

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"

DOUBLETREE HOTEL
100 MADISON
MISSOULA, MONTANA
BLACKFOOT ROOM & BITTERROOT ROOM

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION
MARCH 2, 2000
6:30 P.M.

COURT REPORTER: CATHERINE A. REBISH

MARTIN-LAKE & ASSOCIATES, INC.
THE COURT REPORTERS
P.O. BOX 7765
111 North Higgins, Suite 500
Missoula, Montana 59802

1 THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 2000.

2 THE MODERATOR: We have two elected
3 officials from the Nez Perce tribe here and we'll
4 take their comments first. They are LaLisa Moses
5 and Thomas Joseph. Are they in the room now? So
6 if you could come up to the microphone here in the
7 middle and give your comments to the panel and
8 we'll turn the light on when you're ready to
9 start.

10 LALISA MOSES: Hi, I'm Lalisa Moses, a
11 member of Nez Perce tribe. As inspections turn up
12 safety problems, some towns are faced with
13 six-figure price tags for repairs of these dams.
14 The Department of Natural Resources says 30 dams
15 may be breached in the next five years alone. The
16 effect on export industries would be marginal.
17 Industries outside the northwest pay a thousand to
18 2,400 more per month per 400,000 kilowatt hours.
19 The rate increases would not create a barrier to
20 attracting new businesses to the Pacific
21 Northwest.

22 Electricity will not increase as high as
23 people think if the dams are breached. These four
24 lower Snake River dams were not used to turn that
25 much power. Scientific evidence clearly shows

1 that wild Snake River salmon and steelhead runs
2 cannot be recovered under existing river
3 conditions. Enough time remains to restore them,
4 but only if the failed practices of the past are
5 abandoned and we move quickly to restore the
6 normative river conditions under which these fish
7 evolve.

8 Dam breaching averages an 82 percent
9 relative probability of meeting recovery
10 population escapement criteria, whereas no
11 breaching averages a 47 to 57 percent chance of
12 meeting the recovery criteria and enhance the most
13 robust or risk-adverse option. If the dams are
14 not breached, there will be an increase in
15 attempts to further reduce tribal harvest. We
16 need to honor our treaty rights. Construction in
17 two replacement power facilities will bring 5,572
18 jobs. In new grain elevators, 6,982 jobs. In
19 addition, 2,786 power plant construction jobs
20 outside of this region.

21 Breaching would also bring 20,790
22 temporary jobs in the lower Snake River region.
23 And an increase in personal income at 677 million;
24 or an annual average of 32,548 per job. In the
25 long run for the lower Snake River region, 2,277

1 jobs with an average annual income of 22,266 per
2 job. And I'd just like to add we need to honor
3 our treaty rights. Thank you.

4 THE MODERATOR: I'm going to ask people
5 to hold their applause. I know that will be hard
6 to do, but if we have applause with every speaker,
7 we'll be here until midnight. So, thank you for
8 that. And let's hear from Thomas Joseph.

9 THOMAS JOSEPH: Good evening. My name is
10 Thomas Joseph and I represent Indians from all
11 across this nation today, including myself. The
12 first thing I'd like to state is by these fish
13 going extinct, there's a range between eight to 12
14 billion dollars that the United States government
15 will have to pay to the tribes of the northwest
16 for compensation of these. And that is not
17 acceptable. That 12 billion dollars is not even a
18 drop in the bucket compared to what these fish
19 mean to the Nez Perce people in this region.

20 These fish have been coming up this river
21 for years and they've been coming up and giving
22 our families and our heritage a way of life.
23 They've been giving them nutrients, they've been
24 giving them their ceremonies, their heritage,
25 their tradition. And when this goes, who knows

1 what goes next? This cannot go. These people in
2 this room today are going to tell you about what's
3 right -- they are going to tell you, take down
4 those dams, because those dams are going to make
5 people suffer, or leave those dams up, because if
6 you don't leave those dams up, people are going to
7 suffer.

8 But what we need to do here today is
9 decide what's best for the salmon. And that's
10 what this meeting is for today. The people in
11 this room will decide what is best for that
12 salmon. And what is best for that salmon is
13 taking out those four lower Snake River dams so
14 this river can flow free the way it once did when
15 my ancestors used to live here. It's a touchy
16 topic about the salmon recovery but there's a lot
17 of people that's going to suffer on either ways.
18 But what we need to decide here is what's best for
19 the salmon and what we can do to help satisfy
20 those needs of the people that are going to
21 suffer.

22 When these dams go, we have to rebuild
23 our highways so Potlatch in Lewiston can get their
24 supplies out of Lewiston and we can get supplies
25 back into Lewiston. And those farmers that are

1 going to be losing their irrigation, they need to
2 get some more irrigation pipes or whatever they
3 need so that they won't have to be misfortuned.
4 These salmon have been suffering for years and
5 years because the people of that region wanted
6 progress. We need this. We need that. We need
7 to stop thinking of ourselves and point the finger
8 to us.

9 We can always blame those sea lions down
10 at the mouth of the river or we can blame all
11 those boats out on the ocean. What we need to do
12 is turn around and look at yourself and see what
13 you need to do to make the salmon come back. But
14 what we need to do in this room is decide to take
15 those lower four dams out, because that's what's
16 going to bring back those salmon. Thank you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. I'm going to
18 call now the first three people off the sign-up
19 sheet. And also, let me tell you, if you have
20 written out your comments that you're going to
21 make orally, you could also leave that with the
22 court reporter and that will help her make a
23 completely accurate record. So if you have that,
24 you can just drop it off with her after your
25 comment. So the first three people are Bill

1 Barber, I believe it is, Don Serba and Kim Liles.

2 BILL BARBER: I'm Bill Barber. I'm
3 president of West Slope Chapter of Trout Unlimited
4 here in Missoula. And let me tell you, Mr. Joseph
5 is a tough act to follow. We advocate the removal
6 of these dams. As he said, it's about the fish.
7 These are poorly thought out dams. They may have
8 been well thought out at the time, but they
9 obviously have outlived their usefulness.

10 Another reason we think these should come
11 down is the potential damage to Montana fish
12 habitat, with the peak flows in the Hungry Horse,
13 Flathead and Clarkfork drainages and the Kootenai
14 drainage when we try to get more water downstream
15 and these fish upstream. That's it. We should
16 get those dams out of the way and get those fish
17 back there because this is about fish. Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Next is Don
19 Serba, then Kim Liles, then Rick Stowell.

20 DON SERBA: Thank you for the opportunity
21 to speak tonight. My name is Don Serba. I'm the
22 special projects coordinator for the Pulp and
23 Paper Workers Resource Council for the Rocky
24 Mountain region. The PPRC is a national
25 grass-roots labor organization representing over

1 350,000 men and women who work in the pulp and
2 paper solid wood manufacturing industry and
3 associated businesses.

4 The decline of anadromous fish runs is a
5 very complicated issue that has no easy or fast
6 solution. The question is not should we remove
7 the dams, but how we can protect the integrity of
8 the current river systems, including all social
9 and economic values connected to the river, while
10 preserving and enhancing anadromous fish runs.

11 The PPRC believes a multitude of factors
12 have caused the decline of anadromous fish. Until
13 complete scientific studies are made, taking into
14 account all potential problems associated with
15 declining fish populations, such as sport and
16 commercial fishing, the burgeoning sea lion
17 population that is protected by the Endangered
18 Species Act, the Caspian Terns on Rice Island, and
19 gill netting by Native Americans, we will be
20 unable to find true solutions concerning this
21 issue. The economic and social stability of the
22 region will be severely impacted for navigation,
23 recreation, tourism, industry, agriculture, flood
24 control and clean energy at an affordable rate by
25 the removal of these dams.

1 Therefore, we will continue to object to
2 the single-source solution of dam removal as a
3 silver bullet. Thank you.

4 THE MODERATOR: Rick Stowell, Graden
5 Oehlerich and then Kate Grant.

6 KIM LILES: Good evening. For the
7 record, my name is Kim Liles, I'm also a member of
8 the Pulp and Paper Workers Resource Council of the
9 Rocky Mountain region. I also stand in opposition
10 to the extreme measure of removing all four dams
11 on the lower Snake. And basically for several
12 reasons, but one in particular. And that is,
13 there is no absolute guarantee that this is the
14 answer.

15 There are so many other options, as we've
16 already seen, there are so many other things that
17 we need to look at, other ways that we can go that
18 we should explore before we place such an
19 economically devastating plan in the hands of
20 people of the area of Lewiston, Idaho. Not to
21 mention the fact that the flow augmentation that
22 could and will occur will -- and not only affect
23 the farmers, as was mentioned, in the immediate
24 area of the Lewiston farming community, but also
25 in the southern area of Idaho. It will affect

1 irrigation.

2 So not only that, it has a transportation
3 effect on us here in Montana. It will have a
4 detrimental effect on the power supply for the
5 BPA. And my question in regards to that would
6 be: We're going to eliminate a five percent
7 supply of BPA's power for that area of the nation;
8 what do we propose to do to replace that power?
9 We're concerned about clean energy. I'm concerned
10 about the environment, whether you people believe
11 that or not, I am an environmentalist, also.

12 I believe that we have to find middle
13 ground. We have to maintain jobs. We have to
14 maintain economic viability in the communities.
15 We can't just write people off and out of this
16 factor because they are an important ingredient.
17 People do matter, tribes matter, and the fish
18 matter. And there is, and are, solutions out
19 there if we take the time, if we use common sense
20 and not make rash, no-turning-back type of
21 decisions that we will regret later. And with
22 that, I thank you for the opportunity to speak.

23 THE MODERATOR: Rick Stowell, Graden
24 Oehlerich and then Kate Grant.

25 RICK STOWELL: Good evening. My name is

1 Rick Stowell. I'm the TU member here tonight and
2 hopefully, I'm speaking for the fish. I'd like
3 preface my comments by indicating that I am a
4 professional fisheries biologist, a life member of
5 the American Fishery Society and a certified
6 fishery scientist from that same organization. I
7 have almost 30 years of experience as a habitat
8 biologist in both the Salmon, Snake and the
9 Clearwater Basin; ten years, also, of experience
10 here in the State of Montana. I am an expert in
11 habitat needs for salmon, steelhead and bull
12 trout.

13 This is an extremely emotional issue for
14 me because in my 30 years as a professional, I
15 have watched many species go to extinction or near
16 extinction. The Snake River coho in the early
17 '80s went out without a whimper. Nobody even
18 said anything in the Lewiston paper. Next was the
19 sockeye, fall chinook, spring/summer chinook,
20 which I actually fish for, they are almost extinct
21 right now.

22 And then, of all species, the steelhead,
23 which I thought it could take anything we could
24 throw at it. But obviously it can't. Now, to
25 address this in terms of what you folks have

1 already discussed right now, in my experience,
2 habitat in the Snake River Basin is more than
3 adequate to produce viable populations of both
4 wild and natural-produced fish. It's at least at
5 70 percent of its natural potential, what's left
6 out there.

7 Hatcheries; in Idaho, Idaho has a
8 potential of 42 million smolts annually. That's
9 over ten times what the fish could do naturally.
10 We have also used these fish to supplement
11 populations and that hasn't worked. Harvest; we
12 have restricted harvest to the point of why
13 bother. This year's steelhead fishery is
14 worthless. We don't fish for chinook anymore.
15 The tribes have been severely curtailed in their
16 ability to meet their tribal needs.

17 Hydroelectric; in my career I would
18 venture to say there's been billions of dollars
19 spent on the hydroelectric facilities for
20 retrofitting, flips, lips, passing fish, slapping
21 them, tagging them, putting them in a barge and
22 running them down the river. I guess my point is
23 if all of this works or has worked in the past,
24 where are the fish? They are not there. It's not
25 working. It won't work.

1 I'll tell you where the fish are, they
2 are getting ground up in these facilities. I
3 support the maximum option. Bypass the dams,
4 continue a hard effort in the habitat and the
5 hatchery arena. And if we don't do this, it's not
6 when -- it's not if, but it will be when these
7 things go extinct. They will. We've got about
8 five generations of fish left; 30 years maximum.
9 Thank you.

10 THE MODERATOR: Graden Oehlerich, Kate
11 Grant, Mike Larkin. This is probably a good time
12 for me to apologize for all the names I will
13 mispronounce tonight.

14 GRADEN OEHLERICH: You did a very good
15 job with mine. My name is Graden Oehlerich. I'm
16 here on behalf of the Montana Environmental
17 Information Center and our 3500 members in Montana
18 and around the region. I'm also the chair of the
19 Montana Caucus of the Northwest Energy Coalition.
20 I have two very general comments and I'll be
21 submitting comments in writing before the end of
22 the comment period.

23 I support partial removal of the four
24 lower Snake River dams as the best alternative for
25 restoring salmon and steelhead populations in the

1 Snake River. Partial dam removal is the best
2 alternative for the fish. It's the best use of
3 taxpayer dollars to recover these species and it
4 may be the only way to honor our treaty obligation
5 to the tribes of the Columbia Basin. I'd like to
6 take this opportunity to urge our governor,
7 although I know none of you are he, to get on
8 board with Governor Kitzhaber from Oregon and
9 recognize dam removal as the preferred alternative
10 for the region.

11 Together with the other three governors
12 of the northwest states, Racicot should tell
13 congress and all of you to remove these dams and
14 prevent the extinction of this cornerstone species
15 of the northwest ecosystem and economy. I also
16 urge decision makers, all of you, the governor,
17 congress, and the Clinton Administration, to make
18 this decision now. This decision has been
19 studied -- this issue has been studied to death.

20 The biological and economic cases have
21 been made. Further study of this issue is not
22 necessarily going to bring us any more clarity
23 than now exists. And choosing a recovery
24 alternative is long overdue. Putting a decision
25 off any longer will ensure that there is no

1 decision to make. Governor Kitzhaber put it well
2 this week when he wrote, quote, Extinction is
3 exactly the policy implicit in delay. It is
4 exactly the policy implicit in the rejection of
5 every alternative, end quote.

6 If dam removal doesn't work, we can
7 reverse its effects, if we so choose. But
8 extinction is permanent. The Snake River salmon
9 run's extinction is unacceptable. I appreciate
10 the opportunity to comment.

11 THE MODERATOR: Kate Grant is next, then
12 Mike Larkin, then Harvey Hackett.

13 KATE GRANT: Hello, my name is Kate
14 Grant, and I'm responding to both the EIS and 4-H
15 Paper. And I will submit my comments in writing.
16 I support partial removal of the dams because
17 science shows that it is the best alternative to
18 save these dwindling species of salmon and
19 steelhead. And a recent study funded by Trout
20 Unlimited concluded that if these dams are not
21 removed, then the spring/summer runs of chinook
22 salmon may become extinct in less than 20 years.

23 I also understand that over 400 million
24 taxpayer and utility dollars are spent every year
25 on failed recovery efforts for these fish. And

1 the short-term impact to the commercial barging
2 industry and the handful of corporate funds
3 benefitting from the dams could be offset by
4 reinvestment of this money. So I just feel that
5 the choice is pretty cut and dried. It's a matter
6 of dealing with the dams now or losing these fish
7 forever. Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Mike Larkin, then Harvey
9 Hackett, then Dick Boehmler.

10 MIKE LARKIN: I'm Mike Larkin from
11 Salmon, Idaho. We used to have salmon in Salmon,
12 Idaho. That was before your dams went in. And
13 since your dams, we don't have many fish in
14 Salmon, Idaho. And you, ma'am, have put a lot of
15 restrictions on logging, mining and grazing that
16 have had very negative impacts on our economy.
17 You're killing our fish and you're killing our
18 economy. You say it's all the ages, but we have
19 got a very large wilderness area in Idaho called
20 the Frank Church with the middle fork of the
21 Salmon River. We've got good habitat. We've got
22 no hatcheries. We've had no harvest on salmon for
23 25 years. We still have no fish. The dams are
24 killing the fish. So you have been studying this
25 problem for 25 years, it's time to stop studying,

1 breach the dams. Do it soon.

2 THE MODERATOR: Harvey Hackett, then Dick
3 Boehmler, then Lee Anne Tryon.

4 HARVEY HACKETT: Harvey Hackett,
5 Stevensville, Montana. There is one science
6 that's been totally neglected in this study.
7 That's soil science. Most of you don't even know
8 what that is. But soil is one of the fundamental
9 resources, as are water, air and solar energy.
10 Water acquires its mineral components from soil,
11 mostly in the headwaters of the watershed. Stream
12 productivity and fish population viability are
13 dependent on essential elements from the soil in
14 the headwaters.

15 Soil is also a dynamic resource. Its
16 fertility is dominated by vegetation. The
17 historic vegetation that determined and supported
18 its stream productivity was grassland. Fire,
19 successional understorage grassland -- maintained
20 by native burning for thousands of years.

21 At the time these dams were built, the
22 headwaters vegetation was converting to closed
23 canopy, fine needle conifers. These trees
24 produced acid, low fertility soil, incapable of
25 supporting just about any animal life, including

1 fish. These trees also use a lot of water,
2 incidently. Removal of dams without examining the
3 effects of this massive change in vegetation is a
4 shot in the dark with extreme economic
5 implications.

6 And I have spent my lifetime walking
7 through a great deal of this headwaters area. And
8 I have personally seen the change in vegetation
9 and have studied the implications of that soil
10 fertility and stream productivity. Thank you.

11 THE MODERATOR: Dick Boehmler, then Lee
12 Anne Tryon, then Ray Cross.

13 DICK BOEHMLER: My name is Dick
14 Boehmler. I urge you to recommend the maximum
15 alternative, including the breaching of the dams.
16 I had the opportunity in the '30s to travel with
17 my family down the Columbia Gorge and stop and
18 watch the Native Americans netting salmon out over
19 the falls. I made that same trip in the early
20 '50s and there were no falls and no salmon. We
21 didn't stop building dams then. We kept on for
22 another couple of decades. But the reason was
23 legitimate. Many of those dams were built to
24 produce power so we could produce what we had to
25 produce to win World War II.

1 And that was a decision that we made
2 without concern about long-term consequences. One
3 of the consequences is the destruction of the
4 environment, including the salmon. We're now in
5 the war to recover those salmon. We won World War
6 II because of the technology and the science we
7 had behind us and the political will to do
8 whatever we had to do. We're in a war now to
9 recover the salmon. I urge you to separate the
10 scientific technological information from the will
11 to implement them. And on that basis, urge you to
12 recommend the maximum alternative to congress and
13 let the voters deal with whether we have the will
14 to implement that or not. Thank you.

15 THE MODERATOR: Lee Anne Tryon, then Ray
16 Cross, and after that, Craig Filch.

17 LEE ANNE TRYON: My name is Lee Anne
18 Tryon and I'm the associate director of the Save
19 Our Wild Salmon Coalition. And although I like to
20 fly fish in Montana, I have to admit I'm not from
21 here. I'm probably the only person that can be
22 testifying in favor of taking out these dams today
23 who's not from Montana. But the members of our
24 coalition feel this issue is so important that we
25 wanted to let all the local Montana salmon

1 supporters know that they are not alone.

2 Save Our Wild Salmon is a coalition of
3 more than 50 separate organizations, including
4 sports fishing organizations, commercial fishing
5 groups, businesses, associations, environmental
6 groups and energy activities. Our various member
7 groups come to this issue from many different
8 perspectives and many different angles, but all
9 believe in the same thing: restoring Snake River
10 salmon. But as broad and diverse as our coalition
11 is, it still doesn't begin to incorporate the over
12 700 organizations, businesses, newspapers and
13 prominent individuals from around the nation who
14 support removing four dams that don't make sense.

15 I couldn't begin to list all those
16 entities in my three minutes, but I'll give you a
17 short list, starting with Montana organizations.
18 The Alliance for the Wild Rockies supports taking
19 out these dams, along with American White Water
20 Montana Group, American Wild Lands, Cold Mountain,
21 Cold River, the Flathead Resource Organization,
22 the Medicine River Canoe Club, the Missoula Urban
23 Demonstration Project, the Montana Environmental
24 Information Center, Mont PIRG, Montana River
25 Action Network, the Native Forest Network, the

1 Predator Conservation Alliance and the Montana
2 Wildlife Federation.

3 Other groups around the nation and the
4 northwest include American Rivers, the Association
5 of Northwest Steelheaders, the Columbia River
6 Intertribal Fish Commission, the faster of Fly
7 Fishers, Idaho Rivers United, The Mountaineers,
8 The Natural Resources Defense Council, the
9 National Wildlife faster, the Northwest Energy
10 Coalition, the Northwest Fishing Industry
11 Association, the Oregon Natural Desert
12 Association, Pacific Coast Federation of
13 Fishermen's Association, Pacific Rivers Council,
14 Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition, Taxpayers for
15 Common Sense, Trout Unlimited, and the Washington
16 Wildlife Federation.

17 Just these groups alone represent over
18 six million Americans. But that's not all.
19 Individuals from all over have been making phone
20 calls, writing letters, signing post cards and
21 petitions and sending e-mails. Over 110,000
22 people have spoken out so far to say that we need
23 salmon and those dams don't make sense.

24 And let's not forget our own northwest
25 leader, Oregon Governor John Kitzhaber, who has

1 the courage in his convictions, that has endorsed
2 taking out these four dams. This is just the
3 beginning. More and more people are making their
4 voices heard every day. The science is in. The
5 economics are in. We know the right thing to do.
6 Now, all we have to do is generate political will
7 to do it. And as it always has been and always
8 will be, the people must lead for the leaders to
9 follow. Thank you for listening and we look
10 forward to you making the right decision.

11 THE MODERATOR: Ray Cross, then Craig
12 Filch, and after that, Bob Walker.

13 RAY CROSS: Thank you for inviting me to
14 testify tonight on this important issue. I'm
15 Raymond Cross. I'm a law professor at the
16 University of Montana law school. And I'd like to
17 commend all the law students I see from our law
18 school supporting the breaching of the lower Snake
19 River dams. I'm also a member of the three
20 affiliated tribes. And these tribes and other
21 tribes are intimately intertwined and connected
22 with the issues discussed here tonight. I might
23 also mention that a young Indian woman, a Shoshone
24 woman, started out from Fort Mandan. Her name was
25 Sakakawea. She guided Meriwether Lewis and

1 perhaps walked right through this very area where
2 we are now.

3 I mention these things because I'd like
4 you to think about them in making your
5 recommendations, what Sakakawea and Meriwether
6 Lewis would have said about the destruction of the
7 wild salmon that once populated the Columbia and
8 Snake Rivers. I believe that they would recommend
9 a new 4-H strategy to guide the conservation of
10 the fish in the Columbia River Basin. And this
11 new 4-H strategy would replace the old 4-H's that
12 I believe have failed; the H of hydropower, the H
13 of hatchery, the H of harvest and the H of
14 habitat. The new 4-H that they would likely
15 recommend is the first H of honor, the H of
16 heritage, the third H of heroism and the fourth H
17 of humility. The first H, honor, would require
18 the federal government to honor this 1855 treaty
19 with salmon-fishing tribes along Columbia and
20 Snake Rivers.

21 I dare say that if this treaty had been
22 honored from the outset, we would not be
23 confronted tonight with the hard choices that you
24 have to decide. It's time now to honor the 1855
25 treaty by removing and breaching the four lower

1 Snake River dams. The second H, heritage;
2 heritage recognizes that without the wild salmon
3 in the Pacific Northwest that it won't be worth
4 having. Why? Without the wild salmon, the tribes
5 will be gone, tourism will dry up and our
6 grandchildren will never know what once made this
7 region great. It's time to preserve that heritage
8 by removing the four lower Snake River dams.

9 The third H is heroism. Heroism requires
10 us to walk in the moccasins of that young Shoshone
11 girl, Sakakawea, and to take a small risk. We
12 must curb our hydroelectric hunger by some five
13 percent. That's the marginal amount contributed
14 by these four lower Snake River dams to the BPA
15 inventory. We can take a small risk and be small
16 heroes by shouldering the burden of breaching
17 these four lower Snake River dams to help restore
18 the wild salmon.

19 THE MODERATOR: Ray, you'll need to
20 finish up.

21 RAY CROSS: The fourth H is Humility, and
22 it requires us to learn from our past mistakes.
23 And when we fought to dominate the Columbia River
24 and Snake Rivers and turned them into slack water
25 lakes for our human convenience, I'd recommend

1 that we honor these four H's by recommending the
2 breaching of the lower Snake River dams. Thank
3 you.

4 THE MODERATOR: Craig Filch, then Bob
5 Walker, then Charlie Swanson.

6 CRAIG FILCH: I'm Craig Filch and I
7 represent two groups this evening. The first
8 group I'll be speaking for is Mont PIRG, the
9 Montana Public Interest Resource Group. With
10 membership of nearly 4000 across the State of
11 Montana, we'd like to thank you, U.S. Army Corps
12 of Engineers and the federal government, for
13 giving us this opportunity to speak on behalf of
14 the salmon, an endangered species, and the
15 endangered rivers of the northwest.

16 While hydropower is unquestionably a
17 clean and efficient source of energy, scientists
18 and concerned citizens agree that some hydropower
19 projects just should not be built; dams that
20 endanger the health of a community, dams that
21 interfere with Native American cultural practices,
22 and dams with reservoir capacities so low that
23 their benefits are clearly outweighed by their
24 environmental, economic and social costs.

25 The four dams on the lower Snake River

1 are prime examples of dams that should never have
2 been built. As environmental and consumer
3 advocacy groups, Mont PIRG is concerned with both
4 human costs and the environmental costs of these
5 dams. We are concerned for people who will lose
6 their jobs when these dams are breached and we ask
7 the federal government to set aside transitional
8 funds for those individuals, as they did with the
9 loggers who lost or were replaced in their jobs
10 with the spotted owl.

11 The truth, however, is that only a
12 handful of companies will profit if the dams are
13 not breached. In 1995 U.S. Army Corps of
14 Engineers budgeted 786 million dollars for inland
15 waterways across this nation. 700 of that 786
16 million was paid by taxpayers, while a handful of
17 commodity and shipping heavyweights reported a 160
18 billion dollars in profit.

19 Power users in the northwest pay a mere
20 \$65 per month on average, estimated, while the
21 rest of the country pays on average \$100 a month.
22 An estimated increase of \$1 to \$3 a month on the
23 average power payment plan of an individual
24 taxpayer -- or excuse me, electricity payer, is
25 hardly a concern for the average electricity

1 user.

2 I also speak on behalf the environmental
3 law group here at the University of Montana, the
4 University of Montana School of Law. Our major
5 concern, folks, is on the damage these dams cause
6 to the environment. And as it now stands, sending
7 young salmon to swim down the Snake River is
8 sending them to certain death. The federal
9 government has been barging young salmon down the
10 river and releasing them into the lower Columbia.

11 One of the Army Corps of Engineers'
12 proposals is to increase barging, despite the fact
13 that salmon numbers have plummeted in the last
14 decade. That ignores the greater problem, which
15 is the health of the river system itself. Dams
16 disrupt the natural flow of the river and produce
17 artificial water temperatures. Right here in
18 Montana, the Hungry Horse dam keeps water
19 temperatures so low that whole generations of
20 stonefly never reach adulthood because the water
21 never reaches the level they need to cue that
22 transformation.

23 These four dams have been targeted as the
24 primary reason that the salmon are going extinct
25 on the Snake River. Our treaty with the Native

1 American tribes legally binds us to ensure that
2 there are salmon left to catch and eat.
3 Economists estimate that we may owe the tribes 13
4 billion dollars if the salmon disappear. But no
5 amount of money will compensate them for their
6 cultural loss and no amount of money will erase
7 the guilt and shame that each of us will bear as
8 citizens if the salmon disappear.

9 THE MODERATOR: Bob Walker, then Charlie
10 Swanson, then Ted Antonioli.

11 BOB WALKER: My name is Bob Walker. I'm
12 the general manager of Missoula Electric
13 Cooperative. We're a local small utility by
14 regional standards. We buy all of our power
15 through the Bonneville Power Administration. We
16 serve approximately 10,000 members in five
17 counties surrounding Missoula. We serve rural
18 areas.

19 Over the last 15 years, through our
20 rates, we have helped provide the funding for
21 three billion dollars in fish mitigation projects
22 on the Columbia River system. We still don't have
23 a definite plan as to how to recover salmon. This
24 isn't just about dam removal, this is about let's
25 get a plan that works.

1 We have been spending money for a long
2 time and it is a burden on our rate payers. You
3 know, we have a lot of low income people in our
4 service territory. We have a lot of people that
5 have been displaced from their jobs, their
6 professions in our service territory. We need a
7 plan that looks first at salmon recovery and
8 establishes and follows clear and achievable
9 goals. We have felt for a long time that a lot of
10 the money that we pay through rates has been
11 wasted in efforts -- we have heard of magic
12 bullets before. This is the program you need.

13 We have spent the money, we have paid the
14 money and it hasn't produced results. We need to
15 know what the region has tried to accomplish. Are
16 we trying to increase the overall number of fish
17 or are we trying to protect the number and
18 increase the number of native populations? Some
19 of the hatchery programs we have paid for in the
20 past, you know, have been at odds with some of the
21 natural strains of fish. So we would like to see
22 our money spent in a way with a clear plan that
23 maximizes the chances of recovery. But we need to
24 know, what recovery is the region looking for?
25 Are we looking for overall fish or are we looking

1 for these specific listed stocks?

2 I guess that's one of our greatest
3 concerns today, has been accountability. We have
4 really felt that there has been very little
5 accountability for the money that our rate payers
6 have spent. And this is a concern with our rate
7 payers, is that, you know, we hear this when we
8 talk to our members at our annual meeting, you
9 know, look at the money we have been spending,
10 look at what we have paying in rates for these
11 years. We are not getting results. So
12 accountability has been something we have been
13 very concerned about. Thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Charlie Swanson, Ted
15 Antonioli, and then I believe it's Bailey Roberts
16 (sic).

17 CHARLIE SWANSON: My name is Charles
18 Swanson. I'm the board president of Ravalli
19 County Electric Cooperative located in Corvallis,
20 Montana. We are a member-owned system of 8400
21 people and I was elected to the board in 1980. I
22 have seen changes in the northwest as far as
23 salmon and power issues. The issue of restoring
24 salmon to the predam era on the lower Snake River
25 has to do more with ocean fishing, weather and

1 travel issues than anyone would like to admit. We
2 all have a love of nature and would like to see
3 the salmon numbers return to the days of Lewis and
4 Clark. But this is beside the point.

5 Hydropower on the Snake and Columbia
6 makes the northwest what it is today. To remove
7 four dams for an untested theory would not be in
8 the interest of electric users, agriculture,
9 recreation and river commerce. We have the
10 ability to act on good scientific measures to help
11 solve this problem without turning back the clock.

12 Put aside our differences in theories,
13 act on common sense for the betterment of all here
14 in the northwest. Let's act with good judgment
15 and not short-sidedness. The northwest, including
16 Montana, has much to lose. The cost of power
17 would dramatically increase because hydropower is
18 established and does not have to be changed out
19 for more expensive measures. Let's all unite and
20 feel good about letting our forefather's vision
21 for the northwest continue.

22 The recovery of salmon should be done,
23 but not at a cost proposed by a few for so many.
24 Our rate payers would insist that we be prudent,
25 not foolish in our quest for better salmon

1 numbers. Thank you on letting me comment on these
2 issues.

3 THE MODERATOR: Ted Antonioli, Bailey
4 Roberts (sic) and then Bob Longsly (sic).

5 TED ANTONIOLI: Hi, my name is Ted
6 Antonioli; your apology's accepted. I am here as
7 the president of the Missoula Chapter of the
8 Montana Mining Association. The main issues I
9 want to address first are that for industry, low
10 cost power of the northwest is vital. Our expense
11 for the Butte mines is power. And raising the
12 power cost will have a dramatic effect on mining
13 industry, the aluminum industry. I'm sure that
14 most of you realize that the only reason the
15 aluminum industry is located in the Pacific
16 Northwest is the low-cost power.

17 There is no aluminum ore or source of
18 aluminum ore within our entire region. It's
19 brought in by train from Jamaica and other points
20 far distant. Without low-cost power, that
21 industry will disappear. The steel workers and
22 other people dependent on those industries will
23 lose their jobs. And the same is true for other
24 industries like the paper industry. I want to
25 associate my remarks with those of Don Serba of

1 the Pulp and Paper Resource Council.

2 Those are the main concerns that we have
3 in terms of economic costs. And they have to be
4 addressed in both of these plans. As for the
5 fish, what I would like to see is to be sure that
6 all the issues related to fish are addressed in
7 both plans. For example, the Tanner Gulch fire in
8 Oregon, a wildfire, precipitated a flow of debris
9 and stream sediment into the stream and destroyed
10 the entire population of salmon.

11 Yet, we hear from the Clinton
12 Administration that they want to set aside 50
13 million acres, basically, as the number has grown
14 to, that will be set aside to be removed from
15 mechanical harvest and will basically be set aside
16 for wildfire, where you will have a let-it-burn
17 policy. And a concern of mine is that this could
18 have a dramatic effect on fish habitat.

19 One of the scientists working on this
20 issue, Dr. Kasinski (phonetic) said that that is
21 the number one forest-related problem related to
22 salmon, is wildfire. And yet, I don't see it
23 really addressed in any depth in the current
24 reports. So that will summarize my comments and
25 thank you for the opportunity to talk.

1 THE MODERATOR: Bailey Roberts (sic), Bob
2 Longsly (sic) and Vickie Watson.

3 ROBERT BAILEY: For the record, I'll
4 straighten out my name, it's Robert Bailey.

5 THE MODERATOR: Sorry.

6 ROBERT BAILEY: I'm vice-president of
7 Ravalli County Electric Cooperative located in
8 Corvallis. We are deeply concerned about all the
9 rhetoric to remove the dams in the name of salmon
10 restoration. For the past two decades, the region
11 has proven that they will spend money on the
12 salmon, though not always wisely, to the tune of
13 some three billion dollars to date.

14 It is unfortunate that the region has
15 never established goals or designed procedures
16 around the complexities of the salmon and the
17 Columbia River System. Success is measured by
18 dollars spent, rather than analytical measures
19 from a comprehensive plan. We remain committed to
20 a sound comprehensive and recovery plan. We
21 cannot take steps backwards to the days of Lewis
22 and Clark, even if we wanted to. This is a
23 different era. The economy of the northwest is
24 tied to the Columbia River System. Plans
25 developed on emotion will not restore the salmon

1 and will, in fact, have a huge negative impact on
2 the stability of the northwest.

3 A single plan centered on the 4-H's
4 appears to be the most feasible. Habitat
5 improvement for the salmon should not be to the
6 detriment of habitat for the humans. Harvest from
7 the oceans to the upper regions of the river
8 system has to be a key element. Hydro dams supply
9 us with many things that have -- make living in
10 the northwest a bearable place, such as clean,
11 renewable, hydropower, flood control, recreation,
12 navigation and irrigation, to just name a few.

13 Without adequate irrigation water, we
14 will continue to lose more family farms and become
15 more dependent on imports. Is the family farmer,
16 also an endangered species, less important than
17 fish? We must remember that the northwest, for
18 the most part, is a high plains desert and water
19 is its life blood. Surely, with the immense
20 knowledge we have available, we can design a
21 cost-effective plan to pass fish upstream and
22 down. We remain opposed to the removal of the
23 dams on the lower Snake and any other Columbia
24 River dams. It is a step backward to the dark
25 ages. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

1 THE MODERATOR: Bob Longsly (sic), Vickie
2 Watson, and then Keith Stonebraker.

3 BOB LOVELY: I'm assuming that's me.
4 Just for the record, my name is Lovely,
5 L-O-V-E-L-Y. I'd like to thank you for the
6 opportunity to speak tonight. I'll try to stand
7 close enough to the mike so I can be heard. As I
8 said, my name is Bob Lovely. I'm here
9 representing the Native people from across this
10 land and also as a representative of the Native
11 American Law Students Association across the
12 footbridge at the university.

13 I'd like to start by thanking all the
14 people in the two rooms here for showing up in
15 numbers that cause logistical problems. I think
16 that's always a good sign. We should be proud
17 that you care enough to be here. I tend to be a
18 bit emotional. So I'll try to keep it reined in.

19 As far as the Indians are concerned, I'm
20 happy to see representatives of the Nez Perce who
21 are here this evening, who this more directly
22 impacts than it does me. But one thing that
23 Indian people have always understood is that all
24 life is interconnected. I'm not keen on anyone
25 losing their jobs. I also think jobs will be

1 created and I also think that a nation that's
2 spent untold trillions of dollars and have lots of
3 smart people to figure out ways to bomb the hell
4 out of people all over the world and create
5 nuclear weapons and all of the other wacky things
6 we've done, could find a way to retrain some folks
7 and find another way to regenerate the five
8 percent of the electricity needed for this
9 region.

10 In the meantime, when our grandchildren's
11 grandchildren are walking this earth, they'll need
12 the air that we need and the water that we need.
13 And it's up to us to make sure they have it. I
14 apologize. I wouldn't even pretend to know the
15 science involved and so I won't talk about that.
16 But a huge majority of the promises that this
17 nation has made to the Native people of this land,
18 supposedly solemn promises, have been broken,
19 irrevocably. And the voters of this nation now
20 stand poised at the cusp of a very rare
21 opportunity to actually stand up and honor a
22 handful of those promises.

23 For Indian people, this isn't a
24 recreational issue, this isn't a sport issue.
25 This isn't for aesthetics. People have mentioned

1 culture, and an inseparable part of Indian culture
2 is spirituality. I see my time is up, may I just
3 say one more sentence?

4 THE MODERATOR: Yes. Finish your
5 sentence.

6 BOB LOVELY: Thank you. Indian people
7 don't have to go to church. We live in it every
8 day. We walk in it. We breathe it. We speak
9 it. And these fish, like the buffalo to other
10 Indians, are not only important to these people,
11 they are these people. Thank you.

12 THE MODERATOR: Next is Vickie Watson,
13 then Keith Stonebraker, then Gene Hanson. Vickie
14 Watson? Let's move on, then, to Keith
15 Stonebraker. Is Keith in the room? Great.

16 KEITH STONEBRAKER: My name is Keith
17 Stonebraker. I'm a businessman in Orofino,
18 Idaho. I've watched the unfolding of the demise
19 of the wild steelhead and salmon for the last 40
20 years, served on every committee known to
21 mankind. I served also 11 years on the Idaho Fish
22 and Game Commission.

23 When the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was
24 pitching their plan to the Lewis and Clark
25 Community in the 1950s and '60s, we were the

1 recipients of a number of false promises. Service
2 clubs and local Chamber of Commerce were told, for
3 example, the run of the river dams, i.e. low head
4 dams, would not be detrimental to migrating fish.
5 Don Baskin, the civilian engineer for the Corps at
6 the time, said that slack water would make it
7 easier for fish to go back and forth to the
8 ocean.

9 We were told that the turbines weren't
10 dangerous to fish. One visiting general from the
11 Pentagon told the chamber of commerce that you
12 could stick a horse in the generator and it would
13 pop up the other side intact. It was promised to
14 the Idaho Legislature by the local politicians,
15 that the port of Lewiston would be self sufficient
16 within ten years. We're going beyond 30 years,
17 it's not even close.

18 Lewiston would thrive they said.
19 Lewiston hasn't added any significant businesses
20 in those 30 years. The population is static. The
21 dams were built on a foundation of
22 misinformation. And the misinformation
23 continues.

24 We're informed that barging works because
25 98 percent of the fish arrived alive. Well, the

1 fact is they're talking about juvenile fish and
2 not talking about adult fish. Even though
3 downstream barged migrants have low mortality by
4 the time they are released, delayed mortality is
5 significant. And adult homing instincts seem to
6 be affected. For example, in 1998, 44 percent of
7 the adult Snake River steelhead were lost between
8 John D. Dam (phonetic) and Mary Dam (phonetic).
9 This year it was 69 percent.

10 We hear that the high sea net fishery is
11 the culprit. The fact is that only two percent of
12 Snake River stock is caught in the ocean. And
13 long line drift nets were banned in 1993. There
14 is 38 years of scientific data to point out this
15 fact. Pro dam advocates state that we need
16 fish-friendly turbines. General Carl Stork
17 (phonetic) stated in Lewiston, just recently, that
18 no such thing exists.

19 We're told the seals, Caspian Terns and
20 the killer ocean is the culprit. Seals have been
21 here since before we were. The Caspian Terns only
22 take one percent of the wild steelhead but they do
23 take, quite frankly, a significant number of
24 hatchery steelhead. The killer ocean; isn't it
25 strange that the undammed Skeena (phonetic) and

1 Fraser (phonetic) river drainages have healthy
2 stocks? In fact, the Skeena (phonetic) River has
3 just had, in the last two years, the best
4 steelhead runs in 42 years.

5 The Fraser River has had tens of millions
6 of socceye. And the mid Columbia still has
7 healthy stocks of fall chinook and they only have
8 to traverse four dams. The conclusion is that
9 parties that would be affected have to be
10 compensated. There has to be a mitigation package
11 for breaching. And that's certainly far less to
12 the taxpayers than the current system right now.
13 So in effect, the dams should be mothballed.

14 THE MODERATOR: Gene Hanson, then Mike
15 Schwartz, then Bill Berberet.

16 GENE HANSON: Good evening. I'm Gene
17 Hanson, an elected director of the board of
18 directors of Vigilante Electric Co-op of Dillon,
19 Montana. Vigilante Electric Co-op is a
20 distribution utility serving electricity to over
21 7600 accounts in southwest Montana. We purchase
22 all of our power from Bonneville Power
23 Administrations. Our rate payers have contributed
24 to over three billion dollars that the region has
25 spent on salmon recovery over the last 15 years.

1 We are opposed to removing the four dams
2 on the lower Snake River for the several reasons.
3 Our biggest concern would be the loss of 3033
4 megawatts of clean renewable electric generation.
5 Also, some 37,000 acres of irrigated farmland
6 would be lost. River transportation would cease.
7 And it is estimated as many as 5300 jobs would be
8 lost in the northwest.

9 Electricity is what has made the Pacific
10 Northwest what it is today. Our utility and our
11 members cannot afford to waste huge sums of money
12 on a salmon recovery project that has little or no
13 chance of working. There is virtually no science
14 to support removal of the Snake River dams. We
15 feel that the existing benefits, 3033 megawatts of
16 electricity, river navigation, recreation, and
17 37,000 acres of irrigation far outweigh the
18 unknown possibility of any significant salmon
19 recovery by breaching the Snake River dams.

20 It has not been proven or verified that
21 the dams on the Columbia River System have
22 contributed to the loss of salmon. Salmon are
23 readily available and affordable at any meat
24 counter or any fish market. As a matter of fact,
25 they are featured here in this restaurant

1 tonight. The Northwest Power Planning Council
2 predicts that the Pacific Northwest will be short
3 of energy within the next five years. How can you
4 justify losing 3033 megawatts of generation when
5 we are facing a potential shortage in the near
6 future?

7 The benefits derived from the four Snake
8 River dams will continue to generate income and
9 contribute to the economy in the Pacific Northwest
10 for many years in the future. For these reasons,
11 we are opposed to the removal of the four Snake
12 River dams. We must find other ways to restore
13 the salmon on the Snake River. Alternative No. 3
14 is the best approach. I thank you for allowing me
15 to testify.

16 THE MODERATOR: Before we go any further,
17 when we started the meeting, I said we'd take a
18 break about halfway through. We kind of took a
19 break to shift around because of our technical
20 difficulties. If the panel wants to proceed, we
21 are about a third of the way through the
22 comments. We could either take a break or if you
23 want to keep going, and you need a break, you can
24 come in and out of the room. We'll make sure that
25 we always have about three people up here. We'll

1 go on. I do want to remind folks in the audience
2 that you can, of course, make your comments in
3 writing or at the taping booth. And I think
4 you're probably Vickie Watson. We'll come back to
5 your comment. Go ahead.

6 VICKIE WATSON: I heard you call me just
7 as I stepped out. I'm Vickie Watson, professor of
8 environmental studies here at the University of
9 Montana. But I'm speaking here for myself. I
10 would like to speak in the support of the removal
11 of the earthen dams on the lower Snake River. My
12 evaluation of the historical record of salmon
13 decline convinces me this is the only hope for
14 recovering self-sustaining salmon fisheries in
15 this system.

16 There are few other species that are as
17 important to the northwest culturally,
18 economically and ecologically as the salmon. The
19 northwest dams were built with high hopes of cheap
20 power, transportation, and irrigation. But they
21 have not been cheap. They cost us our salmon.
22 Had we known the cost of the Snake River dams, I
23 don't think they would have been built.

24 But I think we still have a chance to
25 recover this loss but there will be a cost.

1 Removal of the earthen dams is a reversible
2 action. The concrete portions can be left in
3 place and we should remove the earthen dams and
4 give the salmon a reasonable number of years to
5 recover. If they don't recover on their own, then
6 we can try transplants of the most closely related
7 stock. If, after a decade or two, we have not
8 been able to recover a sustainable fishery, we can
9 put the earthen dams back.

10 While the efforts to recover salmon are
11 going on, transportation of grain, via rail,
12 should be subsidized. I don't think it would cost
13 much more than the current subsidy barging, maybe
14 it might even cost less. Irrigated agriculture
15 could be compensated and we should recognize that
16 salmon provide jobs, too.

17 I went home and looked at my electric
18 bill, and I find that I pay about a dollar a day
19 for electricity. Would I pay more to recover the
20 Snake River salmon and ease the burden to those
21 who have relied on the dams; yes, I would. I
22 would pay a lot more and without complaint,
23 believe it or not. I want to share the burden
24 with those who have depended on the dams. So I
25 think we should all pay and share in the cost of

1 recovery of the salmon that have blessed us by
2 their presence. Thanks.

3 THE MODERATOR: Mike Schwartz, Bill
4 Berberet, and then Donald Jones.

5 MIKE SCHWARTZ: My name is Mike Schwartz,
6 I'm a wildlife biologist here in Missoula.
7 Tonight I'm not speaking as a wildlife biologist
8 or for any organization, just as a private
9 citizen. So will the removal of these dams
10 increase the cost of electricity for me? I think
11 the answer is yes. Will it change my recreation
12 opportunities? The answer is yes. Do I want to
13 stop fishing? I don't. I don't want to have to
14 change how I live outdoors. I don't want to have
15 to pay more. But if these are the only costs for
16 restoring 12 runs, 12 species, excuse me, I think
17 that's well worth it. I would pay the extra
18 dollar or two per day of electricity to restore
19 these runs.

20 Charles Wilkinson, great historian and
21 writer, once talked about the rivers, the Columbia
22 River, the Snake River. He said in a chapter
23 about these rivers -- it was titled, The Rivers
24 were Crowded with Salmon. That is something I
25 personally would like to see. Wilkinson blames

1 the dams, the overfishing at the turn of the
2 century, and I tend to agree with him. I would
3 like to see the rivers crowded with salmon like
4 Wilkinson.

5 So I'm definitely in favor of removing
6 these dams. Now, this kind of an emotional plea
7 is not what brought me here tonight. What did
8 bring me tonight is a few statements I saw in the
9 Missoulian today. A few quotes from a scientist
10 who stated that even if we remove these dams, some
11 of these salmon stocks may be functionally
12 extinct. I believe that was the words that were
13 used. And as a scientist, I can't believe that
14 that's correct. Salmon have an amazing ability to
15 work their way out of a bottleneck. They
16 reproduce very fast. This is not a grizzly bear.
17 This is not a lynx.

18 I think we need to think about the life
19 history of the salmon before we write any of these
20 species off. We didn't write off the bald eagle.
21 We didn't write off the gray whale. We didn't
22 write off the black-footed ferret. I think it
23 would be quite silly to write off any of these
24 salmon stocks.

25 In fact, I was looking at the -- I

1 believe it's called the CRI analysis done by the
2 Corps, and that analysis, I assume, is equivalent
3 to a PVA, population viability analysis. And they
4 say that these stocks only have a -- some of these
5 stocks of fish have a 15 percent increase in
6 extinction over a ten-year horizon. That's a
7 pretty high extinction rate for some of these
8 stocks. But that's not the inevitable. In fact,
9 that gives you an 85 percent chance of
10 survivorship.

11 So I really plead that we don't give up
12 on any of these stocks. We do need to remove
13 these dams. And I just want to add my last
14 statements, being that, it's not only removal of
15 the dams, which I support, but we need to be
16 committed to returning the fish stock, which will
17 include some restoration ecology, some
18 enhancement, and just an overall commitment to
19 connectivity and having a positive population
20 growth rate. Thank you for the time.

21 THE MODERATOR: Bill Berberet, Donald
22 Jones and Walt Moore.

23 BILL BERBERET: I'm Bill Berberet. I'm a
24 director on Vigilante Electric, Dillon. My
25 partner give you a rundown on our organization.

1 I'm wondering, it seems to me we have a glimmer of
2 light here with some of the work that's been done
3 on the dams in the last few years to help salmon.
4 And I think it hasn't had time to really show up.
5 But I think there's some things that are being
6 done that perhaps are going to make a big
7 difference. And I think they should have a
8 chance.

9 I am opposed to breaching the dams on the
10 Snake River. If we do breach the dams, there's
11 going to have to be some new generation built.
12 It's not going to be hydropower, a nonpolluting
13 resource, it's going to be gas or coal or
14 something of that nature. If we don't build it,
15 who wants to start taking the cutback? I go to
16 these meetings. I wonder, when I listen to some
17 people on resources and such, they all must have
18 walked there, because they certainly wouldn't have
19 used gasoline or something to get there, from
20 their talks.

21 You know, God created man, and he give
22 him intellect. And man walked at one time. Every
23 place he went, he walked. Maybe he had a log on a
24 river or something, also. But he domesticated
25 animals, horses, probably rode horses, maybe he

1 rode cattle for a while. Then somebody invented
2 the wheel. So we had to have roads. And you
3 know, man's intellect has carried him right.
4 Right to where we are today.

5 I don't compare man to an animal. I
6 don't think that comparison is there or God
7 wouldn't have given man intellect. So man does
8 make mistakes. Anyone with free will are going to
9 make mistakes. And we perhaps have made
10 mistakes. And I think we should try to rectify
11 them. But I think breaching the dams on the
12 Columbia River are not a way to go about it. I
13 thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Donald Jones, then Walt
15 Moore and after that, Kurt Roche.

16 DONALD JONES: Good evening. I'm Don
17 Jones. I'm on the board of directors from
18 Vigilante Electric Cooperative in Dillon,
19 Montana. We serve 4,250 member/owners plus.
20 Vigilante Electric is a full-requirements customer
21 of Bonneville Power Administration. Our
22 member/owners have contributed to over three
23 billion dollars in salmon recovery for the past 15
24 years. Our organization is strongly opposed to
25 the removal of dams on the Snake River in order to

1 save the salmon.

2 Before tearing down million dollar dams
3 we first of all must establish some goals and
4 objectives for saving the salmon. Tearing down
5 these dams may not be the best answer. First of
6 all, these dams provide power to millions of
7 people at an effective and affordable rate. If
8 these dams are removed, cost of power to the
9 public will increase dramatically. Secondly,
10 these dams help in drought control and help the
11 agricultural community sustain proper irrigation
12 levels along the Snake River.

13 By tearing down dams we are taking away
14 millions of dollars worth of technology and will
15 be a regression of how we live today. I am a
16 rancher and raise cattle within a rural
17 community. Growing up, I remember the day we got
18 electricity and how nice it was to be warm and
19 have the conveniences that electricity provides.

20 If we tear down these dams it will be a
21 regression of these convenience as we know it
22 today. If we want the salmon to recover, we need
23 to focus our attention on harvest rates,
24 especially by the foreign communities, ocean
25 harvest, in-river gill netting. We need to look

1 at what the hatcheries are doing, what type of
2 habitat they are living in.

3 The main issue here is salmon recovery,
4 not dam removal. Studies have shown that survival
5 rate of juvenile salmon is the same as they were
6 before the dams were built. And that adult salmon
7 and steelhead pass through these dams readily and
8 have a higher migration rate than in free flowing
9 rivers.

10 The environmental community has proposed
11 that once these dams are destroyed, they will be
12 replaced by gas-fired generation power plants.
13 These gas fired generation plants do not run on a
14 renewable resource and are not as environmentally
15 clean or cost effective as hydroelectric dams.
16 Gas-fired power plants are going to affect the
17 water and the salmon that live in these waters.
18 What about the people, animals and vegetation that
19 live around these plants? Have the people that
20 are proponents to tearing out these dams thought
21 about the above consequences? What type of
22 management plan is there in place to take care of
23 the removal and destruction of these million
24 dollar structures and what insurance do we have
25 for the rate payers that they can still provide

1 cost effective electricity?

2 We are not opposed to helping the salmon
3 recovery. In fact, our rate payers have been
4 doing that for over 15 years. But we are opposed
5 to doing away with technology that has taken years
6 to build and technology that benefits everyone.
7 Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Next is Walt Moore, then
9 Kirk Roche, then Rich Day. And I want to remind
10 people as it gets later in the evening, there were
11 actually two sign up sheets. So if you signed up
12 and you remembered your number, they're numbered
13 consecutively, and we are down to about 25 now.
14 All right. Go ahead.

15 WALT MOORE: My name is Walt Moore. I'm
16 on the board of directors of Missoula Electric
17 Cooperative. We serve locally over 10,000
18 consumers. We buy our power from Bonneville and
19 we are very proud to offer our consumers power at
20 a reasonable rate. I've heard much talk this
21 evening about silver bullets. I have been around
22 the salmon recovery for over 12 years and I have
23 seen lots of silver bullets and every one has been
24 a fizzle. And I think breaching the dams is
25 another silver bullet.

1 There's not enough scientific evidence.
2 There is no comprehensive plan. This is what's
3 been one of the large problems with the salmon
4 recovery in the past, there has never been a
5 comprehensive plan that has brought all phases and
6 interested parties that are interested in the
7 salmon recovery together to make a plan that is
8 viable and would be a good road map that perhaps
9 something could get done.

10 So, many people said about everything I
11 wanted to say this evening. I don't have a whole
12 heck of a lot to say that hasn't been said
13 before. I am very much in -- as the Cooperative
14 representative, we are very much against breaching
15 the dams for the afore-mentioned reasons. And I
16 think that if anyone would really look at the
17 scientific evidence that is available and be
18 honest with himself, not react from emotion, we
19 would see at this time it's not a viable option.
20 Thank you very much.

21 THE MODERATOR: Kurt Roche, then Rich
22 Day, then Steve Stergios. Is Kurt Roche here?
23 Kurt Roche? Rich Day? Is Rich Day here? Thank
24 you.

25 RICH DAY: Good evening, and thank you

1 for having this hearing here in Missoula. My name
2 is Rich Day. I'm a resident of Missoula,
3 Montana. I have been fishing in Montana for over
4 31 years. I'm, I guess, a native Idahoan. I hate
5 to use that word, but I was born and raised in
6 Idaho. So I have a little bit of interest in the
7 dams. I'm also the regional organizer for the
8 National Wildlife faster of the Northern Rockies
9 project office here in Missoula.

10 I represent about four million members of
11 the National Wildlife Federation. And I ask that
12 you submit my comments to both the Corps Draft EIS
13 and the Federal Caucus All-H Paper.

14 The National Wildlife Federation fully
15 supports the breaching of the four lower Snake
16 River dams. We call on this administration and
17 your agencies to pick an alternative that has this
18 removal option and the restoration of wild salmon
19 and steelhead runs as a centerpiece.

20 We need wild salmon and steelhead for our
21 children, for our economies, and for our way of
22 life. No other alternative has been put forward
23 that is as certain that we have salmon in our
24 futures. We no longer have time to wait. The
25 wild salmon and steelhead don't have time. We are

1 looking at the extinction of the Snake River
2 stocks in our lifetime if we don't act now. And
3 that's just incredible. But what is just as
4 incredible is that we still have time to change
5 this tide, to right the wrongs of the past and to
6 save these fish for our futures.

7 Make no mistake about it, if we delay
8 this decision, if we wait and spend another three
9 billion dollars on studies, these magnificent fish
10 will go extinct. We will have studied them to
11 death. And realistically, what are the other
12 options. The governor of Oregon has said it best,
13 if not the dam, then what? End of the quote.
14 Will we stop all fishing? Will we continue to
15 rely on grossly extensive technical fixes that
16 don't work? Will we ask irrigators in Idaho and
17 Montana to give up thousands of acre feet of water
18 to provide for additional river flow? Will we
19 draw down Libby and Hungry Horse Reservoirs to
20 provide increased flows and cool water for the
21 fish?

22 These are the draconian measures, not dam
23 removal. These measures will have drastic effects
24 on a much larger scale than removal of the four
25 lower Snake River dams. And yet, the many

1 scientists that have been looking at this issue
2 over the last several years don't believe that any
3 of these options will have the success that dam
4 removal would have on bringing back our wild
5 salmon and steelhead. So why would we put so many
6 in harm's way when there is an option that will
7 have lesser effects and a higher certainty of
8 success. It's simply common sense.

9 The four lower Snake River dams should be
10 removed to protect and restore our wild salmon and
11 steelhead population. That's not to say that this
12 option will not have consequences for some
13 communities. It will. We all know that. And
14 that is why the National Wildlife Federation and
15 others support the construction of a transition
16 package that will invest in the affected
17 communities to make these communities whole.
18 Instead of debating whether we should follow the
19 science in what is necessary for the salmon to
20 survive, we should be spending time thinking about
21 those communities and what they will need to
22 continue to thrive.

23 Let's begin to put our efforts there.
24 The clock of extinction is ticking for the future
25 of our wild salmon and steelhead. Let's breach

1 these dams. Let's bring back our wild salmon and
2 salmon and let's save all of our communities.
3 Thank you.

4 THE MODERATOR: Steve Stergios. Then T.
5 Jefferson and Caryn Miske.

6 STEVE STERGIOS: My name is Steve
7 Stergios and I live here in Missoula. And I'm an
8 anadromous fish -- I love fishing, salmon and
9 steelhead. I would like to echo Mr. Joseph the
10 Nez Perce man that was here, the Indian. The fish
11 are an important renewable resource. I feel that
12 we have tribal -- I'm not an Indian, but we have
13 tribal responsibilities to these people. First of
14 all, salmon, this is a food fish. Steelhead is a
15 sport fish. We're talking about two species and
16 both of them are in the -- they are on the verge
17 of extinction. I hit the steelhead pretty hard
18 this year and I'll tell you what, it's grim,
19 G-R-I-M. Very few fish. And I'm a good
20 steelheader.

21 But we have spent 25 years and billions
22 on studies. It goes on and on interminably, and
23 what the heck have we come up with that's
24 realistic? I find fewer and fewer fish, smaller
25 limits. I heard somebody else say, Well, now, you

1 know, the fish limits are the things that are
2 causing the problem. Wrong. We have just reduced
3 the limits to almost -- they are nonexistent. Dam
4 removals -- well, first of all, we didn't have the
5 problem until we built all these eight dams. I
6 have taken a look at the map and I see the four
7 Snake River dams are a plug for the fish
8 continuation and for spawning purposes. And also
9 for my fishing purpose and pleasure.

10 Somewhere along the line there are four
11 plugs and that's these lower Snake River dams. If
12 the fish are going to continue, they have to have
13 a free flow of water. What happened to the fish
14 after they got to Ice Harbor? They vanished. I
15 don't understand why. I haven't had anybody tell
16 me why, either. So for centuries and centuries
17 the salmon flowed up these rivers along with the
18 river flow. I think the key to the problem is
19 keep that river flowing. Stop damming it and
20 let's have our fishery back. It's a renewable
21 resource and it's important. Thank you for the
22 time.

23 THE MODERATOR: T. Jefferson, then Caryn
24 Miske, then Tony Schooner (sic).

25 T. JEFFERSON: Servants of the republic,

1 I, Thomas Jefferson, am roused from my eternal
2 rest to separate the shadows cast upon my name and
3 the name of my beloved soldiers by the men who
4 settled this grandness of the upper Louisiana
5 Territory you call the Pacific Northwest. Listen
6 carefully what one of your politicians misquoted
7 me, as westerners so frequently do in the defense
8 of their skulduggery.

9 I gave no instructions to Captain
10 Meriwether Lewis and William Clark that they
11 should find the most significant and magnificent
12 bounty of salmon in the world just so our nation
13 could come and lay ruin to it. To do so would
14 have been a crime upon this country, this
15 community and the Native peoples of this land.

16 Rather, they were dispatched to find a
17 northwest passage. And in seeking that route,
18 they were expressly told they must cultivate
19 peace, harmony, and good neighborhood with Native
20 people they encountered. My vision was we would
21 become partners with these people during the 100
22 generations I estimated it would take to fill the
23 upper Louisiana.

24 Imagine my heart when I read these words
25 of Captain Lewis telling of his discovery of a

1 place not far from the point we are tonight. "We
2 proceeded to the top of the mountain and faced the
3 sea. From this point, I beheld the grandest and
4 most pleasing prospects which my eyes ever
5 surveyed. In my front, a boundless ocean, a most
6 romantic appearance. My men told of rivers so
7 thick with salmon that one could travel across to
8 its banks on the backs of these majestic fish."

9 And in telling of the mighty Columbia
10 River, Captain Lewis wrote, "This immense river
11 water is one of the fairest portions on the
12 globe. As we passed on, it seemed those scenes of
13 visionary enchantment would never have an end."
14 How in error both Captain Lewis and I were. My
15 nation's citizens traveled both the Pacific
16 Northwest and greedily all but ended the mystique
17 of this land. An unmatched bounty of salmon
18 disappears in the clutches of profligate waste.
19 In these modern times the thundering majority of
20 citizens of this republic are calling on you to
21 remove four dams and give the salmon back the
22 essence of what they must have; free flowing
23 waters.

24 Their message is more than just for
25 salmon but through the preservation of democracy.

1 These are rivers of the people. Not rivers of the
2 monied few who seek to intimidate and ignore the
3 masses. Your duty is to right the wrong of such
4 heartless destruction of our nature's riches, to
5 make right your violations of our promises to the
6 Native peoples of good neighborhood and peace.

7 We must be known as a nation who honors
8 our promises and treaties with Native peoples, not
9 one that makes empty promises, later to deceive
10 the very people that trusted our word. Such will
11 require a stiff measure of what so many leaders
12 lack; courage. We have seen your prowess at
13 damming the salmon. Now it is incumbent on you to
14 prove your prowess at restoring the bounty of the
15 salmon this region once possessed, a task you can
16 only accomplish if you chart your way to the dam
17 dismantling corps and recovery. Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Caryn Miske, then Tony
19 Schooner (sic), then -- I'm sorry, I can't read
20 the first name, but it's Standing High, is the
21 rest of the name.

22 CARYN MISKE: Good evening. My name is
23 Caryn Miske and I'm here to support the removal of
24 the four federal dams on the lower Snake River and
25 to bring back the salmon and the steelhead. My

1 comments address both the Draft EIS and the
2 Federal Caucus 4-H paper. Let's be clear about
3 what we're discussing tonight. The question about
4 whether we should remove the four lower Snake
5 River dams is no longer a question of science.

6 The federal agency's own science shows
7 that breaching these dams is the best way to
8 ensure the restoration of wild salmon and
9 steelhead. It's a shame that the U.S. Fish and
10 Wildlife Service is the only federal agency that
11 has had the courage and integrity to acknowledge
12 this science so far. It's not a question of law.
13 The only option presented thus far that clearly
14 meets all federal laws, including the Endangered
15 Species Act and the Clean Water Act, is partial
16 removal of these four dams.

17 It's not a question of keeping our
18 promises and meeting our treaty obligations.
19 Again, the only option presented that clearly
20 meets the moral and the legal duties is the
21 partial removal of these four dams. And finally,
22 it's not a question of economics. Studies show
23 that removing these dams will be good for this
24 region. It will bring thousands of new jobs and
25 restore an industry that has been devastated by

1 declines in salmon and steelhead populations.

2 The only question here is whether we will
3 have the political will to do what is right and
4 take out these dams. The people of this region
5 and of this nation want these dams removed. And
6 they want their salmon back. We've heard that
7 sometimes the people must lead for our leaders to
8 follow. Well, let me submit to you that the
9 people are leading. It is clear that the large
10 showing here tonight shows that people want their
11 salmon back. And they want partial removal of
12 these dams. Thank you.

13 THE MODERATOR: Tony Schooner (sic), then
14 I can't read the first name, Standing High. And
15 then Andy Pucket after that.

16 TONY SCHOONEN: For the record, my name
17 is Tony Schoonen. I'm here representing -- and
18 that kind of reminds me of a schooner of beer the
19 way you pronounced it, but that's fine, too. But
20 I'm here representing the concerns of the Skyline
21 Sports Association of Butte and also the Anaconda
22 Sportsmen Club. And there's a lot of us in these
23 organizations that have fished steelhead and
24 salmon, and in both the Clearwater River and the
25 Salmon River. And I personally have fished there

1 for steelhead for 15 years. But I'm not going to
2 pay \$59 to go down there and get a cold butt and a
3 hungry gut or whatever you want to say, and maybe
4 catch one steelhead. They are just not there
5 anymore.

6 And if it takes the removal of four dams
7 to improve the fishing, if this is the thing that
8 needs to be done -- and I have been involved with
9 a lot of these studies over the years, like the
10 cleaning up of the Clark Fork, they spent millions
11 and millions of tax dollars on studies, by your
12 own figures. If you keep studying this thing to
13 death, in ten years the steelhead will be gone. I
14 mean, that's your own estimation. That's just
15 unacceptable. So most everything else has been
16 said, I'll turn my time over to somebody else.
17 Thanks.

18 THE MODERATOR: Next, I can't read the
19 first name, but the rest is Standing High. Andy
20 Pucket and then David Duncan.

21 MATO STANDING HIGH: Good evening. Thank
22 you for your time. My name is Mato, M-A-T-O
23 Standing High. I am the president of the Native
24 American Law Student's Association here at the
25 University of Montana School of Law. I'm also a

1 member of the environmental law group. I'm an
2 enrolled member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe in
3 Rosebud, South Dakota. And I am here representing
4 the indigenous people of the United States. I
5 support full breach of the dams of the lower Snake
6 River.

7 I'd like to address a few comments made
8 earlier. One was that we can't throw people to
9 the wayside. Well, it's pretty obvious that
10 that's what this is all about from the get go.
11 Ignoring the treaty of 1855 is simply
12 unacceptable. I noticed all the informational
13 panels back there, and not one mentions that the
14 treaty has been clearly breached. And I wonder
15 why that is. Why is everybody ignoring that
16 fact. The honor of the nation is on the line
17 here. And to ignore that is simply, like I said,
18 unacceptable.

19 Now, I shouldn't have to rehash the
20 injustice and all the other treaties that have
21 been ignored and broken to show the importance of
22 the decision that you have to make, which I don't
23 envy you. It's a tough decision to make. But I'm
24 sure you're aware of the power that rests in your
25 hands. And I concur with my good friend Thomas

1 Jefferson, again, that we need to breach the dams
2 of the lower Snake River.

3 I would also like to address someone's
4 comments referring us back to the stone age by
5 breaching these dams. Well, I challenge that
6 statement. It can create an opportunity for man's
7 intellect, quote, unquote, as someone stated
8 earlier, to come up with new solutions for energy
9 loss, which is a small amount relative to what is
10 already produced. I challenge man's intellect to
11 come up with new jobs and new businesses in this
12 area that this area can also sustain.

13 Now, I have also heard of the loss of
14 power and of jobs. What about a loss of a
15 species? That's completely irreversible. And I
16 don't think that can be ignored, either. These
17 dams, they affect an important natural resource
18 along with a way of life for United States
19 citizens. The dams' impact is what amounts to be
20 a violation of the 1855 treaty between the United
21 States and the Yakima, Nez Perce, Umatilla
22 (phonetic) and Warm Springs Tribes.

23 I'd like to conclude that in the interest
24 of honoring binding treaties, citizens of this
25 great country, an important cultural way of life,

1 along with having respect for freedom of religion,
2 that these dams be breached. Thank you for your
3 time.

4 THE MODERATOR: Next is Andy Pucket, then
5 David Duncan. Then I come to a name that I'm just
6 going to try to spell, and if you think it's you,
7 you might come and check with me. From Montana
8 Wildlife faster, what I can read is E-A-M, I
9 believe, U-N-T-H-E-R. When we get to you, you'll
10 know who you are. Again, I mean no disrespect to
11 anyone. I kind of wondered if we had medical
12 students instead of law students. Andy Pucket is
13 gone. And David Duncan is after this gentlemen.

14 GREG MUNTHER: I flunked out of medical
15 school. My name is Greg Munther. I'm speaking as
16 habitat co-chairman of the Montana Wildlife
17 Federation, Organization of 8,000 members here in
18 Montana. I'm also speaking from my own personal
19 experience as a certified fishery scientist, past
20 president of both the Idaho and Montana chapter of
21 the American Fishery Society. I'm a native of
22 Idaho but I have lived here in Missoula for 23
23 years.

24 I request my comments be entered in the
25 record of both the Corps Draft Environmental

1 Impact Statement and the Caucus All-H Paper. I
2 spent four years, in 1972 to 1976, as a fisheries
3 biologist for the Forest Service in the upper
4 Salmon River. I walked those streams. I counted
5 over 800 reds on national forest land without
6 trying very hard. I also worked really hard to
7 take out irrigation diversions. We screened
8 irrigation diversions. We got some grazing
9 practices corrected, and I think the Forest
10 Service and other land management agencies should
11 be proud of the record of restoring habitat
12 conditions.

13 As a result of this type of habitat
14 improvement and a lot of wilderness in Idaho we
15 have a lot of good to excellent spawning habitat
16 conditions in Idaho. The upstream habitat
17 improvement alternative, touted by some, has
18 already been tried. It has been successful at
19 restoring habitat but it's been ineffective at
20 restoring salmon. Partial removal of the four
21 lower Snake dams is the most effective,
22 economical, and, by the way, scientifically
23 supported way to restore central habitat for
24 salmon.

25 Alternatives under consideration by the

1 All-H plan and other agency initiatives have no
2 clear evidence of effectiveness. It would be far
3 more expensive for the public and economically
4 disruptive to far more people. Restoring a
5 free-flowing river is our best investment in
6 habitat, healthy salmon populations and healthy
7 economy for both the entire Pacific Northwest and
8 Northern Rockies Region.

9 According to the Corps' own EIS, dam
10 removal also uncovered another 34,000 acres of
11 riparian land and flowing rivers that would be
12 prime habitat for the spawning fall chinook. The
13 best way to recover habitat for fall chinook is by
14 removing these dams. They would not only provide
15 improved passage, but there's plenty of habitat
16 that would be uncovered, giving them access to the
17 gravel beds that they need to lay their eggs for
18 the first time in over 30 years.

19 There is no other habitat improvement
20 that can deliver 140 miles of 70 percent in-river
21 improvement in one step. The All-H Paper research
22 says that habitat activities might be an effective
23 recovery. Feasibility analysis on the
24 effectiveness of habitat restoration won't be done
25 until June. From my own experience, let me tell

1 you, habitat modifications alone are not enough to
2 return these salmon. We need to take bold steps
3 now to restore the signature species of the
4 region.

5 Any option chosen for the recovery of
6 Snake River salmon must include dam removal as
7 part of the equation. We owe it to future
8 generations and we owe it to these fish. And I
9 might say, I was raised in Southern Idaho. It was
10 a cultural -- it was a way of life. When the
11 salmon were in the upper Salmon River, everybody
12 dropped what they were doing, the show bands came
13 up, they did their cultural thing with salmon.
14 All farmers in Southern Idaho dropped their
15 farming and took off and went to the upper Salmon
16 River. I watched Sum Beam Dam being so crowded
17 you couldn't stand on the rock with salmon
18 fishermen.

19 THE MODERATOR: Greg, you'll need to
20 finish up.

21 GREG MUNTHER: My own in-laws, it was a
22 way of life. They lived on the river. Let's get
23 away from the mediocrity of the river and let's
24 restore the dignity. And I guess I'd like to ask
25 the Colonel and Mr. Wright whether you would like

1 to be the ones that told your children and
2 grandchildren that your agencies are responsible
3 for allowing salmon to go extinct. Thank you.

4 THE MODERATOR: Next is Phil -- I believe
5 it might be Harbit, but Phil, if you know who you
6 are, you're next. Kirk Thompson and then John
7 Calbeck. Is Phil still here? I believe he's the
8 only one on the list named Phil. Let's move on
9 then to James Curtis. Is James Curtis still
10 here? Okay. How about John Calbeck.

11 KIRK THOMPSON: Kirk Thompson you
12 called?

13 THE MODERATOR: Kirk Thompson, yes. Is
14 that you?

15 KIRK THOMPSON: I thought you were
16 skipping over that.

17 THE MODERATOR: No, I am going from list
18 to list as they are numbered here.

19 KIRK THOMPSON: My name is Kirk
20 Thompson. I'm from Stevensville, Montana. I want
21 to comment specifically on the Corps EIS. I'm one
22 of those co-op customers that's benefitted from
23 cheap electricity. And I have to thank the
24 taxpayers that helped me out. But I'm certainly
25 willing to pay more. It's time to propose to

1 remove the dam. A lot of our tax dollars were
2 wasted in building them. Damaged an incredibly
3 valuable resource that we used to get for free.

4 While we cannot know for sure what's
5 going to work and what won't work, we do know the
6 dams damaged the fishery, and we know the
7 attempted solutions for the last 25 years haven't
8 worked. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to
9 figure out that we need to undo a cause of the
10 problem instead of continuing to try more
11 Band-aids. We need to protect the irrigation water
12 of the Idaho farmers. The Washington farmers can
13 pump from the river just as well as from the
14 reservoir. And need to stop the barge subsidy. I
15 say let the free market work in both
16 transportation and power. Thank you.

17 THE MODERATOR: I'll try John Calbeck one
18 more time. Next three then are Deborah Smith,
19 Clay Bohlman and Dave Jones.

20 DEBORAH SMITH: Good evening. Thank you,
21 everybody, for staying here and staying alert.
22 I'm Debbie Smith. I'm the current chair of the
23 Northwest Energy Coalition. I also work with many
24 of the groups that were listed on the fabulous
25 Save Our Wild Salmon banner that was up here

1 earlier. I'm testifying tonight on behalf of
2 myself. I live over in Helena, Montana. And I
3 unequivocally support the partial removal of the
4 four lower Snake dams.

5 And I would say to this panel that,
6 something that you probably all know, there may be
7 no single silver bullet that will restore historic
8 levels of the fabulous salmon and steelhead runs
9 that we once knew, but partial removal of the four
10 lower Snake dams is an absolutely essential
11 ingredient in the recipe to do that. And it's one
12 that at this point is beyond scientific debate.
13 If the four dams are not partially removed, the
14 fish will become extinct. And at what cost to the
15 people of the region, of this state and of our
16 entire country?

17 It's a loss to our heritage. It's a blow
18 to our system of justice where our laws, like the
19 Endangered Species Act and the Environmental
20 Protection laws we have, are based both on good
21 public policy and on moral underpinning. And I
22 think it's easy to do the arithmetic in terms of
23 what is the greater cost, the billions of dollars
24 that we'll have to pay to the tribe for the
25 breaking of our treaty obligations versus the cost

1 of partially removing the dams that studies show
2 will cost rate payers in the region a range of \$1
3 to \$5 per month.

4 But there's no need for the federal
5 caucus, for your agencies to put the region in
6 such dire consequences. I don't need to tell
7 Steve Wright of the Bonneville Power
8 Administration, but maybe the rest of you don't
9 know, maybe you have heard in this hearing there
10 is conservation and renewable power today
11 available in the region that can replace the power
12 loss from the dams.

13 These dams are not religious shrines.
14 They are power plants. They are transportation
15 corridors. They have limited life spans. And
16 it's time to put these four dams to rest and to
17 allow the wild salmon and steelhead to flourish
18 again. For the good of the people and the good of
19 the earth. This slogan on our stickers is
20 correct. These dams just don't make sense. Thank
21 you.

22 THE MODERATOR: Clay Bohlman, and Dave
23 Jones, and after that, John Kober.

24 CLAY BOHLMAN: My name is Clay Bohlman.
25 I'm a deck hand from an Alaskan troller. My job

1 is to gaff kings and cohos over the side of the
2 rail; that's how I make my living and that's how
3 the people from Newport, Oregon clear to Pelican,
4 Alaska used to make their living. They are not
5 here tonight. You're not going to see them. I'm
6 here to represent them in some manner, as best I
7 can.

8 We are stuck with two choices, ladies and
9 gentlemen, and these are the two. The fact is the
10 dams are going to drive these salmon into
11 extinction. That is the bottom line. I have
12 talked with old timers, I have talked with men
13 that fished in the '30s, before World War II, and
14 they say the market decline started in the '50s
15 when the first dams on the Columbia started, and
16 I'm referring to the four from Portland up to
17 Pasco. And then it got even worse.

18 There are 13 irrigation users in the
19 lower Snake that say that their income will be
20 grievously damaged if these dams are removed.
21 Yet, we have 800 power patrol permits up in the
22 State of Alaska that -- well, without action down
23 here, essentially, those permits worth \$15,000 now
24 are going to be worth nothing. Nothing. I cannot
25 let the rancher in Dillon, Montana, where I

1 finished off college, I cannot let him be put out
2 of business by a fisherman up in Alaska. And the
3 same way being in Montana, I will not let a
4 fisherman up in Alaska, essentially, a fisher of
5 the sea or a farmer of the sea, if you will, I
6 cannot watch him be put out of business by
7 interests, whether they be agriculture or power,
8 down here.

9 Yes, it will affect -- it will affect
10 this region. Believe me, it's nothing like that
11 that goes on up in here, that goes on up in
12 Alaska. Virtual communities have been turned into
13 ghost towns. I cite Pelican, Alaska and Port
14 Alexander as two of them. We are faced with two
15 options. People say that the salmon is not worth
16 keeping and it's a dinosaur, its time has come.
17 Well, I suppose tonight if we have to make that
18 decision, it's put all in front of you.

19 Well, many of us will go the way of the
20 dinosaur, too, along with the salmon. Without a
21 season to fish for salmon, there is no commercial
22 fisherman and there is no salmon fish. Thank
23 you.

24 THE MODERATOR: Dave Jones, then John
25 Kober, then Yolanda Page.

1 JOHN KOBER: Dave Jones isn't here. I'm
2 John Kober. I'm with the Montana Wildlife
3 faster. I'm the director of field operations for
4 the Federation. And I'm not going to echo what
5 Craig Munther said, but I will speak from the
6 perspective of a third generation Montanan who has
7 been a fly fishing outfitter in this state for 15
8 years who has benefitted directly from a healthy
9 river resource. And do the right thing, breach
10 the lower four Snake River dams. Thank you.

11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Yolanda Page
12 then Louie Flora, then Jim Haynes. Yolanda Page?
13 Louie Flora? Jim Haynes? Next is Charlie Palmer,
14 then Heather Duncan, then Ari LeVail. Any of
15 those folks here? Charlie Palmer, Heather Duncan,
16 Ari LeVail.

17 HEATHER DUNCAN: Yeah. Heather Duncan.

18 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Heather. Great.

19 HEATHER DUNCAN: My name is Heather
20 Duncan. I'm neither a member of nor speaking on
21 behalf of any organization tonight. Forgive me if
22 I'm a little nervous, I'm not a public speaker
23 like many of those who have come before me. Once
24 upon a time, dinosaurs roamed the earth. They
25 were bigger, stronger, faster, and by most

1 evidence the dominant animal life form at the
2 time. Due to a change in their environment and
3 quite possibly other factors, which we may or may
4 not be aware, they reached a point in time where
5 they were no longer able to adapt to their
6 environment and they became extinct.

7 Had many of these environmentalist groups
8 been in existence at that time, I'm quite sure
9 there probably would have been a loud and vocal
10 outcry to save the dinosaur. Now, what happened
11 to the dinosaur happened without help or hindrance
12 from humans. How is this relevant to salmon?
13 Well, many people are saying that the building of
14 the dams is what is causing the salmon to go
15 extinct. And it's more than likely that that is a
16 factor in the decline in the number.

17 However, there's no way to prove that
18 that is the only factor or even the most dominant
19 factor. There's obviously other things that play,
20 including sea lions, terns, human fishing
21 practices and perhaps other things of which we're
22 not aware.

23 The cost to the economy and lifestyle of
24 the people of the northwest by breaching the dams
25 would be enormous. We have enjoyed the benefit of

1 cheap, safe electrical power generation and
2 transportation. The removal of the dams would
3 adversely affect that. Just in yesterday's news
4 there was an article imminently -- discussing an
5 imminent crisis due to a shortage of power. The
6 amount matching was 3,000 kilowatts. Well, if the
7 3,000 kilowatts represented by these four dams is
8 five percent of the total and we're already short
9 3,000, then we're down by ten percent in what's
10 needed to sustain our lifestyle here.

11 The question is; is removing the dams the
12 best thing to do? Are we allowing ourselves to be
13 wagged by the tail of outspoken environmentalist
14 groups who have already saved the spotted owl,
15 saved the salmon, stay out of the forest, remove
16 the roads. What's next? Remove the rest of the
17 dams, there's no guarantee that breaching the dams
18 would restore the salmon.

19 THE MODERATOR: Heather, you'll need to
20 finish up.

21 HEATHER DUNCAN: Salmon are plentiful and
22 cheap. You can go into a grocery store and buy
23 them for less than the cost of a Big Mac. I think
24 we need to reexamine what's being done here
25 tonight. Thank you.

1 called Indian Creek. And the reason why it was
2 called Indian Creek was because there, the Native
3 Americans would sometimes camp in the spring and
4 peel the bark from the large ponderosa pines to
5 use as gum. Now the salmon was as much a part of
6 the forest of Idaho as the deep pacific ocean.

7 The salmon bring nutrients when they
8 return back to the Idaho batholith where the
9 granitic soils don't provide many. And not only
10 do they provide those nutrients for the aquatic
11 ecosystem, but for the terrestrial, as well. The
12 bears eat the salmon. And we know what the bears
13 do in the woods. The salmon energize the strands
14 of the web, when any of the strands of the web are
15 weakened or lost, the entire web is weakened or
16 lost. In short, the fish need a river and not
17 barges. Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Mac Donofrio and then Don
19 Beckner and then Larry Campbell.

20 MAC DONOFRIO: Thank you for coming here
21 tonight. I'd like to include this comment in
22 whatever you can possibly include it in. 4-H, I'm
23 not sure. Corps of Engineers EIS, is that all you
24 can do? Okay. Woody Guthrie said that salmon are
25 like presidents, they run every four years. Well,

1 now it looks like we may just be stuck with
2 presidents if we don't get our act together.

3 If the northwest has a single symbol of
4 life, it is the salmon; sockeye, coho, chinook and
5 others. They have enriched and sustained the
6 lives of humans and other animals for thousands of
7 years. By building these dams we literally block
8 the flow of life. We need to relieve the
9 tourniquet now.

10 On your map you gave us there's 41 dams
11 shown. I see you didn't get them all, but I'm
12 sure those are the major ones. It seems like
13 asking to remove four isn't that big of a deal,
14 which I am in favor of. We know a lot more than
15 we did in the first half of the last century about
16 river systems, dams, salmon, spring runoff,
17 riverside vegetation. And as far as the comments
18 about forest fires destroying the salmon, if you'd
19 look at the tree rings on these 400-year old
20 ponderosas and ones on the other side of the
21 divide, you'll see that there's been plenty of
22 fires over the centuries.

23 We need to honor also our Native American
24 treaty rights. That would be really a nice
25 change. Oh, I would like to thank the Oregon

1 governor for standing up in favor of salmon and
2 steelhead. Let's admit the mistakes of the past
3 and start correcting them. If you and Governor
4 Racicot and other decision makers choose not to
5 breach these four dams, you will be thrusting your
6 own pitchfork into the pool at that last swollen
7 female laden with eggs. Thank you for your time.

8 THE MODERATOR: Dawn Beckner, and then
9 Larry Campbell and then Jeremy -- I believe it's
10 Hueth.

11 DAWN BECKNER: Hi, my name is Dawn
12 Beckner. I'm a student here at the University of
13 Montana. Thank you very much for staying up and
14 listening to me. I'd like to address, first of
15 all, the question or the comment I have heard a
16 couple times about the grocery store having salmon
17 and them being so cheap. There are different
18 kinds of salmon. Those that are caught by troller
19 and technology, you know, helps us find these
20 salmon with radars and every other gadget that we
21 have invented.

22 And also there's salmon raised in farms
23 and pens. That's a lot different. The Endangered
24 Species Act promised protection and restoration of
25 endangered and threatened fish. In the northwest

1 there are two salmon species listed as endangered
2 and seven threatened. We need to acknowledge the
3 importance of these laws and protect the salmon.
4 Salmon need this protection because their habitat
5 is affected in so many factors across the world.
6 These include illegal drift net fishing, trollers,
7 global warming, habitat loss from oil and gas,
8 road building and clear cutting along riparian
9 zones, leaving spawning beds covered with silt,
10 illegal poaching of caviar, is just some of them.

11 We're at a crossroad now in determining
12 the fate of our salmon. It is less extensive and
13 more effective to focus our effort and money
14 towards preventing extinction during this critical
15 window of time we are at today than waiting for
16 the complete extinction of the salmon running in
17 the lower Snake River. If we let them disappear,
18 we will not be able to get them back. Our chances
19 will be gone. We need to act now and breach the
20 dams. What science leads us to do is save the
21 salmon. We should invest money to restore what
22 our hands have compromised. Thank you.

23 THE MODERATOR: Larry Campbell, then
24 Jeremy Hueth, then Jennifer Ferenstein.

25 LARRY CAMPBELL: My name is Larry

1 Campbell and I live in the Bitterroot watershed.
2 I'm here representing Friends of the Bitterroot, a
3 12-year old public interest organization of over
4 700 families dedicated to conservation of wildlife
5 and wild lands. Protection and restoration of
6 salmon and other species is fundamentally a moral
7 duty. Morality is the obligation that comes to us
8 as humans because we are adaptable and because we
9 have the opportunity to make intelligent choices.

10 We can choose to allow salmon to live by
11 simply adjusting our lifestyles. By adapting to
12 new information and adjusting our lifestyle to
13 restore the health of the ecosystem, we will not
14 only save salmon, we also significantly improve
15 our own long-term physical, cultural and spiritual
16 health. We are incredibly fortunate to have the
17 wealth and the wisdom available to do the right
18 thing. The only impediment to doing the right
19 thing that we face is certain vested economic
20 interest.

21 We dare not let these special interests
22 dam the future of the greater public good.
23 Fairness dictates that we should compensate these
24 vested economic interests and take care of
25 creation as well as the public interest.

1 Breaching the dams is clearly the best approach.
2 Enough science is in, there's no good reason for
3 further delay. We urge you to get on with what
4 needs to be done to save the salmon and serve the
5 greater public good. To turn a phrase, torpedo
6 the dams and full speed ahead to a future where we
7 honor all species and the ecosystems that support
8 all life. Thank you.

9 And on a personal note, I wish the
10 representatives of Ravalli County Electric Co-op
11 were still here. I'm a rate payer in Ravalli
12 County. They did not poll the membership. I am
13 more than happy to pay a higher rate in order to
14 see the salmon live.

15 THE MODERATOR: Jeremy Hueth, Jennifer
16 Ferenstein, and then Jon Beal.

17 TRENT BAKER: Jeremy had to take off. My
18 name is Trent Baker and I'll speak in his spot.
19 I'm a native of the Columbia watershed. I grew up
20 in Pocatello, Idaho on the edge of the Snake River
21 plain and I have lived in Missoula now for about
22 five years. And I'm speaking tonight as a citizen
23 of the watershed and also as a boater. I spent a
24 lot of time floating on the various forks of the
25 Salmon River, recreationally, and I also work as a

1 commercial river guide. And I'd like to talk
2 tonight just for a moment about the effect that
3 those places had on me, the beauty that they
4 possess and what I think is missing.

5 Last fall I went down to the main Salmon
6 River and spent a long weekend fishing with my
7 brother and my dad. I probably fished eight hours
8 a day for four days in a row and I didn't catch
9 any steelhead. And it was all right because the
10 Salmon is an amazing place and just standing
11 around out there is fantastic. And I also was
12 standing next to my brother when he caught two.
13 And one of them was a hatchery fish and one of
14 them was a wild salmon. And I got to say that it
15 may not be indicative of the populations as a
16 whole, but there was a real difference there.

17 And I would like to stress that I worry
18 about the effectiveness of the hatchery programs
19 and the fish that they produce, and I would like
20 to encourage caution there. I would also like to
21 say that the beauty of the Salmon River Canyon,
22 both the River of No Return on the main fork and
23 Impassible Canyon on the middle fork, is really
24 unspeakable. If you haven't been there, I can't
25 possibly begin to describe to you, but I know that

1 there is something missing.

2 And if those salmon were there, I can
3 only imagine what it would be like. But I think I
4 got a small taste of that when I spent some time
5 in Alaska. And if that type of thing could happen
6 again on those rivers, it couldn't be anything but
7 a benefit and would far outweigh anything that has
8 to do with power bills or having to retrain some
9 people that work in a new job. It would be well
10 worth it.

11 I would also like to say that I would
12 hope that you guys would address and consider the
13 north fork of the Clearwater in this plan in some
14 way or maybe consider options for the future, it's
15 not too far from here. I spent some time over
16 there fishing, as well, and I seen the reds that
17 run and they are small. And that's because the
18 Dworshack Dam blocks their passage down to the
19 Snake and main stem of the Columbia.

20 And the hatchery that they put in at the
21 Dworshack to make up for that doesn't really cut
22 it, in my mind. And I would like to see some type
23 of consideration about doing something with the
24 Dworshack dam and opening that basin to a real
25 salmon run again sometime in the future. And

1 that's all I have to say. Thank you.

2 THE MODERATOR: Jennifer Ferenstein, Jon
3 Beal and Ray Vinkey.

4 JENNIFER FERENSTEIN: Thank you for
5 letting me speak tonight. I'm speaking on behalf
6 of the Sierra Club. I'm a natural board of
7 director -- member of that board for the Sierra
8 Club. And again, I want to thank you for the
9 opportunity to speak. The Sierra Club and myself
10 personally support partial removal of the lower
11 Snake River dams. We want to give the maximum
12 possible opportunity to restore our native salmon
13 species that use that area. The dams, they are
14 impermanent. They are impermanent structures that
15 have brought the wild salmon runs to the brink of
16 extinction.

17 The dams are impermanent, but extinction
18 is forever. Last Saturday I was reading the
19 newspaper and I read this little excerpt at the
20 end of the newspaper about two species going
21 extinct in the Middle East. And it made my heart
22 just drop. It made me sick. I started crying in
23 the coffee shop. We talk about you can get salmon
24 in the store, there's nothing wrong; we're going
25 to lose this species and we're going to end up

1 reading about it in the newspaper. I cannot think
2 of anything worse in a country like ours. We are
3 a wealthy country. People talk about maintaining
4 their lifestyle. Its consumption that's killing
5 us.

6 And we could turn off three-quarters of
7 the lights in this room and we could still see
8 each other. We could still talk to one another.
9 We could still maintain civil dialogue with one
10 another. We could still have a community. We
11 don't need to lose the salmon. What we need is to
12 change our lifestyle, to live sustainably and to
13 respect life. Thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Jon Beal, Ray Vinkey and
15 then Ethan Mace.

16 JON BEAL: My name is Jon Beal. I'm a
17 resident of Missoula. And I want to thank the
18 panel for their time and their thorough
19 consideration of this. I strongly support removal
20 of the dams. I would like my comments to be
21 included on the EIS and the 4-H paper. I think
22 it's important that we apply the correct analysis
23 to this. I hear a lot of talk about the increased
24 cost and the devastation that may occur in the
25 certain sectors of the economy because we're going

1 to remove cheap electricity.

2 I think the more thoughtful approach is
3 to look at the true cost that they impose upon
4 society. If an economist would look at this, they
5 would say, has the cost of electricity
6 internalized the true cost of that power
7 production? That's the loss of the salmon
8 species, the inundation of the riverside habitat,
9 et cetera. If we were all given a vote today to
10 say would we pay the true cost for that
11 electricity, and have the dams or not have the
12 dams and pay the true cost of that electricity
13 generation, I think that many people in the room
14 and many people in the area would say that the
15 cost of the electricity is too high and we should
16 look for other alternatives.

17 I, for one, would also pay a greater rate
18 to support any segments of the economy that are
19 affected by the dam removal. I say this from a
20 professional standpoint. I'm a business owner and
21 I understand the increased cost and how that
22 affects us. I also come from a family that's
23 resource based and are ranchers that homesteaded
24 in the Black Hills before it was a state. So I
25 don't say that with any disdain or lack of

1 understanding from other people that say that they
2 are concerned about radical environmentalists,
3 looking for, I think, all in all, a healthy
4 ecosystem, in the long-term will be more
5 beneficial for our economy. And I think that we
6 have shown that time and time again with reasoned
7 environmental protection, with reasoned economic
8 development makes for a stronger, more diverse
9 economy that's better off for us.

10 And as the panel, you sit here today and
11 I think you have an awesome and very important
12 responsibility to thoroughly consider what you
13 hold in your hand. You hold in your hand the
14 opportunity to preserve a very unique natural
15 phenomenon or to have a hand in this demise. And
16 I strongly encourage you to take that
17 responsibility seriously and ensure that the dams
18 are removed. Thank you for this opportunity to
19 speak.

20 THE MODERATOR: Ray Vinkey, Ethan Mace
21 and then Spencer Lande.

22 RAY VINKEY: Hello, I'm Ray Vinkey. I
23 didn't intend to speak tonight, but here I am
24 speaking before you. I have worked across the
25 northwest as a biologist and I have studied salmon

1 populations in Alaska and in Washington and
2 Oregon, and I'm a person with opinions and
3 consideration regardless of what my professional
4 background and history is.

5 And I guess what I just realized,
6 thinking all this over, is there are not very many
7 environmental questions in the last hundred years,
8 and maybe the next hundred years to come, which I
9 think are so defining and bring together so many
10 elements of our approach to another species, as
11 well as different elements of our infrastructure
12 on the earth; whether it be federal energy
13 relicensing and dams or whether it be, you know,
14 the cultural aspects important to salmon to
15 people's tradition, people of the northwest.

16 I think that salmon, more than anything
17 else, bring together kind of a challenge for us as
18 a society and I think very much in America, some
19 of the things that have defined America has been
20 wildness and an opportunity to interact with
21 environments which haven't been manipulated so
22 strong over centuries as places in Europe. And I
23 guess I'd just ask you and ourselves as a society,
24 if we are doing everything we can to ensure what
25 makes life in North America, and particularly life

1 in the northwest, a rich thing.

2 I think the salmon are essential to
3 that. And I know that that richness is not just,
4 you know, a young boy holding up a salmon or
5 myself entertaining friends with fresh sockeye
6 from the grill that I caught in Alaska, but it's
7 also the richness of salmon rotting on a stream
8 and all the insects which feed on those salmon.
9 And it's the richness which has fed bears, bears
10 in Idaho, where traditionally bears in Idaho ate
11 salmon, now those bears use other food sources.

12 In British Columbia as salmon stocks
13 decline there, something is being lost. There's a
14 connection for the local economy and cultures that
15 are being lost, as well as a food source and a
16 piece of the web of life, which has a lot of
17 cascading effects. I guess, again and again, we
18 come to these questions, and we say, Oh, we can
19 solve it. We'll barge these salmon. We'll find
20 some other way to go around what is natural, that
21 there be free flowing rivers with salmon in them
22 and human beings can eat of the flesh of the
23 salmon and the bears and fly larvae and ravens can
24 eat salmon. Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Ethan Mace and then

1 Spencer Lande.

2 ETHAN MACE: First of all, you guys are
3 awesome. I completely appreciate the thoroughness
4 and the dedication you have shown here today. I
5 am thoroughly impressed. My name is Ethan Mace
6 I'm a graduate student here at the University of
7 Montana. I study riparian rehabilitation. I work
8 for the Forest Service, as well. I'm a fish
9 habitat guy. I swim with these guys to find out
10 what they are doing. That's my entire business,
11 and my livelihood. I kind of wanted to talk to
12 you today because I didn't hear a few things
13 illustrated that I think are important points.

14 One of the things, fish bypasses, fish
15 ladders, they sound like a great idea, but from my
16 point of view, when that young juvenile emerges
17 out of that streambed, it's on a ticking time
18 scale fighting the power of osmosis and salt and
19 water regulation. And it has to get from point A
20 to point B before, you know, it starts being
21 prepared to breath salt water. That's the
22 problem. The time delay with these reservoirs is
23 a big problem.

24 Secondly, I don't think removing these
25 dams is a guarantee that salmon are going to come

1 back. But I think it's a good idea to find out
2 what's going on. And I think when you look at
3 this gentleman's outfit here, the Corps of
4 Engineers, they can do whatever they set their
5 mind to. I've seen them move earth. I've seen
6 them remove earth. If they pull this out and do a
7 partial removal, what's really going to happen?
8 We're going to flush the sediment out of these
9 reservoirs. If we find out that it didn't really
10 help the salmon population, you guys can fix
11 them. It's not a done deal. You can go back, you
12 can replace that berm and you can restore those
13 dams if we don't find any significant impact on
14 the population.

15 The other thing I wanted to talk about,
16 is that there's another kind of fish in there, the
17 bull trout, one I spend a lot of time with. It
18 will guarantee the population restructuring of
19 bull trout. That one, I don't see any way
20 around. The cut throat in that area, as well,
21 will definitely significantly have improved
22 habitat and migrational opportunities by removal
23 of these dams. I would say I would just like to
24 implore you to give this a shot and to monitor and
25 to see what happens.

1 Because the thing is, the decision that
2 you make isn't; this is it, it has to be this way
3 for the rest of the time. You know, this is the
4 kind of thing we can reverse. If we find out,
5 well, you know, the salmon just aren't really
6 benefiting from these dam removals, well, in that
7 case you can always have the Lieutenant Colonel's
8 outfit go and put those berms back in and start
9 back into the power generation.

10 And anyway, I want to thank you for
11 having me up here and you guys take care now.

12 THE MODERATOR: Spencer Lande.

13 SPENCER LANDE: My name is Spencer Lande
14 and I'm a high school student here in Missoula.
15 And the reason why I'm here is because I think
16 that what's going on with these salmon is wrong.
17 Our world was created by God or you can believe in
18 the scientific theory or whatever you want to
19 believe in, your religion, but when it was created
20 and the rivers were made, the dams weren't there.
21 Man put these dams in here and they shouldn't have
22 been there in the first place. It wasn't really
23 our right to interfere with nature and put these
24 dams in here. And what it's done is it has this
25 negative effect on the populations of salmon.

1 And I remember a time when I was maybe
2 four years old. I was looking through a book of
3 birds. I came across the dodo bird. And I asked
4 my mom, I said, Can I go see one of these? And
5 she said, No, you can't, they are extinct. I
6 said, Well, what's that mean? She's like, They
7 don't exist anymore. And I didn't really
8 understand what that meant at the time. But now
9 that I do, it means that they are gone and they
10 will never be back. What we're dealing with here
11 is a possible extinction of seven different
12 species.

13 These dams, it's true, they do benefit
14 our economy, but I think it's well worth the risk
15 that we can take and sacrifice in order to save
16 these fish. Now, you have set up hatcheries to
17 try to recover these lost fish. And these fish
18 just aren't raised in the same environment as a
19 natural fish. They don't quite have, I think, the
20 same intelligence. They can't figure out that
21 they need to get up those little steps to go back
22 up the river and spawn. They are just not a
23 natural thing. They are raised under completely
24 different circumstances.

25 You can talk about a problem and you can

1 research it until there's nothing left that you
2 can do because the species is already gone. So
3 that's why I support breaching the dams on the
4 Snake River. Thank you.

5 THE MODERATOR: I want to thank everybody
6 for participating and staying until after ten
7 o'clock. And to quote Ethan, you're an awesome
8 group of folks here tonight. That's the end of
9 the folks of people who asked to make public
10 comment in front of the panel. So at this point I
11 want to turn it back to the panel for any final
12 comments.

13 COLONEL: I'd like to thank the people in
14 Montana. One thing I have to say is my hat goes
15 off to the folks here. You have the most
16 courteous and respectful people we've had in any
17 of the hearings we've had, I've sat through eight
18 of these already, and the decency you showed the
19 folks who were talking and the panel, that was
20 outstanding. And I want to say thank you and
21 hopefully you'll benefit by coming here. Thank
22 you.

23 THE MODERATOR: Sir, do you have a
24 written comment or something?

25 MARK ZUEHLSDORFF: No, I don't have a

1 written comment but I have a short speech I'd like
2 to get out.

3 THE MODERATOR: You would like to make a
4 comment?

5 MARK ZUEHLSDORFF: You better believe it.
6 I signed a paper, I don't know where it went.

7 THE MODERATOR: Okay. I'm sorry if
8 somehow we missed you. Why don't we have you come
9 up and give your comment now. And can you state
10 your name for the court reporter.

11 MARK ZUEHLSDORFF: My name is Mark
12 Zuehlsdorff. My wife and I live in Montana. We
13 raise about two acres of produce. We're putting
14 the blame on all the wrong people. It's not the
15 Corps of Engineers' fault. It's not the dams'
16 fault. It's Bonneville Power's fault. I want to
17 know how many of you people actually went out
18 there and went up to these dams and seen the
19 extensive effort these people made to transport
20 these fish around the dams and to keep these fish
21 safe. Or have you really done that? You want to
22 blame a culprit, you can blame a bureaucratic
23 situation called National Fisheries. The worst
24 bureaucracy in the United States.

25 They take millions of dollars to use for

1 experiments in more ways than in all the foreign
2 countries, your tax dollars. They want to take
3 halibut, sole, flounder, and they've already done
4 it to salmon, made freshwater species out of
5 them. But environmental law -- you go to work and
6 take a wild species to change, alter its habitat
7 and its life but -- not so many fisheries are
8 above the law.

9 I want to tell you something else. I
10 worked with fish for five solid years out there
11 all the way from the coast of California clear to
12 Alaska, Canada, you name it. If you think it's
13 easy out there, you go out there and you get
14 caught in 35, 50-mile an hour winds; you're going
15 to find out what it's really like. You're going
16 to get your butt kicked. You're not going to
17 sleep for four days, four nights, you're going to
18 wonder if you're even coming back or not. If you
19 haven't been out there, then you don't realize the
20 risk that these people take.

21 They've gone so far, they have created --
22 fish farms, private hatcheries. They take the
23 eggs from these private hatcheries, they produce
24 these eggs, these smolts. They sell these smolts
25 to the fish farms -- there are private salmon in

1 the Coeur d'Alene Lake, Lake Coeur d'Alene -- and
2 then sit back and tell us we have a salmon
3 shortage, I don't want to hear that kind of crap.
4 When they are doing that and telling the people
5 they got a salmon shortage, it's coming from
6 Washington DC, not Denmark. We have a
7 bureaucratic bureaucracy. There is nothing but
8 hypocritical liars, just like the politicians.
9 They have one God, and that's money. That's it.
10 Period.

11 We have our commercial fishermen out
12 there that are being derailed. I mean --

13 THE MODERATOR: Sir, you'll need to
14 finish your comments.

15 MARK ZUEHLSDORFF: What they're doing is
16 allowing these foreign vessels to come and drag
17 net. They say they ain't but I call them a liar.
18 We have got to stop the drag netting, start using
19 common sense. We can use fish traps, long lines,
20 we don't need to destroy the plant life, we don't
21 need to do that kind of stuff and they can still
22 make a living. But this is not going to happen if
23 we have a bureaucracy that's not going to look at
24 the facts. I have 28 pages of facts.

25 THE MODERATOR: Sir, maybe you would like

1 to turn your written comments in. But in respect
2 to the other people that had to stick to their
3 time limit, we do need to end this.

4 MARK ZUEHLSDORFF: Anyway, you two up
5 there are going to get the paperwork and the
6 facts.

7 THE MODERATOR: Thank you for your
8 comments and give us your written ones, as well.
9 Okay. Why don't we see if there are other people
10 that need or want to make an oral comment and can
11 you raise your hand now so we can get an
12 assessment of that? We do have a sign-in process
13 but you still want to make a comment, sir? Is
14 there anyone else? Is the panel willing to take
15 three more comments? Why don't you come up first
16 and the other two back here after you. Please,
17 since we don't have your names written down, say
18 it real clearly for the court reporter.

19 EVAN CASEY: My name is Evan Casey. I'm
20 a resident of Missoula here. And I got here kind
21 of late tonight and I have heard pretty much what
22 I expected to hear. I know a little about the
23 issue. I wouldn't consider myself a guru on it or
24 anything. But what I expected to hear I have
25 heard. I don't want to belittle the efforts that

1 have been made in the past; these dams have been
2 here for a while, and we knew when we put them in
3 they would have an effect on salmon and we made
4 every effort we could to mitigate that. It's
5 pretty much been proven that everything we have
6 done to date has not been enough.

7 We barged salmon smolts, we have put in
8 fish passes, stuff like that. There's a lot of
9 other factors other than the dams. But the fact
10 is the dams are the major things keeping the
11 salmon from returning and spawning. And I guess
12 I'm in support of removing the dams, obviously.
13 That's all I have to say.

14 THE MODERATOR: Just have the next person
15 come on up to the mike now.

16 AMY STIX: Hello, my name is Amy Stix.
17 I'm a student at the University of Montana. And I
18 was just able to get here so I appreciate you
19 allowing me to speak. I just want to say thank
20 you for being here and listening to us and I want
21 to support wholeheartedly the breaching of the
22 Snake River dams. I think that it makes a lot
23 more economic and technological sense to breach
24 the dams and figure out alternative ways to ship
25 our human commodities. I think that makes a lot

1 more sense figuring out alternatives for that than
2 to ship and truck salmon around the dams. It's
3 not working. It's proven that it's not working.
4 And I think this partial breaching of the dams is
5 kind of the last best shot of survival of the
6 species. So thanks very much.

7 MATT THOMAS: Good evening. My name is
8 Matt Thomas. I'm with the Montana River
9 Coalition. I won't repeat what anybody else has
10 said, but I do think we in the west and the
11 northwest have been enjoying the cheapest power in
12 the country for quite a long time. So we don't
13 really require any compensation for sacrificing a
14 little bit of that. And I want to compliment you
15 all for developing what was formerly an
16 unthinkable solution, the most obvious one, and I
17 would urge you to follow through with it and
18 breach the lower Snake River dams. Thank you.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. With that,
20 I'm going to thank you again for your
21 participation tonight. And please feel free to
22 make written comments if you want, and good
23 night.

24 (Hearing concluded at 10:30 p.m.)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF MONTANA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF MISSOULA)

I, Catherine A. Rebish, Freelance Court Reporter for the State of Montana, residing in Missoula, Montana, do hereby certify:

That I was duly authorized to and did report the proceedings in the above entitled cause;

I further certify that the foregoing pages of this transcript represent a true and accurate transcription of my stenotype notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand on this the 10th day of March, 2000.

Catherine A. Rebish
Freelance Court Reporter
State of Montana, residing in
Missoula, Montana.