

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"

PORTLAND, OREGON

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION  
FEBRUARY 3, 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

NANETTE WATSON:

-- Mt. Hood Oregon, and I want to address the 4 D rule and what is being considered now as breaching the dams. And I would like to say, yes, please, go ahead, take the dams out. I don't think there is any substitute for taking the dams out. You all have good ideas and what I would like to see is that done immediately.

Concerning any of the opposition, I don't feel that at this point, with the way the federal ruling is that we can say that it's not a viable alternative. At this point, I think that we should go full steam ahead.

And I understand economic consequences are serious, but I feel that losing the salmon is too vital at this point and the costs that we would incur through increased utility rates or food, that the farmers on the river would be worth it in order to save the salmon.

And as far as anything else goes, I think that there needs to be more -- more open communication between the public and the entities involved. I feel that there hasn't been enough as far as opportunities to speak. And I also would like to see a pretty quick ruling on the decision.

That's it.

DEL LATHIM:

1                   My name is Del Lathim. I'm a public utility  
2                   district commissioner for Franklin County PUD in Pasco,  
3                   Washington, and also a commissioner for the Port of Pasco.  
4                   And I am a hydro engineer for two technical working groups,  
5                   one with the Corps of Engineers and one with the Department  
6                   of Energy, on designing and testing fish survival facilities  
7                   for the dams.

8                   I have reviewed the 4,000-page, \$20 million draft  
9                   FREIS document. What a waste of money. For \$20 million, you  
10                  could have fixed the dams and there would be no problem. The  
11                  study assumes that there is a shortage of salmon and that the  
12                  turbines are at fault. This is not the case on either count.

13                  There are plenty of hatchery salmon. If more fish  
14                  are wanted, then more fish could be hatched, just like  
15                  chickens. There is a shortage of genetically pure fish  
16                  because they mixed with stray farm fish that the Fish and  
17                  Game Department transplanted in the Snake River from the  
18                  Lower Columbia hatcheries.

19                  The turbines on the Snake River dams had nothing to  
20                  do with the decline of these fish counts. There are many  
21                  factors that reduced the wild salmon runs before the Ice  
22                  Harbor Dam was built. Brownlee Dam in Idaho reduced the  
23                  Chinook run from an average of 160,000 fish per year to only  
24                  80,000 in 1958 by blocking 4,000 miles of spawning grounds  
25                  because it had no fish ladder. By 1920, the Snake River

1 sockeye were eradicated by the Fish and Game Department.

2           The four Lower Snake dams were the most efficient  
3 and environmentally friendly dams ever built. These dams  
4 actually improved salmon migration in that stretch of the  
5 river. Adult salmon traveled from the mouth of the Snake to  
6 Lewiston, Idaho, in an average of seven hours faster after  
7 the dams were constructed. The number of migrating shad went  
8 from zero to three million in just 10 years. Chinook salmon  
9 counts over Ice Harbor Dam steadily increased from 80,000 per  
10 year before the dams to 100,514 in 1969 after three dams were  
11 completed. Coho counts doubled. Exotic salmon counts  
12 fluctuated as millions were planted in Red Fish Lake.

13           The Lower Snake River drops 400 feet from Lower  
14 Granite to the tailrace of Ice Harbor Dam, making it a swift  
15 flowing impoundment, so swift that 377 pairs of salmon now  
16 spawn there. More than before the dams. Juvenile salmonas  
17 move as quickly as they want while resting, feeding,  
18 imprinting and learning survival skills.

19           The mortality through the turbines is less than 2  
20 percent with 80 percent survival through the Lower Snake  
21 stretch. This is higher survival than in the wild river.

22           There was no problem with the salmon migration  
23 through the Lower Snake dams until the Corps of Engineers  
24 installed fish screens and bypass systems and started  
25 transplanting fish with trucks and barges and flushing fish

1 over the spillways. Fish screen mortality was recorded at a  
2 high of 22 percent by the National Marine Fisheries Service.  
3 Spillways were killing 10 percent outright and exposing the  
4 rest to deadly nitrogen gas bubble disease. Bypass systems,  
5 fish biologists and holding tanks were killing another 20  
6 percent and exposing all of the fish to deadly bacterial  
7 kidney disease and other diseases. Fish barges and trucks  
8 robbed them of their homing instincts and survival abilities.

9           Returning salmon numbers to the Snake River began  
10 plummeting in 1976. In just five years coho counts went from  
11 2,000 per year to only 58. Chinook numbers dropped from  
12 36,556 to only 14,717 in the same time frame despite huge  
13 production increases of the farm fish. The fish screens and  
14 bypass systems were a major catastrophe, but they were not  
15 removed because they created dozens of jobs for the Walla  
16 Walla district Corps of Engineers, saving it from being  
17 consolidated with the Portland district.

18           I have spent a lifetime studying the fish and  
19 wildlife on the Lower Snake River. On October 13, 1992,  
20 while working for the Corps at McNary Dam, I submitted ID No.  
21 CE-PW-93 00 00144 entitled "Improving Fish Passage through  
22 the Turbines" to the Corps and the action agencies in D.C.  
23 Congress then authorized and funded two technical working  
24 groups that are installing fish-friendly turbines and  
25 conducting fish survival studies through the system. I

1       helped design these turbines and am presently a consulting  
2       engineer on both working groups.

3               I am happy to report that my fellow scientists and I  
4       have proven that the safest and most economical way to get  
5       fish down the river is right through the modified turbines,  
6       without the screens. We found all four of the Corps'  
7       feasibility study alternatives unacceptable. Alternative 1  
8       with existing conditions, fish screens and bypass systems and  
9       transportation are costing hundreds of millions of dollars  
10      per year and killing more fish than they are saving.

11              Alternative 2, maximizing transportation --  
12      transportation is not working out now. Maximizing would only  
13      compound the problem.

14              Alternative 3, major system improvements. Fish  
15      should be directed toward the new turbines, not away from  
16      them. Hydro engineers consider bypass systems and collectors  
17      as gold-plated junk.

18              Alternative No. 4, dam breaching. This is the  
19      dumbest idea of all. It would not save one genetically pure  
20      fish, but it would devastate 32 native species and thousands  
21      of species of other life forms. It would take 3,000  
22      megawatts of cheap power off the grid when we need 3,000  
23      megawatts more power. It would take 35,000 irrigated acres  
24      out of production when we need more. It would stop the barge  
25      lines to Lewiston when we need more transportation. Tourism

1 fish and recreation would suffer. The chances of Portland  
2 flooding would increase. It would devastate the economy of  
3 Southeastern Washington.

4 Our alternative of maximizing and enhancing turbine  
5 passage would double fish survival through the system; double  
6 output of clean, cheap, renewable power; save navigation to  
7 Lewiston, save irrigation and water supply, save tourism to  
8 the dams, save recreation facilities, save the established  
9 ecosystem to which the salmon have adapted, save the  
10 ratepayers over \$1 billion per year.

11 This plan has already been approved. It is in  
12 progress and has been proven to work. It has the general  
13 support of hydro engineers, the Northwest delegation, two  
14 Northwest governors and most scientists that are familiar  
15 with it. Almost everyone who has seen the plan is in favor  
16 of it.

17 Thank you for your time.

18 STEVE WEISS:

19 My name is Steven Weiss and I am a senior policy  
20 analyst for the Northwest Energy Coalition. Our coalition is  
21 the largest coalition of its kind in the Northwest. We  
22 represent almost 100 organizations and utilities concerned  
23 with clean and affordable energy and saving the salmon on the  
24 Columbia River system. We represent low income groups,  
25 environmental groups, consumer groups, good government

1 groups, public utilities, private utilities and, as I said,  
2 we're a very large organization.

3 After over a year of a long discussion process with  
4 our coalition, we recently came to the decision to a vote  
5 that these four dams don't make sense and that they can be  
6 economically replaced with clean, renewable resources and  
7 conservation at not too great a cost for the region and  
8 that's the only way the salmon can be restored.

9 I participate in many of the meetings on economics,  
10 the DRU meetings, and so on, and I must say that the final  
11 product seems to have been very selective. The cost of  
12 breaching the dams seem to be scrupulously accounted for, but  
13 the cost of keeping the dams seem to have been minimized and  
14 the cost of extinction essentially ignored.

15 Some of these costs that have not been fully  
16 accounted for include the cost of flow augmentation at the  
17 dams if the dams are kept. Everyone agrees that if the dams  
18 are kept, we are going to need a lot of water from Idaho.  
19 The cost of that had not been included in the alternatives  
20 where the dam is kept.

21 Another cost is compliance with the Clean Water Act.  
22 Again, to bring temperatures in compliance is going -- there  
23 is going to have to be some very expensive measures done with  
24 those dams if they are kept. Those costs have not been  
25 accurately accounted for.

1           The cost of harvest reductions has not been  
2           accounted. There is -- if we have to reduce harvest more,  
3           the cost of communities and jobs up and down the West Coast  
4           has not been accounted for as a cost of keeping the dams.

5           The cost of changing agriculture and timber harvests  
6           and practices have not been fully accounted for. If we do  
7           not remove these dams, the need to change habitat to try to  
8           compensate will be very expensive and these costs have not  
9           been included in the cost of keeping the dams.

10          The costs of native cultural decline and even  
11          possible collapse of native cultures has not been calculated  
12          in the keep the dams alternatives.

13          In addition, the cost of broken treaties with the  
14          tribes and Canada has not been calculated. In looking at the  
15          difference in expectations of restoration levels, it's clear  
16          that the scientists have said removing the dams will increase  
17          the likelihood of restoring the salmon. That delta needs to  
18          be multiplied by the price of broken treaties with tribes in  
19          Canada. That cost has not been accurately accounted for.

20          And finally the existence value to present and  
21          future generations seems to be ignored or trivialized as if  
22          it doesn't matter. I think if you ask the citizens of this  
23          country, they will agree that simply having these salmon for  
24          future generations is extremely important.

25          Therefore, when the true costs and benefits of the

1 alternatives are honestly added up, the decision essentially  
2 becomes a no-brainer.

3 Northwest Energy Coalition urges the federal  
4 government to follow the science and the economics and,  
5 first, remove the dams, the four Lower Snake dams, to replace  
6 the lost hydropower generation with clean resources,  
7 renewable resources and conservation. And finally, mitigate  
8 the effects on the farming communities by investing in  
9 infrastructure, rail infrastructure and wells or other  
10 replacement water for the 13 farms that are -- that will be  
11 affected.

12 Thank you very much. We'll have detailed written --

13 DR. GORDON F. STONE, JR.:

14 My name is Dr. Gordon F. Stone, Jr. This is a  
15 continuation of my talk to the panel earlier in the day.

16 I am and I have been for generations a friend of the  
17 tugboaters such as Lou Russell and his ancestors who own and  
18 started and own Tidewater; the Burnerts, which own three  
19 different tugboat companies in the Northwest. My mother was  
20 named after my great-grandfather's favorite tug Margerie  
21 Allamet. Farmers and ranchers, yes, many of them. And I  
22 know all 14 of the Stoneberg boys. Tackle manufacturers,  
23 sporting goods dealers and many more people in business that  
24 fish is relevant.

25 I have been going to these meetings for since I have

1       been five years old with my great-grandfather and my  
2       grandfather and my parents. Excluding our Indian friends, we  
3       need to stop talking money. We need to stop talking welfare.  
4       Not social welfare; economic welfare, corporate welfare.

5               Irrigation. The farmers have not made the payments  
6       that they said they would 50 years ago to present. They pay  
7       28 times less for electricity and barging pays less than 20  
8       percent of the costs for creating millionaires.

9               I am a free capitalist and I believe in capitalism,  
10       but in my 58 years of life, it seems that the major trend has  
11       been let's stonewall and hopefully they, the fish, will go  
12       away and become extinct.

13               Shame on the ODFW, the WDFW, IMPS, the aluminum  
14       companies, the bargers, the irrigators, and, yes, too many of  
15       the tackle manufacturers, guides, retail stores and, yes,  
16       indeed, many organizations that talk the talk but do not walk  
17       the walk. Nice organizations and I am sure they mean good.  
18       Organizations like the Northwest Steelheaders. No one wants  
19       to bite the bullet and do the right thing.

20               As Captain Mike said earlier, the area has increased  
21       by 87 percent. Well, I don't know if I care whether it's  
22       increased by 1,000 percent. It makes me wonder if the  
23       increase of population is a good thing. It seems as though  
24       the more people I see, the less nice they are and the more  
25       screwed up the environment is.

1           Just not salmon. I'm not talking about that. I am  
2 talking about the whole ball of wax. Progress is not money  
3 in the pocket. It is not -- it is not to have your trophy  
4 house, your big pickup, boat or whatever. It's about air,  
5 food, water, families and quality of life.

6           And last but not least, water temperature in the  
7 Clackamas River, in the Santiam and the MacKenzie River have  
8 been out of compliance from federal regulations for years.  
9 The Clackamas River has not met the water temperature that  
10 was required by the federal government for close to 30 years.

11           Now, please don't go away and please listen to the  
12 rest of this because this is germane to the Columbia River.  
13 According to many biologists, the only remaining indigenous  
14 or native run of which you -- indigenous or native run,  
15 whichever you prefer -- my Webster dictionary does not make a  
16 distinction between the two -- remaining coho are in the  
17 Clackamas River, not in the Willamette River, but through the  
18 entire Columbia system is the Clackamas River run. Two to  
19 four fish returned six years ago. It depends on whom you  
20 speak to.

21           What has the State done? Well, the dams on the  
22 Clackamas are up for relicensure. Therefore, the governor of  
23 the state of Oregon appoints a senior vice president from  
24 PGE-Enron, and on his card it has a title that says head of  
25 hydropower relicensure. Wow, who would have thought of that?

1 Who is running this asylum?

2 Let's not keep doing business as usual. Let's not  
3 keep doing something easy. Let's do something right. Let's  
4 do something for the fish.

5 I humbly thank you for me and I thank you for my  
6 parents, Gordon F. Stone, Sr., who is 89 years old, Margerie  
7 Stone, who is 84. We beg you to breach those dams and let's  
8 start making some good decisions for the betterment of the  
9 environment.

10 Thank you very, very much.

11 DR. JEFFRY GOTTFRIED:

12 I'm Dr. Jeffry Gottfried, and I am speaking on my  
13 own behalf today. I live at 7040 S.W. 84th Avenue, Portland,  
14 Oregon. I'm a biologist by training.

15 I am speaking at this time advocating the breaching  
16 of the dams on the Snake River and lowering the pool behind  
17 the John Day Dam and doing -- and taking whatever steps  
18 necessary to return the Columbia River to a river, to its  
19 being a river as opposed to being a series of lakes.

20 Everyone who has studied what the salmon need, not  
21 what the barge operators need, not what the aluminum industry  
22 needs, not what the wheat growers need, but what the salmon  
23 need, have concluded that they need moving water. The smolts  
24 need to be transported by moving water to saltwater within  
25 the time of their biological clocks. They need to be able to

1 get past obstacles in a timely fashion. They're not good  
2 swimmers. I won't go on and on about the biology of the  
3 salmon, but they need to live in a river and not in a series  
4 of ponds.

5           Unfortunately, we have created -- we as a society  
6 has created a giant economy that depends upon an altered  
7 river. I have to point out that the aluminum industry, for  
8 one, is only here because of that altered environment and the  
9 ultra-inexpensive electricity. The fact that we give away  
10 our electricity is why the aluminum industry is here.

11           I'm not saying they're bad people. I'm just saying  
12 that they have no allegiance to this region. The electricity  
13 -- the price of electricity goes up, they're out of here.  
14 There is nothing indigenous about the aluminum industry.

15           As a matter of fact, the ore is mined in Australia  
16 and transported here. And it's ridiculous to think about the  
17 energy that's expended in getting that ore here and the whole  
18 thing and still it's profitable. It's just an indication of  
19 the fact that we are not charging for the destruction of our  
20 natural resources, for the destruction of our salmon runs in  
21 what we charge for electricity.

22           The dams need to go. They're not providing benefits  
23 that equal the negatives that they are creating for the  
24 survival of the salmon.

25           And -- let's see. That's really what I have to say

1 here tonight. And I, for one, would be very happy to pay  
2 more for electricity if that was the case. I have already  
3 purchased the salmon friendly power that's been in -- made  
4 available by Portland General Electric and would would pay  
5 more. I'd double my bill to save the salmon. I think --

6 Let me go on here a little bit longer because I  
7 think it's also --

8 On a whole other level, I think this is a moral  
9 question, as well. I think it's a moral and ethical question  
10 that we are driving a magnificent living thing, a species to  
11 extinction and destroying the genetic potential of living  
12 things. I mean, it brings tears to my eyes really to think  
13 about what is being destroyed when we destroy salmon.

14 And it's not simply -- it's not simply the fish  
15 because when we destroy a run of salmon, we are destroying  
16 the whole richness of the Northwest. You see, what is the  
17 Northwest? The Northwest is defined by many as anyplace the  
18 salmon can swim and so the Northwest is really shrinking.  
19 It's getting smaller.

20 And, you know, they have traced elements from salmon  
21 to trees so that they know that these salmon are bringing the  
22 wealth, the richness, the energy that's fixed by green plants  
23 in the ocean is transporting it from the ocean to basically  
24 sterile rivers.

25 The rivers of the Northwest are not rich rivers.

1 The Columbia River tributaries are not biologically rich  
2 without the carcasses of the salmon. They're depositing  
3 this. And everything eats those carcasses from insects to  
4 the resident fish. If we want to know why our cutthroat  
5 trout are disappearing, cutthroat trout are disappearing  
6 because they have no salmon to eat. Cutthroat trout eat the  
7 salmon carcasses, they eat the salmon eggs, they eat the  
8 salmon fingerlings and even smolts. And cutthroat trout are  
9 disappearing because there is no salmon left for them to eat.  
10 And the whole web -- ecological web of the Northwest is going  
11 to unravel because, really, it's a salmon economy. We can't  
12 say anything is all important, but it's -- there is a far --  
13 far-reaching ecological effects when salmon are gone in terms  
14 of the numbers of things that depend on that salmon.

15           And wheat can be grown elsewhere. I mean, wheat  
16 could still be grown. I mean, so it has to be shipped on  
17 trains instead of barges. We can't let these, you know,  
18 these people are being hurt financially. Help 'em out. Give  
19 them tax subsidies. Do something to -- you know, don't cut  
20 them off, but do whatever is necessary, figure it out. But  
21 take action now.

22           We can always fix those problems later. If we don't  
23 take action now, very soon, the salmon are gone, never to be  
24 restored. This is a crossroad and an important decision that  
25 needs to be taken in a timely fashion because we can never

1 bring back animals from extinction and not populations from  
2 extinction. The information will be gone. The opportunity  
3 will be gone and this will be a moral tragedy and a blot on  
4 our society forever.

5 Thank you.

6 DENNIS DUBOIS:

7 Yes. Hello. My name is Dennis Dubois. I'm a  
8 member of the Sierra Club, Columbia Group. I also chair,  
9 with my wife, the Tillamook State Forest Park Committee for  
10 the Sierra Club and we're very active in Tillamook on the  
11 salmon issue.

12 I'm here tonight because I am for the breaching of  
13 the dams on the Snake River. It doesn't take a rocket  
14 scientist to see that what has happened over the past 75  
15 years with the decline of salmon not only in the Snake River  
16 area, the basin area, but also in the coastal streams that  
17 we're in desperate need of correction of any kind of methods  
18 we can use that has not been tried as of yet. And I really  
19 think that we need to try this and see if it works.

20 I don't know how anyone could argue over the fact  
21 that 100 years ago we had -- well, I think this is a low  
22 estimate -- 28 million salmon in the basin area. I think  
23 that's a very conservative estimate. I would not be  
24 surprised if it was triple that amount. And since the dams  
25 have been in, we've just seen declining runs year after year

1 after year and now we're in this predicament.

2 So I strongly urge that the U.S. Army Corps of  
3 Engineers remove these dams. Let's see what happens. Give  
4 it a chance.

5 The economic experts claiming these dams need to be  
6 in are not giving the free market an opportunity to respond  
7 to the situation when the dams are removed. The United  
8 States is a strong country. It has the ability to adjust to  
9 things like this and these people will find ways to make a  
10 living, alternative methods of keeping their business intact,  
11 so I think it's really selfish of them to not consider what  
12 is good for the heritage of this country.

13 That's all I have to say on the issue.

14 Thank you very much.

15 PAUL VITELLO:

16 Hello. My name is Paul Vitello. I am a member of  
17 Trout Unlimited. I want to speak in behalf of this process.

18 My own personal experience is that I am a recent  
19 import to the West Coast from the East Coast. We have no  
20 salmon in the East Coast because we didn't implement the  
21 policies that would maintain runs and now the salmon are  
22 gone.

23 When I moved to the West Coast, I was looking  
24 forward to seeing these tremendous runs that I had read  
25 about. And much to my dismay, I found that the runs are in

1 deep and dire straits here. The mistakes that were made in  
2 the East are being repeated here. Special interest groups  
3 seem to take precedence over the good of the environment and  
4 the good of the mass of people.

5 This is very upsetting. I don't get to see my  
6 tremendous salmon runs that I have read about and, in fact,  
7 if we all do not react, we will see no salmon at all.

8 The federal government must implement corrective  
9 measures now to restore these salmon runs. It's a good  
10 policy to focus on habitat, harvest, hatchery measures as  
11 long-term policy. But if the dams are not taken out now to  
12 restore a free-running river, it will be too late for these  
13 measures to have impact. The salmon will be gone.

14 The elimination of the dams will increase habitat,  
15 return cool, clean water and encourage nutrient movement and  
16 provide woody debris for habitat.

17 Artificial means to enhance runs have been expensive  
18 and futile. The only way to save salmon is to return to a  
19 free-running system.

20 Thank you very much.

21 BARBARA MCLEAN:

22 All right. Hello. My name is Barbara McLean. I  
23 live in Beaverton, Oregon.

24 And I didn't want to come out tonight, but I came  
25 out tonight because I feel if these salmon go extinct, I

1 would feel really bad that I didn't do the very best that I  
2 could to help preserve them. I have two children and I have  
3 a grandchild. I'm very concerned that these fish won't be  
4 around for future generations.

5 I have looked at literature and it seems that it's  
6 going to be the most helpful thing to do to partially remove  
7 these dams or fully remove the dams. The literature that I  
8 have read makes sense to me and so I am asking the Army Corps  
9 of Engineers, National Marine Fisheries to make that  
10 decision. Get rid of the dams. Let's make the rivers free  
11 and better for the salmon to survive.

12 It's not fair that certain smaller interest groups  
13 should be subsidized by the government at the expense of  
14 larger more ordinary people, so I am asking you to do the  
15 logical thing and the best thing and to -- if you have  
16 children, look at it this way. You know, you want your  
17 children to be able to see these fish, to know these fish,  
18 eat the fish. You know the fish are a big part of the  
19 Northwest.

20 And thank you for listening to my testimony. I hope  
21 you really consider seriously everyone's testimony. Just  
22 because we don't have big bucks or, you know, we don't have  
23 maybe all the governmental clout of electric companies or  
24 something of that sort, I hope, as our representatives, since  
25 we are the taxpayers and pay your salary, that you will

1 consider the testimony of everyone here tonight.

2 Thank you very much.

3 LAUREN ELDER:

4 My name is Lauren Elder. As I am sitting here, I  
5 see many people from different ethnic backgrounds and many  
6 different generations. I see children no older than three or  
7 four proudly holding signs bearing the words "Salmon rule,"  
8 "Dams rule" while sporting salmon stickers on their clothes.

9 One toddler caught a group of peers and explained  
10 the life of salmon. Around them adults feel the same way.  
11 Colorful displays showing status, options and facts. No  
12 matter how old or how young, the decisions today involve  
13 everybody, not just in this country but all over the world.

14 These ideas have been spoken before, but I want you  
15 to hear them from a youthful mouth. The salmon are needed  
16 along with every other species on this earth, including  
17 humans. They were created for a reason, even if nobody knows  
18 the exact one.

19 The only sure way to save them is to remove the  
20 dams. Not only will this help stop the demise of the salmon,  
21 it will eventually create a more beautiful environment.

22 Does it really matter that the dams put money in  
23 somebody else's pocket or does it matter more that our future  
24 generations will know the pleasure of a flowing river, of  
25 watching the miracle of salmon returning to their spawning

1 ground? Think about these two simple options and make up  
2 your own mind.

3 BARBARA PAYNE:

4 My name is Barbara Payne and I am vice chair of  
5 OSPIRG on PSU campus.

6 Currently, one of our campaigns that we're working  
7 on for the school year of the 1999-2000 is Save Our Wild  
8 Salmon, where we have a coalition with Save Our Wild Salmon  
9 Coalition in Portland, National Wildlife Federation and  
10 Sierra Club.

11 I just wanted to talk about the importance of this  
12 campaign on our campus and that even students do care about  
13 salmon loss. Those that are struggling to get their degrees  
14 and make a better life for themselves actually take time out  
15 to sign postcards and petitions in order to get the word  
16 across to legislators that it is an important issue.

17 We had a table by itself, unmanned, and it got 40  
18 postcards signed in just an hour of being by itself with a  
19 few props. That tells you how important the table is and how  
20 important the issue is to the students on campus. And  
21 besides the dirty water that the salmon are dumped into on a  
22 daily basis, like cleaning the Willamette, of course, this is  
23 one of the biggest issues on PSU campus.

24 I'm a native Floridian, where I have had the  
25 experience with endangered species such as the Florida

1 panther and had success such as the alligator -- Florida  
2 Everglades alligator being brought back off the endangered  
3 species list, so I am familiar with endangered salmon and the  
4 issues surrounding it.

5 I have never seen a salmon in the wild in the five  
6 years that I have lived in Oregon, so it would kind of be  
7 nice to see one before I die.

8 And as I said, I speak for all the students on PSU  
9 campus, for all of the OSPiRG chapters in the state of  
10 Oregon, including the OSPiRG state chapter in Portland, that  
11 we are for saving the wild salmon and removing the lower four  
12 dams on the Snake River in order to continue their success as  
13 a species.

14 Thank you.

15 BRAD WILEY:

16 Hi. My name is Brad Wiley. I'm here to make a  
17 comment in favor of dam removal.

18 Just to give you a little bit of my background just  
19 because it may carry some more weight with my comments. I am  
20 an -- I have a master's degree in marine biology. I am an  
21 ichthyologist. I have studied the population genetics of  
22 fish. I have worked for the South Carolina Department of  
23 Marine Resources in their fish and ichthyology division. I  
24 have also worked for the National Marine Fisheries Service in  
25 Charleston, South Carolina.

1           I just want to say that I think that if we're ever  
2 going to be serious about salmon restoration that we need to  
3 breach these and other dams. I don't think that anything  
4 that we're doing right now is going to be sufficient on its  
5 own. I don't think that removal of these dams is sufficient  
6 on its own, but I think that its an absolutely necessary  
7 component to restore habitat to a level to where survival and  
8 restoration will be possible.

9           I think that the fish hatcheries as they exist now  
10 or actually fish hatcheries in general are a bad thing. They  
11 do nothing but destroy the genetic diversity of the species  
12 they aim to protect.

13           I think that it's a Band-Aid. It's a technological  
14 fix for something that has a much deeper problem.

15           Let's see. I think that's about it. I mean, that's  
16 just basically -- I just want to put in my two cents towards  
17 --

18           BRETT BROWNSCOMBE:

19           My name is Brett Brownscombe and I am here on behalf  
20 of NEDC, the Northwest Environmental Defense Center, in  
21 support of breaching the four Lower Snake dams.

22           I would like to frame this issue because by the time  
23 you hear thistestimony you will have heard much talk about  
24 fish. I would like to frame the issue in terms of people,  
25 because people, when they make resource decisions, they make

1 these decisions based on how those resources are used will  
2 affect people, I think. And NEDC believes the choice is  
3 about trade-offs. This gets into the costs and benefits.

4 First, the science, NEDC, believes is clear, as  
5 expressed by the Fish and Wildlife Service and various state  
6 agencies. I personally also believe the science is clear.

7 I worked as a hatchery employee up in the state of  
8 Alaska for the better part of six months. And when we raise  
9 salmon from fingerlings to smolt size before release, we did  
10 so using the elements, the conditions and the habitat -- in a  
11 simulated habitat that salmon require and these are the exact  
12 conditions that dams cover.

13 For example, good substrate, healthy dissolved  
14 oxygen content in water, healthy flows of water. Dams impair  
15 all these qualities. In the hatchery, we tried to replicate  
16 them.

17 Moving on to the economic costs and benefits, the  
18 Idaho Statesman estimated in its study that the cost of dam  
19 removal -- pardon me, the benefits of dam removal would  
20 benefit the region economically by greater than \$180 million  
21 versus the costs.

22 What are the other costs to people of failing to  
23 remove or breach these dams? There is a loss of cultural  
24 heritage, continued lawsuits, most likely increased, and  
25 trapped revenue potential. The benefits to people, just as

1 the cost to the culture, the revenue, jobs, fishing and the  
2 legacy the fishing has already proven to provide.

3 The cost of transportation. This is probably the  
4 biggest and the most hotly debated issue in this whole salmon  
5 crises consideration. The effect on transportation, I  
6 believe, could be a decrease in barging. I think the science  
7 supports that. But the increase -- the decrease in barging  
8 would increase trucking, would increase rail transport.

9 I would like to point out that the region is strong  
10 economically because of its location and the types of  
11 businesses it houses, not because of the barging, the  
12 trucking or the freight related to those businesses.

13 Finally, I would like to remind you of the second  
14 law of thermodynamics, which is energy never is lost, it only  
15 changes form.

16 You have a choice and I think you should make the  
17 choice in favor of restoring salmon. People adjust, along  
18 with the fish. And on balance, the benefit to fish and the  
19 benefit to people will be greater for the region in failing  
20 to breach these dams at this time.

21 Thank you.

22 PAT HOWELL:

23 My name is Pat Howell.

24 And I just wanted to have on record that I fully  
25 support -- I am actually commenting on both the draft EIS, as

1 well as the list H, I believe it's called, and support full  
2 removal of the Lower Snake River dams in order to protect our  
3 salmon.

4 The science is there. The economics are there.  
5 And, really, I have lived here all my life and salmon are a  
6 huge part of our culture and our well-being as a region and  
7 really as a nation and we should remove the dams.

8 Thank you.

9 KIMBERLY KAMINSKI:

10 My name is Kimberly Kaminski and I am from Portland,  
11 Oregon, and I am a concerned citizen.

12 We have studied salmon literally to death. The  
13 results are in. The scientists agree if something is not  
14 done now, the salmon will go extinct. Indeed some runs have  
15 already gone extinct. It is a shame in a way that we have to  
16 be here to even discuss this issue, that we are facing this  
17 issue today.

18 It is not too late, but it will be soon. Breaching  
19 the Lower Snake River dams is not the only thing that needs  
20 to be done, but it is a step in the right direction.

21 This is a small step that will achieve a great  
22 purpose. When we think of our legacy and to paraphrase a  
23 thought from Mike Dombeck, let's start to think not about  
24 what we take, but what we leave.

25 Thanks.

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

KEVIN ADAMS:

My name is Kevin Adams and I am a concerned citizen.

We still hear ancient legends of rivers so packed with salmon that a man could walk across it on their backs and not get his feet wet. We can read of early accounts such as that of Meriwether Lewis who describes the delicious steelhead trout he ate on his journey.

My father told me stories of growing up on the McKenzie River, that farmers were able to use their pitch forks to harvest the salmon they were so plentiful.

What will I tell my children and future generations when they ask about these great fish? Better yet, ladies and gentlemen of the panel, what will you tell them?

The remainder of my testimony consists of facts and figures written in a Harper index format. It is my hope that this information will help everyone see that these dams and our present methods of salmon recovery do not make sense.

Amount in dollars that taxpayers have spent to date since 1981 on ineffective salmon recovery, \$3 billion.

Estimated number of salmon that once entered the mouth of the Columbia River, 16 million.

Number of spring Chinook salmon that reached the Lower Granite Dam in 1988, 21,870.

Number of spring Chinook salmon that reached the Lower Granite Dam in 1991, 8,475.

1                   Number of sockeye salmon that reached the Lower  
2 Granite Dam in 1976, 531.

3                   Number of sockeye salmon that reached the Lower  
4 Granite Dam in 1996, seven.

5                   Estimated number of years until most Snake River  
6 salmon become extinct, 10 to 20.

7                   Amount of regional electricity provided by the four  
8 Snake River dams, 5 percent.

9                   Estimated rate increase for regional power users if  
10 the dams are breached, one to five dollars a month.

11                   Percentage of flood control provided to the region  
12 from the four Snake River dams, zero.

13                   Yearly dollar amount to maintain nine fish  
14 hatcheries built on the Lower Snake, \$12.7 million.

15                   Yearly dollar amount to barge and truck fish around  
16 dams, \$3.5 million.

17                   Estimated number of commercial fishing jobs  
18 threatened by depleted fish populations, 15,250.

19                   Annual dollar amount spent by Northwest  
20 salmon/steelhead fishermen alone, \$600 million.

21                   Total economic contribution in the region in terms  
22 of hotel stays, restaurant meals and other indirect fishing  
23 related spending each year, \$3 billion.

24                   Number of dams in the U.S. already removed in an  
25 effort to restore fish habitat, 400.

1                   Extinction is forever.

2                   JACK STRATON:

3                   My name is Jack Straton. I have been a citizen of  
4 Oregon since 1959.

5                   As a scientist in another field -- that is physics  
6 -- I may not understand the intricacies of fish biology, but  
7 I know enough of science in general to be shocked to see a  
8 process in which respectable scientific conclusions are set  
9 aside in what appears to be a politically motivated  
10 expedience.

11                   Sure you can find some scientists to back up any  
12 conclusion you desire, even some not funded by farm and power  
13 interests. But having one theory to rebut another theory  
14 does not constitute an impasse. Let us be clear that these  
15 four dams were an experiment foisted off on an unknowing  
16 public. The results of this experiment is an acknowledgment  
17 by all of the devastation of salmon runs.

18                   Let us be clear that the theoretical debate is not  
19 about the cause of that devastation. The only debate is  
20 about the most cost-effective or politically expedient method  
21 to deal with the mess these experimental dams created.

22                   It is time to move to a new experiment. If we  
23 breach the earth berms on these dams for, say, a decade or so  
24 and these salmon runs do not improve, we can always pile that  
25 dirt back in the river and say we tried.

1           Let us be clear that if we don't try the breaching  
2 experiment, in a decade or so we cannot reverse this choice.  
3 The salmon will be gone.

4           Whatever your politics, no matter if you are an  
5 Idaho farmer or a Warm Springs Indian, if you look in your  
6 heart with unflinching intensity, you will know that it's  
7 immoral to even try to balance an irreversible act with a  
8 reversible act.

9           Thank you very much.

10          TONY MURCZEK:

11          My name is Tony Murczek from Portland, Oregon.

12          I don't necessarily represent but I am a member of  
13 the Mazama Conservation Committee and I am speaking on my own  
14 behalf tonight.

15          I feel -- I'm not a person that normally comes  
16 forward to speak about political matters. However, this  
17 issue has definitely struck a deep, deep sense in myself and  
18 a lot of other people.

19          I am encouraged by seeing the turnout here today.  
20 The people that are living very, very busy lives, taking the  
21 time out to come here and express their views, especially the  
22 views of removing the dams and trying to do everything we can  
23 to save the salmon.

24          I grew up in Chicago. I did not grow up in the  
25 Northwest, but have been here since 1990. And just in the

1 last year and a half I have had some extremely awe-inspiring  
2 trips. One in particular was going down the Snake River on a  
3 raft last year, last summer, and seeing the grandeur of that  
4 area and how it's had problems with what people have done  
5 with jet boats and that sort of thing. And just -- when I  
6 was getting into really being on that river and really  
7 enjoying my outdoor experience, we were told to get off the  
8 rafts because there were dams in the way on the Lower Snake.

9           And so I couldn't help but think what a wonderful --  
10 continued wonderful experience it would have been to continue  
11 to raft down that river or that great river and not have  
12 those dams in the way and restoring it as best we could to  
13 its natural state.

14           Since then I went to a salmon festival this year in  
15 Clackamas and have learned more about the salmon and tried to  
16 get involved and have since joined the conservation committee  
17 with the climbing club that I am a member of. And I am going  
18 to continue to do everything in my power to help the  
19 ecological state of our nation. And I think that this is a  
20 very worthwhile effort and I just implore you to deal with  
21 this issue in a very responsible manner.

22           This issue goes well beyond boundaries of ecological  
23 and/or economic -- I'm sorry -- and goes really to a deep  
24 spiritual level where a lot of people are coming together and  
25 we can really make a difference.

1 Thank you very much.

2 RUSSELL DICKSON:

3 My name is Russell M. Dickson. I'm a 74-year-old  
4 Portland attorney. I have been a fisherman all my life. I  
5 have been a resident of Oregon since I was about a  
6 six-year-old.

7 I have been very concerned about this salmon  
8 situation. And it's very discouraging to me that nobody  
9 seems to be able to come to grips with the whole thing. I  
10 applauded Andy Kerr who was the first one, to my knowledge,  
11 who suggested that -- suggested dam removal. He had the  
12 courage to call a spade a spade and to name what the real  
13 problem was.

14 I don't think you have to be a rocket scientist to  
15 figure out that if you have a viable species that goes out  
16 into the pastureland of the Pacific and grows from a small  
17 smolt to a 30-pound salmon, you don't have to cultivate them,  
18 you don't have to fence them in, you really don't have to do  
19 anything except let them do their thing. And for years, they  
20 supported all the peoples of the Northwest area, the Indian  
21 tribes.

22 I don't think you have to be a rocket scientist to  
23 see that if you cut them off from their means of propagation,  
24 you are going to destroy them. And that's what has been  
25 happening on the Columbia River. The only viable remedy that

1 I can see is to remove or modify some of these dams. When  
2 they were put in, no one had any idea of the ramifications  
3 and what was going to happen.

4 The idea was that we'll build all these dams; we'll  
5 put in all these fish hatcheries; the fish will mature in the  
6 fish hatcheries and then we'll just send them down the river  
7 to the ocean and everything will just be fine.

8 Unfortunately, like many of the other things that we  
9 have tried to do in engineering nature, it hasn't worked.  
10 Roosevelt, when he put in Grand Coulee, said we're going to  
11 do a lot of things and if they don't work, we're going to  
12 reverse them.

13 It's time to take those dams out and make whatever  
14 other modifications on the river are required. The world is  
15 close to a food crises. We need salmon.

16 That's all I have to say.

17 JEFF WHITE:

18 My name is Jeff white and I am not representing any  
19 particular organization.

20 However, I would like to say that I am originally  
21 from the East Coast, the Boston area, and I came out here  
22 specifically to volunteer for a -- well, it's the Americorps  
23 program. And what we do is environmental restoration and we  
24 try to plant a lot of trees. But with the idea of not only  
25 reforesting areas, but bringing back native species,

1 including salmon.

2           And I find it kind of strange that this conversation  
3 and this whole debate is even taking place when the evidence  
4 is so overwhelming and obvious. I'm not an expert on salmon  
5 or salmon recovery, but I am essentially dedicating a year of  
6 my life to kind of improve the environment here in the  
7 Northwest because it's one of my favorite places in the  
8 world.

9           And I would just hate to see a resource -- and even  
10 hate to use that word because it just puts it in an economic  
11 context, but I think we need to look beyond that and to the  
12 much broader issues here. And the extinction of a species is  
13 just kind of like the tip of an iceberg. It's much bigger  
14 than that, because you are talking about a whole habitat.  
15 And if the salmon go, I think in the long run, we will go to  
16 some extent if we don't start to save some of these species.

17           And I realize there are jobs at stake here and so  
18 forth, but we always seem to be able to come up with creative  
19 ways to do things economically and politically when there are  
20 things like a war or other things that we get ourselves into  
21 and other kinds of crises. But when it comes to the  
22 environment, it always seems to get pushed aside and kind of  
23 it gets the short end of the stick. And I just think that  
24 that's got to change or else our economy is going to suffer  
25 as well as our -- just everything that makes us human and

1 makes us alive. And I think it's really high time. And I  
2 think the people that have the power to make the right  
3 decisions, if they let their consciences speak to them, I  
4 think they will do the right thing.

5 And I appreciate you listening to everybody's  
6 comments because I know this must be real, real difficult to  
7 sit and listen to all this. But thank you very much.

8 LYNN FORD:

9 My name is Lynn Ford and I am from Portland, Oregon.

10 And I want to urge your agencies to decide to breach  
11 the dams and to do so as quickly as possible. The fish and  
12 other wildlife do not owe humans a living, much less the  
13 chance to make a killing. We do have an obligation, however,  
14 not to wipe out the salmon. That means we must do everything  
15 we can to save them.

16 There is ample evidence that the economic costs of  
17 breaching can be mitigated. We have 20 years of proven  
18 failure of mitigation for the damage the dams do to the fish.  
19 The vast preponderance of the honest science supports  
20 breaching the dams and so do I.

21 Thank you.

22 TANYA SANORIB:

23 All right. My name is Tanya Sanorib and I'm a  
24 resident of Washington state and I am here today because I  
25 support the removal the four dams on the Snake River.

1           I moved to the Pacific Northwest about three years  
2 ago and became very interested in fish issues because I think  
3 it's hard to live here and not be. And I always heard about  
4 the four H's. And I think that although my work personally  
5 has always been involved with habitat, that removal of  
6 hydropower is one of those four H's and is very important, so  
7 please remove the dams.

8           Thank you.

9           SARAH CLINEHENS:

10           My name is Sarah Clinehens and I am a concerned  
11 citizen.

12           I wanted to offer some comments about the removal of  
13 the four dams from the Lower Snake River. I'm just fully in  
14 favor of removing the dams in order to provide more salmon  
15 habitat for all the habitat that's been cut off by the dams.

16           I work for a nonprofit here in Portland doing  
17 habitat restoration, so I am very familiar with the plight  
18 that our native fish are in and I am very supportive that  
19 this would be a measure that would really improve the chances  
20 for us to save these salmon runs.

21           I feel like we have a responsibility to protect  
22 diversity in our species, and all of our animal and plant  
23 species on the planet because that's what gives life its  
24 strength and resilience. And I also feel there are important  
25 cultural values around the salmon and just they're important

1 to people in the Northwest for a myriad of reasons, so I am  
2 very in favor of removing the dams.

3 Thanks.

4 JOHN SWEENEY:

5 This is John Sweeney, and I'm a native Oregonian and  
6 I've lived most of my life in Oregon.

7 And I'm against removing the dams because I think  
8 the deal is the costs will be just too extreme because I  
9 think that you are going to have to replace a lot of roads,  
10 railroads. And the loss of the fish will even increase their  
11 losses because the river will get narrower and the predators  
12 who are in the rivers will be able to gobble up the salmon  
13 even faster, so we need to keep the dams because it has a  
14 benefit.

15 And you have to remember that the dams have been  
16 there a long time and they have created their own ecosystems.  
17 They're just as viable as the old style.

18 And if they want to save salmon, there is two things  
19 that they can do that don't involve doing away with the dams.  
20 And that's, one, they could have our navy ships out on the  
21 sea to keep the foreign fishermen from running in and  
22 scooping up the sea beds about a hundred yards wide four or  
23 five miles at a time that wipes out the bottom of the food  
24 chain.

25 And the other is a fact that you look at the bridges

1 that have gone across the small streams, over a period of  
2 time, they've done away with the bridges and gone to culverts  
3 because they're cheaper. The only trouble with the culverts  
4 is they've created narrow hallways and the fish don't want to  
5 go down those hallways.

6           It's like going home and on your way home and  
7 suddenly there is no lights on the way and, you know, it  
8 looks right but you are -- you are nervous and you don't go.  
9 And that's what happened to many places with the fish that  
10 going to culverts has wiped out plenty of fish runs. But  
11 again, the economic cost of taking out those dams is just  
12 beyond concept.

13           Now, if they got the pressure on so heavy that they  
14 -- it's almost unbearable, instead of taking the earthen  
15 portion out of the dams, just lower the spillways, open the  
16 locks. And then in a few years when you find out that it  
17 didn't do any good, instead of having to be rebuilding the  
18 dam is all they have to do is just close the locks, close the  
19 spillways and we would regain things as they are now. And  
20 maybe people will have it burned into their memory.

21           Thank you very much.

22           Again, my name is John Sweeney.

23           LARRY SNEEDEN:

24           Okay. My name is Larry Sneed. I'm the president  
25 of Clackamas River Trout Unlimited.

1           I am here representing 275 members in our chapter.  
2 I'm not real well prepared for this. I do have a couple of  
3 points that I would like to make.

4           I think that economically, this isn't like it was  
5 when the timber industry got hit so hard a few years back.  
6 This is going to be an economic shift. It happens  
7 everywhere. I just got hit by one myself. I took a major  
8 cut in pay, but it's the way things happen in the world.  
9 Some people have to suffer while the world moves on. I was  
10 hit; I recovered from it.

11           The other point that I would like to make is I think  
12 these -- right now the time is 11:59 for these fish. We  
13 don't have much time left to try new things other than  
14 removing the dams, putting the river back the way it was  
15 before we got in and messed it up.

16           What I hear is a bunch of alternatives which are  
17 exactly what we have been trying for the last 150 years,  
18 which has gotten us into this situation to begin with.

19           I guess, in closing, I would just like to say as a  
20 representative of Trout Unlimited and my chapter of 275  
21 people, we strongly support removing these dams.

22           Thank you.

23           JACK HERBERT:

24           My name is Jack Herbert, John Herbert. I live in  
25 Washington County, Oregon. I'm not representing anybody

1       except myself and my family.

2                It's important -- I think the important things in  
3       life -- physically important things in life are mainly nature  
4       and physical survival, and that we cannot have decent lives  
5       no matter what else we do if we destroy our natural heritage.  
6       So that leads me to say we need to do whatever we can to  
7       restore the (inaudible) fish runs and all other wildlife and  
8       echo systems as much as we can.

9                It's not a matter of calculating dollars. That's a  
10       phony argument. And we know that our economy will be better  
11       if we take care of -- if we have a healthy environment.

12               Removing the dams is one of those steps and we need  
13       to do that. The lower four Snake River dams, according to  
14       what we've heard, is one of the most important parts of dam  
15       removal. We also need to do all the steps, not just think,  
16       oh, we can remove those four dams and then we don't have to  
17       do anything else. We need to do all of them that have been  
18       mentioned in the multiple H plan, deal with the habitat and  
19       the harvesting and the fisheries -- hatcheries.

20               We also need to do each step most effectively,  
21       taking the care necessary to do it well. This means  
22       minimizing the sediment entrainment in the river when we  
23       breach the dams. We should not just bore a hole through it  
24       and let the water rip. It'll probably cost several times as  
25       much to do it right as to do it wrong, but we need to do

1       whatever it costs to ensure that the water is -- there is not  
2       too much sediment in the water to harm the fish.

3               We also need -- we should realize that we're all in  
4       this together. We should have that attitude in our society  
5       so we should provide assistance to the employees and the  
6       smaller farmers, if needed, to obtain water or to change  
7       occupations or locations.

8               George Bush did not want to protect our old growth  
9       cutting but he wouldn't help out the loggers who were thrown  
10      out of work mostly by mechanization, not so much by the  
11      decreasing of cutting. He claimed to be for them, but when  
12      it came to helping them retrain to do something else with  
13      their lives, he wouldn't give them anything. We need more  
14      responsible action from our government.

15              We also need to consider things like the dredging  
16      for the Portland harbor. We need to do that without adding  
17      too much sediment to the stream when the smolts are running  
18      down or other fish are returning upstream. We need to do  
19      each step and need to do it as well as we can.

20              Thank you.

21              ROBERT MOSIER:

22              Okay. My name is Robert Mosier and I am here  
23      because I'm a native Oregonian. I have grown up in Eugene,  
24      Oregon, and this is an issue that's very important to me.

25              I have never come to a public hearing before, but

1 this is something that was very important to me because  
2 salmon are very important to the heritage of the people in  
3 the Northwest.

4 I support the removal of the Lower Snake River dams.  
5 Salmon has always been a prized fish, a prized resource to me  
6 and my family. At family gatherings, we would share the  
7 salmon. We would go out with our grandfather and catch  
8 salmon and share them at the next family gathering.

9 I became aware of the appalling decline in the  
10 salmon in my teens. There used to be a very vital fishing  
11 industry all along the coast. And as I grew up, I became  
12 aware of the lack of resource because they kept on shortening  
13 and shortening the season. The fishing families had no way  
14 to make a living. Eventually, that industry totally died out  
15 along the Oregon coast.

16 It's hard to believe that we could see the  
17 extinction of the salmon in our lifetimes, but that's what  
18 we're seeing right now. It could be another 20 or 30 years  
19 before they're totally gone, but there are salmon that are  
20 going extinct at this time and salmon that have already gone  
21 extinct.

22 The economic impact of this decision is not limited  
23 to the area that they studied. It is not limited to the  
24 local economy in Lewiston, Idaho. This decision affects the  
25 the economy all over the Northwest, just as in the fishing

1 industry on the coast. The health of the salmon as a species  
2 is very important to all of us.

3 None of the economic studies placed a value on this  
4 lost resource or on the lost part of our heritage and the  
5 heritage of our children. The economic studies don't address  
6 cheap power to the industrial power users like aluminum  
7 smelters who do not generate the jobs in proportion to the  
8 power use that they have. This power could mitigate the lost  
9 power from these dams. How can we be so arrogant as to  
10 propose that cheap power is more important than the priceless  
11 resource of this salmon species?

12 Every piece of the salmon recovery puzzle is  
13 important. Removal of the Lower Snake River dams is an  
14 important first step, but only the first step. We have a  
15 moral responsibility to save the salmon.

16 So, in closing, I support breaching of the Lower  
17 Snake River dams and the aggressive conservation approach  
18 that they had proposed in the HHH study.

19 Thanks.

20 BRYAN THEIS:

21 My name is Bryan Theis.

22 I'm a resident of the Northwest, Portland, Oregon.  
23 I do not represent any group or other organization that has a  
24 direct stake in this issue. However, I am a representative of  
25 the people of Oregon and I feel strongly that these dams

1 should be removed.

2 I don't think that you can really make an economic  
3 case for the maintenance of the dams and their current  
4 position once you consider the real costs, which must include  
5 the costs of loss of fish, loss of endangered species and all  
6 of the biological costs associated with that turn of events.

7 I am concerned that the functional equivalent of  
8 these dams is that of a tax on everyone who uses the  
9 ecosystem that surrounds the Snake River. These dams have  
10 the effect of benefiting a relatively small group of  
11 customers, and, in exchange, the community as a whole pays  
12 the price. This is a tax. This is a classic, big government  
13 solution. It's the kind of -- it's the kind of economic foul  
14 play that conservatives often deride but, in this case, they  
15 are -- they seem to be the ones who are supporting the  
16 retention of the dams.

17 You cannot make a real economic case for retention  
18 of the dams. I strongly support the removal of them or their  
19 partial breach.

20 Thank you very much.

21 TOM SCHRAW:

22 My name is Tom Schraw, and I'm representing the  
23 Community Action Directors of Oregon and the Oregon Energy  
24 Coordinators Association. We provide services to low-income  
25 families across Oregon, including programs like Head Start

1 and Energy Assistance.

2 And the concern has come up about dam breaching,  
3 that removal of the hydroelectric power load would increase  
4 electric rates. We're here basically to strongly support dam  
5 breaching. And we believe that the right environmental thing  
6 to do in this instance is the right thing to do.

7 There has been decades of focus on this issue that  
8 hasn't really solved the problem and has cost a tremendous  
9 amount of money. And our druthers in terms of long-term  
10 impact is to do the thing that scientists are saying actually  
11 solves the problem, which is breach dams. It has the highest  
12 likelihood of success and we think in the long run will have  
13 the lowest rate impact on low-income people who we serve.

14 We've worked very hard in Oregon intervening in rate  
15 cases from investor-owned utilities, working with BPA,  
16 getting legislation like SB 1149 passed, to protecting  
17 low-income people's electric rates.

18 We think that dam breaching is exactly the right  
19 strategy in this particular instance over the long run to  
20 provide the types of protections that people need.

21 Thanks for this opportunity to testify.

22 MARILYN LAMB:

23 Hi. My name is Marilyn Lamb and I am a member of  
24 the Northwest and very strongly identified with the wildlife  
25 and the natural resources that have been so generously given

1 to us and that we are responsible for and we must in no way  
2 allow the salmon to go extinct.

3 We're in charge of them and we're guilty parties if  
4 they disappear. We must take the dams out and save the  
5 salmon. Our natural life-style is wrapped around these  
6 animals and creatures.

7 And just take an aluminum can and put it in a nice  
8 frying pan with some olive oil and garlic and fry it up real  
9 good and eat it and compare that with eating a nice salmon  
10 steak. Then you make the decision.

11 And let's keep the salmon and throw out the tin  
12 cans.

13 Thank you.

14 JACK MCDONALD:

15 Okay. My name is Jack McDonald, a citizen of  
16 Portland.

17 I support the EIS option of removing or breaching  
18 the dams. The dams were the last built on the Columbia  
19 system in a time where dam building was done overzealously  
20 and are of marginal economic benefits, I believe.

21 Further, I think removal of the dams will provide  
22 the most cost-effective benefit to restoring salmon by  
23 removing of the dams. Those economically relying on the dams  
24 can be made reasonably whole at least through money provided  
25 that would otherwise serve to operate the dams, could be made

1 -- could benefit those that would be impacted by the removal  
2 of the dams.

3 Any equivalent gains that could be made through  
4 habitat reform, et cetera, first of all, are probably  
5 unlikely to happen due to belligerence through the state and  
6 from the states. And, also, making those whole again, the  
7 farmers, ranchers, et cetera, those relying on the dams would  
8 have to sacrifice to get any equivalent type of benefits that  
9 dam removal would obtain. It would be much to cost expensive  
10 and, therefore, I believe removal of the dams is the best  
11 option.

12 Thank you.

13 MANDY PARKINSON:

14 My name is Mandy Parkinson and I am a concerned  
15 citizen. I'm also a law student.

16 In the interests of longevity, we must make  
17 long-term decisions. We have to, even if this comes down to  
18 economic terms. We must think in long terms. Economic  
19 interests in the long-term support breaching of these dams.  
20 We must take them down. We have to think about all the  
21 factors, and this includes the life of the fish, our life,  
22 all economic interests.

23 Thank you.

24 (TESTIMONY CONCLUDED.)

25