

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"

PASCO, WASHINGTON

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION  
FEBRUARY 17, 2000

Tapes Transcribed by: Michael R. King, CSR

RIDER & ASSOCIATES, INC.  
COURT REPORTERS  
P.O. Box 245  
Vancouver, Washington 98666

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

ROBERT DRAKE:

-- from Prosser, Washington, and I was a former county commissioner for eight years of Benton, County. And thank you for the opportunity to give testimony today.

And I would just like to make comment in regard to the protection of our salmon. We all want to protect the salmon and our whole culture of the Northwest. But when I see a bias, an unbalanced issue or people making studies that don't go to the facts and don't stick to the facts and give biased opinions instead of the facts of saving the salmon and to say the only way we're going to save 'em is to take the dams out, the dams is not -- it may be a little part of the problem, but a very minor part.

And I want to comment and commend the Corps of Engineers for their statement here just recently saying that they have proven to their scientific facts that the dams are not the big culprit.

There is many other things that are depleting our salmon runs, and our scientists and our biologists know that. But when they with their degrees -- and I respect anybody with a scientific degree or biologist degree or any type of degree -- but if you don't have some common sense to go with it, that degree is worthless to you.

1           Now, if, in fact, if they stick to the facts and  
2 tell you how much the predators are destroying our salmon and  
3 our salmon runs from the time that little fish is hatched  
4 out, comes from its egg and starts back down the river and  
5 all those predators that are destroying it, and they -- the  
6 scientists and the biologists know that. They know what's  
7 taking place now and they're not bringing you the facts or  
8 not giving you the facts. They ignore the predators such as  
9 the walleye.

10           I'm a fisherman and a hunter and I fish for walleye.  
11 But every walleye I catch, I know what a predator he is and  
12 how many little silver salmon he's catching in the Snake and  
13 Columbia River before that little salmon ever gets back to  
14 the mouth of the Columbia.

15           Now, another thing, the terns down there is another  
16 big predator, the sea lions and all that.

17           Now, as we leave the mouth of the Columbia River and  
18 go out into the ocean, you have got the other people which  
19 are making a living coming from the all over the world to  
20 fish out there with 30- or 35-mile nets. And they are  
21 destroying our salmon.

22           But to say that the dams are it, take out the dams  
23 and have all this flood -- I came out here in 1946, after  
24 World War II, and I have seen these floods in '48. And  
25 Vanport, I saw that when it was flooded out. And to say that

1 the salmon is -- the only way it's going to survive is  
2 without the dams is wrong, absolutely wrong.

3 PAUL FAITH:

4 My name is Paul Faith and I have lived here since  
5 1974.

6 And the dams were originally built to supply  
7 electricity, provide water to grow crops and flood control,  
8 to protect the people. If you believe breaching the dams  
9 will save salmon, you have been tricked.

10 How about a treat? To get to the mouth of the Snake  
11 River on the way up to spawn, salmon are dodging about 200  
12 miles of river nets. As an endangered species, why then are  
13 people still killing brood stock? It's amazing how the  
14 forests were closed to save the spotted owl, but we allow  
15 random killing in the rivers.

16 We have a program that pays farmers not to farm.  
17 Why not pay Indians not to fish. They only want the two  
18 dollars a pound. And we kill everything for the money since  
19 they know the government will print more money to release  
20 more fish. If they believe salmon are to be saved, stop  
21 killing them.

22 Maybe you support killing the whales. If you do,  
23 then maybe you should kill some bald eagles because the chief  
24 needs a new headdress for a ceremony. And I don't mean  
25 commander in chief.

1           Be an American first. Don't be politically correct.  
2 This is the year 2000. What happened to the words "equal  
3 justice for all"?

4           In the past, all animals have been overharvested for  
5 money and greed. History repeats itself. This is for two  
6 dollars a pound.

7           We let the bureaucrats make a WPPSS mistake; let's  
8 not make a dam mistake, also.

9           ELWIN FISK:

10          My name is Elwin Fisk and I reside in Richland and  
11 my comments are on the National Marine Fisheries Service  
12 Appendix A.

13          The document is seriously outdated. The cool, wet  
14 climate regime of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, PDO, has  
15 begun, not in 2005 as in Section 4.4.4.1, and is now  
16 measurable in increased quantities and size of the anadromous  
17 salmonids in Washington and Oregon and subsequent decreases  
18 in Alaska. Since the pink salmon spends nearly all its life  
19 cycle in the ocean, it is very sensitive to ocean conditions.

20          The average size of the 1999 Alaska commercially  
21 caught pink salmon was only 2.9 pounds, a pound less than  
22 normal. In contrast, Washington's previous pink salmon  
23 record catch of 6.38 pounds was broken seven times in 1999 in  
24 less than 30 days and an 8.3 pounder stands as the state  
25 record.

1           The 1999 spring Chinook Jack count of 8,900 over  
2 Bonneville Dam could predict an adult return of 200,000  
3 spring Chinook salmon this year, about 150,000 more than last  
4 year, and the most since 1977. There should be even more  
5 salmon for the next two or three decades.

6           Since Appendix A discounts the PDO climate effects  
7 on salmon, the text pushes for a decision to be made quickly  
8 to prevent extinction. We now have no need to rush to  
9 judgment. Appendix A is more of a justification for pith and  
10 cry and readily obscures any real salmon survival data.

11           I was hoping to find a very transparent methodology  
12 with best available science. My comments are simple and  
13 transparent.

14           In the proposed dam breaching concept, we start with  
15 one million smolts in Idaho. We lose 50 percent by the time  
16 they reach the Bruneau River. Then we lose approximately .15  
17 percent per mile or 21 percent to McNary Dam due to predator  
18 concentrations. Another 28 percent percent is lost between  
19 McNary and Bonneville dams. After 22 migration days from  
20 Clarkston, we now have 284,000 abused smolts out of starting  
21 with a million.

22           In the transport concept, we again lose 50 percent  
23 to Lower Granite Dam. Then these 500 smolts are transported  
24 by barge in two days to below Bonneville Dam with 98 percent  
25 survival. They are dumped out of the barge and 20 percent

1 are lost shortly thereafter due to delayed transport or  
2 natural mortality.

3           Oddly enough, we now have 392,000 smolts out of the  
4 million headed toward the ocean. This is over 100,000 more  
5 smolts than by dam breaching. Unfortunately, another 17  
6 percent of all smolts are lost to bird predation in the  
7 Columbia River estuary.

8           As a thinking engineer/fisherman, I have to support  
9 maximum barging and dam collection system improvements.

10           JOHN TOWNSEND:

11           My name is John Townsend, Moses Lake, Washington.

12           And I am strongly against the breaching of the Snake  
13 River dams. It is not -- it has not been proven that the dam  
14 removal will increase salmon runs.

15           Also, removal of the dams will reduce the electrical  
16 generation. This must be replaced by the use of fossil  
17 fuels, which will produce CO2, which is also a detriment. I  
18 understand that the replacement will be approximately 5  
19 percent of Bonneville Power's electricity that they're  
20 selling.

21           Why are we harvesting an endangered species? This  
22 is a question that's very interesting. The endangered  
23 species -- or has there ever been an endangered species that  
24 has been harvested while it is on the endangered species  
25 list? We need to stop harvesting these salmon.

1           Let's take the money that is being spent on studies  
2           and alternative actions now and pay the fishermen, the tribes  
3           and the sportsmen not to fish for five years.

4           Also, stop all fishing within a 500-mile radius of  
5           the Columbia River mouth and you will see an increase in the  
6           salmon runs. They are not being lost in the dams; they are  
7           being lost in the ocean and to fishermen.

8           I would like to see this proposal be considered  
9           rather than breaching the dams.

10          Thank you.

11          ROBERT HARDIN:

12          My name is Robert Hardin.

13          And I think breaching the dams is an ill-conceived  
14          plan that would cost everybody. The lost power would have to  
15          be replaced by nonrenewable, very polluting fossil fuel  
16          power, and very possibly there would be brownouts, major  
17          brownouts.

18          It would probably triple the truck traffic on I-84  
19          and I-90 and it would be devastating to the farmers and farm  
20          communities in the Palouse.

21          I'm also against flow regulation because it has been  
22          proven it does nothing for the salmon. It would be  
23          devastating to the irrigated farmers in south Idaho and the  
24          Columbia Basin.

25          It might seem attractive to the people in the cities

1 to make the people in the rural areas pay for saving the  
2 salmon. The loss of a few farmers or a few farm communities  
3 may not seem important. However, in this nation, all  
4 minorities should be treated fairly.

5 And that's it.

6 RICHARD WILLIAMS:

7 I'm Richard Williams from Pasco, Washington.

8 I have been attending these local meetings ever  
9 since they started.

10 Several questions. In the 1855 Indian treaty, was  
11 it allowed for nylon nets and outboard motors or dugouts and  
12 loin cloths?

13 The number of smolts we need to recover, could they  
14 be recovered by getting rid of the terns at the mouth of the  
15 river and the seals?

16 And getting rid of these dams, I think, is stupid.  
17 When the dams were first in, we had good runs over the top of  
18 'em. They didn't seem to hold 'em up much at all. But I  
19 think we really overfished, overharvested in the oceans. And  
20 maybe a five-year moratorium, at least in fresh water, would  
21 bring up the populations quite strong.

22 And that's all I have to say.

23 GLEN HAGY:

24 I'm Glen Hagy and I am a resident of the Columbia  
25 Basin and farm near Ephrata.

1                   And I oppose Alternative 4, dam breaching. The dam  
2 breaching idea does not warrant at this time. From what I  
3 understand, it would cause almost immediate harm to the  
4 salmon, as well as many other species on land as well as in  
5 the river, with possibly no benefit for perhaps 30 years.

6                   I also read that the Fraser River in B.C. is having  
7 perhaps lower salmon runs than the Columbia and there are no  
8 dams. Their scientists attribute it to warming and  
9 conditions in the ocean. This and the fact that the NMFS  
10 shows that out of 10 salmon, 60 percent never return from the  
11 ocean; and of those four of that return, two are taken by the  
12 Indians; and of those two, one goes to predators. This shows  
13 that 60 percent are lost in the ocean.

14                   The economic costs, tax losses by all levels of  
15 government, the economic burden on us citizens, I don't see  
16 any reason to consider removal. If we remove dams, we would  
17 be adding to tremendous pollution of the environment due to  
18 heavy truck traffic and use of coal, diesel or nuclear power  
19 to replace the clean energy that would have been sacrificed  
20 by the removal of the dams.

21                   The following are recent headlines from Northwest  
22 publications, starting in May of this past 1999.

23                   "Bonneville Jack count third highest since 1977."

24                   "Chinook Jack count highest since 1976."

25                   "Outlook bright for salmon runs this year."

1 "Offshore salmon fishing continues into Thursday."

2 "Ocean salmon harvest on deck."

3 "After a successful salmon opener, fishermen don't  
4 feel clipped."

5 "Adult survival to Lower Granite up four times."

6 "Harvest boosted for Snake River fall Chinook."

7 "NMFS, state fish agencies support 30 percent  
8 harvest level."

9 "The Bering Sea is under assault."

10 "Will we exhaust the world's last great fishery?"

11 "By catch is 25 percent of the revenues from the  
12 entire fishery."

13 This headline was from the time magazine: "Salmon  
14 in Columbia River hit record takes."

15 "The fish are biting at Buoy 10."

16 There is quite a few more here, but I am running out  
17 of the time. And I would just like to say I don't understand  
18 why you would consider taking out the dams when you have  
19 these kind of headlines in recent newspapers showing that we  
20 are killing them elsewhere at a higher percentage rate than  
21 on our rivers.

22 I would have to support either Alternative 1 or  
23 Alternative 2. Definitely oppose the dam breaching.

24 JIM FORSMAN:

25 Hello. My name is Jim Forsman. I'm from the

1 Dalles, Oregon.

2           And I'm against breaching the dams. I don't think  
3 it's going to be an alternative that's practical. I think a  
4 lot of people view it as a silver bullet to bring the fish  
5 back. And because there is so much loss of fish costalwise  
6 in the costal rivers that aren't returning, also, and they  
7 can't blame the dams for those rivers coming back.

8           I think the economic costs will be far greater than  
9 the benefits that are hoped for, and there is no scientific  
10 proof that I have seen that it will bring back the salmon in  
11 numbers that would warrant such drastic actions.

12           I think barging and cleaning rip areas and other  
13 fish habitat, other alternatives should be looked into  
14 further and other alternatives should be tried before  
15 breaching the dams. That should be a last alternative and  
16 not one of the first alternatives.

17           Thank you for your time.

18           STAN MICKELS:

19           My name is Stan Mickels. I am an agronomist, having  
20 worked in the Pacific Northwest for the last 23 years.

21           To be honest with you, it would take the average  
22 person a full-time job to plow through all of the layers of  
23 bureaucracy surrounding this controversial salmon issue.

24           You have the Department of Commerce, you have the  
25 NOAA, you have the National Marine Fisheries Service, you

1 have the BIOPS, the H-Papers, the 4-D rules, the ESA, the  
2 ESU, the CRI, to name a few. And besides that, we are  
3 supposed to read and assimilate the contents of a 4,000-page  
4 document in six weeks that the experts say will have a huge  
5 impact on virtually all citizens of Washington state.

6 Now, come on. That is unreasonable. If everyone  
7 involved is truly interested in public comment and wants to  
8 avoid making this look like a railroad job, we need to adhere  
9 to the spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act  
10 established by Congress to ensure all affected parties have  
11 an opportunity to provide meaningful input.

12 We need more time. Therefore, I am requesting the  
13 National Marine Fisheries Service to extend their deadline  
14 until December 31, 2000, so that the environmental impact of  
15 this controversial agenda can be reviewed.

16 Thank you.

17 RICH STEELE:

18 Now, first of all, I want to thank everyone for the  
19 opportunity of letting me speak here today. My name is  
20 Richard Steele. I'm a lifelong resident or nearly a lifelong  
21 resident of Richland, Washington.

22 And I would just like to tell you that I do not  
23 believe that the Snake River fish can be restored without  
24 breaching or removal of the Snake River dams. I think as  
25 long as the dams are in place that we do not have an

1 opportunity to recover those species.

2 Now, everyone talks about the fish passage here  
3 lately, you know, getting fish up and down, you know, through  
4 the dams. I wish that there was more emphasis put on the 150  
5 miles of habitat that has been lost because of those dams.

6 I spent a great deal of my younger years fly-fishing  
7 those stretches of the river that are now under 100 feet of  
8 water from the dams.

9 Again, I don't see how anybody who can claim that  
10 they want to protect the salmon in the Snake River and bring  
11 those stocks back cannot be an advocate for breaching those  
12 dams. As long as the dams are in place, I just don't think  
13 that we'll ever bring those fish back to where they can be  
14 harvested in any numbers.

15 Thank you.

16 BOB DUNNAGAN:

17 Hi, my name is Bob Dunnagan. I am a resident of the  
18 state of Idaho, a tree farmer, and the president of the Idaho  
19 Council of Trout Unlimited and in addition to a grandfather.

20 The history of these dams is interesting to me  
21 because I was a resident of the state of Washington at the  
22 time they were being considered and I remember when the  
23 justifications went to Congress. The justifications did not  
24 indicate a one-to-one cost benefit ratio. And shortly  
25 thereafter, that was changed so that they did meet the

1 criteria necessary for Congress.

2 At the time, Senator Magnusen was chair of the  
3 commerce committee, which of course, in my view, had  
4 something to do with the easy passage of these four dams.

5 It now comes time, in my view, to make a decision  
6 about the impacts of these lower four Snake River dams. And  
7 we as a society need to answer a very complex question. Are  
8 we willing to lose fish species from Idaho? Are we willing  
9 to lose the icon species that identifies the Pacific  
10 Northwest? Do we want the short-term benefits that accrue to  
11 a sector of the regional population or do we want a landscape  
12 for my grandchildren that will support plant and animals that  
13 I knew in my youth?

14 I no longer fish for salmon or steelhead or any of  
15 the anadromy in the Upper Snake River or in the Upper  
16 Columbia Basin, including the Snake in Idaho. I now travel  
17 with my children and my grandchildren to Western Canada and  
18 Alaska. I don't even go to the eastern part of British  
19 Columbia because we've cut off the anadromy from the Upper  
20 Columbia Basin with Bonneville.

21 At any rate, I don't go there to catch fish. I go  
22 there so that my grandchildren can experience this flush of  
23 life that comes annually to these rivers that are unimpeded  
24 by dams.

25 I believe that the science and economics are

1 currently overwhelmingly in favor of breaching the four Lower  
2 Snake River dams in order to support an ecologic system that  
3 will save fish, because it's worth it to me to correct the  
4 legacy of these dams for future generations.

5 I come down hard on the side of saving money, saving  
6 fish and breaching dams that make no sense, saving Idaho  
7 water and saving the cultural and religious heritage of the  
8 native Americans who have lived along these rivers for time  
9 immemorial.

10 Thank you for your consideration.

11 ANEDA EVANS:

12 My name is Aneda Evans. I live here in Pasco.

13 I want to ask you to please use common sense. We  
14 can't have our fish and eat them, too. One group wants to  
15 take money from another. The most drastic, most costly and  
16 most devastating plan is to breach our dams, and no one knows  
17 if that will save salmon either.

18 How many people will need the electricity that will  
19 be lost? What about the fish that will die from all the silt  
20 in the water? What will that silt do to the Columbia? We  
21 need more studies.

22 The funds that are being used for study after study  
23 can help to pay the fishermen not to fish. We can't have our  
24 fish and eat them, too.

25 LOUIS TOWNE:

1                   I am Louis Towne.

2                   I want to give a little history in considering the  
3 proposal to remove or bypass the dams on the Lower Snake  
4 River. I wonder if a little review of history might be more  
5 pertinent. 80 years ago, I was born within a mile of the  
6 Lower Columbia River and my wife, Irene, was born on a farm  
7 near the little farming town of Richland. Most of our lives  
8 we have lived within the Columbia River watershed.

9                   When I was a boy living near a favorite fishing  
10 drift on the lower river, I frequently had the fishermen  
11 complaining about no fish. There were also no dams on the  
12 Columbia and very few on the tributaries.

13                   The simple reason for this lack of fish was  
14 overfishing. There had been many canneries along the river,  
15 but by the time I was a boy, they were -- there were  
16 buildings falling down and rotten pilings which marked closed  
17 canneries. Some of the lower river communities disappeared  
18 along with the canneries. All this before any dams were  
19 started on the river. The single factor which caused the  
20 decline was overfishing.

21                   The fish traps had been outlawed and purse seines  
22 was voted out of the river. Then the fish came back to a  
23 degree, but primarily because hatcheries were located on  
24 tributaries.

25                   I grew up on a little -- in a little fishing and

1 logging community where many of the loggers tried to farm  
2 small places. They had no power-driven equipment either on  
3 their farm or in the woods where they worked. We did have  
4 electricity for lights, but even the store didn't have any  
5 refrigeration or other conveniences. Residents of Portland  
6 and Seattle had refrigeration if they had money enough to buy  
7 ice when the ice man came by.

8 Irene grew up on a poultry farm at the end of the  
9 irrigation ditch northwest of Richland. They had no  
10 electricity. The irrigation was ditch irrigation, which  
11 meant constant checking to see if the water was going to  
12 where it should.

13 With the coming of the dams, there was a lot of  
14 discussion about how they would work and included fishways  
15 for fish to migrate. Until after World War II, little change  
16 was discussed. With the post-war period, the fish started to  
17 decline, but much of the decline was due to increased ocean  
18 fishing.

19 Now, all over the world the ocean fish population is  
20 declining. It would appear that much of the damage is  
21 occurring in the ocean. It is time to regulate and reduce  
22 the take to sufficient levels to get a reasonable return of  
23 fish to the spawning areas. Perhaps a no fishing area along  
24 the coast would help this.

25 I will quit there. Oh, that I had it in my --

1 DONALD BEETS:

2 I'm Donald E. Beets.

3 Hydropower of the four Snake River dams is very  
4 important as they provide a generation capacity of 3,483  
5 megawatts. This is the power usage of the city of Los  
6 Angeles, Seattle and two cities the size of Portland. The  
7 entire states of Idaho and Montana use about about 1,000  
8 megawatts. The American Rivers say the dams produced 950  
9 megawatts. The Corps of Engineers study says 1,250  
10 megawatts. In all, they produce about 1600 megawatts on  
11 average.

12 In the spring of 1999, the dams were producing 2,500  
13 megawatts. At \$24 a megawatt, that is \$1,440,000 a day of  
14 revenue. Hydroelectric dams are the cleanest and the most  
15 environmentally friendly source of mass-produced electricity  
16 in the world.

17 There are news articles in last week's (inaudible)  
18 that says a Northwest Power Planning Council study shows we  
19 are near the electric load capacity and have one in four  
20 chance of having power brownouts the next four years in our  
21 region.

22 There is consistent environmental claim that the  
23 four Snake River dams have no flood control. The Snake River  
24 dams weren't originally authorized for flood control, but  
25 there is a Lower Granite flood control plan. The logbook of

1 Lower Granite shows that the River Control called Lower  
2 Granite on February 10, 1996, during the huge Willamette  
3 Valley/Portland flood and asked Lower Granite to help hold  
4 back the water because the Columbia River is full.

5 If all the dams upstream of Portland had not backed  
6 off on their discharge, Portland would have flooded. The  
7 estimate is the first five blocks of up to 5th Avenue would  
8 have been flooded.

9 Alternate transportation of commodities. Additional  
10 truckloads would greatly increase congestion, road  
11 maintenance and the risk of accident, death and injury. One  
12 four-barge tow can carry an equivalent of 500 semi trucks.  
13 There is an average of seven tows a day that come through  
14 McNary Dam.

15 A tractor double trailer averages 90 feet in length.  
16 Seven barges times 500 is 35,000 trucks a day, times 90 feet  
17 average length, 3,150,000 feet divided by 5,280, 596.6 miles  
18 of trucks bumper to bumper.

19 Many of these of -- the return trips of the barges  
20 that make it up the Columbia River and the Snake River carry  
21 gasoline and diesel fuel. Limiting barge traffic will  
22 greatly increase hydrocarbon, carbon dioxide and nitrous  
23 oxide emissions. The two-lane highways throughout Eastern  
24 Oregon and Washington are not designed for any traffic of  
25 that magnitude. There aren't loading and unloading

1 facilities to accommodate truck and train traffic to that  
2 magnitude.

3           The smog created by the increase in truck traffic  
4 would be greater than the smog created in Los Angeles when  
5 the electric streetcars were replaced by diesel buses. Los  
6 Angeles was the smog capital of the United States. Smog  
7 creates acid rain. Nitrous oxide emissions react with water  
8 and creates nitric acid, which will have a very detrimental  
9 effect upon the United States east or downwind of this area.  
10 Acid rain is very harmful.

11           But on a positive note, that would give the  
12 environmentalists another cause.

13           What will happen to the approximately 2 million  
14 people in this large area, all of whom are affected by the  
15 breaching? Entire communities, jobs, homes, lives and the  
16 future of the people will be terminated.

17           Who'll cover the millions of dollars of mortgages  
18 that can't be paid or the taxes they pay? What will happen  
19 to all of the unfortunate people displaced by the collapse of  
20 the economy of the region?

21           A known way to save the salmon and steelhead is in  
22 the early 1980's, the salmon/steelhead run of Rogue River was  
23 on the edge of extinction. National Marine Fisheries  
24 immediately stopped all harvesting of the salmon and  
25 steelhead. In just a few short years, the salmon and

1 steelhead made a dramatic recovery, far greater than anyone  
2 had anticipated and that National Marine Fisheries has  
3 allowed a limited harvest of steelhead and salmon since then.

4 This is a proven, successful method with dramatic  
5 short-term gain. This does not address the slaughter taking  
6 place over in the Pacific ocean or the three Snake River dams  
7 above Hell's Canyon, Oxbow and Brownlee, who do not even have  
8 fish ladders.

9 ALAN MOORE:

10 My name is Alan Moore. I'm a member of Trout  
11 Unlimited's national staff.

12 I have been asked what it is Trout Unlimited feels  
13 we're accomplishing in attending hearings such as this one in  
14 Pasco where the balance of opinion on issues involving Snake  
15 River salmon and dams appears heavily weighted against our  
16 own. It's a fair question and one I will use my testimony  
17 here in an attempt to answer.

18 Our being here serves two primary purposes. One, we  
19 feel it's important to participate in this process at each  
20 stop along the way, not to stuff the ballot box or to drown  
21 out other opinions, but to offer our views on recovering  
22 Snake River salmon in the individual context of each  
23 community that's affected. This is not a Portland issue, a  
24 Pasco issue, a Seattle, Lewiston, Astoria or Juneau issue.

25 A unique thread that links all of these communities

1 together and puts us in these rooms together to try to work  
2 this thing out, whether we like it or not, is the salmon that  
3 travel through all of our lives. No other species in the  
4 world encompasses a more diverse blend of ecosystems from the  
5 mountain streams to the valley floors, to ocean depths and  
6 nearly everywhere in between. That's what makes this a  
7 regional process.

8           Second, we're also here to listen. By listening to  
9 others' views on this issue in the context of each individual  
10 community involved, it helps us formulate more cooperative  
11 ways to get this thing done and bring these fish back so we  
12 can all go home.

13           Make no mistake, Trout Unlimited is here as an  
14 advocate for breaching the four Lower Snake River dams as an  
15 absolute necessary piece to the puzzle that would bring the  
16 salmon and steelhead back.

17           Breaching is not a silver bullet, but it's a  
18 necessary one. Our argument is that we simply cannot bring  
19 these fish back with the dams in place.

20           Over 30 years and \$3 billion spent in vain trying to  
21 fix the mistakes we built into the dams has proven that it is  
22 the dams themselves that are the mistake and one that can  
23 only be corrected by the removal.

24           But as I said, we're also here to listen. We'll  
25 need a cooperative effort to recover the salmon, just as

1 we'll need to work cooperatively to ensure that we  
2 concentrate our investments in those areas where human  
3 impacts that result from the breaching are greatest.

4 Thank you.

5 ROBERT KALNIOWSKI:

6 My name is Bob Kalinowski. I have been a resident  
7 here for over 30 years.

8 My comments are that I think that most of the  
9 opposition or the intent to tear down our dams is based on  
10 pseudo science. I haven't seen anything in my reading or  
11 travels that would show me that there is nothing positive  
12 from the side that wants to tear down these dams.

13 I'm also a boater. I like to go upriver and enjoy  
14 the parks. We have Charbonneau Park and Fishhook and all the  
15 rest of 'em, and they're going to be null and void. We're  
16 going to have big mud flats down to the water.

17 The farmers, I know, are going to be hurting because  
18 of the costs that it is going to, you know, take to get water  
19 to their property, if they can get it.

20 We have -- the Indians, I think, are one of the big  
21 problems. And they talk about their religious rights, but  
22 when they're selling these fish -- fish that they're netting  
23 -- in our area for a dollar a pound on the shore, it don't  
24 sound religious to me.

25 Also, we have the turbine problem, which I

1 understand you are taking as being taken care of. The new  
2 turbines should be a big help.

3 There has got to be a way to do both things. Our  
4 electric rates are reasonable here and the dams provide a  
5 good living for our whole area. And I think that we have to  
6 look at this thing from the common good and not from the  
7 interests of a few people who have pretty narrow views  
8 politically and also, you know, selfishly economically.

9 That's all I have to say on that.

10 MARIE SNYDER:

11 I am Marie Snyder. I am representing Washington  
12 State Grange. I am an environmental native American. We  
13 have wheat and cattle and I'm a retired educator.

14 Please listen carefully: Tear down the dam, build a  
15 coal burner, pollute air. Save the salmon.

16 Ride a river raft. Save a salmon.

17 Lose the water, let the land blow away. Save the  
18 salmon.

19 Fruit trees die, no water, go on welfare. Save a  
20 salmon.

21 Land not productive, who pays taxes? Save a salmon.

22 Salmon not scarce, big piles in the woods left there  
23 by salmon harvesters. There was no sale. Save a salmon.

24 Are they endangered? People hungry, no jobs. Save  
25 a salmon.

1 Homesteaders rise up from the graves, land ruined.

2 Where is our railroads? People devastated. Save a salmon.

3 Children hungry, dust flying. Save a salmon.

4 River banks eroded, river rafters laughing. Save a

5 salmon.

6 Foolish bureaucrats warned about jobs gone, roads

7 gone. Save a salmon.

8 We in the Washington State Grange support

9 Alternative 1, 2 and 3 of the Corps of Engineers, which is

10 the maximum transport of juvenile salmon.

11 Let's work together to save the salmon and the dams

12 on the Lower Snake River.

13 Thank you.

14 GLEN KALSTROM:

15 Okay. My name is Glen Kalstrom, and I am from

16 Ephrata, Washington. And I want to thank you for making the

17 time so that I can speak up my piece here.

18 I think that this is almost diabolical what they're

19 trying to do. I think that the main trouble here is that

20 nets have been put in this river system.

21 I was born and raised and lived on the Skagit River

22 for 30 years and I can see what the net system does. We

23 lived one mile up from the river and the commercial fishermen

24 at that time had three days they could fish and we had a

25 place where we would have at least 40 sports fishermen come

1 in there. And when they fished at that time, there was no  
2 use fishing because there was no escapement, even though  
3 those nets in those days went only three-quarters of the way  
4 across.

5 I moved away from there after the Boltz decision.  
6 And those fish nets were all in there 24 hours a day, all the  
7 way from the mouth of the Skagit to the Sedro Wooley,  
8 Washington. And after you do that for 15 years, what do you  
9 think is going to happen?

10 My son fishes in Bristol Bay, where the Department  
11 of Game, they have control of it and the escapement comes  
12 first and then they let them fish. And they have never had a  
13 bad year except the last two years were bad and they think  
14 that was because of the Chinese were coming in there and they  
15 weren't watching 'em. But ever since they had that 200 mile  
16 limit, they've had good years.

17 What it all boils down to is catching every fish  
18 that comes up that river and that's what was done for so many  
19 years after the Boltz decision. And it's not being mentioned  
20 now. It's just like a sacred cow and we're bringing in all  
21 these other aspects.

22 Certainly there are a few problems, but that is the  
23 major problem and needs to be taken care of. I don't know  
24 how it can be done, but -- and what else?

25 That's -- that's my main beef is I know there is

1 other smaller problems, but the dams are not it. If I had  
2 anything to do about it, I would build more dams and for the  
3 clean power.

4 And I think that's about all I have to say.

5 BYRDEEN WORLEY:

6 I'm Byrdeen Worley, from Moses Lake, Washington.

7 And I am getting so tired of all this fighting. I  
8 think we could all give a little.

9 I hear comments that our PUD dams are allowing a lot  
10 of young fish back down the river with less damage than any  
11 of the others on the Snake River. Maybe we need to look at  
12 engineering again.

13 I don't know what all of you other people with your  
14 fish pro dam removal do to produce to help mankind, but I am  
15 a farmer. I suggest that maybe we could go back to  
16 butchering our own cattle, making our own victory gardens,  
17 being more self-sufficient on our own if that's what it's  
18 going to do. And if you take the dams out, that's where  
19 we're going to be.

20 To test out this theory that we don't need the dams,  
21 why don't you just pull the breaker on your homes or in your  
22 apartment house, shut off the water, fill the bathtubs first  
23 so you will have water to bathe in, and you can bathe however  
24 you want in the middle of a tub in the middle of your  
25 kitchen. I have been there, done that.

1           You can take your potable water and haul it to see  
2    how much your neighbors would appreciate you borrowing water  
3    and buying water from them. And so that you can go on with  
4    your life.

5           See how you like your TV with portable batteries and  
6    how you would like your solar lights. I haven't seen a solar  
7    light yet that doesn't require a flashlight about the third  
8    or fourth day. And go check and see how expensive it is to  
9    get an alternative fuel plant.

10          Okay. If we have -- if we want to keep our  
11   atmosphere clean, you close down the barging, we will have  
12   vehicles going down the road like you have never had before.  
13   I-5 will be just a breeze compared to what this will be. If  
14   you have been behind a school bus lately, that's what you  
15   will have, diesel fuel going up and down.

16          We'll have to burn alternative fuels for heat. If  
17   this is what you want, take out the dams.

18          I mean, I could go back to the things, but I really  
19   don't like butchering and I don't like canning and I don't  
20   like cold water baths and I don't like inconveniences that I  
21   have waited for years to get to enjoy.

22          Until I was 10 years old, I went to a one-room  
23   schoolhouse and that's kind of the way I lived and I don't  
24   want that again.

25          So let's make -- let's all give a little and keep

1       our dams and do something with them. I am willing to pay  
2       taxes for a different kind of turbine or more fish waterways.

3               I guess that's it. Thank you.

4               JACK HENDRICKS:

5               My name is Jack Hendricks. I'm a farmer from Moses  
6       Lake, Washington.

7               And I am very opposed to the breaching of the four  
8       Snake River dams. The entire breaching issue is about  
9       sensationalism and saving the wild salmon.

10              I don't see the importance of keeping the genetics  
11       of wild salmon. The beef, pork, chicken and cereal grains  
12       that we eat today do not have the same genetics as their  
13       ancestors. Our pets, our dogs and our cats do not have those  
14       same genetics of their ancestors. And we as Homo sapiens,  
15       people, are not the same as our ancestors. We're smarter,  
16       more healthy and live longer.

17              If we want salmon, we can produce millions in  
18       hatcheries and maintain genetic purity. The Tulip Indian  
19       tribes have been very successful in their hatchery project.

20              Grant County PUD, which is located about 75 miles  
21       north of here, is in the process of relicensing their two  
22       hydropower projects, Priest Rapids and Wanapup.

23              It amazes me how many outside entities are  
24       interested in the relicensing process. Several have hired  
25       consultants to follow this process.

1           The groups know the value of hydropower dams and the  
2 positive impact they have on our current county and our  
3 country during the next 50 years, which is the length of the  
4 new license.

5           Northwest Power-Bellevue has announced that they  
6 want to build a gas-fired power generation plant in Columbia  
7 County near Starbuck. That signifies to me they know the  
8 value of power and want to fill any void left by any dam  
9 breaching.

10           Methane gas is an expendable source. It is used  
11 once and then the residue is released into the clean air.  
12 Hydropower water, the resource is used over and over and over  
13 again, four times between Lewiston and Pasco.

14           I learned the value of power at a young age. In  
15 1946, we received electric service. The power line ended at  
16 our farm. The first washing machine my mother had, she got  
17 after we had electricity. She also got her first  
18 refrigerator and she also discarded her old wood cookstove.

19           My father purchased a new electric milking machine.  
20 He was able to increase his milking heard.

21           I don't want to go back to those days of living  
22 without electrical conveniences. Let us not lose our dams.  
23 Their asset value is too great to the Pacific Northwest and  
24 the entire country. And I encourage you to make your  
25 decisions on good science and common sense.

1 Thank you.

2 DENNIS BRAKE:

3 My name is Dennis Brake.

4 I believe we can all agree on one thing: We all  
5 would like to see the salmon runs greatly improved. Where we  
6 disagree is just how do we bring this about.

7 Most of my experiences with the government improving  
8 things make me wonder how we would survive many more of their  
9 improvements. To breach any dams as the first step to  
10 helping salmon runs would be like surgically removing a  
11 patient's eye because they had an eyelash in it.

12 When a salmon has to survive the trip to the ocean,  
13 then face the arctic terns, the cannery ships, some of which  
14 are trespassing to fish in our waters in the first place, El  
15 Nino and the adverse conditions it causes, increasing seal  
16 populations, sports fishermen and all the dangers they have  
17 to face naturally, then return up a river with miles of gill  
18 nets, the dams are a small obstacle in comparison.

19 No dam with a fish ladder is near the obstacle that  
20 Celilo Falls was. Surely the first step would not be  
21 breaching dams.

22 If the dams were the real problem, what about the  
23 decreasing salmon runs on costal rivers that have no dams?

24 How can you place such high value on fish and so  
25 little value on thousands of humans that would be devastated

1 by such extreme actions as dam breaching? How can you be so  
2 eager to spend billions of dollars and adversely affect the  
3 lives of so many people to conduct an experiment that has no  
4 proven chance to succeed?

5 With the money you are suggesting we spend, could we  
6 have a five-year moratorium on fishing for salmon and pay  
7 commercial fishermen what they would have made if they had --  
8 if they had been allowed to fish?

9 Gill nets were not something that native Americans  
10 traditionally used to catch salmon. Why was it ever allowed  
11 in the first place? And tribal fishing was for their  
12 personal use, not a career.

13 Salmon are important and we should try to improve  
14 their runs, but fish were created for mankind; mankind was  
15 not created for fish. We must consider the rights of the  
16 people of this nation to life, liberty and the pursuit of  
17 happiness.

18 The Constitution mentions "of the people, by the  
19 people and for the people," not of the fish, by the fish and  
20 for the fish.

21 Thank you.

22 A WITNESS:

23 I will introduce myself as a citizen of the state of  
24 Washington, a resident of the great Tri-City area and a  
25 defender of what resources we have here on our shores are the

1 greatest rivers of the West.

2 A lot of questions and issues come to rise, but this  
3 question is about one thing: A fish. Ladies and gentlemen,  
4 a fish that isn't even our main food supply, which leads to a  
5 solution of drawing down the dams. Well, ladies and  
6 gentlemen, some proponents might be talking about other  
7 things, but here in Eastern Washington, we're talking about  
8 food. I am talking about grain and fruit and rye, alfalfa,  
9 cows, chickens and all of our crops.

10 May I ask you what the farmers are going to do for  
11 water when the crops dry up? And then you'll know what  
12 shortage is, water shortages for irrigation. A lot of farms  
13 are included in this. A lot of crops not being able to be  
14 harvested and shipped due to transportation costs will go up.

15 Too many commercial vehicles on the road, increasing  
16 risks of accidents, traffic problems, road damages and loss  
17 of businesses. And that's just the tip of the iceberg.

18 Problems faced. We might have people that have been  
19 living here for over 30 years who will be flooded.

20 Are we really just talking about a fish? Let's get  
21 down to the real question about the real problems. What  
22 about gill-netting? If there was a real shortage of a fish,  
23 why are we still allowing the gill nets to go out?

24 Let's go down to the grocery store and take a walk  
25 through the grocery store. And when we buy our meat for a

1       barbecue, is there a sign over the fish counter saying "No  
2       salmon for sale due to a shortage"? No, no, no. But you can  
3       bet your last dollar at that market that the price of bread  
4       will be up in a flash or we will be low on it due to a  
5       shortage of grain, flour and apples or all of the other crops  
6       that depend on our river for water and transportation.

7                 People, look at the facts and fight like hell to  
8       save what we have. We have money in this area and lots of  
9       hard sweat. We're going to lose it if we don't fight and  
10      save what we have.

11                Thank you.

12                STEVE DRINKARD:

13                My name is Steve Drinkard and I realize that some or  
14      all of what I have to say may have already been said, but I  
15      believe that it all bears repeating.

16                I have read that the salmon population is  
17      significantly lower than it was 150 years ago when treaties  
18      were signed with the native American tribes. The dams seem  
19      to be blamed for the decrease in salmon, but how much more  
20      has fishing increased over the last 150 years? Were the  
21      Russians and Japanese clear-cutting the salmon, cutting the  
22      salmon runs out of the Pacific with drift nets as they are  
23      now? Were the U.S. and Canadians doing the same thing back  
24      then? Were the Indians harvesting at the same levels as they  
25      are now in the rivers and were they using the same methods?

1 I don't know for sure so I am asking these questions, but I  
2 believe I know the answer to each one of these questions.

3 If we really want to save the salmon, I believe we  
4 need to cut back to the same levels of salmon harvesting that  
5 we had 150 years ago. Breaching the dams is not the best  
6 answer, nor do I believe it is the only answer. To breach  
7 the dams will release so much silt that it would initially  
8 reduce salmon populations before maybe helping them. To  
9 breach the dams would also significantly reduce irrigation  
10 resources, which would wipe out farming in our region as we  
11 know it.

12 It would virtually return Eastern Washington, Idaho  
13 and Eastern Oregon back to desert. Farming would only exist  
14 on a very small scale.

15 Dams also provide a means of flood control during  
16 high melt-off periods.

17 Finally, the dams provide very inexpensive power to  
18 the Pacific Northwest. This enables us to attract industry  
19 to the region, providing jobs and a tax base. To get rid of  
20 cheap power would force these industries to leave and find  
21 cheaper power. The answer to cheaper power is not going to  
22 be co-gen plants using natural gas, because gas resources are  
23 limited and we have to buy it from Canada, who is already  
24 raising the price of gas.

25 Breaching the Snake River dams is only a foot in the

1 door for the same people to breach the Columbia River dams.

2 I say no to breaching any of our region's dams.

3 BUD SALISBURY:

4 Hello. I am Bud Salisbury, presently living in  
5 Kennewick.

6 I was born and raised in Eastern Oregon. The same  
7 thing happened to the timber in Oregon and Washington that is  
8 going to happen to the dams if we let the animalists, the  
9 environmentalists and the huggers to continue in the asinine  
10 pursuit of breaching dams.

11 If they really are serious about saving the salmon,  
12 which I don't think that is their final goal, they should  
13 start at the river's mouth and control the sea lions, even if  
14 it means destroying them. Put a stop to the long nets in the  
15 ocean. Destroy the terns that are eating the smolts. Put a  
16 moratorium on the fishing in the Columbia River and build  
17 more hatcheries to meet the needs of the fish-eating  
18 population.

19 How many Indians actually eat fish for the religious  
20 purposes? Not many, I believe. They can eat hatchery fish.  
21 The Indians and the rest of the country eat beef nowadays  
22 after the demise of the buffalo.

23 Save the dams and our recreation and way of life.

24 Thank you.

25 Bud Salisbury.

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

DOUG FLETCHER:

Hi. My name is Doug Fletcher. I am from Royal City. I have a small hay farm up there.

If these recovery proposals are implemented, particularly the one on dam breaching, it probably wouldn't affect me much. My place is irrigated with hand-dug wells which have been there since the '30s, which was before the dams were built. So probably the main thing that would affect me is the slightly higher power rates. So why am I here? There is two basic reasons.

One is there is some pretty drastic solutions being proposed, some of which will hurt a lot of people. It'll cost taxpayers huge amounts of money and have major poorly understood environmental consequences, may not be needed and probably won't even work anyway.

This is from the All-H Paper. This isn't stuff I made up.

And the second thing is I don't like these politically correct solutions which affect different classes of people differently, when theoretically everybody should be willing to do what they can to help achieve the objective, and that is to recover these fish populations to the point that everybody can fish on 'em.

I don't have much confidence in the idea that these fisheries have been properly managed or will be properly

1 managed. There are a lot of reasons for that. One is there  
2 are so many agencies involved in it. I can think of at least  
3 20 different agencies and tribes and interjurisdictional  
4 units that are involved.

5 But more than that, these populations have been  
6 declining for years and nobody has really taken appropriate,  
7 timely action to delay that or defer that until we get to the  
8 point that we are now. When at one time minor surgery and  
9 medicine might have cured it and now we're looking at chain  
10 saws and hatchets to try to perform the surgery when the  
11 patient's almost dead. It just doesn't seem right.

12 I had a lot more stuff here.

13 On the confidence that I place in this, I don't like  
14 the analyses. They look flawed to me. And I could point out  
15 a lot of reasons why, but I won't do that in the interests of  
16 time.

17 It seems like the main focus is on whether the dams  
18 should be breached or not and I would like to address that  
19 briefly. The All-H Paper said that even with no change in  
20 present operation, there will be a slight reduction in  
21 extinction risks for listed stocks.

22 So why take such drastic solutions? Breaching dams  
23 result in no change in survival risks for spring and summer  
24 Chinook only -- or spring and summer Chinook and only a  
25 slight reduction in survival risks for fall Chinook and

1 steelhead.

2 And removing those Snake River dams will release an  
3 estimated 75 million cubic yards of sediment, which is about  
4 half of what's behind the dams, and another four million  
5 cubic yards per year coming down.

6 If dams are removed, there will be shifts in fish  
7 populations which nobody really understands yet, I'm sure.  
8 And the All-H Paper said that that would result in increases  
9 in squaw fish populations or northern pike minnows as they  
10 are now called, which is also a major smolt predator.

11 Extinction risks for both fall Chinook and steelhead  
12 could be reduced to acceptable levels by changes in harvest  
13 practices alone. This is from the All-H Paper.

14 I recommend any of the options except dam breaching.  
15 And I thank you.

16 NEAL STEPHENS:

17 This is Neal Stephens. I represent the Burbank  
18 Uptown Homeowners Association in Burbank, and I am a resident  
19 of Burbank.

20 We are against breaching dams at any cost,  
21 vehemently opposed to it. We feel that you will lose your  
22 spring run of Chinook salmon and will be beseiged by mud in  
23 15 years. We are totally against this program and we are  
24 totally for what the Corps of Engineers has been trying to do  
25 with fish ladders.

1           Common people -- common working people can't believe  
2   that dam breaching is even considered. And we would like to  
3   caution everybody that as the situation continues to worsen,  
4   there will be more and more adamant feelings about it.

5           Thank you. That's all.

6           ELIN MIANESKI:

7           I am a member of the Columbia Basin Development  
8   League. My husband and I have made our home in the Columbia  
9   Basin since 1964, where we have a family farm.

10          Our dams and rivers are a lifeline and I strongly  
11   oppose breaching any of the dams on any of our waterways.  
12   The dams in the Pacific Northwest allow farms in the area to  
13   produce food for our great country and a big part of the  
14   world. The dams produce power for a large portion of the  
15   west. Without the dams, there would be in the neighborhood  
16   of two million productive taxpaying citizens who would be  
17   unemployed.

18          Saving the salmon and other natural resources is the  
19   project all Americans, regardless of race, color or creed,  
20   should be pursuing. Habitat in the Basin would be extremely  
21   limited for sport fishing, bird hunting and other wildlife if  
22   the dams were removed. Saving the dams will profit many  
23   people here in the Northwest, as well as other places in our  
24   country and the world.

25          As adults, it is our responsibility to see to it

1 that we are not (inaudible) and are productive human beings.

2 Thank you very much.

3 TOBY BOUCHEY:

4 Hi. My name is Toby Bouchey. I'm a realtor for  
5 Coldwell Banker Adams Realty in the Tri-Cities.

6 I was born in the Tri-Cities in 1950. My father  
7 came in the late '40s as a civil engineer for the Bureau of  
8 Reclamation. His key function here was to help design and  
9 construct the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project.

10 As a child, I remember very well going out to the  
11 farms and meeting the farmers and seeing the land and the  
12 farms that they had go through the evolution of change.

13 To think that we would change and go backwards in  
14 that development and all those things that we've done  
15 throughout the years to promote and build this community and  
16 the resources for not only our nation but even nations abroad  
17 and the impact of what we're talking about doing with the  
18 drawdown of the dams and the elimination of what we have  
19 worked so hard to build over all these many years is almost  
20 unthinkable. I mean, it staggers my mind to think that  
21 anyone who doesn't live here and can't see the transformation  
22 and can't live and understand the impact of what we've built,  
23 to create all of this and then have people from other places  
24 who don't understand what we do try to make decisions that  
25 are so impacting to us is unthinkable.

1                   And I would urge anyone and everyone who are trying  
2                   to make this decision, trying to make the changes that  
3                   they're talking about to this environment, please listen to  
4                   this community of people, farmers, everyone involved. And  
5                   please do not change what we've worked so hard to build.

6                   Thank you.

7                   DAVE THOMAS:

8                   My name is Dave Thomas. I'm a representative of the  
9                   Pulp and Paperworkers Resource Council with approximately  
10                  350,000 members.

11                  Everyone wants to save salmon. The only argument we  
12                  have is how to go about it.

13                  We absolutely reject Alternative No. 4, dam  
14                  breaching. Current scientific information does not support  
15                  dam breaching as a solution to restoring the Columbia River  
16                  salmon runs.

17                  Alternative 2 and 3 both have the ability to help  
18                  restore salmon runs. Alternative 2 would maximize juvenile  
19                  fish transport with current systems. 98 percent of our  
20                  barged salmon enter the mouth below the last dam on the  
21                  Columbia River healthy and strong. Pit tags recovered from  
22                  that prove that they survive.

23                  Alternative No. 3 incorporates a full-length surface  
24                  bypass collector at the Lower Granite Dam, which is the first  
25                  dam juvenile fish encounter. This would be the logical point

1 to collect fish for transport.

2 I would like to quote Don Adarme from the National  
3 Marine Fisheries as saying the data shows that for Snake  
4 River fish, barging avoids what makes the dams the major  
5 problem.

6 The four dams on the Lower Snake River are the most  
7 environmentally friendly renewable sources of energy that we  
8 have. To remove them based on incomplete scientific  
9 information would be foolhardy.

10 Thank you.

11 CARL HOLDEN:

12 Just 30 seconds, okay.

13 Common sense. Control or at least downsize the  
14 offshore fishing.

15 No. 2, stop the Indian barricade on upstream salmon  
16 fish ladder sites. Pay 'em off, whatever.

17 No. 3, we bountied the squaw fish, we bountied the  
18 coyotes, let's bounty off the artificial population of  
19 pelicans and terns.

20 No. 4, repealing these rules is cheaper and a hell  
21 of a lot more practical than replacing dams.

22 No. 5, what are you going to do in place of the  
23 power you give up? Turn up the nukes. I like nukes as a  
24 standby. Given my druthers, there is nothing that makes any  
25 sense like these dams.

1                   One last point would be that if we're in the  
2 business of taking public policies here at this booth and at  
3 this meeting and that sort of thing, why don't these people  
4 that you are taking track of say where they're from. But if  
5 you are going to make your rulings on the vote, a lot of this  
6 population that you are seeing here is just as artificial as  
7 the terns and the pelicans. They came in buses from Portland  
8 or Seattle or wherever to taint the picture, the image of  
9 what our opinion locally is.

10                   That's all. Thank you.

11                   CARL HOLDEN:

12                   Good afternoon. My name is Carl Holder, and I am  
13 from Pasco, Washington 99301. My address is Post Office Box  
14 1316. My phone number is 509-547-9883.

15                   My e-mail address is carlgh@AOL.com.

16                   And I am here today to speak in favor of our dams,  
17 our agriculture, our hydroelectric power and our way of life.  
18 I also come here in very deep respect for the pioneers and  
19 the hard-working people that settled this country. They  
20 settled it with a vision and part of that vision was the  
21 establishment of the control of the wild and dangerous rivers  
22 that we live upon for the betterment of ourselves, our  
23 children, our grandchildren, a clean and bountiful harvest of  
24 hydroelectric power and fish for our tables.

25                   I believe the salmon are an extremely hardy species.

1       However, I know that today, just like in 1890 before the  
2       dams, when the Indians were on the land, the Indians were  
3       starving. And why were they starving? Because they had  
4       overfished the salmon. And it was sad for them as it is for  
5       us now, but they had overfished the salmon and the salmon  
6       have not recovered. We've overfished the salmon and the  
7       salmon are endangered. So the reason then, as it is today,  
8       is the endangerment of the salmon is due to overfishing.

9                We need to stop the predation of the salmon smolt on  
10       the way down the river by eliminating the terns and the other  
11       predators. We need to watch and care for their safe return  
12       at sea. We need to limit the commercial harvests to a large  
13       extent. We need to get rid of the nets, especially on the  
14       fish ladder side of the rivers, so that the fish that are  
15       coming back, those precious salmon that are carrying their  
16       eggs back to their places of final rest need to be guaranteed  
17       their safe passage. The ones that survive the ocean, once  
18       they've come inland and in the Columbia River, they're  
19       extremely precious. There needs to be a price on their head.  
20       They can't be taken. They need to bring their salmon  
21       supplies back to the river where they belong.

22                Thank you very much.

23                LENA BOESSER-KOSCHMANN:

24                My name is Lena Boesser-Koschmann and I am a junior  
25       at Whitman College in Walla Walla, Washington.

1           I was born and raised in Gustavus, Alaska, a small  
2 town with a tourist and fishing economy in southeast. All  
3 around southeast, fishermen are losing their jobs as the  
4 salmon continue to decline in numbers.

5           We need to do everything possible to raise the  
6 salmon population back up to its natural level. Salmon are  
7 important to life in this region for every reason. Our  
8 livelihoods, our culture, our environment all depend on the  
9 health of the salmon runs. Removing the four Lower Snake  
10 dams is the only option now that will restore salmon spawning  
11 habitat and natural river flows, both essential to salmon  
12 recovery.

13           The Fish and Wildlife Service and the Fish and  
14 Wildlife Departments of Oregon and Washington and Idaho all  
15 recommend dam removal as the only option that will work. And  
16 I am fully convinced that this is the only alternative that  
17 can be chosen to save the salmon.

18           Salmon mean jobs. Salmon bring economic resources  
19 to our cities and towns, to our friends. Restoring the Snake  
20 River by removing dams will bring about a \$123 million in  
21 recreation every year to our communities. I want to see a  
22 healthy and alive Columbia and Snake River system with  
23 free-flowing water and abundant salmon runs as we've had in  
24 our past.

25           We need salmon to survive and the salmon need us now

1 to save them from extinction. For 25 years now we've  
2 attempted to make the dams compatible with salmon and our  
3 efforts have repeatedly failed as the salmon populations  
4 continue to decline in number. I don't want to grow up and  
5 have to tell my granddaughter that once upon a time there  
6 were salmon in these rivers. I want to take my grandchildren  
7 fishing and catch large salmon, as I did in my childhood.

8 I don't want the fishermen in Alaska to go out of  
9 business because we are choosing farming and agriculture over  
10 the fishing industry. Dam removal is cheaper than continuing  
11 these efforts with the dams and provides more certainty of  
12 recovery than these untested technological fixes.

13 People in the Northwest pay less than half the  
14 national average for electricity because of cheap hydropower.  
15 These dams don't make sense. The four Lower Snake dams  
16 provide less than 5 percent of the regional electricity and  
17 will cause the salmon to go extinct if they stay. We need  
18 salmon, and the dams on the Lower Snake don't make sense.

19 Thank you.

20 ROBERT MANN:

21 My name is Robert Mann. I'm a private citizen.

22 I am against breaching the dams. I would be for  
23 Alternative No. 3. I don't think there has been enough  
24 studies done on habitat and anything done to encourage  
25 habitat.

1           I don't think enough has been done on the harvest  
2           and what happens to the ocean. I -- and I don't think there  
3           has been any study done about the sediment, what it would do  
4           to the rest of the river if all four dams were breached.

5           Thank you.

6           ALI DOCKSTADER:

7           Hi. I'm Ali Dockstader. I'm a private citizen, and  
8           we've lived here for 30 years.

9           And when we first moved to the Northwest, we had  
10          nuclear power and our electricity bill was so small that they  
11          couldn't bill us every month; they had to send out a bill  
12          every other month. And then it was still about 20 or \$25 for  
13          every two months.

14          When they got rid of the nuclear power, then our  
15          electricity went up considerably. We pay, you know, up to  
16          close to \$200 a month now for electricity.

17          If the dams are removed, I don't know where people  
18          expect to get cheap electricity like we are now. The prices  
19          are going to go way, way, way out of range.

20          Also, with the farmers not being able to utilize  
21          the water to grow crops, our food prices are going to go way  
22          up. And I think the average person that really isn't  
23          involved doesn't even think about that.

24          It concerns me that the tribes keep preaching that  
25          they are to take care of the land. They want to save the

1 salmon and they want to see them increased and yet they're  
2 fishing out almost as many that reach the mouth as they can.  
3 They have the gill nets up. That is not a natural way to  
4 fish. They don't seem to be willing to do their part.

5 The fish numbers seem to have only gone down in the  
6 last 10 to 15 years and the dams have been up over 30. And  
7 there have been years that the salmon have been down, but  
8 they've come back up. And it doesn't appear that the dams  
9 really affect the runs. It appears that the fishing is what  
10 affects the runs of the salmon.

11 And it is my concern that the tribes be willing to  
12 give up at least half of their nets so that more fish can get  
13 up. They can reduce the amount that are harvested out in the  
14 ocean. Maybe they can get rid of the sea lions in Puget  
15 Sound that were never supposed to be there in the first  
16 place.

17 And the birds that -- I can't remember the names of  
18 the birds -- turrets or something -- terns -- I can't --  
19 turnips, not turnips -- anyway, all the predators that are  
20 not naturally supposed to be where they are. It seems maybe  
21 a little cruel hearted to get rid of 'em, but that seems  
22 needs to be what's done.

23 I really think that the minority have a louder voice  
24 than -- the ones that want the dams breached have a louder  
25 voice and a better organization than those of the majority

1 that realize that this is stupid to take the dams out and  
2 take away the livelihood of the barging and farmers and just  
3 people in general.

4 BERNARD ERICKSON:

5 I'm Bernard Erickson, a farmer in the Ritzville  
6 area.

7 I would like to make my brief comments. And these  
8 are that there are many other ways other than dam removal  
9 that need to be tried first. One of the things that I really  
10 feel strongly about is the replacement energy required to  
11 replace the dams and the power will certainly increase the  
12 CO2 in the air and we're seeing that as a problem right now.

13 There will be probably increased rates for  
14 irrigators. And with the farm economy the way it is, it's  
15 hard to make it as it is.

16 I think that removal of the dams will have an effect  
17 on other established species such as the bull trout and many  
18 others that have established themselves, that have a  
19 legitimate right to the ecosystem.

20 One of the things that I do not favor in the four Hs  
21 is the increased flows as they've not been proven to  
22 substantially improve the survival rate of the salmon on the  
23 outflow.

24 And I think that the economic impacts on the region  
25 will be very substantial in general, whether it be railroad

1 or transportation or any of the things affected with power.

2 And that pretty much sums it up. Thank you.

3 JOHN GOLDSBURY:

4 My name is John Goldsbury. I have been a Public  
5 Utility Commissioner in Benton County for 30 years.

6 I originally was requested to be back in Washington,  
7 D.C., at the request of Nethercutt and Doc Hastings to  
8 testify on a dam removals, and it's a matter of Congressional  
9 Record what I had to say and I will not dwell into it.

10 However, as time goes on, I see more and more an  
11 indication that it's really not a fish issue. It's a water  
12 issue. If you control the water, you control the people.  
13 And there is a desire and an element in this country to get  
14 the Northwest particularly under control.

15 This is evidenced by the fact that they attack  
16 Microsoft and they will attack Bonneville and they will  
17 attack our water rights.

18 I was -- I was in New York -- or Washington, D.C.,  
19 last week. I sat in on an Endangered Species Act hearing. I  
20 heard four congressional delegates who were signers of the  
21 original bill made the statement they never believed that the  
22 Endangered Species Act, which they thought was to protect  
23 things like bison and bald eagles and wild coyotes and wolves  
24 and so forth, would end up stopping a street project in  
25 Wenatchee, Washington, a signal lighting project in Richland,

1 Washington, or take away the water from family farms in the  
2 Methow Valley.

3 The issue is water. Face it. Tell us it's water  
4 that you are after. Tell us it's water you can control. You  
5 control the water, you control the people.

6 Thank you.

7 LOUIS CABRERE: (Entire presentation  
8 unintelligible.)

9 PASCAL BOLDVE:

10 -- from Moses Lake, Washington.

11 I have been educating myself on all this subject for  
12 a while and there is a few questions that comes to me.

13 What are the effects of the nonnative predators on  
14 the salmon in the Columbia River system? I'm talking about  
15 like walleye, bass, perch, crappy and all these things. What  
16 are the effects of the shad runs on the Columbia River that  
17 are not native? Young shad, I think, must be competing  
18 directly with young salmon fry for habitat and food.

19 What are the effects of fisheries in the ocean on  
20 forage fish like herring, sardines and anchovies, squid in --  
21 I mean, those fisheries are measured in hundreds of thousands  
22 of metric tons a year.

23 I'm coming -- I have a hypothesis that the river has  
24 reached a maximum biomass. I mean, how many pounds of fish  
25 can the Columbia River sustain and how many pounds of fish

1 are in the Columbia River right now? These are a series of  
2 questions that I think should be answered before we can think  
3 about any other -- any other ideas that we need to do here.

4 I mean, I think there is a lot of unknown before we  
5 make a decision. And I wish we could all open our eyes and  
6 look at things we don't know as much as things that we do  
7 know.

8 Thank you.

9 DAVE SMITH:

10 Hi. My name is Dave Smith. I'm from Moscow, Idaho.

11 And I would like to say that I oppose breaching the  
12 four Lower Snake River dams. I believe that the latest data  
13 from the pit tag studies indicate that breaching the four  
14 dams would not necessarily help the endangered salmon runs,  
15 and it would wreak a lot of economic devastation on the  
16 people of Southeastern Washington and North Central Idaho.

17 I also would like to say that the main factors in  
18 salmon mortality, the facts seem to point toward the Lower  
19 Columbia and ocean conditions as the main killing fields.  
20 And I believe that sooner or later these issues need to be  
21 addressed.

22 And that's all I want to say. Thank you.

23 CARL MANSBERG:

24 I'm Carl Mansberg. I'm at 2815 Alder Road, Pasco,  
25 Washington. I have a farm out there.

1           There are several things that we could do to improve  
2           the habitat for fish and to improve the salmon situation  
3           other than breaching the dams. For example, habitat could be  
4           improved along about 25 miles of Crab Creek by creating  
5           spawning and rearing channels. Water flow could be regulated  
6           by releases from Potholes Reservoir. Some land may have to  
7           be bought or leased from local landowners, but very little.  
8           This is a natural creek area and habitat could be easily  
9           created.

10           Second, the huge pumps on DOE land that were put  
11           there for the nuclear reactors in World War II are not being  
12           used. There is power sources to them and they could be used  
13           to pump water out of the north part of the Hanford  
14           Reservation onto the Hanford Reservation lands and it could  
15           be used to create streams with very efficient spawning and  
16           rearing channels.

17           The land is now owned by DOE, the equipment is owned  
18           by DOE, and it could be done very easily. And the Hanford  
19           Reach has proven to be a very efficient spawning and rearing  
20           area, so you could greatly increase that. You may be able to  
21           double or triple its size.

22           The cost of taking out the dams in the indirect  
23           areas like wheat farmers going broke, the impact on the  
24           residents of Spokane who have depended upon that agricultural  
25           economy, now, the extra 17 cents a mile -- I mean, a bushel

1 it will cost the grower in raising wheat in a market where he  
2 expends 90 -- or where 90 percent of his wheat is exported --  
3 he's in a world competitive economy and the 17 cents could  
4 easily make him noncompetitive. And the whole area could  
5 become nonproductive and the impact on lives of people who  
6 never even thought about it could be tremendous.

7 DOUG JOHNSON:

8 My name is Doug Johnson. I'm a farmer from Moses  
9 Lake.

10 And I am opposed to breaching the dams because, in  
11 my opinion, there is other issues that could be addressed to  
12 solving this problem for everybody. All this is doing is  
13 making enemies out of neighbors.

14 And that's about all I got to say. Thank you.

15 LYNN HATCHER:

16 My name is Lynn Hatcher. I'm the fisheries program  
17 manager for the Yakama Nation.

18 The science is very clear. The alternatives that  
19 would restore natural river conditions are the only way to  
20 restore fall Chinook spawning and rearing habitat in the  
21 Snake River. The fall Chinook only spawns in the main stem  
22 of the Columbia River and the Snake River, in addition to  
23 some tributaries like the Yakima.

24 But we're talking about right here now the Snake  
25 River fall Chinook. There is no scientific question that the

1 dams have covered up the spawning and rearing habitat. There  
2 is no way to restore fall Chinook without providing spawning  
3 habitat.

4 The scientific studies show 100 percent chance of  
5 recovery for fall Chinook under the natural river option.  
6 The science also shows that the natural river option has the  
7 best chance of restoring spring and summer Chinook and  
8 steelhead. It is also the only way to meet the temperature  
9 and gas supersaturation levels in the Clean Water Act.

10 Thank you.

11 ROBERT PERKES:

12 I am Robert Perkes, from Mesa, Washington.

13 I have lived in the area for 42 years. I am a  
14 farmer. I have five children and 10 grandchildren. And I  
15 would like to make a few comments on the removal of the dams  
16 and the salmons.

17 What I understand is most of the streams in the  
18 Northwest, the return of salmon is diminishing. And some of  
19 the reasons I think that this is happening is because of the  
20 fishing in the ocean. They've taken to using nets and drag  
21 nets and capture everything that's in their path.

22 And the other day, I was reading an article where  
23 Japan is using heat-seeking instruments to find schools of  
24 fish and then they direct their fishing process ships to the  
25 location of these fish and they take everything in the

1 school.

2           The thing to do -- things don't stay the same as  
3 they always have. If they did, we would take the farmers off  
4 the Midwest and put them all back on prairies so we would  
5 have buffaloes to shoot.

6           And so if we are going to have salmons, we need to  
7 take and change our operation and have salmon farms and grow  
8 what we need, the same as we grow the vegetables and the  
9 produce that we have on our farms.

10           The dams in the river do not pollute the air as the  
11 fire-powered generators do. And in the last few weeks we  
12 have gotten a very good example of why we should keep the  
13 dams in the river because of the price of oil can go out of  
14 sight in just a few days.

15           I agree that we should do all that we can to fix the  
16 dams so that those fish can go back up the river.

17           I don't know, but I think there is just as much or  
18 more recreation on the river now than there was when it was  
19 free flowing. You see all the skiers and the boats up and  
20 down the river and the parks that's on the side of the  
21 rivers. And I believe there is more food provided with the  
22 dams and the pumping of the water on the irrigation land than  
23 there would be if you took and did it -- took the dams down  
24 and let the fish go back up the river.

25           If we need the salmon and we need to take and have

1 farms to grow them for the people that need 'em.

2 Thank you very much.

3 JAMES MICHAUD:

4 My name is Jim Michaud.

5 I speak against the removal of our dams. The  
6 decline of the salmon runs are not the fault of the dams, but  
7 caused by and large by the treaties granted by the federal  
8 government to foreign countries that allowed unlimited gill-  
9 netting off our shores. These countries came in with 30-mile  
10 drift nets and took everything from the bottom fish to our  
11 nuclear submarines. This killed several life cycles of the  
12 salmon and actually other types of fish, as well.

13 Now, some people would want us to believe that the  
14 dams are at fault. This is a falsehood without good evidence  
15 of proof. How do you explain the decline in the fish runs  
16 below the dams?

17 Removal of our dams will devastate the Pacific  
18 Northwest. The electrical rates will raise to a level that  
19 will kill all the industrial growth. Farming and associated  
20 businesses will die.

21 The employment loss will be in the millions of  
22 dollars, all in the name of saving a fish. If the fish can't  
23 get up here, you cannot save them. Gill-netting takes a  
24 toll, as well as Indian overfishing on the river. Dam  
25 removal will not save one fish unless they have a free run

1 upstream to the spawning areas.

2           Where is the common sense in this issue? There is  
3 none.

4           I have lived here for over 50 years and for many  
5 years, the fish runs grew very -- grew every year. Then  
6 about 30 years ago, the feds decided to allow foreign  
7 gill-netting, which started the decline.

8           I say to you, let the Russians and the Japs pay for  
9 the restoration of the fish runs when the federal government  
10 is the root cause of the decline. Do not bankrupt our  
11 economy that has been built on a solid base of cheap  
12 hydropower.

13           I know from past years that people in government  
14 positions have very little or no common sense and will always  
15 fail to the tune of the squeaky wheel. But please, just sit  
16 back and take a good look at the end result of such ludicrous  
17 action and I think breaching the dams will be the last thing  
18 we do to save the fish.

19           Are the fish the real concern? It doesn't appear so  
20 for many reasons. To save the fish, all that's required is  
21 to remove the barriers that prevent the return to the river.  
22 This would include removal of all foreign fishing from our  
23 coasts, all gill-netting on the river, yes, including the  
24 Indian fishing. And then in about 50 years, the fish runs  
25 might return to normal.

1           Remove the dams and we will return to the spring  
2 floods of yesteryear. This area will return to the dust bowl  
3 of the '40s. If this is progress, then that's good proof of  
4 the lack of common sense in government.

5           That's it.

6           EVERETT HAMILTON:

7           My name is Everett Hamilton.

8           I am here to speak on behalf of the Benton Rural  
9 Electric Association. We as a utility are very concerned  
10 about the continual upward costs of doing studies to save  
11 endangered fish and snails. Throughout the state electrical  
12 consumers are currently subsidizing the studies by being  
13 forced to pay 22 to 24 percent higher costs on their  
14 electricity bills to fund these studies.

15           We are all for improving fish runs, but we would  
16 much rather support scientific and common sense methods of  
17 doing this. We are very concerned about the continuous  
18 studies done by the Corps of Engineers. We do not understand  
19 or agree with the same studies being done year after year at  
20 costs of hundreds of millions of dollars.

21           We are a utility with over 10,000 members and our  
22 goal as a utility is to provide reliable and affordable  
23 electricity. We have been involved in paying for these fish  
24 and, most recently, snail costs for years.

25           There are many reasons for fish declines. Most of

1       them seem to be in how the numbers are manipulated. As a  
2       provider of electricity, we represent our members and we want  
3       results for the hundreds of millions of dollars the Northwest  
4       is paying for fish and snail restoration.

5               We absolutely do not support removal of the dams for  
6       the following reasons. Removing the dams will create miles  
7       of free-flowing rivers which are full of sediment, which  
8       will, in our opinion, cause more harm to the fish and snails  
9       than they currently face. Barging of smolts seems to be the  
10      best way of increasing their numbers and this would be  
11      impossible if the dams were removed.

12             Our customers and the businesses they operate rely  
13      on the river system for cheap transportation and recreation  
14      as well as irrigation. Removing these dams will greatly  
15      decrease the survivability of many of these businesses.

16             The loss of the four dams on the Lower Snake River,  
17      according to the Corps of Engineers, would reduce electrical  
18      output of the Bonneville system by 12 percent. The Northwest  
19      is estimated to increase its population by 50 percent in the  
20      next 20 years. Has anyone studied where the power will come  
21      from for this increased population?

22             We would like to say that the current administration  
23      occupying the White House seems to be concentrating on  
24      destroying our economy of the Northwest. We will adamantly  
25      oppose any studies or discussions of destroying our dams. We

1 will continue our opposition to these insane proposals and  
2 costs.

3 I would like to add that Al Gore has stated that if  
4 elected president, one of his first goals would be to remove  
5 Grand Coulee Dam because it is environmentally unfriendly.  
6 The Pacific Northwest would be very environmentally  
7 unfriendly to the people if we had no dams.

8 In closing, we would like to say we support common  
9 sense ideas which will restore fish runs. Removing dams on  
10 the Lower Snake River will not restore fish runs. Removing  
11 these dams will do the following things: Increase power  
12 costs in the Northwest, increase transportation costs in the  
13 Northwest, destroy economies of crucial cities and  
14 businesses, increase the probability that power outages will  
15 occur in our population as our population increases.

16 We as a utility stand firmly and believe that our  
17 customers and other people of the Northwest would be greatly  
18 harmed if these dams are removed or compromised in any way.

19 Thank you.

20 HEATHER CLINE:

21 -- Whitman College.

22 I think there are many things to think about when  
23 you are thinking about building a dam. Things to consider  
24 are sooner or later the reservoir behind the dam will build  
25 up with sediment -- fill up with sediment, the water coming

1 out of the dam, there is no more sediment left in it, so it  
2 has a tendency to erode further downstream. And there is  
3 increased evaporation in the reservoir behind the dam.

4 An example is Lake Powell is losing 270,000 meters  
5 cubed per year of water due to evaporation.

6 However, there are six good reasons for dams:  
7 Navigation, recreation, hydroelectric power, sediment  
8 retention, water supply and flood control.

9 However flood control directly opposes all of the  
10 other five reasons because, ideally, our reservoirs should be  
11 empty when it comes to flood control because if there is a  
12 flood, you need the reservoir empty to fill. And if it is  
13 full of water, then there is not going to be as much flood  
14 control.

15 Also, when you make a reservoir, you make a new  
16 shoreline, which changes the ecosystem. The aesthetic and  
17 recreational uses change. It hurts the fish habitat and it  
18 destroys floodplains.

19 Many farmers are arguing about how this will hurt  
20 their irrigation and everything, but in reality, the  
21 floodplain is the best farming and soil around floodplains,  
22 the soil is most fertile, more so than anywhere else that you  
23 will ever irrigate.

24 Also, I think this is a form of environmental  
25 racism, singling out the native American community.

1           And one must also take into consideration, I think,  
2   that no one would dispute the fact that the population in the  
3   world is growing. And we will -- with this growing  
4   population, we will need an increase in food supply. Fish  
5   constitute 3 percent of the world's food supply but all  
6   together 27 percent of the world's protein. There is -- more  
7   than 70 percent of the grain produced in the U.S. goes to  
8   feed livestock, which is much lower -- more economical to eat  
9   lower on the food chain which consumes less energy.

10           Fish and a grain-based diet is more economical and  
11   the energy that will go to grain would feed more -- many more  
12   people than it would if it goes to the livestock community.

13           I think one must also take a NIMBY attitude when it  
14   comes to dam construction. You don't want anything like the  
15   Aswan Dam in the Nile -- Egypt -- River, which is considered  
16   the greatest environmental tragedy ever -- which will soon be  
17   replaced by the Three Gorges Dam in China -- to happen.

18           No one wants a dam in their backyard, however, many  
19   people rely on them. So I feel that these are reasons to  
20   consider when thinking about constructing or deconstructing  
21   dams in the Pacific Northwest.

22           Thank you.

23           KEVIN BOUCHEY:

24           My name is Kevin Bouchey and I'm a potato grower and  
25   serve on the Washington State Potato Commission, an

1 organization that represents potato growers throughout  
2 Washington state.

3 Most of the potatoes in Washington state are grown  
4 in the Columbia Basin and rely on irrigation water from the  
5 Columbia and Snake River. Potatoes are the second largest  
6 crop grown in the state with an annual farm production of  
7 approximately \$500 million. Washington state accounts for  
8 nearly one-third of all potatoes exported from the United  
9 States.

10 In addition, the Columbia Basin is the No. 1  
11 producing area of french fries in North America.

12 In summary, Washington state potato growers, packers  
13 and processors create thousands of jobs locally and generate  
14 approximately \$2.5 billion annually to the state's economy.  
15 Because of the devastating impact that dam breaching would  
16 have on the Washington state potato industry, the Potato  
17 Commission wants to take the opportunity today to provide  
18 comments on salmon recovery efforts.

19 First, let me say that I believe we are here today  
20 to discuss all factors that are impacting West Coast salmon  
21 runs. Unfortunately, the debate over restoring salmon runs  
22 on the West Coast has become foolishly and narrowly focused  
23 on the Lower Snake River dams.

24 In reality, we should be considering broader,  
25 holistic solutions that thoroughly examine all factors

1 impacting West Coast fisheries including predation, harvest,  
2 ocean temperatures, loss of habitat from population, et  
3 cetera.

4 People of the Northwest should oppose breaching the  
5 Lower Snake River dams for the following reasons: No. 1, 10  
6 years ago only 30 percent of salmon smolts survived the trip  
7 over the dams. With recent changes in bypass technology,  
8 survival is as high as it was before the Lower Snake River  
9 dams were even built.

10 No. 2, of the 34 West Coast runs of salmon and  
11 steelhead that are listed or proposed for listing under the  
12 ESA, only four pass the dams of the Lower Snake River.

13 No. 3, thousands of acres of highly productive  
14 farmland at Ice Harbor Pool will dry up, which will eliminate  
15 thousands of agricultural and food processing related jobs in  
16 Washington state.

17 No. 4, replacing hydropower with other sources of  
18 power such as coal and oil will adversely impact air quality.  
19 Using more rail and truck transportation to move our products  
20 will increase air pollution, increase the number of traffic  
21 accidents.

22 No. 5, during peak summer and winter months, the  
23 West Coast power grid is at full capacity. If the power  
24 generated by the Snake River dams is taken away, brownouts  
25 will occur.

1            Obviously, taking out dams is not the answer. The  
2 All-H Paper is a step in the right direction. We believe it  
3 looks at more honestly improving habitat, hydroelectric and  
4 hatchery operations while addressing harvest.

5            A lot is at stake in these alternatives and study  
6 results should be considered carefully. Our lives and  
7 livelihoods here in Eastern Washington are built around the  
8 dams and the rivers.

9            In closing, we need to seriously consider the  
10 devastating impact of dam breaching which will destroy our  
11 economy and the lives of thousands of people in the Pacific  
12 Northwest.

13            PEO-PEO MOX MOX:

14            My name is Peo-peo Mox Mox or Yellow bird. The  
15 original signer of the treaties in 1855 was whose name I  
16 carry.

17            The CTUIR believes that the United States has both  
18 legal and moral obligations to honor the sacred promises made  
19 in the treaty of 1855 and to uphold its trust responsibility.  
20 The tribe believes the United States must rebuild salmon runs  
21 to harvestable levels, not merely levels that avoid  
22 extinction with museum relic runs.

23            The CTUIR also believes that the United States must  
24 restrict its own harvest from hydropower generation, land  
25 management practices and water development projects before it

1 restricts tribal treaty fisheries.

2           The current status quo is not without costs. The  
3 single largest cost of the status quo is a virtual  
4 disappearance of salmon in the Snake Basin and elsewhere and  
5 that is an unacceptable cost to the CTUIR.

6           This next quote is from Mrs. Curtis' sixth grade  
7 class at Sherwood Heights Elementary School in Pendleton,  
8 Oregon.

9           "Don't save the salmon, how can you be so selfish?  
10 There are many, many people and other animals who depend on  
11 the salmon.

12           "If we in our greed and ignorance destroy the  
13 species, then where do we stop? What is next? The king  
14 fisher, the marriganser, the great blue heron, the eagle, the  
15 sea gull, the bear, the trout or the seal or the whale?  
16 Salmon are a major food source for all of these species. If  
17 we in our greed destroy the delicate balance of our of  
18 nature, what will we eliminate next?

19           "And how about humans? Will we finally get to the  
20 point that humans aren't necessary either? If you don't care  
21 about nature, then what about the economy and jobs. The  
22 fishing industry supplies jobs for thousands of Northwest  
23 residents, commercial fishing, canneries and packing  
24 companies, fish markets, grocery stores, restaurants sport  
25 fishing, gear manufacturers and retailers, fishing guides,

1 biologists and hatcheries. The loss of the salmon will cost  
2 millions, maybe even billions of dollars in lost wages.

3 Before it is too late, we must do something to save salmon  
4 because they are just one small step in saving our world."

5 Now, as they approach the end of high school, the  
6 federal government seems no closer to answering their  
7 questions or satisfying their concerns. Will you have the  
8 answer for their children, for yours or will it be too late?

9 TESSIE WILLIAMS:

10 I am We-Op-Satsi. That's my Indian name,  
11 We-Op-Satsi.

12 I am Tessie Williams. I'm a member of the  
13 Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation.

14 Today has been a very honorable day to speak for the  
15 salmon. This is the gift that has been given us. And today  
16 it is something that we have to do for our children and their  
17 children because the gift was given to us and we honor this  
18 food because it's one of our traditional foods that got up  
19 and spoke for us and said, "I will take care of you."

20 The creator gave us the water and the land and the  
21 foods and in saying so, he said, "You take care of this  
22 water, it'll take care of you. You take care of your foods,  
23 this foods will take care of you. You take care of this land  
24 and this land will take care of you."

25 Those are the kind of beliefs that we were raised

1 with by our ancestors, because this is how they lived, to  
2 honor the land, the water and the foods that were gifted us.  
3 So today on behalf of the salmon, we do respect what the  
4 creator gave us.

5 And we've always worked hard to take care of  
6 everything the way it was. Everything on this land has a  
7 purpose. And when we're unbalanced, we're unbalanced and it  
8 creates a lot of problems and today there is an unbalance  
9 because we feel that the salmon is being left out.

10 So we have to try to bring back that balance the way  
11 the creator gave us, because everything on this earth has a  
12 purpose, and we have to respect what the creator gave us.

13 And we can work it out if we all can believe in what  
14 the creator taught us. He is first in our thoughts and in  
15 our teachings. So today we continue to teach our children  
16 and our grandchildren to respect the traditional Indian life.

17 Thank you:

18 EMILY LITTLE FISH:

19 My name is Emily Burke Little Fish.

20 Many years we traveled down to Celilo during the  
21 fishing season. And at that time, the fish was very  
22 plentiful. We lived at -- I lived at Celilo the year of 1954  
23 to 1960. We had salmon year-round. It was preserved or  
24 fresh, depending on season.

25 Later on in the years, I worked in the cannery,

1 seasonal. There was many different kinds of salmon. There  
2 was salmon run was like it used to be down Celilo years ago.  
3 I worked seven days a week sometimes and sometimes 10 to 14  
4 hours, depending on the salmon run.

5 In 1989, I was chosen as a juror by several people  
6 from surrounding villages. The subject was of a person that  
7 was cited for making a bridge, a man-made bridge out of  
8 sticks and debris, rocks, and it was wrong because of the  
9 salmon run. That would stop the salmon from traveling up the  
10 creek for spawning and migrating.

11 When you think of it, it would be like damming up  
12 the creek. The fish would not have the freedom with the dams  
13 being there.

14 Just like us many years ago, the Indians had a lot  
15 of freedom to get food just anywhere. Now the fish are being  
16 treated like us. The fish are stopped by the dams and we are  
17 finished off, limited from getting much of our traditional  
18 foods.

19 This is how much I have to say.

20 Okay. Thank you.

21 INEZ SPINO REVES:

22 (Speaking in Indian language.)

23 TRANSLATOR: The aforementioned comments were given  
24 as a testimony by Umatilla elder Inez Spino Reves. And she  
25 was speaking to the importance the salmon as it is put onto

1 this world for our benefit as a tribal people. And she spoke  
2 about the return of the salmon and where it needs to have  
3 spawning habitat where she mentioned "asi shinut," which  
4 means spawning beds and spawning areas.

5 So she spoke to the necessity of having a place for  
6 these salmon to go and that we feel that the importance of  
7 the salmon, as it is a gift, that we as native people are  
8 very thankful that it does return; that we must ensure an  
9 avenue by which it can return from the "adet choos" or the  
10 ocean up to the "aik" to where they spawn in the spawning  
11 beds. And that if we were to restore any of these areas for  
12 the reestablishment of the spawning beds, that would be  
13 something that she would be in favor of if we were to find  
14 the alternatives that we would be trying to be setting forth  
15 our words.

16 And so this much is how much I would like to  
17 translate what she's said.

18 JIM TOOMEY:

19 My name is Jim Toomey. I'm the executive director  
20 at the Port of Pasco.

21 The region desperately needs a recovery plan with a  
22 clear vision, goals and priorities. We need a plan that  
23 rebuilds healthy fish runs while maintaining a healthy  
24 economy.

25 Regarding the Corps' EIS, when the study was begun,

1 I thought it was about fish, a comprehensive analysis of  
2 actions that can and should be taken to evaluate and  
3 recommend how to best preserve certain migrating species.

4 I was incorrect. The study's about dams. Only four  
5 of them. Can they be breached? What are the costs and are  
6 there any environmental benefits?

7 I commend the study and the participants for the  
8 exhaustive review and analysis. I do note that in pondering  
9 the question of the return of the species to health, the  
10 answer comes back as a resounding maybe.

11 As such, we at the Port of Pasco oppose Alternative  
12 4, the dam breaching alternative. As defined, breaching has  
13 negative economic impacts for the region without a reasonable  
14 assurance that the species will return. High risk and  
15 uncertainty is not something we can support.

16 The study has shown that dam removal is not the  
17 silver bullet that many not only thought it would be but also  
18 wanted it to be. The unattended consequences of wanting it  
19 to be so has become the single largest impediment to moving  
20 forward and facing the fish recovery efforts.

21 Proposals to enhance passage, transportation,  
22 habitat or other locally defined options come up against an  
23 insurmountable hurdle of process gridlock. Gridlock is  
24 probably the wrong word. At least it implies an attempt to  
25 move. The better word would be "stalemate." If you move,

1 you lose.

2 My lesson that I have clearly learned today is  
3 standing in line talking to people of different opinions is  
4 one thing we all agree on is that we need to move beyond this  
5 stalemate.

6 Regarding the Federal Caucus All-H Paper, this paper  
7 is a good start. It begins to address all Hs. It is the  
8 first time we have seen attention to habitat, harvest and  
9 hatcheries that equals that of the hydro system.

10 We are also pleased and support the tact that the  
11 agencies have begun to discuss goals and performance  
12 standards. The region needs a recovery plan with a clear  
13 vision, goals and priorities.

14 Thank you for listening to my comments.

15 SVETLANA KRUG:

16 My name is Svetlana Krug.

17 And the problem about dams and salmon is touches me  
18 very close. I have many friends who is farming and to depend  
19 on water from the river. And also, I know that people from  
20 their Indian tribes, they are dependent of salmon also.

21 But I am for the, I would like to say, dams and  
22 salmon and also the money, because let's save the money and  
23 let's spend the money for them -- some for to be save the  
24 salmon and don't destroy the dams.

25 And let's stop our overfishing and cut our appetites

1 because any store you go and any cafe and restaurant, it's in  
2 anyplace is that you can -- you could have salmon.

3 And let's also educate the Indians that they will  
4 know about migration. Seems like they don't know for sure  
5 how the fish -- the migration of fish.

6 And well -- and, too, else what I would like to say  
7 that let's don't make from this the politic issue and don't  
8 put people -- Indian people, whatever people around which  
9 they would hate each other because of this dams and salmon.  
10 And let's save both and try to do the best for our people  
11 here around.

12 KIM PUZY:

13 My name is Kim Puzy. I'm general manager of the  
14 Port of Umatilla.

15 80,000 people live in the Port of Umatilla district  
16 that is in the state of Oregon. It's approximately 3600  
17 square miles in the northeast corner of Oregon.

18 I'm honored to be here today because of the things  
19 that we have heard from people who are many generations in  
20 agriculture and many generations from the tribal tradition.  
21 I believe that the creator holds us accountable for the care  
22 and return of the fish in the Columbia and Snake Rivers, but  
23 that he also holds us accountable for how we treat one  
24 another.

25 And that if we will look to the Umatilla River in

1 our port district where salmon have returned after an absence  
2 of 70 years, I believe that we can find a model of  
3 cooperation and civility which helps bring those fish back.

4 I believe that the expertise and the competence to  
5 be able to restore fish exists within this room. And that if  
6 we will look at the model of the Umatilla River, we will be  
7 able to find answers to that.

8 In addition to addressing the issue of the dams, I  
9 think it's important that we review other factors which may  
10 affect the fish, not the least of which is the ocean. And  
11 the kinds of problems that we see in urban areas such as  
12 straight streams, a flood storm water system, thousands of  
13 acres of pavement and the chemical stew that goes from  
14 parking lots and streets down an unfiltered and untreated  
15 storm water system into our rivers, hopefully we will be able  
16 to work towards water quality both in the areas -- in urban  
17 areas as well as industry, agriculture and municipalities.

18 If we have a federal checkbook, I believe that we  
19 should offer incentives for people to be able to correct  
20 problems that may exist on their farms, ranches, factories,  
21 municipalities and so forth.

22 And I appreciate the opportunity to put these  
23 comments into the record. Thank you.

24 MILDRED QUIPS:

25 (Speaking in Indian language.)

1           My name is Mildred Quips.

2           I'm only thinking of my elders, all the teachings  
3       that they've given us, and the history -- oral history and  
4       how important it is to take good care of all of our living  
5       things and our fish. And I am so afraid for our future  
6       because of all the technology that's going to -- happening  
7       here in this world and how our children are going to stand.  
8       And that's all I think about.

9           And all we can do, we're still taking care of what  
10       we were taught, our sacred laws, and the singing and dancing  
11       and the praying. And I just pray that when we take the stand  
12       that we remember our sacred laws and remembering our future  
13       generations.

14           That's all.

15           JODN:

16           (Speaking in Indian language.)

17           And today I heard many words from all the people  
18       from all over and I felt very small because everybody is  
19       saying breach the dams. And I heard words that our politics,  
20       because we would not be saying those words if somebody didn't  
21       start them.

22           We know that the dams need to be fixed so the salmon  
23       can go by because we revere to them as our food source. And  
24       the people that were there today, the majority of the people  
25       know the reason they're still here was because when Lewis &

1 Clark and all those people walked along the rivers, our  
2 people, the native people, fed them salmon to keep them alive  
3 because when they came to the river, they were starving. And  
4 people need to remember that and not say that we value the  
5 salmon more than human life.

6 We revere it because it's our food. And we still  
7 practice traditional things down along the Columbia River.

8 I also come from a gillnetter family. And I heard  
9 many things today that were hurtful. I felt surrounded by  
10 the majority race, as it is called. But I do not think that  
11 the dams should be breached because it does not benefit  
12 anybody. It just benefits politicians and people that are  
13 looking for money, ways to look for money. That is people's  
14 belief today and people are on a ego trip right now because  
15 of politics.

16 I say these words because I believe in them. As  
17 people said today, we all believe in one creator and we want  
18 to all live alongside of each other. We want to be brothers  
19 and sisters and love one another as best as we can because we  
20 have a lot of people coming from overseas with different  
21 ideas, different ways of living. They don't believe in our  
22 ways, none of our ways.

23 But we can -- but we can't breach the dams. We have  
24 to fix the fish passageways and anything else that needs to  
25 be fixed. And whoever is in charge of those things better

1 not be pushing their problems off on us, the people. Let  
2 them fix it and ASAP, not 10 years from now while they waste  
3 money trying to do it in talking.

4 Thank you.

5 ROBERT WATSON:

6 Good morning. My name is Robert Watson. I live at  
7 Lake Chelan.

8 About three weeks ago there was a very interesting  
9 article on the front page of the Seattle Times. It told  
10 about the villagers in Rivers Inlet in Canada shooting the  
11 grizzly bear because they were invading the town. Bear were  
12 coming up on the porches and into town. They had to shoot  
13 about 11 grizzly bear.

14 After the grizzly bear were shot, the black bear  
15 came into town. The black bear is afraid of the grizzly and  
16 didn't show up until the grizzly bear was eliminated. After  
17 further study, they found out that the bear were starving.  
18 There usually are 350,000 salmon spawning in the fall. This  
19 past fall, there were only about 3,500 salmon that returned  
20 to spawn.

21 Listen to this. There are no dams on the river.  
22 Once again, there are no dams on the river. The problem of  
23 salmon not returning to spawn had nothing to do with the  
24 dams. There are hardly any dams on rivers from Vancouver,  
25 B.C., up to and including Alaska.

1           They are also experiencing the lack of returning  
2 salmon, the same as us, but there are no dams. They say it  
3 is caused by El Nino, La Nina, predators, too much commercial  
4 harvesting of fish, along with other problems.

5           You see, they do not have dams so they cannot put  
6 the blame on the dams. We have dams. They are very large  
7 and visual, so it is easy to put the blame on them. I ask  
8 that you produce scientific evidence that proves that by  
9 removing dams, you will greatly increase the fish runs. This  
10 evidence must also contain the dollar figure to remove dams  
11 and replace them with another source of power. It must also  
12 include the increase in the dollar figure cost to the people  
13 living in these areas where these dams generate power and  
14 control flooding. Please give us the total dollar figure as  
15 to what this dam breaching will cost us and prove to us that  
16 by doing this, you will guarantee that the salmon will return  
17 in the numbers that you state.

18           Thank you.

19           DAVID GLESSNER:

20           My name is David Glessner. I work at an industrial  
21 manufacturing facility. I'm an elected water commissioner  
22 for the City of Wallula.

23           Breaching the Snake River dams is as beneficial as  
24 trying to bring back the horse and carriage for public  
25 transportation. The dams are part of our culture. We all

1     enjoy the benefits of the electricity provided by the  
2     pollution-free turbines.  Irrigation water has turned a  
3     desert into an oasis.  Boaters, fishermen, swimmers, campers,  
4     hikers, water skiers all enjoy the recreation provided by the  
5     design of the dams.

6             In 1996, the flow control provided by the dams  
7     reduced the destructive consequences of the tremendous  
8     run-off water.  Environmentally friendly movement of cargo  
9     provides jobs for the Northwest.  The dams are critical to  
10    the life-style we all enjoy.  Homes, work, recreation and  
11    tourism all depend on the dams.  The fish don't care about  
12    the dams.

13            In 1899, an article was written expressing concern  
14    that the salmon were disappearing.  There were no dams at  
15    that time.

16            The fish count is higher now than it has been for  
17    several decades.  Breaching the dams is as beneficial as  
18    eliminating all flush toilets.  Is a trip back in time to the  
19    horse and buggy beneficial?  Would trips to the outhouse  
20    improve our culture?  Special interest groups with large bank  
21    accounts are trying to roll back the clock.

22            Don't destroy the dams.  Don't wash away fertile,  
23    productive farm ground and leave behind a barren dust bowl.  
24    Don't jam our crowded highways with hundreds more big trucks.  
25    Don't short out our electrical supply.  Don't muddy our

1 fishing water with years of silt. Don't breach the dams.

2 I would like for you to explain the energy effect.

3 Elaborate on the consequences or trickle down effect on the  
4 grid that removing 5 percent of the generation will initiate.

5 That's concern No. 1.

6 Concern No. 2, voltage stability. If you remove the  
7 four Snake River dams, voltage stability will be adversely  
8 affected. Could you justify that?

9 The Federal Energy Regulation Commission is thinking  
10 about deregulating power generation. That will have the same  
11 adverse effect as deregulating AT&T.

12 Thank you for your time. Thank you for your  
13 concerns.

14 ZANE CAREY:

15 I am Zane Carey, a retiree from Hanford.

16 My comments deal with the report. The report  
17 focuses on determining the effectiveness of certain measures  
18 in correcting the decline of salmon concentrations in the  
19 Snake River.

20 It seems the goal is broader. The real overall goal  
21 is to provide a certain number of salmon available to  
22 commercial and sports fishermen or, more correctly, a certain  
23 number of salmon affecting the nation's food supply. So  
24 first of all, we need to identify the importance of the  
25 salmon in the Snake River by its contribution to the broader

1 goal.

2           The cause of the decrease in fish population has  
3 many acknowledged sources, including overfishing in the  
4 rivers or ocean, increased predators, dams, streams, the  
5 pollution and on and on. The effect of eradication of one  
6 source is diminished by the presence of those sources still  
7 existing. And this is magnified when the source that we are  
8 talking about is upstream rather than downstream.

9           An example of this might be the effect of foreign  
10 fishing or overfishing in the ocean. If we have 100 fish  
11 before the first dam and, as the report states, we have 80  
12 after the fourth dam when we get downstream, let us say that  
13 the fishing by American fishermen accounts for only 50  
14 percent of the total take, then this means that only 10 of  
15 those fish are available to the American food supply. The  
16 other 10 go to foreigners.

17           Overfishing is one of my greatest concerns. Do we  
18 have any figures on the effect of foreign fishermen on the  
19 total fish available? Do we have any knowledge of the effect  
20 of nets in the Lower Columbia? Records of fish entering the  
21 ocean and those returning should give some information as to  
22 the trend and the ratio and some estimate of the effects of  
23 ocean fishing. The salmon population in undammed rivers  
24 should give some information concerning the effects of events  
25 in the ocean.

1           The Fraser River is a good example.

2           That's it.

3           HAROLD COX:

4           Yeah, I am Harold Cox.

5           I have spent a lifetime on the Yakima and Columbia  
6 and Snake River. I was born on the Yakima River. I'm an  
7 environmentalist, as most farmers are. If we didn't -- if we  
8 weren't environmentalists, we couldn't survive. It's worth a  
9 lot more to us to have fresh air and clean water than it is  
10 to others because we couldn't raise -- we couldn't make a  
11 living.

12           I'm here to speak for how it just seems like such a  
13 -- such a shame that we've spent my lifetime trying to  
14 develop the Pacific Northwest and now there is a proposal to  
15 tear the dams down and dry things up. It doesn't make any  
16 sense to me. I've been around 73 years and -- and it just  
17 seems like it would be terrible.

18           And another thing I would like to mention is that  
19 this problem was caused indirectly by our legislators  
20 through the Endangered Species Act. And I think they made a  
21 terrible mistake and it needs to be corrected and they're the  
22 only ones that can correct it. I wish this would be brought  
23 to their attention. I know they didn't mean to cause this  
24 turmoil on purpose and they did make a mistake and I would  
25 ask them that they look at this very, very strongly.

1 I can't think of --

2 Two or three years ago I couldn't imagine even  
3 discussing this subject, let alone having people testifying  
4 that it should come out. There are so many more problems  
5 with the salmon, the other predators down at the mouth of the  
6 river and our foreign predators out there with these big nets  
7 scooping 'em up.

8 Rivers that don't have dams in the state of  
9 Washington, the salmon count is down, as well. And there is  
10 other problems we got to look into.

11 I -- I -- I think that's all I have to say. Thank  
12 you.

13 JIM MATTHEWS:

14 Okay. My name is Jim Matthews. I am here today as a  
15 private citizen and a fisherman.

16 It's been interesting to listen to many of the  
17 comments today at this meeting and to hear some of the  
18 different viewpoints. I would like to bring forth my  
19 viewpoints today regarding the DEIA and the other papers.

20 I've been fishing in this area for a long time and  
21 I've looked at a lot of the information out there and heard a  
22 lot of what the biologists and other experts have talked  
23 about. It's been somewhat confusing at times because there  
24 is a lot of information out there, but I would like to speak  
25 about it.

1           One particular fish on the Snake River that seems to  
2 me is a good example of one of the problems, the Snake River  
3 fall Chinook, are right next door to the Hanford River --  
4 Hanford Reach fall Chinook, and yet the Hanford Reach Chinook  
5 are doing well and the Snake River fall Chinook are doing  
6 terribly. At least with that run, it appears that breaching  
7 the Snake River dams is the best thing to do. And for that  
8 reason, I do support the Alternative 4 and the breaching of  
9 the Snake River dams.

10           I also believe that there needs to be a lot of work  
11 on the other factors, the other Hs that are affecting the  
12 stocks. If we're going to bring these fish back, there is  
13 going to need to be a concerted effort to look at all of the  
14 impacts and deal with all the impacts on these fish.

15           I agree with some of the discussion that there is  
16 probably no silver bullet in this issue, and that we're all  
17 going to have to work together on this to make these fish --  
18 bring these fish back.

19           In closing, I support Alternative 4, the breaching  
20 of the Snake River dams, and also support further study on  
21 the John Day Pool drawdown.

22           Thank you.

23           VIC PARKS:

24           My name is Vic Parks. I spent several years working  
25 for NMFS and I was also a commercial fisherman for five

1 years.

2 I have been a sports fisherman all my life, so I  
3 have been on all sides of this fishing issue. I am pretty  
4 well-rounded. And I think the breaching of the dams is about  
5 the craziest damned thing I have ever heard.

6 I think in doing so we would probably be very  
7 detrimental to the salmon we've got left because they've  
8 evolved in an ecosystem with dams in place. And breaching  
9 that is going to change the ecosystem, which means they will  
10 have to change their migration patterns and times and  
11 everything. Plus it's going to create a heck of a sediment  
12 problem.

13 The problem with the fishery is complex. I think  
14 the main problem lies in offshore ocean fishery. I know when  
15 I was a commercial fisherman there was a tremendous amount of  
16 foreign vessels out there, big vessels. And one-fifth of the  
17 world's supply of fish is in American waters, and so fishing  
18 in American waters is a big deal. And in the other  
19 countries -- Asian countries -- fishing is a main livelihood  
20 for them. Americans don't eat fish. We don't value fish  
21 like the Asians.

22 So the species that they're claiming as most  
23 endangered are also species that in the ocean school tightly,  
24 which makes it easy for the net fisheries to target them,  
25 which I feel is one of the reasons we can't sustain adequate

1 runs of 'em.

2 As I stated in the beginning, I worked for NMFS and  
3 I know from having worked with them, NMFS' stand and comments  
4 come out of the Portland office. The Portland office does  
5 not have any biologists. I worked in the field with  
6 biologists who got extremely frustrated at trying to get  
7 truthful information out because it was always edited and put  
8 out as what is politically correct at the time in order to  
9 maintain funding, so NMFS' stand is not always what  
10 biologists are saying. It's what lawyers want the public to  
11 know.

12 And I guess I am limited on time, so I bring it to a  
13 close.

14 LINDA SAMPSON:

15 My name is Linda Sampson, X939, member of the  
16 Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation.

17 Today's comments are on breaching of the dams, the  
18 Lower Snake area. And the one article that I would like to  
19 read that comes from the statutes of the Confederated Tribes,  
20 our treaty with the Walla Walla Cayuse 1855, June 9, ratified  
21 March 8, 1859.

22 "Proclaimed April 11, 1859. We ceded our lands,  
23 title and claim to all and every part of the country included  
24 within our boundaries which commence at the mouth of the Out  
25 of Two canyon, run hence to its source easterly along the

1 summit of the Blue Mountains' southern boundaries and  
2 (inaudible) of the Nez Perce; easterly along the boundaries  
3 of the western limits of the country and claimed by the  
4 Shawnee and the Snakes; hence, southerly along the boundary  
5 being the waters of the Powder River to the source of the  
6 Powder River; hence, the headwaters of Willow Creek, down to  
7 the Columbia, up the channel of the Columbia to the lower end  
8 of the large island below the mouth of the Umatilla."

9 All of these areas are what we're talking about.  
10 These are our ceded homelands that we gave up for the one  
11 thing that's listed farther in this article, which would take  
12 a long time to read.

13 "Provided also that the exclusive right of taking  
14 fish in the streams running through and bordering said  
15 reservation is hereby secured to said Indians and all other  
16 usual and accustomed stations in common with citizens of the  
17 United States and of erecting suitable buildings for curing  
18 the same. The privilege of hunting, gathering roots and  
19 berries and pasturizing their stock on unclaimed land in  
20 common with citizens is also secured to them." These are  
21 articles -- Article 1 from the treaty of 1855.

22 This is not an issue of beyond the obligations of  
23 the United States to make sure that they've fulfilled their  
24 obligation to us.

25 It's true manifest destiny to see the irony of now I

1 look at all these non-Indians that have sustained their  
2 culture and their livelihoods based on irrigation and farming  
3 through all of these areas that we're talking about and now  
4 the threat is now placed upon them and it's good for me to  
5 see this today. Even though there is a lot of hate in this  
6 room, I'm in true awe of watching other people have their  
7 livelihoods and their preservation of their lives put on the  
8 line.

9           For once, I think we might have an understanding  
10 between both societies.

11           Thank you. I'm done.

12           SHAWN LIRIGNANO:

13           -- a citizen. I'm not here for any group or  
14 organization.

15           I am strongly against the breaching of the dams. I  
16 believe it will cause more harm than good. I also believe  
17 that there are probably some organizations or -- I'll get the  
18 right word out here -- some industries that would promote  
19 breaching of the dams that would benefit from it and I  
20 believe these two industries are the railroad and the  
21 trucking industry. The railroad being the primary  
22 beneficiary of the breaching of the dams because of the use  
23 of shipping grains to the market from the farms. And again,  
24 I'm -- I really believe this is something that might want to  
25 be looked into.

1           I believe there are probably some false studies,  
2     some false -- some things that have been falsified in  
3     recording the -- I'll get it out -- in recording data from  
4     tests being done. I believe it's been done in the past and I  
5     believe it's been done here.

6           And we really can't do a whole lot about that, but  
7     all we can do is look at the best options. And I do not  
8     believe breaching the dams is the best option. I believe  
9     there are other ways.

10           I haven't looked at the paperwork yet. I plan on  
11     looking at that in the next couple of days here and hopefully  
12     I will get a chance to vote on it. And let's stand behind  
13     our dams and keep 'em in place.

14           FRANK WILLIAMS:

15           I'm Frank Williams. I belong to a STEP  
16     organization, salmon, trout and (inaudible) program in Coos  
17     Bay, Coos River STEP. It's one of the most successful on the  
18     West Coast.

19           We have more or less a natural enhancement just as  
20     close to the wild as you can possibly be. We have taken that  
21     fish and the eggs from the fish and we get over 80 percent  
22     spawn where, you know, in the wild, less than 20 percent.  
23     And not only that, when we take care of 'em, they don't have  
24     a chance of this high water washing 'em out to sea like they  
25     did this last year.

1           The survival rates and stuff coming back say maybe  
2    2, 3 percent, sometimes 4 percent, according to what they  
3    are, what species it is. We have a real good return. Last  
4    year, in 1997, the ODF&W, we had a three million release  
5    program. They cut us back to 500,000 because they said NMFS  
6    would not let hatchery fish go in the same stream where there  
7    might be a wild fish.

8           In our area there is no such thing as a wild fish.  
9    And I don't know in the state of Oregon, according to most of  
10   the biologists that I have talked to either, the retiring  
11   ones that wasn't afraid to speak up, said that there will be  
12   DNA of Oregon hatchery in just about any fish in the ocean.  
13   Talking to commercial fishermen, they say two out of three  
14   are hatchery fish that's caught out there.

15           I don't know what the answer is here. I don't -- it  
16   seems like to me they're more worried about control of your  
17   land than they are worried about having salmon.

18           The 4-D rules -- I have been to public comment  
19   meetings on them and they don't tell us about the fines.  
20   They don't talk about predator control. There is a lot of --  
21   a lot more issues that they should be covering.

22           And not only that, when NMFS gives a meeting,  
23   they're not giving you the full story. And sometimes it goes  
24   from -- the stories change, like, from 300-foot buffer zones  
25   to from -- one meeting in Gold Beach to now, they say today

1 here at this here meeting here they say, no, not going to be  
2 any buffer zones. So it is hard to believe and hard to  
3 trust. The reliability -- their liability is -- lacks our  
4 trust as being a public.

5 Much of the information that I got from a book from  
6 the NMFS was information that was outdated in that book, so I  
7 don't know how they can come up with some of the things  
8 they're coming up with they're telling us it's good for us.

9 The Division of State Lands in Oregon is in charge  
10 of the beaches where they sand in and they won't allow us to  
11 clean 'em out, so the sea lions are eating the salmon right  
12 on the beach.

13 And that pretty much sums it up.

14 KAY P. METZ:

15 My name is Kay P. Metz. I reside in Kennewick,  
16 Washington.

17 I have been a resident of the Tri-Cities. I came  
18 here in 1943 and I have seen the waterways and all the rivers  
19 before any of the dams were in. When the dams went in, in  
20 most cases the fishing has got better.

21 And as far as the Snake River dams, it's provided  
22 good times for steelheading; that I have caught many of 'em  
23 over the years and salmon.

24 And I have seen what it's done for the farmers, the  
25 irrigators, the jobs it's created. And I will tell you I do

1 not want to go back to the way it was back in those days  
2 because it was nothing but a dust bowl, rattlesnakes and a  
3 real mess.

4           There is a lot of things that need to be done on  
5 fish hatcheries that were never put in by the federal  
6 government. We've still got the offshore netting that is  
7 taking millions of fish. Foreign countries, we need to put  
8 an immediate stop on that.

9           We've got the netting up and down the river, which I  
10 made many a trips down and they're netting all kinds of fish.  
11 They're taking sturgeon, steelhead and salmon.

12           Those nets, if you want to get real -- we're not  
13 killing off spotted owls or we're not shooting bald eagles.  
14 We need to maybe treat it the same way on the fish. Put a  
15 moratorium on it for a year. But to tear the dams out, to  
16 wipe out jobs, to promote possible flooding and to also  
17 promote the silting and the permanent destruction that that  
18 would do is absolutely ludicrous, and I am totally opposed to  
19 it.

20           I think that I will go on the record as saying that  
21 people are much more important than fish. And I'm all in  
22 favor of doing what we can to restore the fish runs, but  
23 absolutely not tearing out the dams.

24           Thank you.

25           JIM KLEIST:

1           Hi. My name is Jim Kleist, and I'm -- let's see. I  
2 work with an industry that requires a large amount of  
3 relatively inexpensive electricity. We have 170 employees.  
4 It's Columbia Cold Store. We're a cold storage distribution  
5 warehouse. I'm also a father of four and a fly fisherman who  
6 believes in catching and release.

7           In looking at all of the different issues presented  
8 by the Corps and NMFS, one of the things that comes to my  
9 mind is there are no easy solutions to this very complex  
10 problem, but one of the solutions that I feel is unacceptable  
11 at this time is the dam breaching. And that's not a solution  
12 that I think needs to be addressed until some other matters  
13 are taken into consideration such as the harvest, habitat,  
14 the 4-D proposal in its entirety.

15           I think we need to take a common sense look at this  
16 entire problem. And before we look for the single little  
17 thing that can save it or the single big thing to take the  
18 dams down, everything is fine, that's not proven. I think  
19 there is a lot of scientific question on it.

20           And I think the Corps continues and the NMFS needs  
21 to continue to study the issue closely and pay very, very  
22 close attention to the harvest. Why are we killing an  
23 endangered species? I have a hard time explaining that one  
24 to my kids.

25           That's basically it. Thank you.

1                   CHRIS KLEIST:

2                   Hello. My name is Chris Kleist and I live in  
3 Richland, Washington. I am thirteen years old.

4                   I believe that destroying the dams is -- on  
5 scientific grounds that it's relatively unstable. There is  
6 no proof whatsoever that within any reason this will restore  
7 the salmon runs permanently. 45 years it will take to see  
8 any changes whatsoever to the runs. And even then, we're not  
9 sure if it was worth what we gave up.

10                  It would destroy the entire economy of the Columbia  
11 Basin and Snake Basin and it is very risky. Floods, deaths,  
12 electricity would go up. And many people do not understand  
13 what will happen, but it will affect everybody here.

14                  Water is the source of life and you cannot value  
15 salmon over people. People are more important than -- in  
16 God's eyes than salmon ever will be.

17                  And salmon are not the only source of life that  
18 there is. There is farming to think of and I believe the  
19 farming is nutritious for the body, obviously. And just  
20 killing the salmon based on -- killing the dams based on  
21 proof that doesn't really exist, it could have been  
22 fabricated partially, is illogical and irrational.

23                  And really, I think it's just not worth it. Even if  
24 it did help -- I am a fisherman. I think I would love to see  
25 lots of salmon and stuff and I have caught salmon and

1 steelhead and it brings me joy, but I do not think that just  
2 anything as massive as this would help and it would not be  
3 worth it.

4 That's my two cents. Thank you.

5 TYLER HANSELL:

6 Hi. My name is Tyler Hansell, and I am from  
7 Hermiston, Oregon. I want to thank you for this opportunity.

8 It will be of great interest how this meeting will  
9 be reported in the press. Will it be on the emotional side,  
10 the science side or the economic side or parts of all three?

11 The old computer models without scientific proof  
12 showed the dams hurt downstream migration of the juvenile  
13 fish. Now with pit tag data and improvements for juvenile  
14 fish passage at dams proved that dam removal will have no  
15 impact up or down for juvenile survival.

16 If you want to shut the power off to the states of  
17 Idaho, Montana, Wyoming and Utah and replace it with burning  
18 fossil fuel and increased carbon dioxide to add to the  
19 greenhouse effect or maybe atomic power, if we don't want to  
20 have river transportation, if we don't want industry and  
21 great communities in the area, if we don't want to have river  
22 recreation, if we don't want any irrigation for the greatest  
23 generation of farming that the world has ever seen, breach  
24 the dams.

25 We can have a commercial and sports fishing

1 industry. We can have tribal religions and culture. Why  
2 can't we work as one and work on tributary restoration and  
3 habitat recovery?

4 The ultimate and underlying goal is the federal  
5 government take care of the 17 Western states. If it is not  
6 breaching of the dams, it will be NMFS' 4-D rules. Divided,  
7 we fall; united, we win. We have to be united.

8 Thank you.

9 MATT ERICKSON:

10 Hi, my name is Matt Erickson. I'm 13 years old.

11 And I believe that tearing down the dams would be a  
12 bad idea, especially since they provide electrical power to a  
13 good portion of the state. They enable a lot of commercial  
14 traffic that would have to be done instead with fuel and very  
15 costly trucks and such.

16 I just forgot what I was going to say.

17 Well, that's my two cents.

18 COLETTE CASEY:

19 My name is Colette Casey and I am just here on my  
20 own as a member of the public.

21 And I am glad that the organizations came here today  
22 for us to talk because we are one of the most directly  
23 affected communities in this decision.

24 I am very concerned that the whole salmon  
25 restoration issue has turned only to breaching of dams. I am

1 concerned also over the disparity between the Marine  
2 Fisheries rules on East Coast Atlantic salmon versus our West  
3 Coast Pacific salmon.

4           It's my understanding that the East Coast Atlantic  
5 salmon counts the hatchery as well as the wild salmon;  
6 whereas on the West Coast, they're separated out between wild  
7 and hatchery. That's not being done. Those who say that  
8 salmon will be extinct, I believe, are grandstanding. Salmon  
9 hatchery fish are doing great.

10           I think a great example of how well the salmon are  
11 being managed is by the Yakama Nation Hatchery, Reese and the  
12 Umatillas. My point is you have separated salmon into two  
13 categories, wild versus hatchery, when you have not done that  
14 with other fish across the nation.

15           If you are interested in salmon restoration, you  
16 need to look at the reasons for decline. No. 1, Rice Island,  
17 a man-made island that is home to over 8,000 breeding pair of  
18 Caspian terns. These terns eat close to five million  
19 juvenile salmon every single year.

20           No. 2, fishing. I grew up in Florida. The  
21 alligator was on the endangered list. Nobody could go near  
22 it, but here we continue to hunt the wild salmon.

23           Up until the late 1970s what was the main staple of  
24 meat for America was steak. With the advent of health clubs  
25 in the '80s and more health conscious diets, seafood has taken

1 a huge leap in popularity.

2 Also, what other endangered species is allowed to be  
3 hunted on its way to its breeding ground? I have to really  
4 ask that question.

5 The other item for decline, I believe, is ocean  
6 currents. And I think that's evidenced that in 1920 when all  
7 the salmon canneries were closed because there were no salmon  
8 to process and the dams were not in place at this time.  
9 This, of course, is correlated with the most famous ocean  
10 current story, which is the Titanic. At the same time as our  
11 salmon canneries were closing, large icebergs were coming  
12 down further south than they ever had before in April, which  
13 was not the normal time for iceberg migration.

14 So the ocean is a living, breathing entity and I  
15 think that we need to take that into consideration and it  
16 should be researched.

17 So here's my suggestions. I have never wanted to  
18 make a complaint without a suggestion. Remove Rice Island.  
19 Don't relocate the terns. My four-year-old knows where to go  
20 for dinner every single night and these birds will return.  
21 Remove the island. It was man-made to begin with. Dig it up  
22 and spread it out.

23 No. 2, limit fishing during the Pacific Decadal  
24 Oscillation period and stop hunting endangered species on the  
25 way to their breeding grounds.

1           As a side note, I find it interesting that the same  
2 groups that support dam breaching are also the ones fighting  
3 dredging due to increased silt transportation. Let's not  
4 screw up the river. Let's keep the things in perspective and  
5 let's do something about the salmon runs.

6           TIM REISENAUER:

7           My name is Tim Reisenauer. I'm a native of the  
8 Tri-Cities area.

9           And I'd like to know if it's been -- whether anybody  
10 has given an alternative to the Indians whether they would  
11 like to have their fish or whether they would like to have  
12 their casinos, power for the casinos.

13           I would also like to know why the people in other  
14 parts of the country have not been told the whole truth. I  
15 have talked to people from Texas and people from back East,  
16 and they're just hearing the -- all they hear is breach the  
17 dams. They don't hear what's actually going on with our  
18 agriculture industry and other industries that would be taken  
19 out with the breaching of the dams.

20           There is alternatives. Use 'em.

21           Thank you.

22           CAROL CRAIG:

23           My name is Carol Craig. I am a Yakama tribal  
24 member.

25           Through the tribal generations and since the

1 beginning of time, traditional environmental knowledge has  
2 taught us that economic activities in natural systems should  
3 further conservation and/or restoration at the same time that  
4 the resources are being extracted. There is no doubt in our  
5 minds about the need for harmonious existence between humans  
6 and nature.

7           Since the arrival of nontribal people, our main  
8 resource and way of life, salmon, have been decimated from  
9 millions to mere thousands today. As a Yakama tribal member,  
10 I urge you to help us restore the salmon runs.

11           Most here today are nervous about breaching dams and  
12 saying many lives will be disrupted. I know. I understand,  
13 because nothing stays the same forever and there have been  
14 many tribal people's lives disrupted continually since your  
15 arrival.

16           Today now more than ever there needs to be change if  
17 the salmon are to survive in this harsh world. If fish are  
18 continually degraded and become extinct, then what we were  
19 taught as children will prevail. And that's when the creator  
20 placed us on this part of the earth, he instructed us how to  
21 care for the resources so they could take care of us and if  
22 these resources ever disappeared, then we, too, as a people  
23 will disappear.

24           But it's difficult for nontribal people to  
25 understand how fish and people could disappear at the same

1 time. But salmon is central to our lives and our reverence  
2 for nature inspired ceremonies to express our response to a  
3 benevolent creator.

4 I urge you today to help the salmon and the  
5 important consideration for breaching the Lower Snake River  
6 dams. Treaty rights are absolute in describing the values  
7 tribes attached to natural resources. We have practiced a  
8 natural sustained yield conservation since the beginning of  
9 time, a time without liabilities of federal, state and local  
10 laws, and without numerous private entities waving best  
11 science solutions to take us further from natural  
12 progression.

13 Tribes are concerned about the ways in which  
14 nontribal people interpret and implement their own human  
15 laws. The Endangered Species Act was legislated, then  
16 challenged by everyone from the former president on down to  
17 the man on the street. Greater concern arises from the East  
18 in which compromises result in the political forums like  
19 today. Expedience to satisfy social personal wants replaces  
20 the best science originally intended to guide public policy.

21 Tribal people are here to represent a cultural  
22 history. Some are here to represent a contemporary story.  
23 Your economic goals and practical knowledge places us on the  
24 threshold of prosperity or poverty. Who shall prosper? Who  
25 has prospered?

1           The Yakima River in the last few years has had fall  
2 Chinook and coho returning for the first time in well over 30  
3 years and everyone, not just tribal people, got to fish. But  
4 these are tough times requiring gifted minds and great  
5 hearts.

6           And I thank you.

7           DAVID MCDONALD:

8           I'm David McDonald.

9           I support saving salmon and preserving the dams.  
10 With a little common sense, we can do both.

11           We're deceiving ourselves if we think breaching the  
12 dams on the Snake River is going to save the salmon. The  
13 dismal returns for salmon are not unique in the Columbia and  
14 Snake rivers. Most rivers and streams from Oregon to Alaska  
15 are experiencing depressed escapements of spawning salmon.

16           Whether it's Lake Ozette sockeye in Washington, Gold  
17 River coho in Vancouver Island or Chinook coho and sockeye in  
18 the Skeena River, the salmon stocks are depressed. At one  
19 time the Skeena River supported 18 salmon canneries. Today  
20 there are none.

21           There are no dams on the Skeena and there are no  
22 fish in the Skeena River. There are literally hundreds of  
23 salmon streams and rivers on the B.C. coast, almost all of  
24 them, including the Skeena and the Fraser, are dam free, yet  
25 there is a salmon crises with B.C.

1                   According to an article in the Vancouver Sun, the  
2 B.C. coho stocks that once supported one of North American's  
3 greatest sports and commercial salmon fishery have all but  
4 been wiped out. The severe decline in the salmon stocks on  
5 the B.C. coast caused Canada's fisheries minister, David  
6 Anderson, to shut down the coho fisheries in May of 1998.

7                   What's happening to the salmon? According to a  
8 noted scientist at the University of British Columbia, there  
9 are serious problems with the ocean. One of them stated the  
10 ocean is going wrong big time. Others believe that the  
11 collapse of the salmon fishery is due to overfishing of not  
12 only salmon but also the food stock such as herring.

13                   Mr. Polly, a noted scientist at the University of  
14 British Columbia, stated that if present exploitation  
15 patterns continue in the oceans of the world, in 25 years,  
16 the only fish in the sea will be jelly fish and krill.

17                   To save the salmon, we need to develop a holistic  
18 approach that involves looking at more than just dams. Okay.  
19 We need to study the whole life cycle of the salmon. Not  
20 only should we make improvements to the dams, but we should  
21 severely curtail fishing and aggressively manage predators.  
22 Without curtailing fishing and keeping salmon predators in  
23 check, we will lose the salmon.

24                   We need to follow the example of the Canadians who  
25 have embarked on a recovery program for salmon in their

1 country by limiting fishing and working with the Alaskans to  
2 limit fishing. Within the last two years, the runs on the  
3 Skeena River have increased significantly and it's been  
4 attributed to the fishing restrictions that have been placed  
5 upon fishing in that country.

6 I do not support Alternative 4 of the DEIS. It  
7 should be rejected and we should seriously look into  
8 eliminating salmon fishing and managing the predators that  
9 prey on salmon. If we fail to do these things, no amount of  
10 dam removal will save the salmon.

11 I cut a whole bunch out.

12 Thank you.

13 HANK WERNER:

14 My name is Hank Werner, W-E-R-N-E-R, and I am here  
15 to comment on the All-H Paper and the Corps' DEIS.

16 I am no expert certainly on the issue of preserving  
17 and restoring the salmon, but I have lived in Oregon for the  
18 past two decades and thought frequently about the issue and  
19 read the material available to lay people. Based on this  
20 information, it is my firm belief that we must make the  
21 dramatic steps necessary that are sure or reasonably sure to  
22 restore the salmon to their past standard.

23 These steps would include removing the four Snake  
24 River dams or the certainty strikes me as being that that  
25 will be the end of all the Snake River coho. And that what

1 we will have left behind for our descendants is sort of a wet  
2 freeway where nothing much grows but things are able to move  
3 well up and down.

4 For those -- or to those who say that breaching the  
5 dams will cost jobs, I would say that trading the certainty  
6 of salmon extinction from the Columbia-Snake River system for  
7 the uncertainty of jobs here now doesn't make sense. If the  
8 last 25 years should have taught anything, it is that there  
9 is no such thing as a certain good paying job.

10 For example, once upon a time, I was an American  
11 steel worker. Once upon a time, I drove a flatbed truck to  
12 Gary, Indiana, for coil and sheet steel. Once upon a time,  
13 my father built cranes and power shovels for Caring in  
14 Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Once upon a time, my aunt and uncle  
15 were small dairy farmers and so on and on.

16 I am saying that we should not assume that keeping  
17 the dams in place at the price of the salmon will mean that  
18 the whole Eastern Washington economy will be healthy. The  
19 businesses, ranches, barging, farms, logging, et cetera, will  
20 continue to grow in the foreseeable future. There is -- that  
21 is not a certainty with the dams.

22 Based on the past 25 years, we can only say that  
23 there is a really high probability, if not a certainty, that  
24 the salmon will be gone at the end of the next 25.

25 Thank you.

1 R. THOMAS MACKAY:

2 My name is Rex Thomas MacKay. I am representing  
3 myself and also I am president of Columbia Snake River  
4 Irrigators Association.

5 My comments are to all of the above agencies: The  
6 Army Corps of Engineers, the National Marine Fisheries, U.S.  
7 Fish & Wildlife, Bonneville Power and to the U.S. Bureau of  
8 Reclamation.

9 A review of the draft EIS prepared by the Army Corps  
10 of Engineers suggests that dam breaching is a very iffy  
11 approach to salmon recovery with enormous costs and risks.  
12 Dam breaching is only more effective if delayed mortality in  
13 the Columbia River estuary and the ocean is solely attributed  
14 to hydro system transportation and passage as opposed to  
15 ocean and other conditions playing a factor. Transportation  
16 is showing low mortality and known improvements to that  
17 system will only improve migrant survival. The data  
18 collected indicate that current transportation survival is  
19 high and that dam breaching may not improve Snake River  
20 spring migrant flows, and will not improve them as compared  
21 against the transportation option.

22 In the study, the costs associated with dam  
23 breaching have been understated by 50 to 75 million dollars.  
24 First and foremost is the underestimated costs associated  
25 with replacing the power generated by the four Snake River

1 dams. The Northwest Power Planning Council, BPA and other  
2 forecasting agencies see a need for additional generating  
3 resources within the next five years. Replacing this  
4 hydropower with thermal or renewable generation sources will  
5 be very costly.

6 A comparison of 1999 versus 1998 natural gas costs  
7 show that domestic and Canadian natural gas prices on WACOG  
8 and FERC increasing approximately 20 percent in 1999.  
9 Current renewable generation sources are over 30 percent  
10 higher than hydro.

11 Recreation benefits of the natural river are also  
12 greatly overstated. The survey used for developing these  
13 benefits was flawed. Long-time residents remember a Lower  
14 Snake River before the dams not conducive to the increased  
15 recreational activities shown in the draft EIS.

16 Some of the advocates for breaching want more than  
17 salmon recovery. They want to control the use of water. Dam  
18 breaching is very speculative and this debate over dams has  
19 taken resources away from effective restoration.

20 Thank you.

21 SUE MILLER:

22 I am Sue Miller. Washington state president of  
23 Women Involved in Farm Economics. My husband, Wilbert, and I  
24 recently retired as irrigated farmers in the Columbia Basin  
25 project at Othello.

1           Women Involved in Farm Economics or WIFE is a grass  
2 roots agricultural women's organization with the mission to  
3 improve profitability in production agriculture through  
4 education, legislative, communicative and cooperative  
5 efforts. WIFE's policy states, "WIFE requests that before  
6 instituting any new rule affecting farmers, the government  
7 analyze the benefits as compared to jobs lost, food  
8 production capacity eliminated and damage to farmers."

9           The reason I was asked to appear today by our  
10 national president, Mary Schuler, on behalf of national WIFE  
11 is to express our thoughts and concerns with the All-H Paper.

12           The issue is saving salmon. We support that  
13 mission. Dam breaching is not the issue and we oppose any  
14 consideration of that option.

15           Through improved technology and cooperation, we can  
16 have both fish and dams. If we can put man on the moon, then  
17 we have the intelligence and the ability to develop ways of  
18 getting fish downstream and upstream. Science has  
19 demonstrated there are methods working today. Barging smolts  
20 downriver and with fish bypasses, we are seeing large numbers  
21 getting out to sea. Fish ladders are working to assist  
22 adults in returning to spawning grounds.

23           There are efforts in trying to improve these systems  
24 to have higher survival rates, and we endorse those efforts.  
25 We just need more fish to use these systems.

1           We are seeing reports of numbers increasing, not  
2 decreasing. Why don't we have more fish using these systems?  
3 Our perception is that ocean conditions are playing a huge  
4 part in the salmon population numbers. Overharvesting in the  
5 ocean and nets dragging the floor of the ocean disturbing the  
6 food supply, plus climate conditions, are factors in the low  
7 population numbers.

8           Harvesting in the river system also plays a role in  
9 what is happening to salmon. When other species are found to  
10 be endangered and then the Endangered Species Act has totally  
11 shut down all activity around the species. The timber  
12 industry was devastated over the spotted owl and the eagle  
13 listing. Then why don't we shut off the harvest of salmon  
14 until the numbers rebound?

15           Reports estimate that it will take up to 30 years  
16 for the fish to recover if the dams are to be breached. What  
17 would five years of nonharvesting do? My farm background and  
18 everyday experiences working with nature and the environment  
19 tells me that we would see larger numbers return if  
20 harvesting was not allowed for a short period of time.

21           Those who think they cannot live without salmon  
22 could survive on farm-raised salmon. I would rather make  
23 sacrifices for five years compared to 30 years.

24           It is unknown if breaching of the dams will help  
25 salmon recover. Science does show that dam breaching will

1 have a harmful impact on the overall ecosystem of the river.  
2 Silt will cover up spawning beds. We will see loss of other  
3 species of fish and wildlife, loss of wetlands and other  
4 populations.

5 We must all work together and have a comprehensive  
6 plan if we expect a solution to salmon recovery.

7 PERRY KELLY:

8 Hello. My name is Perry Kelly, and I am from  
9 Tri-Cities and I teach here at one of the local high schools.

10 And when I think about the dam issue and what's  
11 really at stake and what people are looking for sometimes, I  
12 think that maybe there is this -- this idea of Lewis & Clark.

13 I remember when I used to go hiking, I would be out  
14 in the Gifford Pinchot Wilderness Area or whatever wilderness  
15 area I was in at the time and that feeling of being alone and  
16 the only one in the world and the forest is yours. And, of  
17 course, then another hiker comes along and makes you realize  
18 that, no, there are other people in the world.

19 And when I look at the dam breaching, I think that  
20 there are some people who have that idea about nature and  
21 would like to return us back to that. I don't think it's  
22 possible with the amount of people that we have in the world  
23 right now, so I am not for breaching the dams and I would ask  
24 you to consider not to do so.

25 As far as with the impact, one of the things that I

1 haven't really heard, and I had hoped somebody would think  
2 about, would be what about the impact on human lives? How  
3 many people have not been killed in highway accidents because  
4 we've been able to have barges? And yet when we increase the  
5 number of traffic on a highway that's not created for it even  
6 if we add another lane, it's not going to be enough. How  
7 many people are going to die on that highway because we think  
8 that maybe possibly we might have some kind of effect on the  
9 fish?

10 I don't think that it's a reasonable thing to even  
11 challenge or, you know, make it more likely that one person  
12 would even die if we don't even know for sure whether we're  
13 going to be helping the fish out. I think it's an  
14 unreasonable thing to do.

15 The amount of damage to our environment and things  
16 like that by taking out the dams and having increased traffic  
17 on highways and railroads are also things that will  
18 negatively impact it, and I don't think we should consider  
19 that at this point.

20 One minute. Okay.

21 So anyway, I would like you to think about that a  
22 little bit. Not that that's the only thing, but it's  
23 certainly important, human life is.

24 As far as species by stream and saying that the  
25 salmon are endangered, I really question that and I certainly

1 would ask you to rethink your science and look more into the  
2 oceanographic studies or at least make some.

3 Thank you.

4 GEORGE STOLTZ:

5 My name is George Stoltz. I'm from Kennewick,  
6 Washington. I'm here on my own behalf but I am speaking for  
7 14 to 16 of our additional farming neighbors that couldn't be  
8 here tonight.

9 We are against the breaching of the dams. We are  
10 for increasing the hatchery of salmon to increase the amount  
11 of salmon available. We think the breaching of the dams  
12 would be a detriment to the economic well-being of the  
13 Columbia Basin. It would extremely degrade or actually  
14 possibly eliminate all irrigated farming that is presently  
15 done in support of feeding the world population.

16 We think the salmon issue is actually a hoax. If  
17 the salmon issue and the quantity of salmon available were  
18 actually the priority that is being spoken, then the  
19 gill-netting on the Columbia River -- the salmon hunting  
20 season opened up in Yakima this year for the first time in  
21 probably 30 or 40 years -- would not be happening. The gill  
22 net extensions that are allowed on the trawlers out in the  
23 Pacific within the costal waters of Washington would not have  
24 been increased in '99. All these things point to the salmon  
25 not being the issue on the breaching of the dams.

1                   We would like to hear some other explanation as to  
2 why these dams should be removed when they were placed on  
3 this river to improve the quality of life, control the flood  
4 waters so that we had less loss of life, as history has shown  
5 in the past, and also an abundant supply of electricity.

6                   And that's all I have got to say.

7                   TERRY BANTA:

8                   Yeah, my name is Terry Banta, and I live in Franklin  
9 County. I have lived in Franklin County since 1979.

10                  My opinion on this breaching of the dam thing is I  
11 am kind of against it because, one, they need to do more  
12 studies of other options, hatcheries and stuff like that.  
13 You know, stuff where they have the technology to clone, why  
14 don't they clone fish? I mean, they've cloned practically  
15 everything else.

16                  But more separate science looks need to be made.  
17 Looks into different avenues of approaches, not necessarily  
18 just breaching the dams and putting the economic hardship  
19 onto one section of the country or one industry.

20                  Agriculture is dependent on cheap power. I have a  
21 father-in-law who is a wheat farmer, and if he had to pay  
22 more for pumping water and like that, he would be out of  
23 business. Farmers in this area run a fine line between  
24 profit and loss. And unless the government wants to spend  
25 hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out all the farmers, I

1 mean, otherwise, they will lose a lot just in the area.

2 And economic impact, it might not seem a bad idea,  
3 but there is more than just economics involved. They need to  
4 take a look at other scientific options available.

5 And that concludes my comment.

6 LYNN JENSEN:

7 Hello. My name is Lynn Jensen.

8 I would like to place my comment on the public  
9 record for saving our dams. I don't see, from what  
10 information that I have been able to garner and gather for  
11 the last little while, that it makes any economical or  
12 ecological sense. What I have been able to discover, with  
13 the breaching of the dams you would have the silt coming down  
14 the river. We'd have a dead river for four or five years,  
15 not to count the amount of time at which it would take to  
16 allow the fish to come back and breed.

17 We've spent millions of dollars trying to  
18 reestablish salmon runs in the Yakima River, only to turn  
19 around and kill 'em again if we bring the silt down the other  
20 rivers and smother it.

21 I have also heard of some of the sediment that's  
22 sitting behind the McNary Pool, that if that silt is allowed  
23 to come down and to change the current channels that there  
24 will be chromium brought back into the ecology of the area.  
25 I'm not sure that we want to bring that heavy metal back up

1 to the surface.

2           What I have read about the problems with the salmon  
3 going up or down the river, what I have heard put out by the  
4 environmentalists, I have not heard anything positive that  
5 it's going to save anything, that they are accomplishing  
6 anything. On the contrary, I have read information that the  
7 dams may actually be allowing more fish up the river and  
8 providing them predator-free migration up to where they need  
9 to be. Most of what I have determined from my studies is a  
10 lot of it is loss of habitat. And why don't we concentrate  
11 on replacing the habitat which has been lost?

12           I think I will end my comments on that. Thank you.

13           ED HEUBACH:

14           My name is Ed Heubach. I live in Richland,  
15 Washington. I have lived in the Tri-Cities area for  
16 approximately 23 years and I believe the Northwest is one of  
17 the most beautiful parts of the country.

18           I know that the dams on the Columbia and Snake River  
19 serve a lot of different purposes, power production, flood  
20 control. I know they pose an obstacle to the passage of  
21 fish. The Grand Coulee Dam certainly allows no salmon up  
22 past it ever since it was built.

23           And fish ladders are a partial solution to fish  
24 passage, but I think, on balance, the dams do far more good  
25 than harm. And I believe that the target of dams for

1 removal, partial or complete removal, is a political option  
2 rather than a serious economic one or one that will really  
3 save salmon.

4 Without restoration of habitat, without maintaining  
5 some balance on the fish catch for what's available,  
6 regulating the dams or tearing down the dams is really an  
7 incomplete option. I believe they're being picked on because  
8 they're there. And their license is up for renewal and if  
9 they can't be renewed, then maybe people say then we can tear  
10 them down.

11 So that's my case. And I say keep the dams, at  
12 least for the time being.

13 Thank you.

14 ELDON LADD:

15 My name is Eldon Ladd. I am the author of a  
16 steelhead book that was published in 1998 and I am a  
17 fisherman.

18 I'm against breaching the dams and I would like  
19 answers to my following questions before further considering  
20 the breaching.

21 My questions are: What is your plan to get to  
22 delisting and when? Secondly, what is your plan for each  
23 specific ESU? Thirdly, do you have any analysis or recovery  
24 plan for each ESU? Fourth, is the allocation of the recovery  
25 burden broken down and shared by each of the four Hs:

1 Habitat, hydro, hatcheries and harvest? Next, can you show  
2 an equitable share of the recovery burden for each of the  
3 four Hs?

4 Another question is we need to change the focus of  
5 hatcheries from an emphasis on smolt production to an  
6 emphasis on the number of adult salmon returning, because I  
7 understand the return is like 1/10 of 1 percent.

8 Another question is we need to determine where the  
9 mortality is occurring throughout the life cycle of salmon.

10 Next, I would encourage the Corps to continue their  
11 efforts to improve fish passage by installing fish-friendly  
12 turbines and flow deflectors. Continue barging; it works.

13 And lastly, we need to separate salmon and steelhead  
14 smolts prior to barging in order to reduce the salmon smolt  
15 mortality.

16 Thank you.

17 KRISTI BROWN:

18 My name is Kristi Brown.

19 And I think there is a lot of alternatives that can  
20 be, should be, must be considered before dam breaching is  
21 even considered as a viable option. And I think No. 1 among  
22 those is eliminating netting of fish, both native American  
23 and other netting of fish on the river.

24 And I think, as a native American, I can say this  
25 with a clean conscience.

1                   Further, I think that the tribal contracts that have  
2                   been need to be readdressed.

3                   That's it. That's all I have to say.

4                   TAHNIA JENSEN:

5                   My name is Tahnia Jensen.

6                   And I think that we should not breach the dams  
7                   because it would be -- it would destroy the fish and hurt a  
8                   lot of people. And the fish would not come back for over 40  
9                   years because there would be so much silt in the water that  
10                  it would kill the fish and it would take a while for the fish  
11                  to come back into the river.

12                  I am 11 years old and I would like to have the fish  
13                  in the river from now until the day I die.

14                  SHALEE JENSEN:

15                  I'm Shalee Jensen.

16                  And I think that we should not breach the dams. I  
17                  think they are a very important part in our society because  
18                  of the hydropower.

19                  I am 13 and I want the fish there all of my life.  
20                  If you breach the dams, the silt would kill the fish for  
21                  years and I don't want them gone for years.

22                  I'm all for keeping the dams. Get rid of the nets.  
23                  The nets are our problem.

24                  DARLIN JOHNSON:

25                  My name is Darlin Johnson.

1           To the Army Corps of Engineers about breaching dams  
2       on the Snake River, listen, environmentalists. Breaching the  
3       dams on the Snake River could have an overall negative effect  
4       on the environment. The release of silt, the need to replace  
5       lost power generation by using fossil fuels, increased truck  
6       and rail transport and the loss of habitat for other species.

7           Please, engineers, stop wasting my tax dollars  
8       studying this no-brainer and use the money to make more  
9       salmon in hatcheries. Instead of dams, destroy the man-made  
10      island the terns use for a base for killing salmon. Stop the  
11      use of 40-mile-long nets for fishing in the ocean.

12           Breaching dams would cost hundreds of millions of  
13      dollars and disrupt the economy of the region while returning  
14      only minimal or even speculative benefits for salmon over  
15      nonbreaching alternatives.

16           Please care about the Homo sapien species.

17           Thank you for considering my thoughts.

18           DENNIS LOCKARD:

19           My name is Dennis Lockard.

20           And I grew up on the Snake River about three miles  
21      from the Snake River in Starbuck, Washington, with two  
22      friends of mine who have eventually become biologists with  
23      the federal government, fish biologists. And these guys with  
24      their previous experience of recreating on the Snake River as  
25      a free-flowing river in the '50s and '60s, now being

1 professional biologists with over 30 years of experience,  
2 they say that they oppose the breaching. They say it will  
3 not work. And I wish that we would for once start listening  
4 to the real hands-on pros.

5           Probably the biggest thing that bothers me about  
6 breaching the dams that they're not giving much concern to  
7 and it's seldom addressed is the 100-mile-or-so-long mud bank  
8 that's going to be created by breaching the dam. There will  
9 be a channel running through as much as 50-foot deep mud.  
10 This mud has accumulated over the last 30 years.

11           How many years will it take to flush this mud out?  
12 What about all the toxic chemicals that have been washed down  
13 into the river and settled in the mud? Has anybody studied  
14 that? How many muddy months will there be out of the year?  
15 What's going to happen when it rains, when the spring runs  
16 off, when the upper dams in Idaho release extra water when  
17 they're generating more electricity? The answer is mud, mud,  
18 mud.

19           One other thing that bothers me about this mud is  
20 that, Ken, has any studies been made to see if the  
21 nonmigratory fish can survive in this extra mud, like the  
22 sturgeon and the bass and the trout and the crappy and all  
23 that? Some of these are predatory fish and they can't see  
24 their game in the mud.

25           Even if we think about the nonmigratory fish, how

1 about the salmon and the steelhead? Can they survive in  
2 there? What's going to grow on these mud fields? A bunch of  
3 noxious weeds that are -- what about the danger to natural  
4 life when they come to the edge of this mud bank that sloughs  
5 off because it's unstable and they try to get a drink of  
6 water?

7 How about mankind? Are we going to eventually fence  
8 this off and put no trespassing signs up because it's  
9 dangerous out there?

10 What is going to make this area into a major  
11 recreational attraction now when only some 30 years ago as  
12 teenagers, us boys would go down there and have miles and  
13 miles of this river all to ourselves? I don't get it.

14 Let's get practical for once. We should start  
15 listening to our hands-on professionals in the field and stop  
16 the harvest and find a conservative plan that will benefit  
17 both man and fish.

18 RUSS WHIPPLE:

19 -- a 20-year resident of Columbia County.

20 And I am against the breaching of the dams for  
21 several reasons. One reason is that I think that behind the  
22 dams there is an estimated 20 to 30 feet of silt and mud that  
23 is going to present a problem to all of the residents that  
24 try to use the river, recreate on the river, and also, the  
25 remaining fish and the salmon that are trying to get up

1 through this mud bath that's going to be created every time  
2 it rains.

3 Another and more powerful problem for me is flying  
4 heavy-lift helicopters. I am forced to work in other  
5 countries now and not be able to work in my own country. The  
6 reason being is the environmentalists have chased me to  
7 Canada, Alaska, South America. And the reason they've done  
8 this is they've shut down the logging industry and they've  
9 also shut down or virtually shut down the mining industry.

10 I'm getting sick and tired of the environmentists  
11 chasing me out of my country. And I think that the best way  
12 to try to save the salmon is to reduce the salmon harvest  
13 before we start tearing out dams that create vital electrical  
14 power to the surrounding areas. Because if this doesn't  
15 work, and there is no proof that it will work, if the  
16 breaching of the dams doesn't work, who is going to be left  
17 behind with the mess? It's the residents of Columbia County.  
18 And the environmentalists are all going to be back over there  
19 in Seattle and we are going to be left with their mess.

20 And I think that if this is unsuccessful, I think  
21 that those who are pushing for this to be done, I think that  
22 they should be held personally and financially responsible  
23 for this.

24 Thank you.

25 BOB WHITELATCH:

1                   My name is Bob Whitelatch. I farm in Franklin  
2 County. I'm owner and operator of RC Farms' Clare Cellars  
3 Winery.

4                   I'm opposed to breaching the dams. I don't believe  
5 the science is correct. I don't believe it's going to  
6 benefit saving of the salmon.

7                   I'm curious how we cannot be able to tell the  
8 difference between hatchery fish and native fish and yet we  
9 spend all the money we're spending on studies to try to tear  
10 down the dams while we're closing hatcheries. I'm in favor  
11 of doing all we can to restore salmon, but not at the expense  
12 of the entire way of life in the Pacific Northwest.

13                   We have to find a balance between the salmon and the  
14 fish. At this point there is no balance. There is no  
15 looking at harvests. There is no looking at hatcheries.  
16 There is no looking at habitat. All we're looking at is  
17 hydro.

18                   There is four Hs, not just one. We need to balance  
19 the four Hs and find a way to move forward with all of us  
20 gaining, including the salmon. But tearing down the dams  
21 benefits no one.

22                   Thank you.

23                   STEVE FISHER:

24                   My name is Steve Fisher, and I live in Pendleton,  
25 Oregon, and I wish to have the opportunity to have some input

1 into the decision-making in our problem with our salmon  
2 returns.

3 I lived in the Upper Salmon River in Idaho for 20  
4 years, and since then I have kept track of what was going on  
5 with the river fish.

6 I would like to begin with a -- 1957 was an economic  
7 boom in America and this boom increased tourism and  
8 vacationing in the national parks and other good recreation  
9 areas such as the Stanley Basin.

10 The number of people fishing on the Upper Salmon  
11 River at that time increased about a hundred fold, where at  
12 one fishing hole, like Tunnel Rock, there would be 100  
13 fishermen in a line paying one dollar each for a line and one  
14 cast at a time. And the person owning the Rock opened a cafe  
15 and was making a phenomenal \$150 a day in 1957.

16 By 1964, the fish run had declined to the point that  
17 Tunnel Rock Cafe closed and nobody was fishing off of Tunnel  
18 Rock.

19 Some of the demise of the fish was Indian fisheries  
20 had become more mobile. In 1955, I watched four middle-aged  
21 Indian men harvesting fish in the Yankee Fork of the Salmon  
22 River. They had a smoker going and drying fish. They had an  
23 old Ford sedan, 1940's Ford sedan and an army tent. By  
24 1963, they numbered in the thirties, young men having pickup  
25 trucks. And I watched the pickup trucks heaped with salmon

1 and it smelled so bad that several of the fish were several  
2 days old.

3 At this same time, the American white people had  
4 more time, more vacation time and they were doing more trout  
5 fishing in the mountain streams. And they were poaching the  
6 salmon out of the small tributaries in the Upper Salmon River  
7 area, killing the runs in the small streams. By 1967, people  
8 had almost stopped fishing in the Salmon River. There were  
9 no fish to catch.

10 Some of the things that I think need to be done to  
11 -- harvest needs to be stopped. Ocean nets need to be  
12 controlled. They are interfering with the food chain in the  
13 ocean so that salmon smolts are more part of the food chain  
14 than they used to be.

15 The debate over the hatchery fish. I believe the  
16 hatchery fish are actually helping the wild fish because  
17 there are so many hatchery smolts, they protect wild smolts  
18 from being eaten in the food chain.

19 That was way too short.

20 JESSICA COLE:

21 Hello. My name is Jessica Cole and I would like to  
22 speak on behalf of my experiences as a student at Walla Walla  
23 Valley and as a citizen of the Pacific Northwest.

24 I occupy a very interesting space, I feel, as a  
25 human being over here in the Walla Walla Valley and my family

1 is at Asotin, in the Lewiston area. And my father grew up on  
2 a very prosperous ranch, a very large ranch in the area. And  
3 I grew up hearing a lot of negative comments about any  
4 environmental or tribal influences in the area.

5 My second influences growing up was in a white water  
6 rafting family. My father is a guide and spending lots of  
7 time on our rivers. And I am from -- I was born in Eugene,  
8 Oregon. I spent a lot of time over here.

9 And as a college student, I spent much time on the  
10 Federated Umatilla Reservation doing interviews on the  
11 cultural relevance of salmon and with non-Indian members of  
12 the Walla Walla community, as well.

13 I think that -- I think that this is an incredible  
14 sadness for me in this whole debate and I would really like  
15 to go on the record as saying that I hope that people are  
16 going to be able to look past the fear and symbolism that  
17 they've drawn up around the salmon as a symbol and the dams  
18 as a symbol.

19 Our rivers are really beautiful and even with a  
20 critical eye, I feel it's possible to imagine a place with  
21 free-flowing rivers. I am very much in favor of the  
22 breaching of the four Lower Snake dams from my experience and  
23 my research on the Washington State University campus and the  
24 Whitman College campus about the effect of -- the probable  
25 effects and the possible effects of the breaching of the dams

1 and effects of the breaching of the dams.

2 And I pray very much that you all will have the  
3 energy to do what you think is right and be fair and help to  
4 bring this back, make it a nonandrocentric experience. And  
5 remember, there are other things here, not just us.

6 Thank you.

7 SHELLEY GRIMSHAW:

8 Okay. My name is Shelley Grimshaw, from Pasco,  
9 Washington. We farm and my husband does construction.

10 And we went to the other meeting that they had at  
11 CBC some time back and they explained what they were going to  
12 do and we were -- our understanding was that even if they  
13 were to pull the dams out that it really wouldn't -- it might  
14 actually kill the salmon worse than if they left 'em in. So  
15 our feeling is that they should come up with some other kind  
16 of solution.

17 We're already paying a lot of money for the salmon  
18 problem as it is, meetings and research and whatever they're  
19 doing, but they need to come up with something else.

20 And peronsally, I don't think they should take 'em  
21 out because they don't have any alternatives on the power.

22 We've listened to the environmentalists to the point  
23 we -- you know, we don't have coal fired. We don't have the  
24 nuclear. They are afraid of that. And I don't think they  
25 want us to warm our houses with wood stoves either because

1 somebody might have hay fever or asthma or something.

2 We have to have some way to feed us and to keep us  
3 warm. And it seems senseless to pull those out when it's  
4 actually not going to solve the problem.

5 I thought some bad thoughts about environmentalists  
6 and we live on the west side and have a little bit different  
7 kind of mentality for that.

8 I might close.

9 Am I close?

10 Anyway, I don't need to take the full three minutes,  
11 but I definitely think that they should leave the dams in the  
12 way they are. We need the power and we need the water for  
13 electricity. We need to be able to take the wheat down the  
14 river rather than put them on trucks. That's going to be  
15 definitely not an environmental advantage.

16 I think there is another solution they can come up  
17 with, whether it be to put up fences across that dam so that  
18 they can redirect the fish would be my solution to the  
19 problem rather than to pull 'em all out and get the silt  
20 going all the way down the river like it's going to do.

21 So, anyway, thanks.

22 SANDIE DAVE:

23 Sandie Dave, (inaudible).

24 On behalf of the natural wildlife of the Pacific  
25 Northwest, the water and land from which all people of the

1 Northwest have benefited, some have gained by exploitation of  
2 this natural resource while by means of monetary wealth and  
3 others by personal gain or enhancement by engaging themselves  
4 in the land, by working with the natural element, by  
5 utilizing the resources in their homes, by hunting, fishing  
6 and preserving the annual bounty of nature, therefore,  
7 gaining them their own understanding of conservation and  
8 replenishment.

9           We are all dependent on conservation practices,  
10 whether we want to admit that or not. This means the human  
11 population are totally dependent on preservation of all  
12 species. The things that are natural and wild are what have  
13 sustained all generations of human kind, starting with the  
14 Garden of Eden.

15           Because of an imbalance of the catastrophic loss of  
16 any species is an indicator of problems in the system,  
17 adjustments need to be made in human practices -- ongoing  
18 practices that cause the corruption of the Pacific Northwest.

19           Indians have changed to everyone's detriment. Now  
20 it is time to do like the Indian and work with nature. If  
21 you folks don't have the authority to change things or make  
22 decisions about dam recon -- I'm sorry -- reconfiguration,  
23 let's just go to Congress so we can quit all this stalling  
24 due to political pressures brought on by those who have  
25 gained -- brought on by those who have gained monetarily, not

1 those who have learned to work with the forces of nature to  
2 everyone's benefit, not just by a few. The harvesters were  
3 the consenters. Now is the time for others to make the  
4 sacrifice, too.

5 Thank you.

6 JACK LESTER:

7 My name is Jack Lester. I own a business in the  
8 Columbia Basin dealing with agriculture.

9 I guess coming to this meeting tonight, it really  
10 disgruntled me. The public speakers that are up there are  
11 people that are for breaching the dams. And the thing that I  
12 find most distressful is these people don't really seem to  
13 have a private-sector job. They have some type of  
14 public-sector or a college student, which to me I can make  
15 assumptions that many of them are on government grants. I  
16 find people making these type of comments very ignorant and  
17 brainwashed by whatever resources that is feeding them.

18 I ask those people that are for breaching the dams  
19 to step into the shoes of the working people, the people that  
20 are the taxpayers, truly the taxpayers, to take a look at the  
21 economy that is built around this river. I do believe that  
22 there are improvements that need to be made to the dams, but  
23 breaching 'em is an absolute no.

24 The Indian tribes stand up and say look at the  
25 heritage. Yes, Indians, take a look at the heritage of

1 America. There is a new heritage. You know, get out of the  
2 stone age. You know, start your own fishing ponds, raise  
3 your own fish. We do not have to pull 'em out of the river.

4 Again, take a look at the economies that are  
5 developed from the dams such as the agriculture industry. We  
6 have one of the largest agricultural industries. Next time  
7 you bite into a McDonald's french fry, a Burger King french  
8 fry, think where it came from. It came from your own  
9 backyard. Many other natural resources are made in this  
10 area.

11 Please get educated and take a look at what is  
12 founded in the agricultural industry here in the Columbia  
13 Basin.

14 Thank you.

15 GENEVIEVE HOWARD:

16 Hello. My name is Genevieve Howard. I'm from  
17 Kennewick, Washington.

18 And I do not want these dam breached. We have no  
19 reason to breach them because we can do it other ways.

20 But now I listened today to all of the comments and  
21 we have a lot of very intelligent people here making their  
22 pros and cons, so I feel that we have a good representation  
23 here in this area. But I do not want the dams breached  
24 because there is -- we could quit capturing the fish for a  
25 while and let 'em get built up again because we have outside

1 influences.

2           The ships that are taking our salmon from the ocean,  
3 all the fish nets that's in the river, there are -- there are  
4 many ways. We do not need to breach these dams and I mean  
5 it. I think it's time for people to be more responsible  
6 about their actions. They don't need to be wasting --  
7 catching all those fish.

8           And there are many ways -- like at the entrance of  
9 the Columbia River there is a piece of land that these  
10 certain kind of birds are on eating up the salmon just as  
11 quick as they come down the river.

12           So I think it's time for us to be real. I know the  
13 other people want to breach 'em, but we can't go back to the  
14 past. The Indians wouldn't have the fish if we didn't have  
15 our type of society because they were already becoming  
16 extinct in the 1850's.

17           And so I think it's time for us to not breach the  
18 dams, not breach the dams. There is no excuse to breach the  
19 dams.

20           Thank you.

21           JOE DOBIE:

22           I'm Joe Dobie. I'm a sophomore at Kamiken High  
23 School.

24           I would like to say that I am totally against  
25 breaching the dams. My generation will be affected more so

1 than the people that are represented here. We have people  
2 from the old generations standing up and talking about what  
3 they would like to see in the future for these dams. But how  
4 does it affect my generation? We have to live with the  
5 broken-down structures and the removed land and watch these  
6 dams rot next to our rivers.

7           We talk about the pollution that we have now from  
8 Hanford and from the dams in our rivers, but how does the  
9 rust from these buildings and concrete flakes and the silt  
10 from all the land that we've removed affect the salmon? When  
11 they swim down river, their gills will catch full of sand and  
12 it will kill them.

13           We've come into a society where we move forward, but  
14 at this point, we're talking about taking steps back. The  
15 power we receive from these dams is more important than we  
16 could even begin to imagine. If we take out these dams,  
17 power and power costs will go up and my generation will have  
18 to suffer. We need to think of other alternatives.

19           We talk about how the salmon are caught in the  
20 turbines. Why not put a grating system in front of the  
21 turbines so that the salmon can't be sucked into these holes.  
22 We can build other spillways and bypasses around the dams  
23 that will lead the salmon out. Put up a metal grating across  
24 the area where the salmon swim towards the dams and force  
25 them to go through an irrigation ditch type structure around

1 the dams. I know that we say that we've done that already,  
2 but it doesn't work. We lose too many fish.

3 That is all that I have to say.

4 TODD NEWSOME:

5 My name is Todd Newsome, and I represent myself as a  
6 citizen of Richland, Washington.

7 And basically, I'm in favor of breaching the dams.  
8 My taxpayer money goes to heavily subsidized barging of the  
9 wheat down the river and I want my tax money to go to rail  
10 and trucking. However, I also want to tell you that I want  
11 my kids to see salmon in the Snake River. I want to drive my  
12 jet boat. I want to fish the Snake River. I want to see  
13 salmon in the Snake River. I want to see salmon in Idaho. I  
14 want to see a free-flowing river.

15 And that's all I have to say.

16 SHERRY GROSS:

17 I'm Sherry Gross of Kennewick, Washington.

18 And I just wanted to bring to the attention of the  
19 panel an article taken from the January 10, 1999, Tri-City  
20 Herald. It's on 50 years ago today.

21 It starts out here saying that the coal stokers at  
22 the schools would not -- the schools were closed because of  
23 coal stokers would not kick on automatically, electric clocks  
24 would not operate. Schools in Pasco and Richland stayed  
25 open. Only the small, isolated quanset huts may close.

1 Fuel's painfully short in the Tri-Cities today as a result of  
2 the lock at Bonneville being frozen up and halting all river  
3 traffic.

4 And anyway, it goes on to talk about -- this was  
5 before the Snake River dams were built. This was before John  
6 Day was built, before The Dalles dam was built.

7 We have experienced a change in our whole way of  
8 life here because of the rivers and the water available to  
9 us. By breaching the dams, we're talking about eliminating a  
10 way of life, the agriculture producing food for these people  
11 in this area. And, you know, we're trying to preserve a life  
12 for the Indian way.

13 I have met Chief Tom Thompson before Celilo Falls  
14 was taken out. He was the head of that tribe down there. I  
15 was a little girl. And he said that they had to change --  
16 life had to change for the Indians or they would not survive.  
17 And yet I hear all this people trying to go back to a way of  
18 life that he knew at that time would be the end of his tribe.

19 I can't help but wonder why people are worried about  
20 who is going to pay for the breaching of the dam and the  
21 fixing of the pumps and what have you. They say is it going  
22 to be you or the taxpayer. But it's all of the taxpayers  
23 because the government is made of the people who do pay the  
24 taxes.

25 We need to check into this more closely. We need to

1 do the job well and to think it over and not work on  
2 emotionalism alone.

3 Thank you.

4 JOHN NUGENT:

5 My name is John Nugent. I live in Richland,  
6 Washington, and I am here for myself.

7 I am in favor of breaching the dams. I think it's  
8 economically beneficial to take out the dams. I think it'll  
9 restore habitat and I --

10 I guess that's all I really have to say.

11 ROGER MARCHAND:

12 Good evening. My name is Roger Marchand and I  
13 recently moved to the Richland/Tri-Cities area.

14 In many ways, I have to say I am not as familiar  
15 with the issues involved, but a few things are pretty clear  
16 to me. One is that despite the considerable efforts that  
17 have been put into increasing the salmon population, that  
18 these efforts have been modest to unsuccessful.

19 It seems clear that the only way that the salmon  
20 population are going to be brought back on a permanent basis  
21 is with dam removal. I speak here then in support of dam  
22 removal.

23 I am sympathetic to the difficulties this is going  
24 to cause in terms of transportation, in terms of  
25 hydroelectric power and the effects on agriculture in the

1 area. And as a taxpayer, I do see it as part of my burden to  
2 support recompense for these individuals.

3 At the same time, I would like to make comment that  
4 it's important that we also bring as much federal support in  
5 on these as we can because, certainly, local efforts will be  
6 limited.

7 Thank you for your attention.

8 RICHARD BRUNKEL:

9 Yes. My name is Richard Brunkel.

10 And I'm totally in favor of breaching these dams.  
11 I'm a 60-year-old man and I was used to catching fish on many  
12 of our rivers. And the last few years, it's been almost  
13 impossible to catch a nice fish, so we need to do something  
14 to save these species of fish.

15 If we as a human race continue to eliminate species  
16 on the earth, I believe that's the way we will go and we will  
17 end up as these species will end up.

18 And that's basically all I have to say. Thank you.

19 REBECCA FRANCIK:

20 I'm Rebecca Francik.

21 As a child, I had the privilege of growing up and  
22 playing in the Snake River Canyon. When they built the dams  
23 there, I didn't want to see them come because I knew that it  
24 would tame this river. And, indeed, the wild river of my  
25 youth no longer exists. However, a huge economic culture has

1 grown up around the dams that were built on the Snake River.

2 Now I would like to talk to you as the mayor pro  
3 temp of Pasco, and there are three points that I would like  
4 to bring to your attention. Those points being the  
5 environment, the economy and silt.

6 I guess we'd have to say that barging has been the  
7 most successful mass public transit program that the United  
8 States has ever put into place. I think we're going to have  
9 to very seriously consider what the economic impacts are  
10 going to be if we take those four Snake River dams out.  
11 Cargo estimates are that if they come out we will have  
12 700,000 more trucks annually on the road. That's going to  
13 have an impact on air, it's going to have an impact on fuel  
14 consumption, it's going to have an impact on storm water  
15 runoff. Additionally, someone's going to have to build the  
16 transportation system to support those trucks, and I would  
17 like to know where the revenue streams are going to come  
18 from.

19 I guess the economy is my next point and that is  
20 very specifically, if these dams are breached, the State of  
21 Washington has passed a resolution which says that they will  
22 not send unfunded mandates to the cities. And I would  
23 request, respectfully, that you, the federal government, do  
24 not send any unfunded dam breaching down into these local  
25 communities. We cannot afford the tremendous economic impact

1 that that will take, not as individual people, not as cities,  
2 not as a state. There needs to be revenue streams studied on  
3 the complete economic impact on this region and there need to  
4 be revenue streams identified to help pay for that.

5 The third issue is silt, and that is I do not want  
6 to see salmon die. And so before we make such a drastic step  
7 as taking dams down, I would like to have a better than 80  
8 percent assurance that the silt will not kill the very  
9 fragile population which we are trying to save.

10 Thank you very much for allowing me to comment  
11 tonight and good luck with your decisions.

12 (TESTIMONY CONCLUDED.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25