3 the certain way that the women handle themselves at camp, a
4 certain way that the men handle themselves with respect for
5 the fish, the animals, the water, the trees, the medicine
6 plants. All of that was used when we went out to the field.
7 Even the rocks, ceremonies are holy. There is a lot of
8 holiness out there. How can we pass this on to our
9 children, especially what -- working with the junior, senior
10 high school. This is what we are calling our living
11 classroom. This was the classroom of our ancestors, so
12 we've been taking the kids right back to the classroom that
13 was already established by the creator.

14 So we need to protect our culture. We need to
15 pass this on from one generation to another, even for the
16 nonmembers, because we all have to live on this earth. We
17 have to watch over each other.

18 We need to bypass those dams. We can't be using
19 that word "breach." That word "breach" is very harsh,
20 either side channel them or go around them because is the
21 more lenient term.

22 As for the 4-H's, I don't worry about habitat.
23 The habitat is there. The fish isn't there.

24 Leave the hatcheries in place because if these
25 four lower dams do go, well, we'll need those hatcheries to

1 rebuild the stocks.

2 That is all I have to say, thank you.

3 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lavern.

4 Dale Rockwood, Ryan Kearsley and then Margery Fulton.

5 DALE ROCKWOOD,

6 MR. RICKWOOD: My name is Dale Rockwood. I'm a
7 member of the Committee of Nine. I live on a family farm
8 homesteaded in 1885. I live north and east of here. I also
9 like to fish and hunt but, you know, before I can enjoy the
10 pleasures of fishing and hunting, I have an obligation to
11 provide a living for my family. My farm provides income for
12 the schools, for the roads, the county governments and the
13 whole works. So it involves a lot more than just a family
14 farm.

15 In order to raise a crop, we have to have water
16 in our area, and I'm opposed to additional flow
17 augmentations.

18 I have when I stopped last night at the store,
19 just for your interest here, I find it interesting that
20 endangered salmon listing are the only species that I can
21 buy a can at the grocery store for less than five bucks,
22 chinook salmon.

23 The Army Corps has built a series of dams on the
24 Upper Snake River that provides a stable source of water for
25 irrigation, recreation, power, and one of finest cutthroat

1 fisheries in the world.

2 We have in the Pacific Northwest a hydroelectric
3 system that provides the cleanest and most reasonable power
4 in the United States.

5 The four dams in question provide enough power to
6 supply all the homes in Montana and Idaho. For the good of
7 all the citizens in Idaho, the last thing we need is a
8 political war between north and south Idaho.

9 And if you're ever going to save the fish and you
10 start a war between the two, we're not going to save the
11 fish. It's just not going to happen politically.

12 If we are to restore the salmon and the steelhead
13 runs, we must all work together. And I suggest we do this
14 by improving our habitat, our hatcheries, our fish
15 transportation systems and a good predator control system.
16 Thank you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dale.

18 Ryan, are you with us? After Ryan, Margery
19 Fulton and Larry K-E-R-B-S.

20 MR. KERBS: Kerbs.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

22 RYAN KEARSLEY,

23 MR. KEARSLEY: Good evening. I'm Ryan Kearsley.
24 I'm the vice chairman of the board of directors of Fall
25 River Rural Electric Cooperative in Ashton. I live in

1 Victor. And we are against the breaching of this dam or
2 these dams.

3 In the studies that we have gone through and
4 meetings that we've gone to, I really appreciated the Corps
5 of Engineers. I think they've done a super job of making
6 this problem -- if it's a super problem, work out for all
7 areas. I just think that there is other ways to do this
8 besides just breaching the dams.

9 Just a couple of suggestions. In the program
10 that is used, the Path Program, I think we need to look at
11 that program a little more. It's a module. It's something
12 that is supposed to work, but who knows if it does.

13 And yet, we're standing on that module as
14 something that's actually happening and things that are
15 going to happen in ten, twenty, thirty, forty years. So I
16 would think that we should look at that program really
17 close.

18 Also, I noticed on some of the slides that a lot
19 of this money was coming from Bonneville Power. And when I
20 think of that, that means that's coming from all of us
21 through our electrical bills. And even though we don't
22 realize that we're paying for this expense, we all share in
23 that expense.

24 And I would really like the panel to reassess
25 that and put the expense to where it should be. If there

1 are some groups that want to be against this, let them
2 really be shown up-front.

3 I think that we've got a lot at stake here.
4 We've got a lot of good people in this room, and I think
5 that we can all work together somehow. Thank you.

6 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ryan.
7 Margery?

8 MARGERY FULTON,

9 MS. FULTON: And Gary Lampson taped Lost River
10 Electric's message and it is a public utility and we are
11 against breaching the dams, but Gary Lampson taped it in the
12 hallway.

13 THE MODERATOR: Okay, great. Thank you, Margery.
14 I appreciate it.

15 Larry Kerbs, Bob Vesser and Doug Schwieder.

16 LARRY KERBS,

17 MR. KERBS: I'm Larry Kerbs from St. Anthony,
18 Idaho. I'm going to be testifying upon my own. I am a --
19 have been a director on a -- I live on a community named
20 Wilber and there is a Wilford Canal, manufacturing
21 irrigation canal that runs through this community. I've
22 been a director on that for many years. And a couple years
23 ago I was voted to serve on the Committee of Nine.

24 My farm is along the Teton River. And I've
25 always realized this is a great country for nationalities, a

1 melting pot for me. My grandfather immigrated from Russia
2 of West German descent and my son is farming the ground now
3 and is the forth generation farmer on this particular piece
4 of ground.

5 My grandfather told me stories before the dams
6 were built. In late July and August, they would run out of
7 water and so they would have to trade with farmers. And as
8 they had the water for two or three days, depending on the
9 decrees, they would save this water day and night getting
10 over as many acres as they possibly could and letting the
11 rest go, hoping that it would rain to save some of them.
12 Dams on our system were built in the thirties. This
13 supplied water for us in later years, but to finish crops.

14 But some years the dams don't fill. Man was
15 talking about Henry's Lake. I understand it takes that
16 reservoir three years to fill, so if we drain them down
17 every year, there would be many years we would be in
18 trouble.

19 Now, I know you're not considering breaching the
20 dams on our system, but we've been providing a lot of water.
21 And once you give somebody something, they expect it. And
22 that's what we're concerned about. Dry years, if we drain
23 all the water out of our reservoirs, and they are small
24 reservoirs in comparison with these others you're talking
25 about. We're talking about dry years, we would be out of

1 water. It would cause serious concerns.

2 I've never read information that was legitimate
3 where increased flows have actually helped the salmon. I
4 feel there needs to be more studies on ocean conditions.
5 That has already been mentioned here tonight.

6 What about the rivers with no diversions on them?
7 Are they overflowing with salmon? Some of them were not.
8 Why? There is no dams on them.

9 We had a dam we breached on the Teton River back
10 in 1976. It changed that river. It used to be fun to float
11 that river because it was a free-flowing stream, but now it
12 isn't. The sediment has never left the river. Some of it
13 has, but there are many pockets, many dams, later in the
14 fall where the sediment has slowed the water down.

15 The fisheries in Teton River aren't as good as
16 they used to be. I remember as a young man catching a lot
17 of fish there. I see outfitters going down the Teton River,
18 hook and release. Our fisheries have declined in Island
19 Park, Henry's Lake and on our streams. So I don't know what
20 the reason is there.

21 Thank you.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Larry.

23 Bob Vesser. Doug Schneider, then Don Hale.

24 BOB VESSER,

25 MR. VESSER: Yes. My name is Bob Vesser. I live

1 in Pocatello. I'm speaking as a consumer. And no
2 reflection on the Corps of Engineers on the Teton Dam, I
3 think that was not built where they recommended to build it.
4 They built it where the environmentalists recommended to
5 build it, but in any case.

6 That being a fact, I think it would be fair to
7 say that to the native Americans, I think in the
8 government's requirement in our treaties, the Fort Bridger
9 treaty was passed by two-thirds of the Senate and was
10 ratified. It was literally a binding treaty against the
11 United States. Many past presidents, Indian Affairs
12 Department of Army were not so ratified, but the Fort
13 Bridger Treaty was. I just want to say we have obligation
14 there.

15 And I think the obligation on salmon could be met
16 if in this subsistence requirements of that treaty that as
17 much Alaskan salmon as they care to consume ought to be part
18 of that subsistence arrangement.

19 And I'm sorry. I think there is an obligation
20 there. And there has been a very large representation of
21 the Bannock-Shoshone here.

22 Concerning breaching the dams, I think there
23 should be other alternatives. As you go in the room over
24 here, the Washington-Oregon Department of Fisheries provided
25 information on the salmon production of the Colombian versus

1 the year.

2 If they care to look at it, you'll find it went
3 down in order of magnitude when the Grant Coulee was
4 starting to fail. Now when we're talking about restoring
5 salmon, I think we better talk about really what has is
6 caused the major depreciation of it. Certainly commercial
7 fishing. But the Columbia itself is a long river, and it
8 was a great salmon stream.

9 As far as restoring Idaho salmon, it's been said
10 that there is extinction there. I think that probably
11 unknown to a lot of people are the hydro capability of these
12 four dams. They're open sets at 3,000 megawatts. They --
13 it's a multiple of Idaho power and Idaho production.

14 And we all depend, irrigators, farmers, native
15 Americans, we depend on maintaining hydro rates. If we
16 quadruple our rates, it's another \$250 a month to the
17 average Idaho household. Our incomes don't support this.
18 Our agriculture can't live with it.

19 I think it would be a wrong step in breaching
20 these four dams and breaching Grand Coulee or anything else.
21 I think we have, if we're going have the benefits in the
22 culture, I think sometimes we have to pay the price.

23 Thank you very much.

24 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Bob.

25 Doug, are you with us? And Don Hale and then

1 Lane Hansen.

2 DOUG SCHWIEDER,

3 MR. SCHWIEDER: Hello. My name is Doug
4 Schwieder. I represent the IGPA Idaho Grand -- tonight.
5 But I'm also on both sides of the fence being a river guide,
6 too, so I have kind of two opinions. I'd like to make a
7 living. I really would love to see salmon back. And that's
8 what we are all here for.

9 The great would like the firm our desire to
10 return the wild to sustainable levels. We believe science
11 has shown breaching the dams would take additional water
12 from Idaho would not bring back sustainable levels to Idaho.

13 For this reason, farmers of Idaho are united in
14 our opposition to flow augmentation or dam breaching.
15 Protest industry has cranked up the rhetoric, in fact,
16 members of the protest industry and certain scientific
17 associations have not -- about dam breaching.

18 THE REPORTER: Can you speak up a little? I'm
19 losing you when you mumble. Thanks. I just want to make
20 sure we have your full statement. That's all.

21 MR. SCHWIEDER: It is hard for the grain
22 producers of Idaho to support any of the draft options from
23 the options that are set in stone or the real problem as
24 identified. We believe that recent research has shown
25 predators, man included, are the major cause of low returns.

1 And one other comment I'd like to make is
2 throughout the testimony tonight, all I've heard is, I think
3 this will help. I think that this will help, but I have yet
4 to hear anybody said that I know this will help.

5 Thank you for your time.

6 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

7 Don Hale. Lane Hansen and then Jerry Rigby.

8 DON HALE,

9 MR. HALE: I'm Don Hale. I represent my family
10 and myself. I also represent some irrigators from my area,
11 but more importantly, my family. I equate closely with some
12 of the native Americans who spoke here today about our
13 heritage.

14 My family was driven from Ohio, Illinois. Made
15 to cross the plains, given an opportunity to live in this
16 mountain area. We were given the opportunity by the federal
17 government, and I consider you our trust. I feel like when
18 we dug the canals with our horses and with our slip
19 scrapers, with your encouragement, that we were fulfilling
20 part of that dream which the United States had for this
21 area.

22 When we built the dams in our area, we paid for
23 them. The irrigators paid for Palisades. The irrigators
24 paid for Jackson. We repaid every cent that the federal
25 government allowed us to use to help in the construction of

1 those facilities.

2 My family was one of the first to have a
3 commercial dairy in the Blackfoot area. There were only
4 three commercial dairies when my grandfather started there.
5 One was with the Indian school, one was hospital south and
6 one was my grandfather's. They milked eighteen head of cows
7 every day, night and morning, separated the milk by hand and
8 sold the cream. They worked hard as a family.

9 I am about the third or fourth generation in that
10 area now to milk cows, to work with my family every night
11 and every morning. We get up. We milk our cows; my
12 children, myself, all of us working together. It's our
13 heritage.

14 If you people could give us assurance 100 percent
15 that no water would come out of Idaho, I would support
16 breaching the dams. But you all can't do that, because you
17 don't know if it will work and neither do I. And that's why
18 we are standing here today.

19 Flow augmentation is not right. It doesn't work.
20 And we can support breaching, if you can guarantee that it
21 wasn't necessary to augment flows, but you can't. And we
22 can't trust the federal government to not expect more water
23 out of Idaho, because just like the Indians and just like us
24 as irrigators, the promises we've been given have not been
25 kept. The federal government has not been a good trustee.

1 Thank you.

2 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Don.

3 Lane Hansen. Jerry Rigby and Darren Huntsman on
4 deck.

5 LANE HANSEN,

6 MR. HANSEN: I'm going to comment on both the
7 Corps and the other papers.

8 My name is Lane Hansen, and I am a former salmon
9 fisherman from Arco, Idaho. I might say I love these fish.
10 I can't imagine a Salmon River without salmon. You know,
11 when you're there, and I'm sure these native Americans have
12 expressed that today, and you can feel the fish are there.
13 If the fish aren't there, you're going to know it when you
14 go to the Salmon River. It's going to be a joke.

15 I'd like to thank you for holding the hearing
16 here, and it's easier for us to testify than if we had to
17 drive to Boise or wherever. However, some of those who fish
18 for salmon in a '40s, '50s and '60s to knew what a great
19 mountain top experience it was to fish for these beautiful
20 creatures are still not able to be here in Idaho Falls
21 tonight.

22 Some of them are dead and gone, and they're not
23 able to be here. And some of them are too old to be here
24 and testify that something real must be done to save these
25 fish.

1 One such man is Herb Paulson, who will soon be
2 eighty years old. Herb got his first salmon on hook and
3 line in about 1940-41 and ran Herb's Sports Shop in Arco. I
4 have great feeling and great respect for Herb Paulson as a
5 fisherman and as a person. And I fished with him many
6 times. He asked me to mention his name as being on record
7 to requesting a bypass these dams and save the fish.

8 And my main message to all those who have been
9 involved in this decision, is basically extreme urgency.
10 We've studied these fish to death. We've got to do things
11 that will turn things around for the salmon. And you must
12 take positive action now that will turn things around for
13 the salmon.

14 You must take that action on the options that
15 show that breaching the dams with no changes to the hatchery
16 until the numbers warrant that.

17 Now, many promises were made when these dams were
18 built that the fish would not be lost. We waited twenty-two
19 years since our last salmon fishery on the main salmon. And
20 we waited patiently. Now we're told by many that we must
21 wait again while we study some more. Let's study some more.

22 Well, barging has not worked in the past and it
23 never has worked. The only thing that's got our fish back
24 has been high water flow years that power greater than our
25 provided that water and these fish made it to the ocean

1 without traveling through barges, many of them.

2 I would just say that it's our responsibility by
3 law and by treaty to restore these great fish to the
4 fishable levels. If you combine all the other things in the
5 papers together without breaching the dams, they won't begin
6 to restore the fish.

7 The only thing that would begin to get any
8 numbers would be if they take many, many, much more water
9 than has been talked about here today.

10 I would just like to say that the salmon survived
11 beautifully before the dams were built. And if we were in a
12 battle or war right now and we studied things out like we're
13 doing on these salmon, we would have been dead a long time
14 ago.

15 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lane.

16 Jerry Rigby. And Jerry is number forty, for
17 those of you keeping track, then Darren Huntsman and Larry
18 Fullmer.

19 JERRY RIBGY,

20 MR. RIGBY: Hi, I'm Jerry Rigby and I'm from
21 Rexburg, Idaho. I'm an attorney there. I represent the
22 Committee of Nine. And I guess more important than that,
23 I'm also a native Idahoan. In fact, we talked a lot about
24 heritage tonight, about way of life. My forefather, in
25 fact, the town of Rigby fifteen miles from here is named

1 after him. So I am not just the attorney representing them
2 and the hired gun; I guess that's the point.

3 I'm also a member of the Idaho Water Resource
4 Board. And in that capacity, I truly have had an
5 opportunity to study this. I've had an opportunity as an
6 attorney in the litigation through all of this, to listen to
7 what is out there.

8 I guess my point, and a lot has been said
9 tonight, and I don't want to go over that too much other
10 than to say this. I believe, that the way of life is an
11 issue for all sides. I won't say both sides. I'm saying
12 all sides.

13 And I would hope that no one here is against
14 bringing salmon back. It's a question of the approach. And
15 call it the lawyer in me, but I still say as I reviewed all
16 of this litigation, as I reviewed everything that's come
17 down the pike, as others have said here tonight, where is
18 the proof? The proof is in the pudding. The evidence, the
19 trial or whatever you want to say, it's not there.

20 And, therefore, to take the drastic approach that
21 we're talking about just the four lower dams, no big deal,
22 very small power, and yet it's the peak power.

23 Another client we represent are three
24 cooperatives, electric cooperatives. They're run by the
25 people. Again, it's their power. It's the power. It's the

1 peak power. So it's not just a small amount. It is the
2 most important, if one could really put it that way.

3 And so before you take that drastic approach,
4 let's get the proof. Let's get the evidence. It's not
5 there. I would submit that if anything, it's on the other
6 side.

7 But there is -- there are some other conditions
8 that are obviously out there. When we talk about the smolt
9 making it down to Bonneville. And we look at that
10 initially. In fact, your own report said that early
11 estimates of this delay mortality were high, but recently
12 the studies of the 5th Ag indicate that spring-summer
13 chinook do not suffer substantial delayed mortality from
14 transportation.

15 Okay. So they're getting down there, but they're
16 not coming back. Why isn't that a big issue? If they're
17 not getting back in the first place, that's something again,
18 we continue to look at, before we take the drastic approach.

19 Now, one last thing, it's the most important one.
20 When we talk about the dams and we say that the dams are --
21 just take them out and we don't have to worry about flow
22 augmentation, that's not true.

23 In fact a week ago, Nibbs (phonetic) told us that
24 even if the dams come out, flow augmentation is required.
25 If flow augmentation is required, and a little is good, more

1 is better. Then the livelihood you're talking about for all
2 these people that have built and have their heritage here,
3 is going to be in jeopardy and we're going to lose family
4 farms. Remember that. Thank you.

5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jerry.

6 Darren Huntsman, Larry Fullmer and Mark Ricks.

7 DARREN HUNTSMAN,

8 MR. HUNTSMAN: My name is Darren Huntsman. I am
9 the Upper Snake River Valley director for Idaho Steelhead
10 and Salmon Unlimited. We are a fishing group, a bunch of
11 sports fisherman from all walks of life, farmers and all
12 different types of people.

13 I appreciate you folks coming. I hope that what
14 has been said here tonight isn't falling on deaf ears. I
15 hope it's not falling on minds that have been closed, as has
16 happened before.

17 I was fortunate enough to be born and raised here
18 in Idaho. I caught my first spring chinook salmon when I
19 was nine years old in 1969 with my dad. Family fishing
20 trips were a big part of our culture. A lot longer
21 traditions than what those four Snake Rivers have provided.
22 It's all I hear is how they are a tradition. They're an
23 icon of the northwest. No, the fish are the icon of the
24 northwest.

25 Three years following the completion of Lower

1 Granite dam, our family tradition ended. 1978 was the last
2 salmon season we had in our state. This summer I'll pass
3 the tradition on to my twelve year old son to fish for
4 spring chinook. Unfortunately, I'm going to go up to Alaska
5 and fish for one of those cans that this gentleman held up,
6 two different stocks.

7 Not too long ago I was amused by a statement of
8 Senator Crapo's chief of staff John Hainey (phonetic). I
9 quote him, he says, "We want a recovery plan that does not
10 wipe out any given economy along the system."

11 My statement to Mr. Crapo and Mr. Hainey and the
12 members of this panel is, what about the economies that rely
13 on the fish runs? Before we decide what we are going to
14 lose when we pull those dams out, we need to decide what we
15 lost before we put them in.

16 The truckers, the railways, the fishermen, the
17 25,000 fisherman that lost their jobs from Astoria all the
18 way into Idaho, what are we going to tell those people?

19 All I heard tonight is, we don't know what the
20 science is. That's what our politician says. We need more
21 science. We need more science. The vast majority of the
22 scientists, you guys as in scientists included, have told
23 you what the science is. They told you what's going to
24 happen if you pull those dams out. They told you what's
25 going to happen if we don't.

1 The one thing that we know for sure, the one
2 thing that we have proof on for everybody that doesn't
3 believe it, is barging does not work. If it worked, I'd be
4 taking my son out to the Middle Fork this summer instead of
5 Alaska.

6 People say there is no delayed mortality that
7 don't know about it. I heard a scientist, a fishery
8 biologist in the field for over twenty-five years, he says,
9 when I look at the delayed mortality, he says it's like the
10 lieutenant colonel here, grabbing a fish bowl of gold fish
11 and running to the top of a ten-story building. When he
12 gets up there, those fish are shook up just like they do
13 when they go through a bypass system. He looks at them.
14 They're okay. He drops them off the roof.

15 All of the people and all of the scientists and
16 all of the farmers who can't see that what's going to happen
17 if they don't breach, when those fish go whipping past the
18 fifth-story window, they're okay. They must be fine.

19 We know that barging does not work, and I'll
20 hurry.

21 THE MODERATOR: I'm counting on it.

22 MR. HUNTSMAN: We know that breaching will work.
23 Your scientists have told you that. Don't let Senator Craig
24 and Crapo and all of the rest of the people take your water.
25 Because one thing I can guarantee you is if they don't

1 breach the dams, it won't take long and you'll be yelling
2 for breaching the dams because your water will be going down
3 the river. Thank you.

4 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Darren.

5 Larry Fullmer, Mark Ricks and Matt Darrington.

6 LARRY FULLMER,

7 MR. FULLMER: Larry Fullmer of Pocatello. I'm
8 here representing a specific chinook salmon. It died about
9 ten years ago. I was a biological aid for the Emergency of
10 Idaho Chinook Research Station on the Haygaden River
11 (phonetic) in Lemhi Valley.

12 That salmon was the first one I ever saw. It was
13 the first salmon I ever caught in the trap as part of my
14 job. I spent a couple of hours with it after having read
15 about them all summer. I spent a couple of hours looking at
16 it and thinking about where it had been. And I made some
17 promises to that fish and being here tonight is one of those
18 promises.

19 I saw the bureaucracy from the inside. I worked
20 for a man who was one of the scientist members of the
21 northwest salmon recovery team. He was the head of the
22 Department of the Fisheries at the University of Idaho.

23 My job was to track all the downstream smolts
24 that year and take them up to an abandoned fish hatchery so
25 his graduate students could do experiments on them that

1 fall. Long story, short, all of those fish died. He didn't
2 give a shit. What he cared about were the grants from the
3 BPA.

4 I met a lot of ranchers there in Lemhi Valley.
5 They told me in the '50s and the early '60s, there were so
6 many fish in the Lemhi River you could not drive a tractor
7 across the river without killing them.

8 I was there in 1990. I trapped the upstream
9 migrants twenty-seven fish came back. There were thirteen
10 reds. The ranchers' story to me matches identically the
11 graphs that all of you have seen. It's the dams, folks.
12 It's the dams.

13 Tonight I heard you presenters say, we don't have
14 a specific recommendation. We need more data. These are
15 just proposals. We don't know. There is no silver bullet.
16 There are no overnight solutions. It's a very complicated
17 issue.

18 Well, deja vu. Rerun. I came to a salmon
19 hearing in Idaho Falls ten years ago, and the only
20 difference was it was sponsored by the Northwest Power
21 Planning Council, but there were representatives here from
22 all of your organizations.

23 Army Corps was represented by a guy named Witt.
24 Making proposals. Saying the same things: We need more
25 data. We need more studies. We don't have a silver bullet.

1 It's a very complicated issue.

2 Five years later National Fisheries got this in
3 the mail. Proposed recovery plan. You guys are here
4 tonight, five years later, proposed recovery plan. It's
5 time to have a recovery plan, isn't it?

6 But I think you have to say, one of your options
7 was, do nothing. I believe that's what you decided in the
8 first place. You want to do nothing. You're going to wait
9 until the last fish come back. And then you're going to
10 say, we figured it out. We took all of Idaho's water. We
11 figured it out.

12 THE MODERATOR: Larry.

13 MR. FULLMER: Unfortunately, only one fish came
14 back. Only one fish came back. Okay? Too late to breach
15 the dams now that we know we should.

16 We're going to build a museum. We'll stuff that
17 fish, put it on the wall, and it will be there for all of
18 posterity to see. We meant to take the dams out. We
19 financially decided it was a good idea but, sorry, it's too
20 late.

21 THE MODERATOR: Mark Ricks, Matt Darrington and
22 Ken Retallic. I'm sorry. I don't know how to pronounce it.

23 Mark, are you here? Mark?

24 Matt, is that you? And then Ken is next.

25

1 MATT DARRINGTON,

2 MR. DARRINGTON: I spent until 1:30 yesterday
3 morning or this morning, I guess it would be, writing a long
4 paper to read to you people. It's in my hand, and I'm not
5 going to.

6 My name is Matt Darrington. I'm a farmer. I am
7 a fisherman, and I'm a member of ISSU, A sport fisherman's
8 group. I don't feel conflicted.

9 We have been told many times that the problems
10 with the salmon in Idaho are ocean conditions and seals and
11 arctic terns. And we've been told that the solution to this
12 problem is hydro power dams that are fitted with fish
13 friendly turbines and that if we improve our nesting
14 habitat, those fish will return.

15 The facts of the matter are, before the four
16 Lower Snake dams were in place, Idaho fish were numerous.
17 After the last dam was completed, Idaho fish were not
18 numerous anymore.

19 I, for one, would like to see the four lower
20 Snake dams breached. We've studied and studied and studied
21 the problem, and it's time for a solution. Thank you.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Matt.

23 Ken and then Keith Esplin, and then Garth
24 Towersap. Thank you.

25

1 KEN RETALLIC,

2 MR. RETALLIC: My name is Ken Retallic. I live
3 here in Idaho Falls. My educational background is in
4 biology. I've been a writer and photographer for more than
5 twenty years here in Idaho. I've seen this issue from
6 virtually every side.

7 In the interest of brevity and to keep moving
8 along, I would like to address two specific issues that
9 haven't been covered too much tonight.

10 It's a tragedy, of course, that the salmon are an
11 imperiled species after only two centuries that fall into
12 the Lewis and Clark's entry into the Pacific Northwest.

13 It's also appalling that every other chartered
14 species in Idaho either are listed as endangered species or
15 is being considered to be listed on the ESA.

16 One of the things that hasn't been discussed here
17 is that the millions of salmon that once returned to the
18 highland, including the standing basin and upper tributary
19 waters of the Columbia Basin is that they brought back the
20 nutrients needed to continue that cycle of life. They
21 brought them back from the ocean and provided heavy nutrient
22 load to the upper rivers that has been lost and could be a
23 contributing factor to other native species being harmed.

24 My comments are addressed to both issues on the
25 table tonight. Breaching the dams, I feel is a viable

1 alternative and one that could be showing more quicker
2 results than the others that have been proposed, including
3 barging and other factors. But in supporting breaching the
4 dams, I have to say that you can't take the water from the
5 Upper Snake River.

6 One of the species under consideration for an ESA
7 listing here is the Yellowstone cutthroat. In addition to
8 the, you know, prime economic reasons for using the water
9 from the Upper Snake here, we have a very viable wildlife
10 and fishery population, that if we have another endangered
11 species on the table, how are you going to make the choice
12 between the salmon and the cutthroat?

13 So, again, I ask you to breach the dams and save
14 the native species. Thank you.

15 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ken.

16 Keith, Garth and then Ted Chu's on deck.

17 KEITH ESPLIN,

18 MR. ESPLIN: Hello. I'm Keith Esplin from
19 Blackfoot, Idaho. I'm a family farmer, a potato family
20 farmer and I'm also president of the Potato Growers of
21 Idaho.

22 Producers of Idaho's most famous commodity, the
23 Idaho potato, supports solutions that will lead to the
24 recovery of the state salmon runs. However, the potato
25 growers of Idaho do not believe that breaching and a

1 continued flow augmentation are viable alternatives.

2 The 1999 Idaho potato growers produced
3 approximately 138 million hundred weight of potatoes on
4 approximately 400,000 acres. Their production represents
5 thirty percent of all potato production in the nation.

6 By comparison, Idaho has the largest potato
7 acreage space and higher production than all of Canada.
8 Consumers worldwide recognize the Idaho potato as the
9 safest, the highest quality available by paying a premium in
10 the marketplace.

11 A large shipping and processing industry has been
12 created around this production. We've created value-added
13 product that creates jobs and helps build Idaho's economy.

14 Potato growers of Idaho have a strong commitment
15 to irrigated agriculture. Inaccurate and misleading
16 assertions include dam breaching and flow augmentation as
17 potential solutions to the salmon problem threaten not only
18 Idaho's economy, but also the livelihood of all Idaho farms,
19 farm families, and the people who process and distribute our
20 products as well as those who supply input for our farms.

21 Mandated flow augmentation continues to be
22 unrealistic and without scientific basis. Idaho has
23 supplied more than ten million acre feet of water in the
24 past five years and it has resulted in no measurable benefit
25 to salmon.

1 Taking an additional million acre feet of Idaho
2 water will drive 600,000 acres of productive farmland.
3 Because grain crops utilize mainly early season stream flow,
4 as many as 400,000 acres of the acres in question are the
5 equivalent of Idaho entire potato -- which will be high
6 value, late season, storage irrigation, intensive crops,
7 mainly potatoes and sugar beets.

8 This scenario will bankrupt many farms and
9 trigger over production of already surplus grains. Potato
10 production turns approximately \$1600 per-acre, while their
11 crops, like grain, will be much closer to \$300 an acre.

12 Taking an additional million acre feet of Idaho
13 water means that many of Idaho's reservoirs in dry years
14 will be empty up to ten percent of the time. Tearing out
15 dams also result in an increase in power cost.

16 Breaching these four dams could result in a
17 twelve to thirteen percent increase of wholesale power
18 rates, a backbreaking blow to economically-strapped farmers.

19 PGI supports turbine modifications, fish streams,
20 modifications, fish improvements and bypass improvements
21 that will give salmon a better chance of reaching the ocean
22 as juveniles and returning to spawn as adults.

23 PGI supports further funds for more research in
24 ocean and historic conditions in order to uncover additional
25 information of predators and their relation between the

1 salmon and predators.

2 The proposal to breach the four Lower Snake River
3 dams, augment flows, water along side those farm families
4 will then render the state's economy to virtually destroy
5 industry and unravel the social fabric of our people and
6 bankrupt our already struggling farm families.

7 This is an unacceptable price to pay for a plan
8 that won't recover salmon. Thank you very much.

9 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Keith.

10 Garth, Ted and then Steve Murdock, Steven Murdock
11 is on deck.

12 GARTH TOWERSAP,

13 MR. TOWERSAP: Hello, I just wanted to let you
14 know I'm going to try to address both issues as best as I
15 can. You've heard many of the viewpoints --

16 THE MODERATOR: State your name for the record,
17 please.

18 MR. TOWERSAP: Certainly. My name is Garth
19 Towersap and I'm a tribal member of the Shoshone-Bannock
20 tribes.

21 Okay. First of all, you heard many of the
22 viewpoints that have been presented before. And I want to
23 talk to you about one issue that really hasn't been
24 presented until now. That is, specifically, the health
25 benefits of having a strong salmon population.

1 Up to the 1960's, we had tribal members that were
2 living in the salmon river area. And during that time, you
3 know, we, our families were strong. Our culture was strong.
4 Our heads were strong, and our hearts were strong.

5 One major part of that is because of that salmon
6 right there. That is our link to our mother earth. It is
7 one of many links.

8 Even when we were relocated to Fort Hall, we
9 still made the journeys. We always were constantly going
10 back and forth. Sure, we did it by buckboard at first and
11 then we went to cars later on, but the thing is that we
12 still made that journey to that area.

13 I would call it a pilgrimage to that area because
14 we had to go up there. We had to perform the ceremonies.
15 We had to make sure our culture was still alive.

16 Now with the suffering of the salmon, so does the
17 health of our tribe as well. We look at today now, for
18 example, one of the biggest problems we are facing now is
19 that we have a serious epidemic of major health-related
20 diseases such as diabetes.

21 If it's unchecked, the viability of our
22 reservation and of our people is threatened. All the
23 federal agents that are out there, that are trying to work
24 on this situation, must realize that we must maximize, we
25 must all work together to ensure that this does not happen.

1 We have an opportunity here to bring back the
2 salmon. We have an opportunity to rectify the situation.
3 And I would encourage you all to seriously consider the
4 words we have said here and to consider all the deeds that
5 have been done and all the data that's already been gathered
6 and critically evaluate what's been done.

7 And we ask that based on this information and on
8 the opinions of my people and of other people as well, that
9 the dams must be breached.

10 One other thing that I wanted to discuss, you
11 mentioned -- somebody was mentioning, why doesn't the Indian
12 simply go back and forth with the horses. I think one of
13 the reasons why is because we'd probably get plowed over by
14 a truck. Thank you.

15 THE MODERATOR: Ted. Steven Murdock and then
16 Karl. And Karl is number fifty. And we have 102 signed up
17 so we're almost halfway there.

18 TED CHU,

19 MR. CHU: My name is Ted Chu. I live in Idaho
20 Falls. I've been a resident of Idaho for approximately
21 thirty years. I support breaching the four dams of the
22 Lower Snake River as the best alternative for restoring
23 salmon to Idaho and removing the demand for Upper Snake
24 River water for flow augmentation. I have reviewed all the
25 information I could obtain on this issue before arriving at

1 this position.

2 As a biologist, I agree with the science that
3 strongly indicates bypassing the dams is the only action
4 which will be successful in restoring salmon runs to Idaho
5 in fishable numbers.

6 As a former Salmon River salmon fisherman, I know
7 firsthand what the loss of runs have meant to local
8 businesses, to our Idaho heritage, and to our collective
9 spirit. As a taxpayer, today has convinced me that
10 bypassing the dams is economically sound.

11 The people whose lives and livelihoods were
12 destroyed by the construction of these dams were not
13 compensated for their losses. Nonetheless, I firmly believe
14 that people in businesses negatively impacted by the
15 dismantling of these dams should be generously assisted at
16 public expense in transition to alternative employment and
17 alternate means of transportation of goods and products.

18 I chose breach over flush. Prior to the
19 construction of these dams, there was no need for water
20 releases from our reservoirs to assist downstream smolt
21 migration.

22 In the future, I will actively oppose any attempt
23 to release additional water from the Upper Snake River for
24 this purpose once the dams are bypassed.

25 And I would add that believing that we can have

1 both the dams and retain our water in the Upper Snake basin
2 is unrealistic if you understand the provisions of the
3 Endangered Species Act and the treaties of the tribes.

4 Along with the construction of these dams came a
5 promise: Salmon numbers would be maintained. We have been
6 overly patient waiting for this promise to be kept. It has
7 now been obvious for more than twenty years that we can't
8 have both the dams and anything more than token number of
9 salmon.

10 I have heard a number of people say here tonight
11 that we need to work together. What has been going on all
12 this time? I thought we were working together. If working
13 together is working for the salmon, it's been awfully
14 one-sided up to this point. Working together to save the
15 salmon is going to have to be different in the future.

16 It is imperative that we begin the process of
17 removing the earthen portions of these dams immediately.
18 Decommissioning these obsolete structures will be the most
19 enlightened progressive act of conservation conducted by our
20 society during the first decade of the twenty-first century.

21 The salmon are running out of time. Any attempt
22 to delay dam breaching with promises of new fixes must be
23 viewed as nothing less than a calculated strategy of driving
24 these fish to extinction so they will no longer be in the
25 way. This is unacceptable.

1 Additionally, I have attached to my comments a
2 copy of an article that appeared in a local paper that
3 describes the salmon fishing trip that I was on in 1973.

4 Thank you.

5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ted.

6 Steven Murdock, Karl Williams and Rob Van Kirk.

7 STEVEN MURDOCK,

8 MR. MURDOCK: I'm Steven Murdock, an irrigator
9 and also a director on the People's Canal and Irrigation
10 Company. I'm happy to be able to be here this evening to
11 share just a few thoughts and feelings I've had and also
12 with those by other individuals I talked to over the last
13 few years on the proposals being discussed here tonight.

14 Reactions to the idea of breaching the dams has
15 been everything from anger to total disbelief. In my mind,
16 there are still many unanswered questions. And the proof is
17 not there to support dam breaching or even flow
18 augmentation.

19 One of the big questions I've always had is, what
20 is happening to the salmon when they get to the ocean? It's
21 not hard to quickly figure out that a fish in the stomach of
22 a predator or fishing boat headed for another country,
23 regardless of all the work and preparation we do to invite
24 them back up the river, will not come.

25 I feel there should be more research done on

1 these questions and that has been stated also by you this
2 evening.

3 Above and beyond everything else, however, is at
4 what cost is all this worth? Well, I think we should do all
5 that is reasonable to save the salmon. I can't help but
6 think of all the people affected adversely by the effects of
7 these proposals.

8 Over the years, I've come to admire and
9 appreciate the wisdom, hard work and foresight of the
10 generations that preceded ours.

11 We have, in my opinion, one of the greatest river
12 systems and it benefits so many people in so many walks of
13 life.

14 The dams and rivers make possible irrigation of
15 millions of acres of farm ground, power generation which we
16 all are the beneficiaries of, recreation for so many,
17 habitats for so much wildlife, and waterways for moving
18 supplies and commodities to markets, and countless other
19 benefits.

20 Let's move forward and not backward, and weigh
21 all the pros and cons and above all, keep your priorities in
22 the right order to help and protect people in their way of
23 life. Thank you.

24 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Steven.

25 Karl, Rob Van Kirk and Jeff Barney is next.

1 Karl, are you with us?

2 Jeff Barney, on deck Jerry Hanson.

3 ROB VAN KIRK,

4 MR. VAN KIRK: My name is Rob Van Kirk. I live
5 in Ashton, Idaho. And even though I'm an avid sports
6 fisherman and spent my entire life fishing for salmon,
7 steelhead and trout in Idaho and throughout the Pacific
8 Northwest, I'm here primarily tonight as a scientist.

9 Many people who have spoken before me this
10 evening have quite eloquently discussed social and economic
11 details of this issue. However, I'm here this evening as a
12 mathematical biologist. By training, my area of expertise
13 is in fish and wildlife population dynamics and in
14 particular, the dynamics of extinction and persistence in
15 small populations.

16 Research on the Snake River salmon population has
17 shown that survival of downstream migrating smolts is the
18 major factor limiting salmon populations.

19 Regarding the Corps of Engineers Juvenile Salmon
20 Migration Feasibility Study, the scientific evidence
21 strongly suggests that the only option that provides
22 significant benefits to downstream migrant juvenile salmon
23 is the natural river draw down option.

24 Successful downstream migration of salmon smolts
25 to the ocean is not simply a matter of transporting the fish

1 alive to the lower Columbia as barging has demonstrated.

2 Juvenile fish must undergo physiological
3 alterations that allow them to successfully make the
4 transition from living in fresh water to living in salt
5 water.

6 These alterations have evolved over thousands of
7 years to occur during the time it takes the fish to migrate
8 from headwater streams to the ocean under the natural
9 hydrologic regime of a free-flowing Snake River.

10 Construction of the four Lower Snake River dams
11 dramatically altered this migration timing, disrupting a
12 life history that had successfully maintained abundant Snake
13 River salmon populations for thousands of years.

14 It is true that we don't know with a 100 percent
15 certainty that breaching the lower four Snake River dams
16 will recover those populations to pre-dam levels, but it is
17 nearly certain that salmon recovery will not occur without
18 restoring the environmental conditions under which the
19 juvenile migration phase of the salmon's life history
20 evolved.

21 Juvenile salmon have successfully migrated to the
22 ocean for thousands of years before the dams were built.
23 They had failed to migrate successfully only since the
24 construction of these dams.

25 Simple reasoning yields the conclusion that the

1 key to increasing migration success is to return the river
2 to its natural flow condition by breaching these dams.

3 In addition to breaching, I also support
4 coordinated regional planning for habitat improvement,
5 fixing in river harvests to 1999 levels until recovery goals
6 are achieved, and utilizing hatcheries for conservation
7 rather than mitigation.

8 Outside of my occupation as a scientist, I could
9 list a lot of reasons why we ought to recover salmon. I
10 could also list a lot of scientific reasons why salmon ought
11 to be recovered.

12 However, the point I would like to leave you with
13 tonight is, that if we as a society are serious about
14 recovering Snake River salmon, then the lower four dams must
15 be breached.

16 On the other hand, if we were not willing to
17 breach these dams, then we should admit that we are not
18 willing to restore salmon and quit wasting time, money and
19 resources on continuing debate and research until the debate
20 and research are no longer of interest. The salmon will be
21 extinct at that point. Thank you very much.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Rob.

23 Jeff, Jerry Hansen and Lyn Benjamin.

24 Jerry, are you here? Jerry Hansen, Lyn Benjamin,
25 after that is Paul B-E-R-G-G-R-E-N, I think. It's hard to

1 read. Go ahead.

2 JEFF BARNEY,

3 MR. BARNEY: Thank you. My name is Jeff Barney.
4 I'm with the Idaho Wildlife Federation. We represent a
5 group of sportsman across the state of Idaho of 5,000
6 members and affiliate members across the entire state. And
7 I'll keep my comments very brief.

8 After reviewing the draft EIS, there was one and
9 only one alternative that represents any viable way of
10 recovering Idaho salmon and steelhead; that being
11 Alternative Four, bypass the Snake River dams. And I feel
12 very strongly about that.

13 The Idaho Federation have been strong advocates
14 since the beginning of this issue for preserving rural
15 economies -- preserve rural economies, protecting Idaho
16 water and getting our fish back.

17 As it stands now, the economies and the
18 biologists point very strongly to the fact that that can be
19 accomplished only if bypassing these dams is kept on the
20 table.

21 Many of our members contributed to the \$1.1
22 billion dollar industry known as recreation and tourism in
23 the state of Idaho. That is a very far-reaching economic
24 fact -- effect, I should say, in this state.

25 To that end, the people who fly fish and fish

1 across the state of Idaho, myself included, we want to see
2 no flow augmentation. In fact, we want to see flow
3 augmentation taken off the table so that Idaho's water is
4 not at risk for nonrecreation industry and for farming.

5 The risk to South Fork and Snake, the risk to
6 Henry's Fork basin, should these dams not be bypassed, is
7 very far reaching. We think it will have a very dramatic
8 place for those rural economies that depend on these
9 resources.

10 And I just want to make sure that bypassing these
11 dams is kept on the table as a viable alternative to
12 recovering our fish and protecting your rural economies and
13 protect Idaho water. Thank you very much.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you Jeff.

15 One more time, Jerry Hansen, are you here?

16 Lyn Benjamin.

17 After Lyn, Paul Berggren and Keene Hueflle.

18 LYN BENJAMIN,

19 MS. BENJAMIN: Good evening. My name is Lyn
20 Benjamin. I'm from Teton Valley, Idaho. I'm a hydrologist
21 by profession. I'll be speaking to you tonight about both
22 papers that are on the table.

23 I would like to commend all the agencies that
24 were involved in producing these documents. Of the amount
25 and quality of information that they compiled about a very

1 complex issue. These studies that provided comprehensive
2 cross-disciplinary summaries of the issues that need to be
3 addressed in order to meet the mandates of the federal
4 Endangered Species Act.

5 These documents clearly outline the risks and
6 consequences involved with each of the options that face us
7 now. So much has been accomplished and presented to the
8 public by these agencies, I believe that it is now time to
9 consider the options and make our choices.

10 Although some groups say that science is still
11 inconclusive and that we need to continue the studies, I
12 disagree with this and propose we now have the best model
13 we're capable of producing and should make decisions based
14 on the information that we have.

15 At the this point in time, the decisions to
16 postpone actions are simply decisions to ignore federal law
17 and permit several stocks of anadromous fish to become
18 extinct.

19 In a similar vein as a resident of eastern Idaho,
20 I am dismayed by the position taken by a variety of groups
21 and individuals in the region that salmon recovery is not a
22 concern of theirs and that protection of water supplies for
23 irrigation or in stream flows should supersede salmon
24 recovery effort.

25 We are all residents of the Columbia River

1 ecosystem. And the health of our smaller watershed is
2 intimately tied to the health of the larger watershed.

3 At this point in our history, it is critical to
4 set aside parochialism, and to work toward a regional
5 prospective.

6 To protest flow augmentation for the Upper Snake
7 River basin, whether it be at the current level or one
8 million acre feet, without offering viable alternatives of
9 salmon recovery is also a way to ignore federal law and
10 permit these fish to become extinct.

11 Each paper offers a series of alternatives. In
12 both papers the current programs or existing conditions do
13 little to improve the condition of the salmon species.

14 The second series of options entitled, "Major
15 Systems Improvement," are important, but it appears from the
16 modeling efforts that without dam removal, these steps would
17 not significantly increase population growth of fish
18 species. These second options would necessarily involve
19 high levels of flow augmentation which would have
20 unacceptable impacts in head water regions.

21 The third option to breach the Lower Snake River
22 dams or natural draw down option. This is the alternative
23 that biological opinions cite as the only one likely to
24 bring salmon population back to a viable level. Although
25 other factors, such as habitat, harvest and hatcheries need

1 to be addressed, without dam breaching, it is unlikely the
2 salmon species will recover. Thank you.

3 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

4 Paul, thank you.

5 And then Keene and Fred Davies.

6 PAUL BERGGREN,

7 MR. BERGGREN: My name is Paul Berggren. Tonight
8 I represent the New Sweden Irrigation District, at which
9 every one of you is a guest sitting here. That's our falls
10 in front of the building here. I've been here a long time.
11 My grandparents settled here in the 1890s. They came from
12 Sweden. And this is the New Sweden Irrigation District.
13 That figures out.

14 I'm in opposition to option four of, dam
15 breaching option, for many reasons. First one is, of
16 course, National Fisheries indicate that there isn't any one
17 alternate, alternative alone that's going to save the
18 salmon.

19 There are quite a few things that are probably
20 going to go have to be done. But all of the options
21 proposed by the federal government, except one include the
22 existing low flow augmentation. I've heard tonight several
23 times that it's either salmon or water.

24 Well, every one of the federal options, with the
25 exception of one, indicates that the current flow

1 augmentation, that's 427,000 acre feet from the Upper Snake,
2 237,000 for Idaho Power, and from one and a half to 1.9
3 million acre feet from Dorsack reservoir. And this is
4 status quo is well over two million acre feet annually.

5 Additional flow, this million acre feet study
6 would devastate the economies of the Snake River Valley as
7 well as destroy the resident fisheries in these reservoirs
8 that we depend on so much because these reservoirs would be
9 completely drained part of the time.

10 The studies now conclusively demonstrate between
11 95 and 98 percent of listed salmon stocks are alive when
12 transported through barges to the mouth of the Columbia
13 River, however, less than half of one percent of the adults
14 return. This indicates ocean conditions to be one of the
15 major problems.

16 We could talk quite a bit about this. I feel
17 that this is something we certainly need to look at, the
18 terns and the squaw fish and, well, many other things need
19 to be mentioned, mackerels, to say nothing about lost power
20 generated capacity if the dams are breached.

21 We're talking about more than a total generating
22 capacity of Idaho Power Company, and say nothing about the
23 increased pollution, expense, the loss of jobs by replacing
24 river barge transportation with an additional 2,407
25 semi-trucks on our highways or an additional 600 rail cars.

1 The dams can't be breached in time to save salmon.

2 The absolute minimum for Congress to authorize
3 and appropriate money for agencies to develop environmental
4 impact statements, for engineers to design the work, to let
5 the bids for contracts to be selected is from nine to
6 sixteen years, if no one sues.

7 My time is up. Appreciate the opportunity, thank
8 you.

9 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Paul.

10 Keene?

11 Let's see. What kind of keys are they? Two sets
12 of car keys if anyone is missing their keys.

13 Keith, are you with us? He left.

14 Keene left?

15 Fred: Go.

16 FRED DAVIES,

17 MR. DAVIES: Go?

18 I would like to commend the board. Six of the
19 nine are here, and you have a very unenviable task. I know
20 you're highly paid government employees, most of you, and we
21 all -- most all of us in this room appreciate that. And I'm
22 here to assure you, you don't get paid enough for the job
23 you've got to do.

24 This is an extremely touchy situation. It
25 affects the cultures of all the people living in the

1 Columbia River Basin, and it affects their livelihoods.
2 There are a lot of issues here. And of all the people who
3 have spoken tonight have honest intention in what they say.

4 This is a very tough issue to do. One of the
5 definitions of insanity is to continue to do the thing
6 you've been doing and expect to get different results. If
7 we continue to do what we've been doing and expect to get
8 different results, we are insane.

9 If we continue to try to methods we have tried
10 and do them more, more is not necessarily better, we will
11 get the same results we have been getting. We must do
12 something different.

13 If we have graphs that indicate that the decline
14 became very sharp when these four dams were constructed,
15 then it would behooves us to remove these four dams.

16 That alone will not be enough, but that alone
17 does solve a lot of the concerns which have been expressed
18 here tonight. Some of the concerns have been expressed are
19 the loss of water and the related crops. That's a very real
20 concern. That's a very valid concern, but breaching the
21 dams minimizes that concern.

22 By breaching the dams, we minimize the need for
23 augmentation to drive out that stagnate water and correct
24 that chemical imbalance that you can't do with some of the
25 methods that have been tried and haven't worked, like the

1 flip tails on the spillways, and those types of things.

2 A lot has been said about the cost of doing this.
3 The cost of doing this approach is some \$265 million dollars
4 per year. But that's only the cost in lost revenue. It
5 doesn't reflect necessarily the lessening of expenses, and
6 doesn't take into account the increased revenue available
7 upstream by being able to release those flows of water in a
8 calculated manner through the turbines upstream, such as
9 Palisades, CJ Strike and those dams.

10 It releases that waters in augmentation form, not
11 at the time when it can do generation. And the power that
12 will be lost is an average flow of power. It isn't the peak
13 amount year-round. It's not lost to us. It's lost to the
14 Dalles and Soletto (phonetic) and the transformation into
15 D.C., which is then shipped southwest from here.

16 That is who loses that power. The people who
17 have been stealing our water over the power lines for the
18 past twenty-five years.

19 Thank you very much.

20 THE MODERATOR: I'm sorry it's after the fact,
21 but can I get you to state your name?

22 MR. DAVIES: Fred Davies. I live in Pocatello,
23 Idaho.

24 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

25 Okay, folks we're going to take another break

1 here and give our panel a chance to stretch. Ten minutes.
2 We'll be back at twenty till. We're on Number fifty-eight
3 and the next person up will be Lonnie Racehorse.

4 (Off the record.)

5 THE MODERATOR: Move up to the mic, please.

6 Lonnie, you're on. And after Lonnie is Denny Manning and
7 then Jeff Anderson.

8 LONNIE RACEHORSE,

9 MR. RACEHORSE: My name is Lonnie Racehorse. I'm
10 a tenth generation Indian from this valley. I am here
11 representing myself, and I'm a tribal member of the
12 Shoshone-Bannock tribes. I've been fighting this situation
13 for over twenty-five years.

14 I used to be the director of Idaho Intermountain
15 Policy Board out of Boise. And I have a little -- from the
16 Idaho State Journal here that is dated April 23rd, 1981,
17 saying that I blame the river dams for dip in fish
18 population. I've known what you guys are learning now for
19 over twenty years, nineteen years. And I've stated that in
20 this paper.

21 I heard from a number of biologists around that
22 this is the case. At that time they were telling me that
23 the trips around the dams would take care of everything and
24 bring the fish population back. And they didn't work. And,
25 plus, a number didn't do the fish ladder deal and so forth,

1 and none of them worked. And now you're being told that the
2 dams is a problem.

3 I believed that then and I believe it now, and I
4 think the only way to bring those salmon back is to breach
5 the dams.

6 And at that time I called them the dam dams. We
7 had fights with the fisherman out on the -- on the rivers.
8 We had one big battle. I know where the expert tribe on
9 Rapid River where they called out the SWAT teams because of
10 the battles with the fish and game. We was doing the
11 fishing up there. And they couldn't. And they would try to
12 run us off. They called SWAT teams on us.

13 And after that, it was up here on the Salmon
14 River with the fisheries. And now the information is
15 getting out, where all the people are getting together and
16 saying let's do something.

17 And at this point, I think it's time to do
18 something. And I'm going to leave this article with you
19 folks. And that's my position. And that's what you've been
20 hearing all evening.

21 I think the people that are starting to change
22 their mind is the one that started learning about the
23 situation. They're basically learning from you people here.

24 You people have still got your thoughts up in the
25 air, you're saying, but I think the position is clear. I

1 think, let's get on with it. Thank you.

2 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lonnie.

3 Denny Manning. Jeff Anderson and Dale Swensen.

4 Denny, are you with us? Denny is off the list.

5 Jeff Anderson.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

7 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Great.

8 After Jeff, then Dale Swensen and we move on to

9 Salle Engelhardt.

10 JEFF ANDERSON,

11 JEFF ANDERSON: My name is Jeff Anderson. I'm a

12 biologist for the Shoshone-Bannock tribes, and I'd like to

13 address my comments tonight to the All-H paper.

14 The CRI modeling used in -- used throughout the

15 paper uses the assumption that there is zero indirect

16 mortality associated with dam passage and transportation.

17 In other words, they are assuming that a smolt

18 collected at Lower Granite dam, placed on a barge or a truck

19 and released below Bonneville dam is not going to suffer an

20 adverse effect as a result of this experience.

21 This is not a realistic assumption. Throughout

22 the evening, several people have commented that the ocean is

23 responsible for the significant portion of mortality for the

24 Snake River fish.

25 I would argue that a significant part of this

1 mortality is indirect mortality associated with dam passage
2 and transportation. If it's not, we have an awful selective
3 killer ocean out there that is working on actively weeding
4 out Upper Snake River fish.

5 If the CRI assumption that no direct mortality
6 due to dams and transportation is invalid, then the model
7 and its predictions throughout the rest of the paper should
8 also be called into question.

9 Time is critical for the recovery for Snake River
10 fish. Many upper bays and stocks are on the threshold of
11 extinction as we speak tonight. The All-H paper uses the
12 quasi-extinction level of one fish or less returned in a
13 given year for modeling extinction risk.

14 This threshold is too low. The population will be
15 functionally extinct well before this one fish level is
16 reached. By using this conservative level for modeling, the
17 paper does not bring to the forefront that time is of the
18 essence for salmon recovery.

19 Many stocks in upper Salmon basin today are
20 already extinct based on this criteria, including Herd Creek
21 (phonetic), the East Fork Salmon River, Yanky Fork Salmon
22 River, Marsh Creek and Sulfur Creek.

23 The extinction probabilities as well as the time
24 extinction for salmon and steelhead populations would be
25 vastly different if a more reasonable level of fifty

1 spawning pairs were used for modeling, which is an accepted
2 for conservation biology theory.

3 Alternative seen in the paper defers the decision
4 on dam breaching. There is no time to defer a decision
5 unless the powers at be are willing to let the Upper Snake
6 River populations go extinct while we wait for a decision.

7 Incremental survival, improvements at hatcheries,
8 hydro, habitat and harvest will not recover Snake River
9 salmon. No more incremental fixes. We need to make the
10 quantum leap and breach the dams if we expect to recover
11 Snake River salmon and steelhead. Thank you.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jeff.

13 Dale, are you with us?

14 Salle. After Salle, Mike Haddix and Jim Mathias.

15 SALLE ENGELHARDT,

16 MS. ENGELHARDT: My name is Sally Engelhardt.

17 I'm an American, a third generation American and a citizen
18 of Pocatello, Idaho. I'm not a capitalist. I don't bow
19 down to the almighty dollar. I do bow down to a God who
20 created nature and all of us. And I believe in what native
21 Americans have been telling us this evening. I think that
22 their point is well made. And I think that we have been
23 ignoring them way too long.

24 I would like my comments to be applied to both
25 the DEIS and the All-H. And I'm sure that you've heard all

1 of the studies. I'm not going to get real technical. I'm
2 sure you've heard this study as well which was completed
3 recently by Gresh, LaChadwich and Shumacher (phonetic).

4 And they point out that these salmon, these
5 anadromous fish that return to the headwaters in the natural
6 wilderness that we have left here actually supply a major
7 amount of nutrients to the plant life, endangered species
8 within these areas, including the grizzly bear. And some of
9 these species will alter their breeding patterns in order to
10 facilitate the nutrients that are brought back by the
11 salmon. And the carcasses as they were left in the streams
12 and they die.

13 They also feed their spawning or their smolt.
14 They also feed the smolt. And if they don't have these
15 nutrients to gain weight and get stronger to go downriver.
16 They're not going to make it through the turbines. They're
17 not going to make it to the ocean. They're not going to
18 make it back.

19 And I agree with this statement about the
20 selectivity of the ocean. That's pretty farfetched. So I
21 don't really think that that's really the problem. I think
22 the dams are what the problem is because they obstruct the
23 flow of these fish coming back.

24 I think we, as a society, have errored terribly
25 in building these dams because we really didn't put a lot of

1 forethought into what was going to go happen to the
2 ecosystems upstream when they were built. And I think in
3 our greed and our need for money and the almighty dollar, we
4 have not considered what we are now all worried about.

5 If they were a society that actually considered
6 such things and could control our destructive behavior, we
7 wouldn't need protection-type of policies like the ESA, the
8 Clean Air, the Clean Water Act, breaching the dams and
9 worrying about all of these situations to sustain ourselves
10 when we're not really concerned about other species.

11 I claim we are specie eccentric and it's time for
12 us to stop it now. Thank you.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Salle.

14 Mike Haddix, are you with us, Mike? No.

15 Jim Mathias, is that you?

16 MR. MATHIAS: Jim Mathias.

17 THE MODERATOR: Sorry, Jim.

18 MR. MATHIAS: No problem. Anything but late to
19 lunch.

20 JIM MATHIAS,

21 MR. MATHIAS: I'm Jim Mathias from Blackfoot,
22 Idaho. I'd like my comments to apply to both papers. I am
23 the conservation chairman for the local "TU" chapter, but my
24 comments tonight will be as a resident and citizen of
25 southeast Idaho.

1 I am an engineer and made my living for thirty
2 years in our world famous potato industry. My job and the
3 livelihood of my neighbors and friends depend upon
4 irrigation water and agriculture.

5 We are faced today with complex issues and
6 painful choices. I do not believe we should risk, allow the
7 salmon river, allowing the Snake River salmon to become
8 extinct, but who must bear the job change and the
9 relocation?

10 After careful consideration, I now support
11 Alternative Four of the Corps' draft EIS or any alternative
12 that calls for breaching and no use of additional water from
13 the Upper Snake River system.

14 That is the best choice. These are my reasons.
15 When the four Lower Snake River dams went in, the salmon
16 runs plunged quickly to one-sixth of predam levels. Five
17 years after commissioning Lower Monument and Little Goose,
18 the runs were cut by two-thirds, and they were cut again by
19 half when Lower Granite was commissioned.

20 This corresponds exactly with the four-year spawn
21 cycle. I fished those runs and I watched. I witnessed this
22 destruction. And it wasn't because seals or terns ate the
23 fish. Those salmon go to sea, and they return four years
24 later bearing jobs for people.

25 Studies are showing the revitalized fisheries

1 along the Snake and below, together with grain
2 transportation industry jobs and will compensate for the
3 loss in the barging jobs. I believe it will happen. I
4 remember cars lining the roads along the big name holes on
5 the Salmon River.

6 I remember restaurants, motels crowded with
7 fishermen. Idaho's population has grown fifty percent since
8 then. There is more leisure time. With that fishery
9 revitalized, watch the small towns boom.

10 Any nonbreaching alternative will require a lot
11 of southeastern Idaho's water. I do not believe in saving
12 subsidized shipping and barging jobs by sacrificing our
13 irrigation water, our farms, and our jobs in southeast
14 Idaho. This is win, lose. Breaching creates replacement
15 jobs and this is win, win.

16 I believe we've had over twenty years of a grand
17 experiment with our hatcheries, barging and another schemes.
18 They are obvious failures and we need to admit it.

19 Yes. We can devise new studies and endlessly so.
20 My own engineering boss had a sign over the back of his desk
21 that read, "There comes a time when you must fire the
22 engineers --" sorry about that, Bill -- "and get on with
23 what must be done."

24 Breach the dams, save the salmon, and keep our
25 water for productive agriculture and jobs. And the data for

1 the decline is attached.

2 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jim.

3 Lawrence Ford. And after Lawrence, Roger Bray,
4 and then Stan Latimer.

5 LAWRENCE FORD,

6 MR. FORD: Hi. I am Larry Ford from Pocatello
7 representing myself. It seems to me that there really is
8 only three options available to us. One is to preserve the
9 status quo and I heard that deeply espoused tonight by the
10 city councilman from Idaho Falls and various representatives
11 of the Committee of Nine.

12 Now, the gentleman over here, Fred, I think, used
13 my best line, but it bears repeating. Evidence of insanity
14 is repeating the same acts over and over while expecting
15 results to be different.

16 We've had years of barging, hatchery, harvest
17 reductions, things like that while salmon stocks have
18 plummeted. It is insanity to continue this policy while
19 expecting the results to be different.

20 I see that most people have opposed option two
21 here tonight which is the flow augmentation option. It will
22 devastate the farming economy in Idaho with the associated
23 production economies.

24 But those who support option one, the status quo,
25 have to realize that they are, by default, going to select

1 that option two. Lawsuits are going to come on the
2 Endangered Species Act, and tribal rights, treaty rights.
3 And you're playing Russian roulette if you don't think those
4 lawsuits are likely to succeed. And if they succeed,
5 they're going to take massive amounts of water from southern
6 Idaho and not all of it from willing sellers.

7 The remaining option action as I see it is
8 breaching the dams. It has the best chance of restoring the
9 runs. There will be associated costs, but I think that
10 those costs have been drastically inflated for us here
11 tonight.

12 To those who say the problem is other places,
13 ocean conditions, predators, over fishing, and so on, I ask,
14 how do you explain the fact that the salmon stocks in the
15 Hanford breach of the Columbia are doing well?

16 They face the same predators. They face the same
17 gill nets, the same ocean conditions. They have to bypass
18 Bonneville, McNary, the Dalles, John Day dam, face the squaw
19 fish, the whole bit. They're doing well. What's the
20 difference between them and the Snake River stocks? Those
21 four dams on the Lower Snake. Breach the dams.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Larry.

23 Okay, Roger and Stan is on deck and then Jackie
24 Maughan.

25

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

ROGER BRAY,

MR. BRAY: I'm Roger Bray from Pocatello. I don't represent a committee. I don't think we need another one involved in this. I speak tonight in favor of the Alternative Four of the Corps' draft EIS and All-H paper that addresses the mothballing of the four Lower Snake dams. I think that it's necessary in order for us to restore salmon steelhead populations. I am against any flow augmentation that fixes downstream problems with upstream resources.

When I left Idaho for pursuit of my education and career, I entrusted the care of the salmon and steelhead populations to the government entities that were in charge with that responsibility.

When I was able to return back to Idaho, I felt betrayed by those who fell asleep at their job and those who fell asleep on their watch over this valuable resource.

It's my conviction that the proposals to create free flow around the four Lower Snake dams is a necessary first step to remedy the tragic situation of our dwindling salmon and steelhead populations. I would like to state the obvious fact that many people seem to convincely jump over in their search for facts.

We broke the environment that produced the fish for the sake of one dam after another dam after another.

1 The fact is that God had the best system in place for the
2 proliferation of these fish for the ages. The facts are
3 that the salmon steelhead population's creator, when we were
4 arrogant enough to think we could have it all by adding the
5 four Lower Snake River dams, we stripped nature's power away
6 by building those four dams, by turning 140 miles of
7 free-flowing river into 140 miles of fish impoundments.

8 It's time to quit playing God and questioning the
9 creator's ability to design, and to return the 140 miles to
10 nature's way.

11 I grew up on a farm in the Blackfoot area. I've
12 heard water users here tonight tell the story how breaching
13 the dams will require more flow augmentation and all that.
14 I also remember growing up on the farm, we increased our
15 flows by simply clearing the obstacles in our ditches. We
16 pulled vegetation and things like that.

17 If the dams are reducing the flow, then if the
18 dams are removed, we should improve the flow. And I think
19 it's common sense if you ever grew up on a farm, that's what
20 you do to manage your own farm, why not the resource of this
21 stream as well.

22 The facts are that the eastern states have
23 restored salmon runs by beginning with the removal of dams.
24 The fact is that our neighbor to the north in British
25 Columbia has just recently negotiated the removal of a

1 hydroelectric dam there as of March 1st, 2000 in order to
2 restore salmon runs.

3 The facts are we have too many people who fail to
4 lead in this issue. It's time for us to remove the dams and
5 get on with the recovery. We don't need more answers. We
6 need more people to make decisions.

7 THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Roger.

8 Stan, Jackie and then Chris Hays.

9 STAN LATIMER,

10 MR. LATIMER: Okay. My name is Stan Latimer from
11 Pocatello. I really didn't come with anything prepared, but
12 I am for dam bypassing and I'm against flow augmentation.

13 I'm a lifetime resident of Idaho. And when I was
14 younger, my parents used to take me out fishing and enjoyed
15 the outdoors. I've never really fished for salmon. I never
16 have gotten the opportunity to, but I would like to. I
17 really would like to pass on that opportunity to my own
18 sons.

19 By trade I'm an engineer. And as an engineer, I
20 have to make choices, decisions in my work that are based on
21 science and common sense. And it appears to me that we have
22 the science, but we're just not maybe applying enough common
23 sense to the issue, because these dams are what is creating
24 the problems with the fish right now.

25 This might be a silly analogy, but I think if we

1 maybe relate something that's happening applied to ducks,
2 and we built a 5,000 foot fence on the border between the
3 U.S. and Canada, a restriction for the ducks to come back
4 and migrate back and forth. I would say there was going to
5 be a big population decrease in the ducks because we
6 restricted the access so breeding grounds and feeding
7 grounds. And, you know, I think that's an appropriate
8 example as to what the dams are doing to the salmon.
9 Anyway. Thank you.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Stan.

11 Jackie and after Jackie is Chris, and then Rick
12 Eike is on deck.

13 JACKIE MAUGHAN,

14 MS. MAUGHAN: Jackie Maughan and I'm representing
15 the Idaho watersheds project. I'm an eastern Idaho range
16 monitor for the watersheds project. Thank you, folks, for
17 sitting here. I know it's hard.

18 Anyway, I wanted to make some comments for IWP
19 and personal comments for myself. Idaho watersheds project
20 is against flow augmentation for the reasons already stated
21 tonight. We need to keep the water in the streams in
22 southeastern Idaho. We are for breaching the dams.

23 I've heard claims tonight the four dams didn't
24 ruin the salmon runs. I have an anecdote. My father was an
25 outfitter and guide in Hell's Canyon, and I watched his

1 guiding business go out of business as those dams came on
2 line in 1974 when the Lower Granite dam came on line, that
3 put him out of business. Because there were no more -- the
4 salmon and steelhead runs had been depleted so much, he
5 couldn't make a living off of that.

6 So, what I want to -- it seems to me that it's
7 fairly obvious to me, it's self-evident what the problem is
8 with the salmon is those four dams. I want to apply this
9 principle Occam's razor that the simplest and most obvious
10 explanation is usually the correct explanation.

11 So in this case, those four dams are the problem.
12 They're depleting the salmon runs. And what I'd like, very
13 much like to see happen is let's apply Occam's razor to
14 those dams and breach them.

15 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jackie.

16 Chris Hays, are you still with us, Chris?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What number are you on?

18 THE MODERATOR: We are now on number seventy.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that might be me.

20 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

21 CHRIS HAYS,

22 MR. HAYS: My name is Chris Hays. You'll have to
23 excuse my voice, I've been hollering all day. I've been
24 waiting for years for this opportunity. I don't need a
25 prerehearsed of any sort.

1 I'm not Shoshone-Bannock Indian of any sort, but
2 we should be ashamed of ourselves for what we've done to
3 this place. It's time to make right what's been wrong.
4 These fish were here. These lands were here. Nature is
5 natural. It's so obvious. You put a concrete barrier in
6 the middle of a river and you expect something to go through
7 it. It doesn't work that way. Technology is not more.
8 It's not going to happen. They need to be breached. It's
9 that simple. Thanks.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Chris.

11 Rick Eike. If you're with us, still, Ralph
12 Maughan and then Charles Pace.

13 RICK EIKE,

14 MR. EIKE: My name is Rick Eike. I was born and
15 raised here in Idaho. And some people seem to think that is
16 important if you make a comment in Idaho. I don't.

17 But I did learn to fish here in Idaho at places
18 like Big Horse Lake, Perkins Lake and some of the other
19 incredible spots that Idaho has to offer.

20 In the '80s, my job required me to travel full
21 time, and I spent time at every other major city in eleven
22 western states. And I had the opportunity to see first hand
23 what can happen to beautiful places and pristine habitat if
24 they're not protected.

25 When I returned to Idaho in '95, I started to

1 learn about salmon, Idaho's fish, the salmon in particular.
2 I learned every native species of fish in Idaho, they're
3 either extinct, endangered, threatened or in decline.

4 Now, maybe I'm lucky, maybe I'm not, because I
5 have a good friend who is an anadromous fish biologist. I
6 can get good, accurate information about what was happening
7 to the fish.

8 But to me, this isn't about biology. I'm sure
9 that's part of it, but what this is about is what we value.
10 What we value as Idahoans and what we value as Americans.
11 What do we leave for the future? Do we take our kids
12 fishing for salmon or do we take them to a museum to show
13 them what a salmon looked like before they became extinct?

14 I know the choice is clear for me. But this is
15 about promises, promises made, promises broken, and the
16 promises of the future.

17 In the mid-1800s, the government promised
18 American Indians the rights to hunt and fish and by
19 extension the rights of the fish to return to Idaho.

20 That promise has certainly been broken when we
21 talk about the Coho (phonetic) and soon about the sockeye.
22 And then, what, about the chinook?

23 In the '60s and '70s, we were promised that the
24 four dams on the Lower Snake River wouldn't destroy our
25 salmon and steelhead runs and wouldn't destroy the original

1 renewable Idaho resource that had created so many jobs. We
2 were promised that the hatchery programs would be so
3 successful that we would have more fish than ever. We were
4 promised that barging was a solution for having turned 130
5 miles of river into a highway for commodities. Those
6 promises were broken or we would not be here today.

7 Politicians have promised us all sorts of things,
8 huge electric rate increases in Idaho if the dams are
9 breached. I have a videotape of Larry Craig says of the
10 doubling or tripling of electric rates. We are promised
11 huge job losses if the dams are breached. I guess the ten
12 or twenty thousand fishing industry jobs that were already
13 lost don't figure in.

14 We are told the technology is the answer to fix
15 what technology has ruined, even though it has failed for
16 the last thirty years to do so. And we only have ten or
17 fifteen more years left to even try.

18 One promise I do believe is the promise if the
19 dams are not breached, the federal government will take an
20 additional one million acre feet of our water or try to
21 unsuccessfully flush pass the dams.

22 It's clear that flow augmentation won't recover
23 our salmon runs. It delays extinction. But in the process,
24 it hurts every Idahoan that relies on that. That is a
25 promise you can rely on.

1 Breaching the dams is the only solution that can
2 save our salmon and steelhead runs as well as the needs of
3 other native fish, all without requiring additional Idaho
4 water.

5 The life span of the dam is limited no matter
6 what you do. Extinction is forever. Please do what's
7 right. Breach the dams. Bring back our fish.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Rick.

9 Ralph and then Charles Pace.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Breach the dam.

11 THE MODERATOR: Is that you, Ralph?

12 MR. MAUGHAN: No, I'm Ralph Maughan, Pocatello,
13 Idaho.

14 THE MODERATOR: You're Ralph. Okay. I just
15 wanted to make sure that wasn't your testimony. Thanks,
16 Ralph.

17 RALPH MAUGHAN,

18 MR. MAUGHAN: I don't have any prepared
19 testimony, but you can put me down in favor of Alternative
20 Four, breaching the dams. I do have a few observations
21 about the politics of the situation, and I understand that
22 this is as much politics as it is science.

23 One of the things that was spoken of earlier is
24 there was a similar gathering like this in 1990 and again in
25 1995. And really what we have here is a great public

1 ritual. We have all of the settings of a ritual. We even
2 have a court reporter, which adds a lot of gravity
3 indicative to the situation.

4 But the point of a ritual is, is to make it so
5 that the people appear that they had their say and they have
6 been heard. I don't have any illusions this is necessarily
7 going to change anything, but one of the nice things about
8 political problems is if you study them long enough, they
9 oftentimes go away.

10 And I think in the matter of five or ten years,
11 this problem will go away. There may be the problem of the
12 fact that the irrigators have their water taken from them.
13 I'm not in favor of flow augmentation, but that is the next
14 step, although it appears that those associated with the
15 Committee of Nine don't see that, but I can envision a
16 hearing ten years from now and people will speak of the
17 irrigators as they did the salmon. Well, I remember the
18 time when you could walk along the Snake River in Idaho and
19 go from one irrigated farm to another.

20 But the important thing is to hold the no action
21 coalition together for a little while longer. As our
22 senators have told us, it's very important Idahoans not be
23 split on this situation. That we have things in common with
24 the waterway up at Lewiston.

25 And I say that's sadly absurd. That's why they

1 keep saying that they are afraid people will finally wise up
2 a little bit about that. In some, I think our politicians
3 are very concerned about one river, and that one river is
4 the Potomac. Thank you.

5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ralph.

6 Charles Pace, Mitch Papa and Ronald Hover.

7 CHARLES PACE,

8 MR. PACE: My name is Charles Pace. I'm an
9 economist and I've worked on a number of these issues. I'm
10 representing strictly myself tonight. These views are my
11 own.

12 And I should say to start with, an avid eater of
13 Idaho spuds. I like them fried and mashed and creamy with
14 cheese on the top and all of that, but I also like fish.

15 I believe the time to act for the fish is now.
16 Power Planning Council has been around for twenty years.
17 They have become the handmaidens of industry. They have no
18 remaining credibility.

19 The question now of whether the fish would be
20 better off without them, you're not going to get that kind
21 of action. That kind of action that's necessary from the
22 Power Planning Council, it's going to be up to the federal
23 caucus.

24 And there are going to be entities, particularly
25 the tribes that hold your feet to the fire and insist you

1 carry out the full scope of your responsibilities under the
2 Endangered Species Act and other studies.

3 There are a number of holes in the studies that
4 generally are deliberate. I've worked on these studies for
5 a number of years. They have flawed baselines. The cost of
6 fish and wildlife measures are systematically overstated.
7 The benefits are systematically understated, neglected or
8 attacked. This has been carried through from Drew through
9 the multispecies framework.

10 Particularly in the case of hydro and breaching,
11 those four dams were sized with the expectation of upstream
12 storage. That never developed. Those dams produce
13 electricity. When you have hydro in the system, when there
14 is a release needed, they don't make that kind of
15 contribution. We could easily do without those four
16 particular dams and still have a very strong, viable
17 Bonneville power administration and hydro system.

18 On navigation, the cost of breaching and shipping
19 are overstated. Flow augmentation, you've heard quite a bit
20 about tonight, the fact is we need flow augmentation and not
21 substitute the 427,000 that are coming out of Idaho has no
22 biological referent.

23 It's true that you cannot double dipping, water
24 spreading all kinds of practices, involving federal largess
25 in the Upper Snake, you cannot keep those in place and do

1 flow augmentation. But there is questions about whether or
2 not you should keep those in place.

3 Ralph mentioned some of them earlier. It's not
4 just about economics or ecology, it's about politics. In
5 this region if you look at Idaho's position, don't touch the
6 port of Lewiston, don't touch the water district 01 and
7 don't touch our power company. And that's what Idaho is
8 going to contribute? I suggest that what you need to do as
9 a federal caucus is thank them for their input, cook them
10 and eat them.

11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Charles.

12 Mitch, you're next, and then Ronald.

13 And then Mark. I can't make out the last name
14 but I think it's T-H-I-E-L maybe.

15 MITCH POPA,

16 MR. POPA: My name is Mitch Popa from Pocatello,
17 Idaho. And I'm for the options that are in favor of
18 breaching the dams. In my opinion, the dams we are talking
19 today are an experiment which didn't go as well as expected.
20 With began as an effort to adopt a recourse to meet our
21 needs and demands resulted in a chain of inefficiencies we
22 must now face up to.

23 Commendable and respectable as these efforts
24 were, the time has come for us to face the fact they are no
25 longer needed.

1 I've read much about what would be lost if the
2 power generation, irrigation, transportation. I've come to
3 the conclusion that what we're getting from the dams is not
4 justifying what they are taking away from us.

5 My dad loves to tell me the story about fishing
6 for the salmon on the Salmon in the '40s, '50s and '60s with
7 his best friend Joe. On one particular trip, Joe hooked the
8 big one and they had forgotten the net. My dad jumped in to
9 save the day. When he landed, it was not the river bottom
10 he hit, but a bed of salmon. The salmon swam and my dad got
11 an unexpected battle.

12 None of my kids shall ever have that happen, will
13 never see what my dad saw as will both of their kids. I
14 hope you wish the same for your children and grandchildren.

15 To me, this issue goes beyond whether or not dams
16 should go or stay, but challenges us as humans to
17 acknowledge our mistakes and begin restorative processes.

18 The time has come for us to seriously consider
19 the legacy we're leaving future generations. Will they look
20 back on us with respect and admiration for correcting our
21 mistakes, or will they look at us as being weak, selfish and
22 passive for allowing the salmon to go extinct.

23 The three options are to do nothing, increase
24 flow augmentation barging or return the Snake River to a
25 natural river system.

1 I guess it's my opinion that option one should be
2 thrown out the window. When has doing nothing ever solved
3 anything?

4 In terms of option two, you know as well as I,
5 the cost in this controversial option does not have the
6 desired results; otherwise, we would not be here today.

7 The third option, and I guess it's the only
8 option in my opinion, is to breach the dams. Although I
9 sympathize with a few this will negativity impact, I can't
10 help but think in the long run society as a whole will be
11 better off.

12 In the political arena that this fight now
13 exists, something must be done soon. We can all continue to
14 deny the real problem until the salmon are no longer an
15 issue, and in the end tell your kids and grandkids there
16 just wasn't enough information available at the time when
17 you all know there is. Or you can accept the fact those
18 dams are no longer an asset and side with the majority of
19 the people and all of the salmon.

20 In closing, I'd like to leave you with words of
21 Ignascio Spone, (phonetic), "The only true dignity of man is
22 his ability to fight against insurmountable odds." Thanks.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Mitch.

24 Ronald, are you with us? Great.

25 And then Marc and then Sue Holbrook.

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

RONALD HOVER,

MR. HOVER: I'm Ron Hover. I'm from Idaho Falls. And I'm a fishery biologist by training, but I've not been active in that function other than advocationally for a number of years. I'm also a Pices. Yesterday was my birthday so I'm here representing myself and my family.

I'm an advocate of the Alternative Four. I've been studying the -- I guess the underlying documents for the All-H papers today, and ran across some calculations for cost benefit ratios on the fish. And I have some problems with those, but I understand those are not to be commented on here so I'll write comments later on that. I don't think that the fish in the lake should be included with them as part of the cost.

And, also, it's been brought up here that predators are considered by our water advocates as being one of the major issues. I would like to point out the breaching of the dams will eliminate a number of the introduced resident fishery predators in the reservoirs. This has not, you know, been a major issue, but north pike, if that is in fact what the northern pike minnow that is referred to in three of the reservoirs' fishery surveys, is a very voracious predator of salmon about the size of smolt.

I have personal experience in Colorado where they have caught rainbow trout up to eighteen inches with tooth

1 marks of northern pike on them in that reservoir where the
2 northern pike are not that numerous. So I know they stocked
3 the reservoir northern pike and they are very voracious
4 feeders. They have the ability to grow to three pounds in
5 the first year of life, which is unheard of in fish
6 community, so.

7 That may be another problem that nobody has
8 really looked at that would be addressed by breaching the
9 dams and eliminating them.

10 As far as the flow augmentation, I would not take
11 that off the table. But I would not readily support the use
12 of it. Unless it proves to be required above and beyond the
13 removal and breaching of the dams. Thanks.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ron.

15 Mark, I can't make out the last name. I'm going
16 to try and spell it to see if you're still here. I think
17 it's T-H-I, either C or E or L-E, K-L. I'm sorry. I can't
18 make it out. No? Okay. Sorry.

19 Any Marks here at all who signed up?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That must be me.

21 THE MODERATOR: Good try. Sue Holbrook, you're
22 next. And then Jeb Blakeley and Don Parker.

23 SUE HOLBROOK,

24 MS. HOLBROOK: My name is Sue Holbrook. I'm an
25 Idahoan. I currently reside in Pocatello. I support

1 Alternative Four of the Army Corps draft EIS.

2 Humans have a great capacity for adaptation. Now
3 is the time to put this powerful characteristic into
4 practice and breach the dams for the benefit of the species
5 that cannot adapt to concrete walls and slack water
6 reservoirs.

7 Dam breaching opponents can show that statistics
8 that state the cost are too great to breach the dams. I
9 think the dams have cost us more in ways that are hard to
10 put a price on. Ask the native Americans to put a price on
11 losing their spirituality and a link to their past.

12 These dams are predicted to have a life span of
13 100 years. Future generations will not look kindly on us
14 for allowing salmon to go for 100 years worth of subsidized
15 barging and cheap power. Will that be worth the cost?

16 We should not have to be motivated to do
17 something because of the laws that mandate the salmon must
18 be saved. Let's do it because it is the noble thing to do.

19 Many of us like to think we are superior to all
20 creatures here on this planet. Let's act like it. Breach
21 the dams. Thank you.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

23 Jeb Blakeley, are you still here? Great.

24 Don Parker and then Mike Settell.

25

1 JEB BLAKELEY,

2 MR. BLAKELEY: My name is Jeb Blakeley. I'm a
3 twenty-two year resident of Idaho Falls. I miss the salmon
4 fishing. But I've been steelhead fishing for about twenty
5 years around here. I believe my comments address both
6 documents.

7 I oppose the use of Upper Snake water for flow
8 augmentation. I'm in flavor of dams and fish. I just like
9 to remove the earth on the lower four dams, and we'll still
10 have about 250 some.

11 I think thirty years and three billion dollars
12 of studying and twenty years of barging has brought us to a
13 fish population headed to extinction. I say, do not study
14 these fish to extinction. Take some useful action. It's
15 time to do something other than study.

16 Why don't the fish come back? The fish have some
17 physiological processes they need to go through as they move
18 downstream. That is in the river environment. You put them
19 in a tin can. You shake them up. Let the terns pick them
20 off. It's no wonder a lot of them don't come back.

21 They face the same ocean conditions. They face
22 the same predator conditions for the last four dams. A lot
23 of the same conditions as other fish that are doing much
24 better. The big difference is the four dams on the lower
25 Snake.

1 My recommendation is that you breach those dams.
2 Give us a natural river run. Do not use Idaho water for
3 that natural river. Remove the dams to get the natural
4 river.

5 You say it will cost a lot. I agree it might
6 cost some, but I think your economic analysis is overstated.
7 And the slides up here today, I did not see any economic
8 benefits for the permanent jobs in the new power plants and
9 in the rail and trucking industry that would be created in
10 place of barging. I did not see any cost relieving the dams
11 that are related to the devastation to Idaho economy.

12 If you don't breach the dams, you will take Idaho
13 water. It will be hard on the farmers around here, and
14 that's going to be devastating to this part of the world. I
15 think that costs should be included in any economic
16 analysis.

17 Another thing I'd like to say is breaching is not
18 permanent. After fifteen or twenty years if we see that it
19 doesn't work, we put the dirt and rocks back in and we run
20 the place like it used to be. The fish will be gone and
21 won't be an issue.

22 Idaho is world famous for its spuds, not as a sea
23 port. Do not get confused and save the wrong one. I
24 support any alternative that includes breaching the four
25 Lower Snake dams.

1 Corps of Engineers closed the bypass tunnel at Hell's Canyon
2 dam permanently sealing off the Upper Snake from the Lower
3 Snake in the early sixties it was days away from what would
4 be the largest salmon run on record.

5 There were no protests, no fan fares, no
6 lawsuits, only millions of cohos, sockeye and chinook coming
7 to a dead end.

8 In contrast on Butte Creek on the Sacramento
9 River tributary removing the dam there brought an increase
10 in chinook population from 44 in 1987 to 20,000 in 1988,
11 proving that breaching can work.

12 Prior to the Hell's Canyon dam, there were no
13 Lower Snake River dams and salmon could be fished out of
14 streams as far away as Nevada. Prior to Hell's Canyon dam,
15 the Snake River plain was the largest fish migration
16 corridor in the world. It was like paradise.

17 As a youngster I thought it was. You see, my
18 father was a fisherman, not by trade, though he had done
19 that. Aside from his job, everything he did revolved around
20 fishing. He built fishing poles. He repaired reels. He
21 built and repaired boats. He tied flies, made lures, smoked
22 salmon, raised fish bait. And in his retirement years, he
23 ran a small fishing shop.

24 When he went fishing, he took me everywhere. We
25 fished the Louis River, St. Joe, Couer D Alene, the Snake,

1 the Columbia, the Shoots, the Spokane, the Salmon and on and
2 on. I used to think that fish was the symbol for the state
3 of Idaho.

4 One day we passed John Day dam while it was being
5 constructed and he stunned me by saying, son, I don't know
6 if it will ever happen, but if they keep building so many
7 dams, we'll have to take up another hobby.

8 Sadly his prophecy proved true. And like many
9 others, his fishing shop he lost, and his zeal for the sport
10 he so loved.

11 Now he are faced with the choices of uprooting
12 these ill-conceived dams that were built more for
13 professional pride and pork barrel than actual need.
14 Returning the Lower Snake to a free-flowing river is the
15 only long-term reasonable solution.

16 Therefore, I support Alternative Four, breaching
17 in that Army Corps of Engineer EIS, and I also support the
18 breaching alternative in the All-H study.

19 But it needs to go beyond that as well. A
20 complete process of restoring what was stolen away from
21 those of us who love and depend on the river and all it can
22 provide is what's needed. Thank you.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mike.

24 Dino Lowrey, Scott Levy and then Gerald Jayne.

25

1 DINO LOWREY,

2 MS. LOWREY: My name is Dino Lowery. I've been
3 nan archeologist for twenty-seven years. I recently went
4 back to school, actually night school, ten years and became
5 a geologist. I'm now studying theology in graduate school.
6 Go figure. I'm member of the GYC, Idaho Rivers United and
7 American Nuclear Society.

8 And I have a friend that has cancer. And maybe
9 you know somebody that has cancer, maybe a relative. Now
10 imagine that you have cancer yourself and your doctor has
11 given you four options: Do nothing and death is certain and
12 swift; two, undergo surgery but no chemotherapy, radiation
13 or experimental drugs and your survival rate is less than
14 fifty percent.

15 Undergo chemotherapy, radiation, no surgery, slim
16 chances; option four, pursue the most aggressive course of
17 therapy known; surgery, chemotherapy, experimental drugs.

18 What would you chose? It doesn't take an
19 oncologist or a rocket scientist or ichthyologist to know
20 you would chose life. You would go with the most aggressive
21 course of surgery that you could.

22 Those are the same options that the Army Corps of
23 Engineers has when it comes to saving Idaho native steelhead
24 and salmon.

25 Option one, status quo, fish die.

1 Option two, increase the number of fish placed on
2 barges and trucks to be transported around the dam, and what
3 do you get? You get a river that's safe for wheat but not
4 too good for fish. And the latest past study said that the
5 probability of recovery with this option is less than fifty
6 percent.

7 Option three, makes some minor improvements,
8 maybe redesign some turbines. Again, slim chances.

9 Or option four, partial removal of the earthen
10 position of the four Lower Snake River dams, and what do you
11 get? The reported -- the latest path report says by
12 returning to the natural river option, within twenty-four
13 years we have an eighty to one hundred percent probability
14 of recovering Snake River spring-summer chinook. Not that
15 bad of odds. In fact, odds that most cancer patients would
16 die for.

17 Another study wasn't quite as optimistic and
18 claimed it would take forty-eight years to restore the
19 fisheries if the four dams were breached. But what's
20 forty-eight years in fish time if the alternative is
21 extinction.

22 So where do you plan on being in forty-eight
23 years? I plan on being dead, but I know the human species
24 will carry on and I can guarantee you in forty-eight years
25 this controversy will be gone unless it's like some cancer

1 therapies that we do too little too late.

2 I recognize that the economic hardships will be
3 incurred in the Lewiston area, but I have no doubt that the
4 richest nation in the world can mitigate that hardship, if
5 the political will is there. And I believe it is.

6 In return many smaller communities in Idaho will
7 experience economic gains from the restored fishing
8 industry. Small communities tucked into the back woods of
9 Idaho but do not have the flexibility of a big town like
10 Lewiston.

11 Yes, some people will be financially hurt, but
12 not mortally wounded, mind you. And where are these people
13 going to be in forty-eight years anyway?

14 Therefore, I support option four not only because
15 the number show it will work, but because the U.S. law
16 mandates salmon and steelhead recovery.

17 I'd also like to address a couple of quick issues
18 that came up. One gentleman said, we have a good dam on the
19 Henry's Fork. It is a good dam, but we also know there are
20 a lot of bad dams out there put there by bad judgment. I'm
21 asking you to use good judgment. Remove the four dams.
22 Thank you.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Is your name Dino?

24 MS. LOWREY: Yeah, first name. That's it.

25 THE MODERATOR: I just wanted to make sure.

1 Okay. Scott Levy, Gerald Jayne and then Jon
2 Ochi.

3 SCOTT LEVY,

4 MR. LEVY: Yeah, my name is Scott Levy. I've
5 been to a few of the testimonies earlier. I made the Red
6 Fish Blue Fish maybe you've heard about it. Also the web
7 site bluefish.org, which I would suggest you check out.

8 Addressed in previous testimonies are concerns of
9 shippers and irrigators, and tonight I would like to address
10 concerns of repairs, BPA repairs who fear that the removal
11 of the four Lower Snake River dams will cause an increase in
12 your electric power rates.

13 This is a particular concern here in southern
14 Idaho where significant cost for farmers is pumping
15 irrigation water. Army Corps of Engineers has estimated
16 that the one time cost of decommissioning and removing the
17 dam embankments, protect the reservoir embankments,
18 channelize the river, costs about 479.

19 Another 340 million is estimated for fixing
20 railroads, rivers, bridges, recreation areas, culverts, et
21 cetera. The revenue that would arguably come from the
22 taxpayer rather than the BPA repair.

23 So let's assume that the BPA repair are asked to
24 pay 470 million dollars of the 810 projected cost. It shows
25 that the turbines only last about twenty-five to fifty

1 years, and the upcoming tern rewinds already scheduled are
2 expected to cost 420.

3 Without the dams, this expense won't be needed.
4 So 420 of the 470 is already in the rate structure, leaving
5 50 million.

6 Removing the dams would also free up 21 million
7 in de-gasification construction project. That brings us to
8 twenty-nine million.

9 Additionally, property that could be salvaged
10 from the decommissioned projects could be sold and reused
11 elsewhere, bringing in at least 15 million, leaving us with
12 14 million dollar expense.

13 Considering that the BPA cash reserves are
14 currently 700 million dollars and projected would be 1.2
15 billion dollars by 2006. We see that the one-time cost of
16 breaching can be readily paid for with existing BPA funds.

17 Now, the lost hydropower revenue of these four
18 decommissioned dams amounts to about 250 million dollars per
19 year. However, the BPA, i.e., the federal government, make
20 up for this lost revenue.

21 First consider the cost that will be avoided once
22 these dams are decommissioned. 25 to 35 million in
23 operations maintenance, 35 to 99 fish, new fish streams that
24 would be needed with the dams now. 30 to 50 million per
25 year for flow augmentation in Idaho without the four Lower

1 Snake dams, this will no longer be needed.

2 These are where you costs add up to 130 to 175
3 million. Subtract this from the 250 hydropower revenue
4 leaves the BPA a lost revenue of 75 to 120 million per year.

5 For the moment let's consider that we are paying
6 for 750 million dollars of outstanding debt on those dams,
7 there are fish hatcheris and fish mitigation funds. And an
8 additional 135 million of work in progress will soon be
9 added.

10 From the financial loss, the Corps draft report,
11 it is, quote, "It is possible that congress will reduce some
12 or all of this long-term debt," end quote.

13 If congress does choose to write off all of this
14 bad dealt, then the BPA would be left with a loss of revenue
15 anywhere from 32 million per year, which would mean an
16 increase of BPA risk of about one and half percent worse
17 case.

18 Let's assume Congress does not write off this
19 debt. How would BPA come up with 75 to 120 million per
20 year?

21 THE MODERATOR: I need to ask you to wrap.

22 MR. LEVY: I will be very quick.

23 As luck would have it, BPA rate bearers are
24 currently paying 550 million dollars per year for a whoops
25 debt that would begin to go down in the year 2013 and paid

1 down completely in 2018.

2 So what if the U.S. Treasury lends BPA the
3 necessary funds until 2013. Then the whoops debt begins to
4 disappear. The debt for decommissioning the four Lower
5 Snake dams kicks in. Level it all out, the BPA remains
6 unaffected.

7 This is simple really. No change in BPA power
8 rates is necessary. So let's do the right thing. No
9 economic effect to the shippers, the irrigators, or the
10 repairs. Save Idaho's salmon and steelhead. Breach the
11 Lower Snake River dams. Thank you.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Scott.

13 Gerald Jayne, are you still with us? Okay.
14 Gerald is number Eighty-three. We've got about twenty to
15 go.

16 GERALD JAYNE,

17 MR. JAYNE: Thank you. I'm Gerald Jayne. I live
18 in Idaho Falls. My comments are directed primarily to the
19 Army Corps of Engineers but also to the federal caucus.

20 It is the dams that have devastated the Snake
21 River salmon, and I think that's been pretty well
22 established. I won't repeat the arguments. The population
23 decline did coincide with the construction of the dams.

24 From about the 1940's to the 1970's, the U.S. was
25 engaged in a dam building orgy. These four dams were built

1 in the latter part of that period to make Lewiston, Idaho a
2 seaport. A few voices warned that the dams would decimate
3 the salmon, but these voices were drowned out in the hoopla
4 of engineer ubris and the squealing of political pork.

5 It's also clear that to restore the fish, dam
6 breaching is our only choice. Alternative Four should be
7 supported; therefore, I support it.

8 The scientific studies support this claim. The
9 large majority of biologists agree that if the dams remain,
10 the fish will become extinct. Salmon need a healthy
11 free-flowing river ecosystem. Only bypassing the dams will
12 save Idaho salmon.

13 I wish to select Alternative Four to breach the
14 dams. I support alternatives of the federal caucus to help
15 recover the salmon. It is clear that any reasonable
16 recovery plan developed by the caucus, breaching of the four
17 Lower Snake River dams and the federal caucus ban should
18 also specify that no addition storage water will be needed
19 from southern Idaho for flow augmentation because of the dam
20 bypass, flow augmentation -- further flow augmentation is
21 not needed.

22 It's been stated by some that dam breaching is an
23 extreme act. I would submit to you that the extreme act
24 would be knowingly allowing, maybe even causing the
25 vertebrate species to become extinct is what is extreme.

1 supersaturated gasses killed seventy percent of Snake River
2 smolt. And by the way, all the figures I've quoting are
3 from documents that the Corps of Engineers has provided and
4 they're all documented.

5 Technology, such as gates with holes to let the
6 nitrogen gases escape, failed. Fish sucked through the
7 gates were so dazed and injured that fifty percent of them
8 died.

9 Predators, particularly squawfish love dam
10 reservoirs. The Walla Walla district biologists said, I
11 stood and looked down over a dam and all you can see walls
12 of squawfish. For juveniles it was like swimming into the
13 jaws of hell.

14 Transporting fish by truck, plane and barge has
15 failed. By 1989 the Corps transported over twenty million
16 fish annually, still the fish go extinct.

17 Hatchery programs were said to be the salvation
18 until biologists realized that the hatchery fish were
19 biologically inferior and were weakening the wild species.

20 Supersaturation, predation, technology,
21 transportation, and hatchery augmentation, have all been
22 well-intentioned failures for more than fifty years.

23 Meanwhile, the fish go extinct.

24 Suppose we let the fish die to keep cheap power?
25 Native Americans have promised to sue the federal government

1 for breach of contract. The five affected tribes of the
2 Columbia and Lower Snake ceded more than forty million acres
3 of land to the United States. The following explicit
4 protection can be found in each treaty. Article Three, "The
5 exclusive right of taking fish in all streams at usual and
6 custom places."

7 The U.S. Supreme Court further affirmed that in
8 any treaty between the United States and an Indian tribe,
9 the treaty must be construed in the sense that would be
10 naturally understood by the Indians.

11 Native Americans traded forty million acres of
12 land for their fishing rights. Native Americans could not
13 adjust and likely case that they have been injured by the
14 taking of their livelihood and resources. The four Lower
15 Snake dams and reservoirs inundated and flooded 140 river
16 miles of tribal lands.

17 The Nez Perce, Shoshone, Bannock, Yakima,
18 Umatilla and Warm Springs tribes once harvested 17.8 million
19 pounds of salmon yearly.

20 A Yakama, Chris Walsh said, "Food carries
21 culture. If you lose your foods, you lose part of your
22 culture. It has a devastating effect on the psyche."

23 In exchange for forty million acres, the tribes
24 got extreme poverty when they lost their salmon. For
25 example, the Shoshone-Bannock have 43.8 families, percent

1 families living in poverty. Winter unemployment is eighty
2 percent.

3 Only the breaching alternative offers the high
4 probability of saving the salmon, avoiding demands on Idaho
5 water, and avoiding high energy cost to do justifiable
6 damages paid to native Americans. Thank you.

7 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jon.

8 Peter Young, Robert Fallon and Ted Carpenter.

9 PETER YOUNG,

10 MR. YOUNG: My name is Peter Young. I'm here
11 representing myself and my family. The reasons for removing
12 the four Lower Snake River dams are to me overwhelming.

13 The fact that they supply roughly five percent of
14 the northwest's power. The fact that they provide no flood
15 control, nor are they a significant source of irrigation
16 water. The fact that other attempts to save the salmon have
17 cost billions and have failed miserably. The fact that
18 salmon sport fishing and increased tourism would bring in
19 millions to the area. The fact that the barge traffic would
20 easily be replaced by rail and the existing rail lines all
21 along the Lower Snake River, and the fact that we would
22 violate numerous treaties if they were to let the salmon
23 become extinct, would all point to removing the dams.

24 There are other reasons to breach as well, ones
25 that can't be spelled out in statistics or dollars. You see

1 we are stewards of all that God has given us, the plants,
2 the animals, everything. He saw fit to put salmon here. Do
3 we really think that our dams are more important than salmon
4 that have been living in these rivers for ages? What does
5 our support of these dams say about our stewardship of this
6 earth? What does it say about our choices?

7 I wonder if we really realize the total
8 insignificance of these dams when compared to the salmon?
9 These fish are an amazing gift. The damn government are
10 relics of government excess. Somewhere in an old federal
11 building in some old dusty office are the blueprints for
12 those dams, but I dare you to find the blueprint for the
13 salmon. We don't have them. We can't duplicate these awe
14 inspiring fish. We can't build them. And once they're
15 gone, they're gone forever.

16 If they do leave, what will we say to your
17 children or grandchildren when they ask you where the salmon
18 went? Will you say you were too afraid to act or will you
19 say you stood up for creation and you did something?

20 We in Idaho have a precious resource that very
21 few places in the world have. You can't find these
22 particular salmon anywhere in the world, but here in these
23 rivers.

24 The dams are another story. There are
25 approximately 75,000 dams in the lower forty-eight states.

1 I think we can survive with 74,996.

2 Removing these dams will take courage. Let's
3 show everyone we have the courage and the foresight to do
4 what's right. Rather than take the easy road, do nothing,
5 and hope the problem will go away. Because the problem
6 won't go away, only the salmon will.

7 I cringe at the thought of being a part of the
8 generation that let the salmon become extinct. Years from
9 now no one is going to remember these dams, but they will
10 remember that we didn't do anything. The dams need to go.
11 Thank you.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Peter.

13 Robert, are you still with us? Robert Fallon?

14 No? Ted Carpenter. Wynona Boyer.

15 After Wynona is Jon Burrup and then Fred Brog.

16 WYNONA BOYER,

17 MS. BOYER: My name is Wynona Boyer. I'm here to
18 represent myself and my children, my future grandchildren,
19 great grandchildren, my tribe and especially the salmon who
20 cannot be here to represent themselves, and a great part of
21 my people's culture.

22 I'm in full support of Alternative Four, the
23 breaching of the dams. In reaching this conclusion, I can
24 see no other solution. These salmon are on the verge of
25 extinction if no further actions are taken.

1 What right do we have as people to decide that a
2 specie are worth extinction? Remember that we are just one
3 species in this world and at the moment, we are the dominant
4 one.

5 Our earth has limitations and we are currently
6 realizing its resources are finite. As a resource to this
7 environment, the salmon are at the brink, if we are -- if we
8 as people, don't take any action.

9 As a tribal member, we do have a cultural
10 interest in promoting recovery of the salmon. The
11 Shoshone-Bannock tribes have treaties guaranteeing our
12 hunting and fishing rights. Part of our culture is also
13 becoming extinct.

14 My children, my nephews, my nieces have been
15 fortunate enough to experience a small amount of our
16 culture, which is spear fishing. They won't be able to see,
17 they haven't had an opportunity to see the types of runs
18 that I got to see when I was a child. I don't know if we'll
19 ever see that for a long time.

20 There are a number of second, third and fourth
21 generation farmers and irrigators who are against the
22 breaching. They're afraid and concerned about losing their
23 heritage, culture and livelihood. I wonder where these
24 concerns were when the dams were -- went up and affected
25 entire tribes, culture and heritage and our own livelihoods.

1 my opinion. In Idaho, we live close to the land as farmers,
2 loggers, miners and ranchers. We all love Idaho and its
3 outdoor opportunity it offers us, but we also make our
4 living from the land. And we need this living to be able to
5 recreate, hunt, fish and enjoy this beautiful state.

6 Under any plan, Idaho residents must be
7 compensated for any takings. The constitution requires it.
8 The treaties require it. All across the board if there is
9 any job losses, revenue losses, they must be compensated, in
10 my opinion.

11 We all need to realize that we all eat fish. We
12 eat beef. We live in wooden houses. We wear jewelry. All
13 these industries require access. I believe that the ESA is
14 being used as a club to direct and control these western
15 states. All these products come from producers. They don't
16 come from takers.

17 Basically, like I said, if we get a firm
18 agreement, I don't have a problem with taking the dams out.
19 If we don't get an agreement, I don't trust the federal
20 government. In lots of instances in the past, my mother is
21 Sioux Indian. I'm part native American. And the treaty
22 agreements between native Americans and the federal
23 government have been dishonored numerous times.

24 I don't trust the federal government to not come
25 after Idaho water if we allow the dams to be removed at a

1 later date. I need firm commitment on paper. I would even
2 suggest that it be ratified by Congress. That's basically
3 it. Thanks for your time.

4 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jon.

5 Fred, are you still with us. Fred B-R-O-G?

6 Fred.

7 Jim Webb, are you still with us? Okay.

8 Douglas Coffman, are you there? Okay. Douglas.

9 After Douglas is Rick Williams and Claire Ashton. Good.
10 Thank you. Got it.

11 Okay. Douglas, you're on.

12 DOUGLAS COFFMAN,

13 MR. COFFMAN: Thank you. My name is Douglas
14 Coffman, and I've been a lifelong forty-three year resident
15 of Idaho here, a native. I come from Blackfoot, twenty
16 miles south of here.

17 I'm against flow augmentation for the reasons of
18 economic necessity in this area, due that we are a people
19 who live very close to the land. And many of our businesses
20 in the area are supported because of the funds that are
21 generated from farming.

22 I am for breaching of the dams for many of the
23 reasons that have been stated here. I want to share with
24 you a few studies by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game.
25 They have been conducted in the upper headwaters here that

1 directly affect salmon recovery. It has to do with the
2 Yellowstone cutthroat. Obviously the Yellowstone cutthroat
3 is not a salmon but is a member of the same family and is an
4 indicator fish, meaning that it is very sensitive to
5 habitat. As a result of that, when the cutthroat begins to
6 go, it's beginning stages of problems in the habitat.

7 It's my understanding, through reading and
8 research that three dams have been removed back East for
9 various reasons. And that's the result has been at least
10 two of the three situations have been a building population
11 of the Atlantic salmon and American chad.

12 The Atlantic salmon back East has been going
13 through for years the same problems our salmon are beginning
14 to go through. And with the breaching of these dams, the
15 Atlantic salmon is beginning to come back in the region and
16 that's because there are more salmon being able to reach
17 their spawning grounds.

18 As a result, there are many more eggs laid.
19 There are many more salmon hatched that travel back down to
20 the ocean, are able to come back up and go and the spawning.
21 And the cycle begins or begins to grow. And we have seen
22 some very good results back East.

23 This has raised some eyebrows and has made
24 national news. In the last several years, the Idaho
25 Department of Fish and Game have done a study on the South

1 Fork of the Snake River several miles from here. This is a
2 major headwater to the Snake system.

3 Many Yellowstone fisheries, what they found in
4 high flows bode well for cutthroat and low flows favor brown
5 trout. Spawning is detrimental for Yellowstone cutthroat
6 known as fine spotted -- subsequently, which has a small
7 geographical area here directly affected by flows. And it's
8 very important that, I believe that before we mess with flow
9 augmentation that we have more information out there to
10 study the effects of what happens when we take water from
11 the environmental sensitive species that has now been
12 suggested by sent to be listed under the ESA.

13 Real quickly, north of here about sixty miles, we
14 have a situation that's very similar in that we have trout
15 that travel up into five or six streams that flow into what
16 was once a natural lake that is now dammed. They come down
17 this reservoir much like the salmon do to the ocean.

18 And what happens is in the 1970's, the catch rate
19 began to plummet very quickly. The fish and game department
20 began to study the area and found out that there were
21 obstructions in the several rivers and streams that flowed
22 into this lake. And when those were removed, the cutthroat
23 were able to travel up into the streams, successfully spawn.
24 The fingerlings were able to come down into the river, and
25 as a result of removing those stream obstructions, the

1 population, which is in the two to three million fish range
2 in this lake are now seventy percent naturally spawned.

3 Remove the dams. They are obstructions. Fish
4 can't get through them in the numbers they need and they're
5 sure having a terrible time getting back out in the numbers
6 they need. I think we have studies in this area that will
7 show that that supports evidence. Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Rick Williams. Rick, are you
9 still with us? Okay. Claire, you're on.

10 After Claire is David Richmond, and then Kathy
11 Richmond.

12 We are on number ninety-five and we have one
13 hundred four people signed up.

14 CLAIRE ASHTON HECKATHORN,

15 MS. ASHTON: Thank you very much for your
16 patience. My name is Claire Ashton Heckathorn. I'm a new
17 resident to Idaho Falls. I've been here since September.

18 After a year of searching, we chose this area to
19 retire because of many things. I was active in the Sierra
20 Club. I represent the Sierra Club.

21 In the Seattle area in the rivers work, I hadn't
22 expected to get back into environmental work. Did not know
23 I'd land back in rivers work, but I'm glad that I can bring
24 my interest back to this.

25 I'm a nurse. Health is primarily important to

1 me, the health of rivers, how they affect people.

2 Basically, it's all about people.

3 The four dams on the Lower Snake River are like
4 diaphragms on the river which prevent the distribution of
5 life-giving material to inland areas. It is in the best
6 interest of the citizens of Idaho -- you're suppose to laugh
7 there -- it is in the best interest of citizens of Idaho, as
8 well as those of the greater northwest, to allow the
9 free-flow of the Snake River in this area again.

10 I am for Alternative Four with no flow
11 augmentation.

12 What will be affected, and are these effects
13 easily assimilated? Production of electricity, but the
14 wattage produced accounts for only four to five percent of
15 that consumed. Ongoing conservation methods can recover
16 this reduction.

17 There will be no loss of irrigation water to
18 farmers. And these are flow of the river dams. Farmers
19 will only need to lengthen their intake pipes.

20 Will we ever be able to recover use of these dams
21 if national emergency warrants production of all power?
22 Possible, yes, because only the earthen portions of these
23 dams will be removed and reconstruction would be quite
24 feasible.

25 There have been many disasters created in the

1 United States by unchecked building and unsafe materials
2 disposal. These problems will take many lifetimes, if ever,
3 to correct, but by allowing free flow of the Lower Snake
4 River, we can recover from this error in our lifetime.

5 Let us exercise our stewardship of this waterway.
6 Its fish, animals and surrounding land responsibly that our
7 children and grandchildren will not be ashamed that we
8 wasted part of their precious inheritance.

9 I was a long-time Florida resident, and that is
10 why I mainly got interested in river work when I moved into
11 the northwest. The channelization of the Consemi River
12 (phonetic) didn't just kill a lot of fish and decimate the
13 habitat for ninety-five percent of the birds in the
14 Everglades. It has endangered and polluted and caused
15 problems to the drinking water to ten million people in
16 southern Florida.

17 How we treat our rivers is not just about fish,
18 birds, grizzlies, snails and things like that. It's about
19 people. Let's think about what we're doing for our people.
20 Thank you very much.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Claire.

22 David Richmond and Kathy Richmond is next. Are
23 you folks still here? Gone.

24 Okay. Thanks. R.V. Kimball, are you still here?

25 Debra Patla.

1 Bruce Rose.

2 I think it's Claudan L-I-L-Y-A?

3 No.

4 Owen Scoresby? No.

5 Charles Scoresby? No.

6 That's it. Those are the names I have.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I get on the list?

8 THE MODERATOR: You don't need to get on the
9 list. If you want to say something, go ahead. Is there
10 anyone else after this gentleman who still wants to speak?

11 One, two, three, four. You already spoke. I
12 passed your name. It may be late, but I ain't buying that
13 one.

14 Yes, sir. You'll have to give your name.

15 KARL AMONSON,

16 MR. AMONSON: My name is Karl Amonson. I was
17 born and raised in Salmon, Idaho. And I think the dams need
18 to go, but you talk about spending all this money on it.

19 If a natural disaster occurred, an earthquake or
20 something, the dam was blown out, mother nature would
21 recover. When you look at the Teton dam that blew out, now
22 you can fish the Teton River, it's pretty good.

23 Yellowstone Natural Park had a fire. People
24 thought that it was the worst thing that could happen to it.
25 And I fought fires for years, I think it was the best.

1 Because now you can actually see the park. It's recovering.
2 It's getting back to its natural condition.

3 And you take an area like that and you dump all
4 that silt down there, it's going to cause a problem. Mount
5 Saint Helens, that had a big problem. And people want to
6 control everything about their lives. They want to control
7 the rivers. We want to do this. We want to do that. It
8 gets impossible. And we become control freaks and then it
9 just keeps compounding. Where do you stop?

10 Now we've got to take water from up here and
11 we're going to effect this fish to save this fish. If
12 things were left naturally occurring, it would not have
13 created these problems.

14 I fish the Lemhi River, one of the areas that the
15 salmon move through. That river is perfect. There isn't
16 anything wrong with it. It's the best fishery I've been to.
17 I've fished many places. My business deals with fishing.
18 And I go back to the same place I've been fishing since I
19 was five years old. I won't go anywhere else. If the
20 salmon can only get there, it's ready. Nothing has changed.

21 The dams did make a change. And everybody talks
22 about something else outside of that. There are all kinds
23 of factors, you know. But it just makes sense that you look
24 at the dams and give it a consideration. Other dams, I
25 don't know the names of all of them, they are probably

1 causing a problem, too. Maybe they should all come out,
2 maybe they shouldn't. It gets confusing.

3 But when you stop and look at the most simple
4 obvious aspect of it, that would be that a dam will stop
5 them. Barbed wire broke the west. That's what limited a
6 lot of things from moving.

7 And if you look at how it changed everything
8 here. It's the same with the rivers, and the rivers are dam
9 tiny compared to the west and the huge tracts of land, you
10 put a barb wired fence across it, it's going to stop stuff.
11 Thanks.

12 THE MODERATOR: We had a couple of other people.
13 What I do need for the people who weren't on a list is for
14 you to give us the correct spelling of your name before
15 you leave.

16 MR. AMONSON: A-M-O-N-S-O-N. And Karl with a
17 "K."

18 THE MODERATOR: Can you give me your name,
19 please?

20 KIRK PETERSON,

21 MR. PETERSON: Yeah, my name is Kirk Peterson
22 K-I-R-K. Peterson with an "O."

23 I want to thank the panel for their patience and
24 their attention tonight. I stand before you to add my
25 support to those that spoke before me, the scientists, the

1 fish biologists, the environmentalists, the government
2 officials and others who endorse Alternative Four of the
3 Army Corps of Engineers draft EIS.

4 Breaching the dams is the only alternative to
5 salmon steelhead recovery. Other options may address
6 population conservation, however, they are more costly and
7 do not sufficiently restore salmon and steelhead population.

8 I will not argue the numbers. With scientists
9 have provided them. Politicians can and will ignore them.
10 However, I will argue that we, as a nation, need to make up
11 our mind. We must decide if our heritage is important.
12 Those that came before us thought the salmon so beautiful
13 and inspiring, they named rivers, cities and lakes after
14 them. Visit the beautiful Salmon River in Alaska, and you
15 may see what Idahoans once saw here.

16 We must decide if our ecosystem and species
17 preservation is important. We must decide whether our
18 elected representatives gave us the Endangered Species Act
19 and the Clean Water Act to pacify us or rather formed on
20 foundations on how a civilized society should treat their
21 environment.

22 We also must look at the level that impacts our
23 economy. From Challis to Shoup, the steelhead sport fishing
24 industry has rapidly declined. There will be agricultural
25 impact as well. We must ask ourselves are the farmers that

1 benefit from subsidized BP electricity somehow more
2 important than those upstream to lose valuable
3 irrigation water in flow augmentation? Are several dozen
4 jobs so important in Lewiston that they overshadow sporting
5 and agricultural jobs all along the Salmon and Snake Rivers?

6 Unfortunately, we must decide. I firmly believe
7 that if we put politics and emotions aside, and look at what
8 is best for northwest economy, we can agree that dam
9 breaching is the only sensible alternative in the draft EIS
10 or the other proposals.

11 More science is not necessary. More political
12 posturing is not necessary. More economic studies are not
13 necessary. Let us not miss this unique opportunity to right
14 a terrible wrong. Save the salmon. Save the steelhead, and
15 please breach the dams.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Kirk.

17 Okay, next?

18 DOUG NILSON,

19 MR. NILSON: Well, all of you are earning your
20 money tonight. Thanks. I'm Doug Nilson, N-I-L-S-O-N, like
21 Wilson but with an "N." I'm from Pocatello. I support the
22 EIS Alternative Four, dam removal is our only chance to save
23 the salmon.

24 Let me make about ten points, probably make about
25 six points in support of this proposition.

1 One, for small benefits in electrical power and
2 navigation, the four Lower Snake River dams threaten to
3 extinct a number of runs of salmon and steelhead. This is
4 not in our longer term economic and political interests. It
5 is environmentally unacceptable. It flies in the face of
6 the Endangered Species Act. It is morally wrong.

7 Data that has been presented tonight, have show
8 negligible increases in power costs as the result of the
9 removal of these dams from the power production system.

10 Point three, investments in alternative
11 infrastructure, notably rail, and short-term subsidies to
12 victims will largely mitigate the cost to grain and other
13 shippers who use barges to move their products to market.

14 Four, restoration of the salmon runs will
15 eventually create economically viable fisheries even beyond
16 the Snake and Columbia River system.

17 Five, creation of a free-flowing river will
18 remove the need to use Upper Snake River stored water to
19 flush salmon to the ocean, flush is detrimental to
20 agricultural interests.

21 Six, bringing back the salmon will eliminate the
22 need to compensate native Americans for violation of their
23 treaty rights, sending lots of money, maintain healthy
24 inter-group relationships.

25 Seven, fish restoration will benefit recreational

1 anglers as well as commercial fishermen. Indeed, a
2 free-flowing river will provide an enormous boost to other
3 recreational use than do by four stagnate pools.

4 Eight, a natural river will reproduce the many
5 functional environmental values associated with the ebbing
6 and flowing of a stream that changes with season and weather
7 conditions.

8 I'll move to ten. To many people of the
9 northwest, the salmon are a symbol of what's wild and free
10 of our unique region. Our willingness and ability to save
11 the salmon and the face the grave threat will be a critical
12 test of our stewardship. Let's show the courage and
13 commitment to pass that test with flying colors. Our great,
14 great grandchildren will thank us for our unflinching
15 vision. Thanks.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Doug.

17 Okay. Anyone else?

18 Yes, go ahead.

19 A reminder, for those of you who have written
20 your comments up, if you can leave your written word with
21 us, that would help with putting together the record.

22 What's your name?

23 DACIA SOULLIERN,

24 MS. SOULLIERN: I'll just spell it. D-A-C-I-A,
25 last name S-O-U-L-L-I-E-R-N.

1 THE MODERATOR: Why don't you pronounce it for
2 us?

3 MS. SOULLIERN: Dacia Soulliern.

4 THE MODERATOR: Great. Thanks, Dacia.

5 MS. SOULLIERN: I appreciate your time and
6 patience. I've been here before on the wolf issue. I
7 worked on that for well over ten years so I know exactly
8 what you're going through and it's not fun. But these are
9 critical times and critical decisions, and they require
10 people to sit down and act, rather than just keep relying on
11 study after study.

12 Unlike the wolf issue, however, time is of the
13 essence here. Granted, the wolf was endangered of
14 extinction in the lower forty-eight, but it was not in
15 danger of extinction period.

16 Salmon, however, these variety of salmon that we
17 have available to us in Idaho are on the verge of virtual
18 extinction. Time is of the essence. The studies have been
19 done.

20 We did the wolf reintroduction from a heck of a
21 lot less science than we are doing on this. An eighty
22 percent change of recovery? They didn't give my wolves that
23 kind of chance and look at what they have been able to.
24 When you let mother nature work, she works hard. She puts
25 back what man has destroyed.

1 So if nothing else, take an example from hard
2 work. It took us twenty years of political bantering to put
3 the wolves back. We don't have that kind of time here. The
4 fish need us and the fish need us to act now.

5 One thing that I will close on is, on the first
6 wolf release when we were driving down that icy river road
7 to drop them by truck down at the campground to put in for
8 the Salmon River, you may want to consider that. It's named
9 the Salmon River. Hint, there were salmon in it.

10 The last time I saw salmon go up Dagger was in
11 '93. I've been back every year. I raft those rivers every
12 year. I've not seen them jump since. That's a tragedy.

13 But getting back to my story, that morning they
14 let the wolves go, an eagle came screaming down the river
15 right along side level with the road, crying the entire way
16 we were driving in a caravan. It was mostly media. The
17 eagle just screamed the entire way. It was one recovered
18 specie welcoming another to recovery.

19 The last wolf release was at Dagger Falls. The
20 eagle made a promise to the wolf. The wolf made a promise
21 to the fish. Let's bring the fish back and breach the dams.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dacia.

23 Anyone else?

24 Charles, maybe you can put your additional
25 comments in writing for us. That would be greatly

1 appreciated.

2 Well, it's been my pleasure being with you this
3 evening. You have a great community. Thank you all for
4 adhering to the ground rules.

5 Panel, Bill, do you want to make any closing
6 comments?

7 LT. COL. BULEN: I'd like to thank everyone for
8 coming. This has been a very professional organization as
9 far as the courtesy and respect you've shown each other.
10 Thank you for your time. It was well worth it for us.
11 Thank you.

12 Good night.

13 Off the record.

14 (Off the record.)

15 (The public hearing was adjourned
16 at 12:16 a.m., March 7, 2000.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

OFFICER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF IDAHO)
) SS
County of Bonneville)

I, Katherine McCoy, CSR, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct transcript and record of the proceedings of the hearing in the matter of the 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; that said hearing was taken at the time and place therein named; that the testimony of said witnesses was reported by myself, Notary Public and Certified Court Reporter; that the hearing is a true record of the testimony given by the witnesses, as recorded on the foregoing 199 pages.

And I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties nor do I have any financial interest in the matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office this 14th day of March, 2000.

Katherine McCoy
Certified Shorthand Reporter
Notary Public for Idaho
Commission expires 3/12/2002

