

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”

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

FEBRUARY 29, 2000

TRANSCRIBED BY NANCY J. SMITH

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

PO Box 245

Vancouver, WA 98686

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MR. NELSON: I am Ted Nelson, a retired professional forester. My
2 wife and I have co-authored three books on the Columbia/Snake River inland
3 waterways. We have traveled its length many times. Some say that breaching the
4 four lower Snake River dams is a bold solution to salmon recovery in the Snake River
5 Basin. I submit that it is a draconian measure inspired by the philosophy of
6 appearing to be doing something, even if it's wrong.

7 The so-called solution ignores changes in Pacific Ocean temperatures
8 and their known adverse effects on salmon survival, growth and egg count. It ignores
9 the issue of proliferating Caspian tern populations at the Columbia's mouth and their
10 predation of juvenile salmon. It ignores the issue of salmon predation by increasing
11 numbers of seals and sea lions. It ignores predation by resident fish, a risk that is
12 reduced by the barging or trucking of juvenile fish.

13 It ignores the issues of over-harvesting, but fails to adequately address
14 the adverse environmental consequences from the loss of hydropower and the
15 subsequent increase in the use of fossil fuels for power generation and the overland
16 transportation of goods. It fails to recognize the beneficial effects that can come
17 from improved agricultural practices in the way that Washington's recent forest and
18 fish legislation will improve practices on forestlands.

19 Rejuvenation of salmon stocks involves a host of intertwined and
20 complex scientific, economic and societal issues. We should not be diluted by the
21 silver bullet approach that is implied by the breaching proposal. Please reject option
22 four in the All-H paper. Thank you. Okay. Is that all right?

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. You're all set.

24 MS. GARRISON: Hi. I'm Karen Garrison of the Natural Resources
25 Defense Council. I want to start by stating that the Natural Resources Defense

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 Council and our 400,000 members support removing the four lower Snake dams as
2 part of a comprehensive restoration plan, as the best way to recover endangered
3 Snake River salmon and steelhead.

4 We've come to that conclusion after careful review of the biological and
5 economic studies. We also support and urge Bonneville Power Administration to
6 pursue a strategy for replacing the energy from those dams with conservation and
7 renewable resources that will not increase carbon emissions from the western grid.

8 Based on a preliminary analysis, we believe that Northwest energy
9 rates could still be among the lowest in the nation, even after incorporating the cost of
10 dam removal and a zero carbon energy replacement plan. We think the costs of both
11 of those things are likely to be less than about a dollar for Seattle residential energy
12 users.

13 We were disappointed to hear Governor Locke pose the question, why
14 trade clearly-known benefits for something very iffy. That question reveals just how
15 shortsighted and narrow a perspective he has on this issue. In fact, those dams
16 displaced clearly-known benefits, the enormous environmental, cultural and spiritual
17 value that salmon created over centuries.

18 The biggest difference between the benefits dams create and the ones
19 they displace is that the first could be replaced if dams are removed through a series
20 of affordable steps that will help set the region on a sustainable course for the future.
21 The benefits displaced by the four Snake dams in contrast are likely to go down in
22 the latter as a permanent, indelible loss if the dams remain in place.

23 The Northwest faces a critical choice. It can take the path that almost
24 certainly will lead to extinction by choosing delay or complex alternatives that exclude
25 dam removal as an option, or it can take the path that leads to robust salmon runs

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 and a healthier environment, one that positions the region for a strong economy in
2 the 21st century. That path involves removing some dirt, investing in a transition plan
3 that mitigates the impacts of taking out the dams, and renewing the push for energy
4 conservation and renewables. NRDC considers the latter a far superior choice. I
5 can't believe -- yeah, that's it.

6 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Go ahead.

7 MS. O'KANE: Hi. My name's Mary O'Kane, and I'm not representing
8 an organization, but I'm a mother of four, and I'm concerned about the heritage that I
9 leave my children and grandchildren. So this is what I was hoping to testify before
10 more people than a tape-recorder. We're wearing red, red for the wild salmon to
11 show our allegiance with these, our kin.

12 We are here to lend our voices to support the removal of the four lower
13 Snake River dams. We are here to bear witness to the consequence of those dams,
14 to the stark facts of decline. Ninety percent of the inland west's wild salmon in 25
15 years were obliterated.

16 We are here to declare that it is imperative to turn this around, to
17 allowed the river the freedom to follow its currents, to fulfill its course, unhampered by
18 the intrusion of industrial engineering.

19 We wear red for the wild salmon because life hangs in the balance, no
20 longer one by one, but a whole species at a time. We wear red for the wild salmon
21 whom I represent here today in asking, how dare we even consider continuing to
22 infringe on their way when it spells irrevocable extinction. There is an old Okanogan
23 story from before the white man imposed his way upon the land. In it, the people are
24 starving because the monster deities have built a great dam that obstructs the river
25 trail of salmon.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 The people do a prayer dance day after day, night after night. Coyote
2 hears them, and in his rascally ways brings down the dam and restores the running
3 salmon. In our time, it is not the monster deities that have built the dams and it is not
4 coyote who'll breach them. It is clearly up to us. Wear red for the wild salmon to
5 insist upon a future that will allow them to flourish. May their way be opened.

6 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

7 MS. MINIUM: My name is Deborah Minium. And I'm a homemaker in
8 the Seattle area. I oppose the removal of the dams on the Snake River for two major
9 reasons. First, I believe it will have serious financial impact on my family and all
10 families throughout Washington, and second, the benefit to the salmon population
11 seems highly questionable. This isn't a knee-jerk reaction. I was so surprised to
12 learn of the effort to breach these dams on what seemed to me to be the obvious
13 consequences that I decided to get on line and do some research.

14 First, I'd like to say that I'm proud to be an American citizen and
15 Washingtonian. I'm grateful to the Corps of Engineers for using their exceptional
16 expertise to enable us to responsibly and efficiently make use of our natural
17 resources, and I applaud the National Fisheries for their meticulous management of
18 America's rivers, lakes and oceans. I have a deeper appreciation of their efforts and
19 contributions after investigating this issue.

20 Here's what I found out. The extent of our concessions to and
21 observations of salmon is enormous, from fish ladders and special turbine design to
22 pit tagging and studies of demortality rates. It seems that if the Chinook had taken
23 the same evolutionary decision approach as their genetic cousins the sturgeon, their
24 decline would have been delayed and that this forum would have been unnecessary.
25 Sturgeon adapted to freshwater life while salmon have remained anadromous.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 An organism's evolutionary strategy is the key to the survival of its
2 species is clear from the geologic record. The definition of "species" is, by the way,
3 organisms capable of breathing. This seems to be a bone of contention because
4 there is so much effort expended on keeping the salmon strains pure by prohibiting
5 inter-breeding.

6 However, hybridizing is naturally-occurring adaptation to environmental
7 system change that can take place between two distinct species. In my view, the
8 hatcheries that produce hybrids should be hailed for their rational and effective
9 scientific techniques. Nature is dynamic and change is constant. Trying to hold
10 things static in a constantly fluctuating environment seems silly.

11 So these anadromous fish have selected a survival strategy which
12 places them in unconfined ocean waters for about 70 percent of their lives. We've
13 modified our dams to accommodate them, and the modifications work. The fish can
14 and do climb the ladders and the fingerlings do make it to the oceans.

15 But what happens outside the managed watershed? Governor Locke,
16 who has publicly opposed the dam breaching, is negotiating with Canadian officials
17 on just this issue. It's been observed that the anadromous fish population from the
18 rivers of the Pacific Northwest can migrate as far as the Bering Sea. That's a large
19 area to be wandering around in for six years before returning to the managed
20 confines on the Snake River.

21 The commercial fishermen of Washington state are doing their part
22 because of 40 years of ever-increasing governmental restrictions and requirements.
23 But what about operations based in other countries that fish in international waters
24 near Washington? Governor Locke's negotiations with Canadian commercial
25 fishermen are essential to providing a more secure safety zone along the North

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 American coast. Back to the freshwater, though. There are no guarantees that if the
2 dams are breached that the salmon will return to the spawning sites. Our
3 neighboring state -- well, one neighboring state, welcomes this breaching, but not
4 specifically because of the salmon.

5 They want to improve the recreational aspects of the --

6 THE MODERATOR: If you can wrap it up real quickly. Yeah, it's after
7 three minutes.

8 MS. MINIUM: Could I just read this?

9 THE MODERATOR: Sure.

10 MS. MINIUM: We should not rush to judgment on this issue. Maybe
11 we need to modify our individual lifestyles. If we the people truly feel the need to
12 save our salmon, drastic federal edict is inappropriate. Instead, the decision should
13 be made by the citizens who are directly and specifically affected by this action. I
14 would prefer to allocate my limited resources toward a sustainable environment in a
15 prudent and rational means under the leadership of a government of the people by
16 the people and for the people, but in the meantime, I'll only serve my family farm-
17 raised fish.

18 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Go ahead.

19 MS. GRAMS: Hello. My name's Janell Grams. I'm from the Ritzville,
20 Washington, FFA chapter. I'm part of the 1999 national winners for agricultural
21 issues. And the issue that we took back to Louisville, Kentucky in October to win the
22 nation with was whether or not breaching of the dams would be a good idea for our
23 economy or for the salmon.

24 And after interviewing multiple sources and doing a year and a half to
25 two years worth of research, we have come up with an overall consensus, which is

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 that we need to do something to save the salmon and not breach the dams, to come
2 up with a happy medium. I feel there needs to be more research that's done as far
3 as ocean factors are concerned, and I feel that breaching the dams is a drastic
4 measure that will not benefit the salmon or the people who call the Pacific Northwest
5 home.

6 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

7 MR. MIANEZKI: Go? Okay. My name is Frank Mianezki, and I live in
8 Royal City, Washington. I'm a farmer in the Columbia Basin. And I believe the four
9 dams on the Snake River should be left in. The dams are far more beneficial left in
10 for power, transportation, agriculture, jobs now and for many generations to come. I
11 believe in salmon recovery, also.

12 The salmon recovery can be done by sound fish management practice
13 other than dam removal. The dams need fish-friendly turbines. They say less than
14 one percent are lost going through the fish-friendly turbines. The Army Corps of
15 Engineers say that about 70 percent of the smolt make it to the river, which I think is
16 a good percentage for the fish.

17 The other practice for salmon recovery should be done first than dam
18 removal. Other things tried would be a lot less expensive than the dam removals.
19 The streams with no dams have very little fish that come back to spawn, so I think the
20 biggest factor is the harvest of the fish in the oceans. My first steps of salmon
21 recovery would be cut commercial fishing, cut sport fishing, take the nets out of our
22 river, improve on the hatchery fish is a big factor. And the big and the best salmon
23 are caught on our commercial gillnets, and the little salmon pass through the nets
24 and are the ones left to come back to spawn, so they are not the best salmon for
25 reproduction.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 We should have a season on salmon fishing like we have a season on
2 deer, elk and so on. We don't have deer, elk -- we don't have deer and elk season
3 while the mothers are having little ones, and here, yet, we harvest salmon that are
4 coming up to spawn before they are even able to have babies.

5 And the dams need to be there for our people and for our generations
6 to come. So let's try other sound management practices first.

7 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

8 MR. GERRITSON: Okay. My name is Steve Gerritson. I am chairman
9 of the Cascade chapter of the Sierra Club representing approximately 20,000
10 members in western and central Washington.

11 The Cascade chapter supports breaching of the dams on the lower
12 Snake River for the following reasons. One, the National Marine Fisheries Service
13 and Corps of Engineers assessments indicate that breaching offers the best chance
14 of recovery, although breaching alone may be insufficient.

15 Two, salmon are a benchmark species. Many others depend on them
16 for survival. Losing salmon will result in impacts on the regional ecosystem well
17 beyond the fish themselves.

18 Three, a free-flowing river is the only way to provide a healthy
19 environment. Fish barging, so-called friendly turbines and other technological
20 attempts have not worked and have wasted hundreds of millions of dollars.

21 Four, the tribal treaties. If the salmon are lost, the economic impacts as
22 a result of our obligations under these treaties will be enormous. The Sierra Club
23 recognizes that breaching alone will not solve the problem.

24 They pledge to work with all agencies and government units to assess
25 other steps which should be taken to improve the species' chances for survival. But

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 let's be clear. Most experts agree that dam breaching is necessary and fundamental
2 to this process.

3 Finally, we recognize that breaching these four dams will have
4 economic and social consequences to those who live and work in the Snake Basin.
5 These will include modest reductions in electrical generation capacity, the loss of
6 barges as a transport option, and changes in how irrigation water is obtained. We
7 feel that these impacts are real, but that mitigation will be relatively easy, especially
8 with the dollars saved on spurious technological fixes. Salmon benefit us all. Let's
9 work together to benefit the salmon.

10 MS. CADY: My name is Pamela Cady, C-a-d-y. I am from Seattle.
11 And do I give my whole address?

12 THE MODERATOR: No.

13 MS. CADY: Okay. And I think that the Snake River dams should be
14 breached, and I would like to support that option. I'll try not to speak too long. But I
15 just think that a couple of people at the testimony, not the taped testimony, have said
16 a couple things, and I've done some research.

17 I think that the sediment that would occur if the dams were breached
18 would not do permanent damage to the recovery of the salmon. I think they could
19 eventually survive. And that the irrigation for crops, that could also be worked out.
20 So I think that we would be able to try to help the salmon as well as not destroying all
21 of the human factors in it as well.

22 I think that it's important that we realize that we're talking about the
23 extinction of species vs. harm to humans, which wouldn't cause humans to go
24 extinct. So I think that there's a real difference there. And we should consider the
25 graveness of the issue of stocks of salmon going extinct because of our actions. I

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 think that's a serious effect of the dams. So I'd like to have the dams removed.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. PENDLETON: All right. My name is Kris Pendleton. I'm with the
4 Washington Wilderness Coalition. We live in the Northwest, a place where we can
5 look out of our windows and still see unspoiled wilderness. We can walk trails and
6 still explore some of the beauty out in our mountains. We even have something not
7 many other states have any longer, a chance to protect our areas and live with them
8 sustainably.

9 We even have a chance to save what many people consider our true
10 Northwest heritage, our Pacific wild salmon. Over and over again, I've heard
11 testimony trying to preserve a way of life that relies on irrigation from dams in the
12 desert climate where farms have no logical place. Over and over again, I have heard
13 frustrations from farm workers who can't understand why the salmon are gone where
14 there are no dams.

15 An elderly woman testified that there were no longer salmon at her
16 childhood home on the Columbia where once the river was flooded with silver
17 flashes. She noted that the dams could not be to blame because the salmon did not
18 go through the dams to get there. She's wrong and frustrated, because she, along
19 with many others, don't understand that the salmon die, for the most part, on the way
20 out to the ocean, the smolt by (inaudible) the turbines of our dams.

21 Scientists believe, also, that the barging of our salmon deprive them
22 from the essential smells of their free-flowing river home that they need to return to
23 spawn. We are in environmental debt all across the board, and especially with our
24 salmon here in the Northwest. We need to invest and sacrifice some privileges to get
25 back to balance. I, as a citizen of Seattle, am not willing to pay the consequences of

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 a loss of a species just so a minority of the population can keep a way of life that has
2 only been around for three generations.

3 The Army Corps of Engineers has stated that there is a feasible and
4 economic breaching plan. What are we waiting for? I am very afraid that we are
5 waiting for the approval from big money campaign sponsors. I work for the
6 Washington Wilderness Coalition canvassing door-to-door. A man once asked me at
7 the door when we were going to stop protecting.

8 I asked the man the same question with this reply. When are we going
9 to stop the decimation of our future? How long will it take for us to get wise and stop
10 the shortsighted greed? When are we going to use common sense? When are we
11 going to invest in the future?

12 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Go ahead.

13 MR. KINDER: Hi. I'm Nancy Kinder. I'm from Moses Lake,
14 Washington, formerly from Chewelah, Washington which is 50 miles north of
15 Spokane. I am opposed to breaching the dams on the lower Snake River. I'm not
16 opposed to salmon. I like salmon. I've looked at the data from both sides of this
17 issue, and I'm totally confused with the contradictory information I have read. There
18 are too many important issues which enter into this decision.

19 One issue being, the City of Portland was regularly flooded prior to the
20 construction of dams on the rivers. What is the solution for this problem once the
21 dams are removed? Who wants to pay the hundreds of millions of dollars for the
22 clean-up and repair of this flood damage that will occur every couple years, or
23 possibly, a couple times in one year?

24 Another issue being, what is going to happen to our electrical supply
25 source which supplies power for the Pacific Northwest and other areas of our nation

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 such as California? Are we going to use coal-fired power plants? Where will the coal
2 come from? How will it be transported here? Are we going to resurrect our railroad
3 systems in the Pacific Northwest?

4 And another issue being, what about our food supply? The Pacific
5 Northwest is a major contributor to the source of food for our nation and the world.
6 Without the ability to irrigate from the rivers, the production of food in our nation
7 would be cut considerably. Are we going to rely on foreign food suppliers which are
8 unpredictable and uncontrollable or what? This is all being done to supposedly save
9 the salmon, but why aren't the salmon there?

10 Does the weather and ocean temperatures have anything to do with the
11 salmon runs as some claim? Is it truly a reduced salmon count? Why aren't all the
12 salmon counted, the hatchery and the wild salmon? Is it true that salmon are
13 selective when they breed and they don't fertilize hatchery salmon eggs, and the wild
14 salmon -- or vice versa? Hatchery salmon have been put into our river systems for
15 over 50 years so it is doubtful that there is no pure wild salmon in existence.

16 Can anyone determine if we have purebred wild salmon? I am appalled
17 to think anyone could not consider these complications listed plus many others I've
18 not mentioned, and make the decision without having alternatives already put in
19 place. Is the information and data presented to them being considered equally and
20 without bias from all sources, or are they being selective? How can they disregard
21 some data and not other? What is the criteria for data to be considered or not
22 considered?

23 We have the end -- the National Marine Fisheries Service, the U.S. Fish
24 & Wildlife Service, EPA and many others whose specific job it is to take care of their
25 fellow man as the definition of the agencies and the jobs within them. Citizens of this

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 country have put their trust in these agencies, and they have a responsibility to do
2 the very best they can for their country. That is who they work for. How can anyone
3 make such a decision with such long-term and far-reaching results to so many people
4 without assessing all information without prejudice? I thank the panel for being here.
5 Thank you.

6 MS. WILKINS: Hello. My name is Davis Wilkins. I'm a 29 year-old
7 native of Idaho. I grew up on a small angus cattle ranch in southwestern Idaho,
8 southwest of Nampa, close to the Snake River as it arcs across southern Idaho on its
9 way to Hells Canyon and the Columbia River.

10 I spent weekdays waking up with cattle and tending to their feeding,
11 their calving and their health on the weekends. My parents, both fishers, took me
12 and my younger brother to the mountains and valleys, lakes and rivers of Idaho. The
13 Snake, the main and Middle Fork of the Ssalmon, the Boise, the Clearwater, the
14 Bitterroot, the Lochsa and Silver Creek.

15 There's been a lot of discussion that breaching the dams goes against
16 the ranching, farming interests in the region, but I'm living proof that these interests
17 are not incompatible. I grew up sleeping against the side of heifers and bull calves at
18 the county fair. I grew up trying to peer into the rushing waters for the fish, a glimpse
19 of silver, a flash of red where it was not before. I grew up with the salmon and
20 steelhead as a metaphor for the way to live life, that growing up and getting out into
21 the world can be fraught with difficulty, that there are those who'll eat you alive if you
22 are at the wrong place at the wrong time.

23 It takes time to learn when a shadow is a bird of prey or merely a
24 branch growing in -- branches blowing above the river or your own shadows scaring
25 you. But once you are out there in the big wide world of the ocean, everything is not

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 as before, not safe like the stream, but filled with strange creatures who do not
2 necessarily have your best interests in mind.

3 You must go out there. You must see what life and the world is like out
4 of your home. I left Idaho and went to Duke University where I swam with a lot of big
5 fish in a big ocean. I have traveled and worked outside the country in places like
6 Africa and the Himalayas. I have returned home like a salmon.

7 I've returned to the needs of my community. I am here in Seattle in
8 medical school soon to become a doctor. I'm also busy helping to discover a way to
9 cure macular degeneration, the largest cause of blindness in our country for people
10 over the age of 55. You will hear about these successful results soon.

11 But I am asking you who'll make this decision to work on eradicating
12 blindness, too. We are coming to the point where further blindness will leave us
13 without many things that all of us in this region, despite our differences, hold close to
14 our hearts. Forests empty of crowds and full of trees, rivers devoid of the silver-
15 backed salmon and steelhead returning every fall and winter to remind us of the
16 change of seasons here.

17 The salmon that survive the trials of the sea return. We are still
18 amazed at the magic accuracy with which they find their way. But we find our way
19 home, too, if we can still see or be guided by our instincts or someone who loves us.
20 The salmon and steelhead return to give up all they have for their progeny, their
21 children, just as I have returned to the new -- to the Northwest from corners of the
22 world to help my community fight disease and live a good life and experience a good
23 death.

24 I need to give my children and my patients the story of the salmon to
25 help guide them on their own journey. I need the salmon to help me live my own.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 Please choose to breach the dams and leave the salmon to surprise us and our
2 children and our children's children with their silvery backs and their red bellies full of
3 life and secrets we all hold about the importance of living life to the fullest and the
4 power of returning home. Thank you.

5 MR. GREBB: My name is Don Grebb. I'm from Quincy, Washington.
6 And I am not in favor of breaching the dams. One of the problems I have with this is
7 when the smolts go out to the ocean, that they don't come back, there must be a
8 problem someplace out there. And our power bill that we pay, we are 200 miles
9 away from the ocean, but we are supporting the salmon habitat with our power bill.

10 And we don't believe that salmon should be eliminated, but we do feel
11 that there should be some other method of figuring out why these salmon don't come
12 back up because there are rivers that they don't get into before they ever get into the
13 Columbia River. This is one of the problems I have, and I'm -- I kind of wonder
14 whether the species protective act has gone too far with protecting seals. And the
15 Corps of Engineers putting the island out in the middle of the Columbia River with the
16 terns, they are taking a good portion of the salmon, plus the nets that are across the
17 river. This is the only comment that I have.

18 MR. HAYES: Hello. My name is Peter Hayes. I'm from Kenmore,
19 Washington outside of Seattle. And I've had a 44-year involvement with the
20 Columbia/Snake system. I grew up on the banks of the Columbia. My family's had a
21 162-year involvement, seven generations since the first missionary arrived with the
22 Spaldings on the bank of the Snake in 1836.

23 I've made a living as a commercial fisherman; currently make a living in
24 commercial forestry where we've made lots of changes in concessions to encourage
25 the health of salmon. I'm in full support of the breaching of all four Snake River

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 dams. My support is based on four main reasons. Government and the citizens
2 have a responsibility to reverse the decline of the salmon. That we have it for
3 economic reasons, for cultural, for ecological, and bottom line, for legal reasons that
4 we must act.

5 Two: That it's time -- it's long overdue, time to stop unfair subsidies.
6 We're currently providing subsidies to barge transport to a location that can be
7 served well by other means of transportation. It's time to stop federal subsidies of
8 irrigated agriculture that continues to damage the lands of the Northwest.

9 Three: It's time to stop the endless studies and the politicization of
10 science. We're politically paralyzed into inaction at a time when we most need to
11 take decisive, courageous action. Science clearly supports that the action of
12 breaching will make a significant difference and it's time to act.

13 Fourth, and finally, but probably the most important reason is, I believe,
14 we have an ethical obligation to prevent our blind arrogance from continuing to
15 destroy nature. You and I depend on it, and more importantly, our children depend
16 on it and the next seven generations depend on it. So I expect you to act. Thank
17 you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

19 MR. HAYES: And I have one final comment, which is, I'm quite
20 shocked as I'm handed information at the hearing to find so many things on one-
21 sided copies; that if you put them on two-sided, obviously you use half the paper. So
22 how can we have the process represent the change that we ought to be making? So
23 thanks for all your work.

24 MR. KAHN: My name is Brad Kahn From Seattle. When I sat down to
25 write this last night, I spent a long time staring at the screen of my computer trying to

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 think about something new to add to this debate. The more I sat and thought, the
2 more I became convinced that we have enough information. There are economic
3 reports, social analyses, transportation studies and biological assessments.

4 Now we are taking part in this survey of public opinion in the form of
5 official public meetings. All of these comments will be tallied, sorted, grouped by
6 theme, cross tabulated and tested for significance.

7 In the end, they will be reported in a document that I guess will weigh
8 between 20 and 30 pounds before appendices. And will the people who are
9 assigned to ultimately make this decision read all of this? I don't think so.

10 I suspect that these reports will fall into the lap of some unlucky
11 analysts and associates, aides and assistants who'll have to pore over thousands of
12 pages and then present a succinct five-page summary to their superiors. My point is
13 that we have enough information to act.

14 In every decision, there is an element of uncertainty. Because none of
15 us are omniscient, we will always have questions about our decisions, always have
16 difficulty in foretelling the future. Does this mean we should cease making decisions?
17 Impossible.

18 Simply deciding not to decide is a decision. But all the while, Snake
19 River salmon continue to go extinct. So how do we make the best decision if we
20 can't tell the future?

21 We look to the past trends. In this case, we see the economies of
22 towns like Lewiston, Pasco, and Kennewick continue to miss the economic boon that
23 has engulfed other parts of the Northwest as small farmers are displaced by
24 agribusinesses that export their profits to urban centers. We see decades of fish
25 barging and hatcheries failing to restore self-sustaining wild salmon populations. We

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 see dramatic reductions in ocean harvest, constricting coastal fishing economies to a
2 shell of what they once were.

3 We see sharply declining salmon runs coinciding exactly with the
4 completion of the Lower Granite Dam. Did these dams bring wealth, health and
5 prosperity to the Northwest? It certainly doesn't seem that way. A quick look at the
6 past 25 years of failure to restore wild salmon populations proves that technological
7 quick fixes cannot circumvent the fundamental reality that salmon need free-flowing
8 rivers.

9 The time has come to make a decision. Engineers tell us that if we
10 begin breaching the dams today, it may take ten years to restore a free-flowing river.
11 Scientists tell us that Snake River salmon may only have 17 years before they're all
12 extinct. Simple math tells us that it's time to act now. We have tried other
13 approaches. We have analyzed the science. We have studied the economics. Now
14 we must act to save salmon. We must breach these dams and restore the Snake
15 River to a free-flowing river.

16 There is uncertainty in making this decision as there is in every
17 decision, but with careful planning, thoughtful action, and on-going evaluation of our
18 efforts, this is the only way we can save the Snake River salmon. Please remove
19 these four dams. How long was that?

20 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

21 MR. PARSON: My name is Perry Parsons. I'm a native Washingtonian
22 living in Seattle, 18 years in eastern Washington. I feel very strongly in favor of
23 removing the four Snake River dams under consideration this evening because of the
24 great many benefits that would be a result of that. I feel the benefits outweigh the
25 consequences, and we should move forward in that direction in all due haste.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 MR. BAKEN: My name's Brian Baken, And I'm here to speak on behalf
2 of the salmon and to have the four lower Snake dams removed. The salmon on the
3 Snake River need the four lower dams bypassed, but if you see that as a problem,
4 then you need to see the big problem. The salmon will die if you don't bypass the
5 four lower dams on the Snake River.

6 If this helps the salmon on the Snake River, then maybe other dams will
7 be bypassed and even more salmon can be saved. As a fisherman, I like the idea
8 because everybody should be able to catch a salmon. Thanks.

9 MR. KENNEDY: My name is John Kennedy and I'm from Seattle. I
10 need to stop for a second. My name is John Kennedy and I'm from Seattle. And
11 what I wanted to comment on was the economic analyses that I've seen so far of
12 breaching the dams. I believe that they fail to take into account the intrinsic value of
13 salmon as a species. Although it doesn't fit well into a classical, economic model,
14 there is a lot of precedent for assigning monetary to value to intangibles.

15 Trial lawyers and insurance agents know that in a liability lawsuit,
16 intangibles such as the use of an arm or the accompaniment of a spouse are
17 regularly assigned monetary value. So why is there no monetary value assigned to
18 salmon extinction as an intangible concept?

19 How do you set that value? Take the state of Washington, poll citizens,
20 and ask how much the salmon are worth to them. Let's say the average turns out to
21 be a dollar a year. Multiply that times the population of the state and credit that
22 towards your cost-per-year column. In other words, please internalize your
23 externalities. And for the record, I support the most aggressive options, including
24 dam breaching, to help save salmon. Thanks.

25 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MR. GRUDOWSKI: My name is Ted Grudowski. I'm from Seattle,
2 Washington. I just want to -- I'm in favor of breaching the dams. People can adapt --
3 people can adapt and will. The salmon cannot. So it's very important that we save
4 the salmon which have been here far longer than any people. Thank you.

5 MR. PANTON: My name is Blake Pantan. I live in Seattle,
6 Washington. As a geographer, my perspective on the landscape is one of the -- is a
7 regional one. And I think it's clear from that perspective that these dams represent a
8 huge subsidy to a small geographic region.

9 They were put in towards the end of the Army Corps' dam building
10 spree over the entire western United States. Justification for them in terms of
11 economic terms that the Corps has put out are overblown and do not take into
12 consideration alternative forms of energy and navigation.

13 I would just reiterate that in a geographic sense, this is nothing more --
14 and an economic sense, nothing more than a subsidy. Other regions of the country
15 have had to -- had their subsidies taken away in order to restore the environment,
16 and it's our turn. That's all I have to say.

17 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

18 MR. ROMBERG: My name is Harry Romberg. I live in Seattle,
19 Washington. And I believe that breaching of the lower Snake River dams is really the
20 only alternative that will allow recovery of salmon in the upper Snake and that whole
21 portion of the Columbia Basin. It's obvious that the current mode of operation doesn't
22 work.

23 Hatcheries are worthless. Barging and trucking of the fry are even
24 worse. Habitat and other improvements in the upper river, I don't believe, will work if
25 the dams remain.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 Nobody said the recovery process would be easy. Breaching is not
2 without cost. I think most of the opposition, however, comes from those who refuse
3 to change their ways to save the salmon. They fear change regardless of the fact
4 that in the long-term, it will benefit everyone as well as the salmon. The lost power
5 can easily be made up with renewable energy alternatives and conservation.

6 There should be no lost irrigation if we extend the intake pipes to the
7 lower river levels, and barge transportation can be replaced with rails and trucks.
8 Technological fixes have proven useless or practically useless. We should not just
9 allow those who are negatively impacted to suffer, however. Saving the salmon must
10 be the overriding concern.

11 We should help those that will be impacted to adjust, but this should not
12 be to the detriment of the salmon. Salmon must survive, and I believe the only way
13 this has a hope of happening is through the removal of the lower Snake River dams.
14 All other actions will fail if the dams remain. The dams just don't make sense. Thank
15 you.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

17 MR. CHAPANIS: I'm Roger Chapanis from Issaquah, Washington. I
18 know that a lot's been said about the danger of letting anything go extinct, and I
19 certainly fear letting any living thing go extinct, but I realize that our elected officials
20 and probably many government officials are only going to pay attention to only
21 economic issues surrounding these dams.

22 So what I want to do is give you some actual numbers here which were
23 prepared by the Oregon Natural Resources Council. It clearly shows the economic
24 benefit of removing the dam is greater than the economic benefit of leaving them in
25 place. For instance, the actual benefit of removing the four dams on the lower Snake

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 River would save approximately 87 million dollars each year, and that's computed by
2 taking the annual costs of keeping the dams, which is 236 million dollars, and
3 subtracting the costs of restoring the river by removing the dams, which is 149 million
4 dollars.

5 So it's pretty plain from these numbers that it's much more cost-
6 effective to remove the dams than keep them, quite apart from the extinction issue.
7 Some specific benefits and findings by the Oregon Natural Resources Group are that
8 the lower Snake dams and reservoirs require the Bonneville Power Administration to
9 spend 194 million dollars every year on salmon restoration.

10 Taxpayers and electric ratepayers subsidize the electric power
11 production, river transportation and irrigation from the lower Snake dams and
12 reservoirs. With all costs accounted, these three lower Snake dam benefits actually
13 produce a net benefit loss to the economy of 114 million dollars every year. Electric
14 power from the lower Snake dams is not competitive. It costs 2.44 cents per kilowatt-
15 hour. If we restore the lower Snake River and purchase power elsewhere, we could
16 provide energy for 1.87 cents per kilowatt-hour.

17 River transportation on the lower Snake is expensive and heavily
18 subsidized. Although river shippers pay only \$1.23 per ton to go from Lewiston,
19 Idaho, to Kennewick, Washington, taxpayers and electric ratepayers pay an
20 additional \$12.66. The total cost to ship one ton of goods on the lower Snake is
21 \$13.89 in comparison to rail costs -- only costs \$1.26.

22 Thirteen agribusinesses pump water from the Ice Harbor Reservoir.
23 Together these farms earn a net \$1.9 million per year. The taxpayers and electric
24 ratepayers subsidize these farms with \$11.2 million. If the farms paid their full cost,
25 they would lose \$9.3 million every year. It would be cheaper to buy these farms

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 outright and end their production altogether. All of these arguments suggest there is
2 no compelling economic reason to keep the dams in place. I strongly urge that the
3 dams be removed for economic reasons only. Thank you.

4 MR. BORDEN: My name is William Borden. I'm from Seattle,
5 Washington. I am new to the area and new to the issue, so I can't bring a lot of my
6 own wisdom to this issue. I wish I could. What I've tried to do, instead, is bring the
7 wisdom of a few folks in my pocket. One of them is the ecologist Aldo Leopold who
8 spoke eloquently about extinction when he said the first law of intelligent tinkering is
9 to save all the parts.

10 A wise move indeed. And we've made great progress in the Pacific
11 Northwest. As I say, I come from the Midwest, and it's wonderful to see the
12 restoration and preservation movements that have taken place here in our
13 ecosystems. And I think of the words of another great writer, Wallace Stegner, and
14 he wrote about wilderness, something that pertains to us and our goals.

15 Something will have gone out of us as a people if we ever let the
16 remaining wilderness be destroyed, if we pollute the last clear air, and dirty the last
17 clean streams and push our paved roads through the last of the silence. We have
18 made tremendous strides here. This issue, as I see it, is not about people vs.
19 salmon. It's not one or the other. It's both. And the decision in my mind is about
20 making the right choice.

21 And as I looked around the room tonight and I saw the young people --
22 mostly young people, people with lots of life in their eyes and people who live with
23 our decisions and people who hold great promise, I just urge this panel and urge our
24 government to breach the dams and to let those waters run free and to save those
25 fish.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MS. FIELDS: My name is Elyse Fields. I am a resident of Seattle, but I
2 am originally from eastern Washington. Last year, I worked as the program
3 coordinator at the Washington Wheat Commission, and I worked personally with
4 hundreds of farmers. They're really suffering. They're in one of the biggest
5 economic depressions that they've ever known, and right now, every cent counts.

6 Their cost to transport their goods to market is significant, and with the
7 loss of barges, which is what will happen if the dams come down, will cost too much
8 for them to stay in business. This really saddens me. I see the small family farm as
9 much a part of sustainability in this region as the salmon. Small farms are when
10 farmers can really take good care of their land and have good stewardship, and they
11 have the smallness to be able to take a lot of responsibility for that land.

12 It's the small family farmers that are going to lose, and when those
13 farms are gone, that land will be taken over by large farms and corporate farms. And
14 that is not a sustainable situation, in my eyes. I am for dam breaching. I think that
15 we need to save the salmon, and it's worth the cost. But the costs need to be
16 acknowledged. And I'm for dam breaching with strings attached.

17 There needs to be a plan for farmers immediately. It needs to be part of
18 the policy in place to compensate them for their loss, especially small family farmers.
19 And there needs to be transportation options discussed before the dams come down,
20 alternative plans for those farmers to get their stuff to market. A good rail system
21 would be pertinent and in place. Thank you.

22 MS. KENNEDY: Hi. My name is Katie Kennedy, and I live in
23 Wallingford here in Seattle. I'm an environmentalist, and when I think about all the
24 environmental crises there are in the world, it makes me so sad and frustrated a lot of
25 the time. And I think it's so exciting that there's actually this one crisis that we can do

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 something about. And for that reason -- well, in so many ways, I feel like we're
2 moving backwards in the world environmentally and always doing these things that
3 are more and more destructive and more harmful to the environment, and finally,
4 here's something that we have a chance to make right and to move forward
5 environmentally, to actually do something that's positive, to undo these things that
6 we've done.

7 I've heard a lot of environmentalists say that we need to turn this
8 movement around. A lot of people who are serious about the environment say we
9 need to turn this -- turn the tide and start doing what's right for the environment, and I
10 think this is a chance to do it. I voted today for a president, and it was really
11 empowering. And it's so exciting to think you're making a difference. And right now,
12 I'm voting again for removal of the dams. And I'm voting because I'm hopeful about
13 this situation, and it's very exciting to think that this could happen. I think we should
14 learn a lesson from our experience that these dams aren't doing anyone any good.
15 And all the reasons that I've heard for keeping them are not -- they're not that strong
16 economically.

17 They don't seem to be doing that much good. And it seems like it
18 wouldn't be that harmful to remove them. I can't think of any economic reasons not
19 to remove them. I don't think we should be afraid to learn from our experience. We
20 should undo this thing that we've done now that we realize it's harmful. And there's
21 nothing that's more important than removing these dams.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

23 MS. BURGESS: My name is Joelle Burgess. I'm from Seattle,
24 Washington. I'm a fourth-generation Washingtonian, and I implore you to breach the
25 four lower Snake dams. The science has shown that this is one of the best ways to

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 desperately -- to help restore the desperately struggling salmon populations. Salmon
2 deserve to live in their own right. We do not have the moral authority to knowingly
3 allow a species to go extinct. And we also know that because all life is connected,
4 the devastation to the salmon affects bears and many other species including us
5 humans.

6 We often forget that we are part of the natural system, and arguments
7 are made in favor of the dams in the context that they help humans. The greatest
8 way we can help humans is to leave our ecosystems as intact as possible. Salmon
9 have survived so much and are so strong, it is a travesty to not do what we can to
10 allow them to live and flourish. Humans are intelligent. We can make up for the
11 losses associated with dam removal. There are power alternatives. The farmers can
12 be paid what we will lose, and they can come up with new -- we can come up with
13 new solutions to bargaining.

14 I'm here to say that as a citizen of the human race and as a taxpayer,
15 I'm willing to pay my share. All of these arguments in the name of some jobs pale in
16 comparison to the pricelessness of a species. Extension is forever. All the money n
17 the world cannot bring back a species once it is gone.

18 To me, the answer is crystal clear. We must act now to do what we
19 know will make a difference for salmon. We owe it to our children and our children's
20 children. We do not own the rivers or the land. The time is now. We need salmon,
21 and these dams don't make sense.

22 MR. ADLER: My name is Paul Adler, and I'm from Shoreline,
23 Washington. I'm just here representing myself. I'm in construction and education.
24 And I'd like to comment on the All-H Paper and the draft EIS and on the John Day
25 drawdown. And I support the most conservative alternatives for listed species,

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 including removal of the four Snake River dams, and I also support the full drawdown
2 proposal for the John Day.

3 Extinction of Snake River salmon runs are a very real possibility unless
4 we remove these dams and take serious attempts in all the four H's. I'd particularly
5 like to comment on the use of hatcheries, particularly hatcheries for compensatory
6 measures for the existing dams. Hatchery fish are not wild fish. And studies show
7 that in the long-term, compensatory hatcheries actually have an adverse impact on
8 wild salmon returns.

9 And we need to decrease the mitigation rates, and we need to consider
10 the impact of compensatory hatcheries in terms of the endangered species acts and
11 their potential in terms of adverse impacts. I think that hatchery impacts need to
12 focus specifically on genetic conservation, and long-term management strategies
13 also must consider (inaudible) integrity of the runs, especially as outlined under the
14 Endangered Species Act. And these dams being federally licensed certainly have
15 that federal access. So in summary, I support the most conservative measures on all
16 four H'S; the full drawdown proposal on the John Day and removal of the four Snake
17 River dams. Thanks.

18 MS. BROWN: Okay. Great. My name's Lindsay Brown, and I'm from
19 Seattle, Washington. And I'm very happy to be part of this public comment period
20 right now. I would like to state for the record that I am for option D, which is the
21 breaching of the dams.

22 And I feel that this is a very important thing to do because we have
23 been paying such a high price for the operation of this dam, the price of the loss of
24 salmon, the loss of indigenous communities along the Snake River and the Columbia
25 River Basin.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 I feel that the only option that we have to respect the life that is in that
2 river and the life that is around that river, would be to restore it back to its natural
3 state. I have heard a lot of comments tonight about people saying, you know, we've
4 had this cheap electricity and we've benefitted from these cheap crops.

5 Well, I think that if you really put the true costs into those equations, the
6 cost of the loss of salmon that cannot be replaced, the cost of the loss of people and
7 culture which has no value, dollar value that I can see, I feel that, you know, it would
8 -- how can I say -- it would escalate the cost of what people are saying as cheap fuel
9 and cheap electricity into a category that is more realistic and more just, which is,
10 again, as I've said, at a cost of the death of the fish and the communities around
11 there.

12 So again, I'm for removing the dams. I feel that we are an incredibly
13 intelligent species that can find other ways to get the power that we need. We don't
14 have to do it this way. And I'm very happy that people have taken the time to do
15 these studies, but I feel that it's time to take action.

16 I've been hearing that the salmon really only have about 17 years to live,
17 and that the breaching of the dams would take about ten years. That really doesn't
18 give us much time. If we lose the salmon, we're also going to be losing so many
19 other wildlife that depend upon that. I think when we put the dams up, people know
20 the outcomes. They took a chance. Okay. Let's try this. Obviously, it's not working,
21 so let's look for some other options.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

23 MS. SMITH: I think that you should remove the dams because salmon
24 are very important, not just to people, but to the other animals who live in the sea and
25 outside. If the salmon become extinct, then other animals may, too, that rely on the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 salmon to come back so they can eat them. And also, bears really like to eat salmon
2 and fish, too. And if all the fish are going extinct, then pretty soon some of the bears
3 will start to disappear, too.

4 THE MODERATOR: Say your name.

5 MS. SMITH: My name is Mari Smith.

6 MS. SAVITT: Hi. My name is Meghan Emily Savitt, and I think that we
7 should take out the dams because salmon were there first. And they need to go up
8 the river to get strong and to make sure that they don't get sick so they can come
9 back and spawn and have more babies, because that's the way that the life cycle
10 goes. And if they die out, then the food chain will die out, and all sorts of people will
11 be losing some of their main source of food and the Native Americans will have
12 trouble getting their food, too. And I think that we should definitely try and do
13 something with the dams so the fish can have plenty of places to go so they can get
14 back to spawn.

15 THE MODERATOR: Is that it? Okay.

16 MS. WALKER: My name is Addy Walker, and the reason I think we
17 should take out the dams is because the salmon were there first. And if you don't
18 take out the dams, the salmon might become extinct, and we don't want to take the
19 chance.

20 MS. ENGLE: I'm Helen Engle. I'm a native Washingtonian, and I know
21 and love the evergreen state's every ecosystem niche. I'm speaking in favor of the
22 breaching of the earthen portions of the four lower dams on the Snake River. This
23 farthest corner of the lower 48 has been tagged as a utopia based on the wondrous
24 beauty and amazing productivity of its natural systems. These natural systems which
25 have provided us with the means to a sustainable economic base have been treated

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 badly, and the free-flowing rivers are suffering the worst. In my short lifetime, the
2 great rivers of the west, the mighty Columbia and the Snake Rivers, have been
3 largely changed from dynamic free-flows to impounded slack water. And in the case
4 of Grand Coulee, whose building and opening I remember well, 1,000 miles of fish-
5 spawning streams were denied their native runs return.

6 The impounded waters have not only different hydraulic forces, but
7 different temperatures, different chemicals, different biota, different or non-riparian
8 zones. How can we, then, expect the richness of the world's greatest fishery
9 resource -- sustainable fish resource to carry on? We have an opportunity to do
10 what's right for the natural systems. Something that would cause the least
11 discontinuities to our dam-provided systems of any experiment around. I want to live
12 long enough to see us do something right for our rivers, for our legacy of free-flowing
13 fisheries. Let's do the morally right thing, legally right thing for the endangered
14 species, the treaty rights and our oldest natives. Thank you.

15 MR. HUDSON: This is a comment on the Seattle meeting on the 29th of
16 February, the year 2000, on the draft EIS and EIS by the Corps of Engineers.
17 Primarily, the subject has become the removal of the dams. I know the Corps of
18 Engineer -- Colonel Magnon stated that we have to look at the larger picture of this,
19 it's a regional thing, the whole watershed of the Columbia and the Snake River.

20 But without hardly any difference here that all the comments today were
21 made about the breaching of the four dams. It's the thing that has taken everybody's
22 attention. Along with that, I would like to say that there -- on the official comment
23 period by elected officials from the state on this subject, it became aware to me in
24 listening to their comment, that many of these people came over from eastern
25 Washington to this meeting, and that's fine. We're all free to choose and do that. But

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 there were many people speaking from the cities of Quincy, Ephrata and Moses
2 Lake, and speaking as if the breaching of the four Snake River dams would
3 immediately and drastically affect them and their economy.

4 Some comments about 600,000 acres of land under irrigation. I hope
5 the people on the panel are aware enough and briefed enough and are aware of the
6 geography over there that Moses Lake, Ephrata and Quincy have absolutely nothing
7 to do with the four lower Snake dams, so let's not buy that.

8 But specific comments. I am for the breaching of the four dams. I was
9 raised over in Pullman, Washington. I know what that free-flowing river looks like. I
10 will separate myself, I think, with some of my friends in the conservation
11 environmental area by saying that I do feel like harvest of salmon is a major problem.
12 I also suggest that predation by whatever animals or birds be addressed very
13 strongly.

14 It is a part of the problem. I do, however, strongly favor alternative four.
15 And this has been George F. Hudson speaking at the February 29 meeting in
16 Seattle, Washington. My address and phone number are on the sign-up sheet here.
17 Thank you very much.

18 MS. ROSS: My name is Adrienne Ross. I'm a writer. I'm a naturalist,
19 and I am here because I would like to have the dams, the Ice Harbor, Lower
20 Monumental, Little Goose and Lower Granite dams removed from the Snake River
21 system. The record of the dams speaks for themselves. By 1986, all Idaho, Oregon
22 and Washington coho dependent on the Snake River migratory system went extinct.

23 From 1990 to 1999, 20 sockeye salmon in total returned to that system.
24 In 1997, all surviving Snake system salmon and steelhead were listed as threatened
25 or endangered. It goes on and it goes on, and the projected extinction of the Snake

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 River salmon runs are now set for the year 2017. I would like to see those dams
2 come down. They are supplying five percent of the region's power. That is a
3 negligible loss of power, but an enormous loss of life if the salmon disappear. Thank
4 you.

5 MR. COCHRAN: Okay. Hi. Thank you for having the opportunity to
6 testify. My name is Phil Cochran. I have been a resident of Seattle for over six years
7 now. I don't even have testimony. I guess I'm just going to try to speak from the
8 heart as best as possible.

9 Let me start by saying that I moved out here from the east coast, New
10 Jersey, actually, about six years ago. So I'm another east coaster coming out here to
11 tell people how to use the land and water, I suppose. But what brought me out here
12 is the quality of life.

13 I was attracted to the fact that we've got clean air, clean water,
14 wilderness, wild salmon, within an hour's drive of Seattle, and I want to see these
15 qualities stay around here. I don't want to see Seattle become another Los Angeles.
16 I think wild salmon need to exist. They have a right to exist.

17 We, as human beings, do not have a right to exterminate another
18 species. We've done enough of that already. Salmon have an incredible economic
19 and spiritual and symbolic role here in the Northwest. I think that we -- but if we take
20 down the Snake dams, we can go a long ways toward recovering these runs. You
21 know, the science is definitely there to show it.

22 It's kinds of funny. I've heard some of the opposition to tearing down the
23 dams testifying earlier, and they were saying, well, we need sound science, but we
24 don't want any more studies of tearing down the dams. It's like, well, what are you
25 afraid of? Are you afraid that maybe the studies will show that it works? They've

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 already torn down some dams with incredible results already such as on the
2 Sacramento River. They're talking about taking down the Elwha Dam here on the
3 Olympic Peninsula. It's surely going to work.

4 The opposition is afraid of losing their livelihood. I understand that. I
5 would like to see all the money that's currently wasted on barging and trucking the
6 salmon down the river, hundreds of millions of dollars, whatever is spent on that, that
7 should be put into lowering the irrigation pumps and subsidizing, you know, rail and
8 truck use. You don't have to worry about their livelihood and the cost. I'm fully in
9 support of the government supporting that.

10 But these guys should realize that the American public, for decades,
11 have subsidized their way of life. They say the costs will be passed on to the
12 consumer. That's fine, you know. If it's not passed on to the consumer, they're just
13 going to take it out of our tax dollars. So I guess I'll close by saying that it's time to
14 face up to reality. These dams don't make sense anymore. The one dam on the
15 Snake River, the Ice Harbor Dam, it's used for irrigation for 13 major farms. It
16 represents five percent of the power.

17 I am happy to pay my fair share of the cost of those dams. But all the
18 habitat restoration, cutting back on fishing, none of that makes a difference if we
19 don't take down the dams. Thank you.

20 MS. MILLER: I am Sue Miller, President of Washington State Women
21 Involved in Farm Economics. Women Involved in Farm Economics is a grass roots
22 agriculture women's organization with a mission to improve profitability and
23 production agriculture through educational, legislative, communicative and
24 cooperative efforts. WIFE's policy states -- WIFE requests that before instituting any
25 new rule affecting farmers, the government analyze the benefits as compared to the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 jobs lost, food production capacity eliminated, and damage to farmers. I'm here
2 today at the direction of our national president, Mary Schuler, to comment on the All-
3 H Paper.

4 WIFE applauds the intent of the All-H Paper, however, the goals outlined
5 in the paper conflict with each other. There are vague guidelines for setting priorities,
6 and therefore, are unrealistic. Additionally, those goals set up the people in the
7 Northwest in conflict with each other without establishing a procedure for working
8 things out.

9 Finally, the goals conflict with federal laws and regulations, one being
10 the Clean Air Act. Obviously no consideration other than statistically is given to jobs
11 lost, food production capacity eliminated or damage to farmers.

12 The issue is saving salmon, not breaching dams, however, one would
13 never know when attending these meetings. It is a waste of time and irresponsible to
14 suggest such an action.

15 Farmers want fish saved just as do the tribes, but it is not necessary for
16 one way of life to die to save the other. Farmers need reasonably-priced electricity to
17 power irrigation and keep the costs down, but the tribes must realize that the casinos
18 so enjoyed by the people in the Northwest and which provide income for the tribes
19 will also suffer financially if the dams are breached or removed. Instead of allowing
20 ourselves to be pitted against each other, we should be cooperatively seeking a
21 solution that helps both sectors.

22 I won't speak on what would happen if our barges were not allowed to
23 go and the 750,000 trucks on the highways, over the passes, and clogging up the
24 highways on the coastal side of the state. One can only use their imagination.

25 Unfortunately, though, in the rush to respond to pressure groups and provide a near

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 perfect world, America has been over-regulated until we are now backed into a
2 corner. We have nowhere to go.

3 The only way to get out of this mess is sit down and use common
4 sense. Get all of the players at the table and work this out in an orderly manner, and
5 it can be done if everyone cooperates. It was done in the Umatilla Basin in Oregon
6 state, and we can do it here.

7 Breaching dams is a worst-case solution and should be considered only
8 after all else has been attempted and proven unworkable, and then only if it is based
9 on science. We are wasting everyone's time and money, and we're getting nowhere
10 other than to provide an opportunity for theatrics, the definition of which is artificial
11 and exaggerated mannerisms.

12 There is no place --

13 THE MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

14 MS. MILLER: -- there is no place for it here or any other place where
15 such important decisions are to be made.

16 It is time to get down to business, stop kicking buckets, and seriously
17 pursue a solution to this very important problem.

18 THE MODERATOR: Eleven seconds left.

19 MS. MILLER: Okay.

20 MS. WELLS: Hi. My name is Kimberly Wells, and I'm originally from
21 the state of Arizona. And not knowing a lot about the salmon issue and the river
22 system here in Washington state, it took some time to gather enough information and
23 become aware of what the problems are and what needs to be done.

24 When speaking of ecology in my classrooms, my students are
25 dumbfounded and wonder why salmon face so much peril. And I told them the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 reasons. I tell them we've needed to dam up the rivers; we've needed to for
2 agricultural reasons and for hydroelectricity.

3 And they wonder why the dams aren't breached and that these salmon
4 are saved in some way. And it's hard to tell them about the economic gain and what
5 we face. But my belief is, is that we need to save the salmon for future generations.
6 We need to help Mother Nature in protecting what she has given us. And my
7 students are very supportive of this, and have a hard time understanding why these
8 four dams are needed for the economic reasons that many people say they are
9 intended.

10 So I vote to breach the dams, and I hope that the council and
11 recommendations to the federal government will be the same. And that's it. Thank
12 you.

13 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Go.

14 MR. LORTZ: My name is Peter Lortz. I'm an environmental science
15 teacher at North Seattle Community College. And this quarter, I'm having the
16 pleasure of teaching salmon issues and the impact to the Endangered Species Act
17 on residents of the Pacific Northwest. My students have been real receptive to this.
18 One of the things that we've been talking about is the issue of compromise.

19 And I feel it's important to teach the students about the compromises
20 that need to be made. I, myself, may be accused of being a liberal, but it's important
21 for me, at least, to teach them the information so that they can make their own
22 decisions. I wanted to bring up three, what I consider, fair compromises in the issue
23 of restoring the salmon.

24 The first, if you look at the situation, we've essentially been beating up
25 on these salmonids for centuries. Salmon populations have been reduced drastically

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 over many, many years for a variety of reasons. The first compromise that I propose
2 is that I feel it's time for us to give them a chance. We've been beating up on them
3 for centuries and now it's time, in this new century, to give them a chance.

4 The second situation is that all of these H's have contributed to the loss
5 of salmonids. It's not just hydropower like was being discussed today ad nauseum
6 sometimes. But it's also habitat like we're dealing with here in the urban systems,
7 hatcheries and harvest. It's time to make a compromise with all of the H's. And I
8 think it's important to realize that the opponents of dam removal recognize that
9 compromise need be made and should be made on all four of these.

10 Nobody's finger-pointing or picking on hydropower as the sole reason. I
11 feel it's important for us to recognize that all of these H's are important. The third
12 compromise or -- the third situation is that there are eight dams on the lower
13 Columbia, lower Snake system. All eight of those dams negatively impact, but it's
14 four -- the four on the lower Snake which are having the greatest impact if we look at
15 the 25-year population decline.

16 The compromise that I propose is the removal of four. And I'd like to
17 dispel, at least on my part and the part of my students, the notion that removal of
18 these four will lead to this witch hunt which will remove all dams. The classes
19 discuss the idea that 80 percent of the hydropower -- 80 percent of power in
20 Washington comes from hydropower.

21 And so it's important to recognize that dams do provide clean energy.
22 It's equally important to recognize that these four dams supply very low amounts of
23 that energy. Low enough that the positives of energy, the lack of flood control, and
24 the positives of irrigation are all outweighed by the negatives of salmon removal by
25 the dams.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 I think that we're at a point where we need to think -- to be pro-active.
2 And being pro-active means that we need to break the status quo. The status quo
3 for 25 years has been dams, and it's time to remove those. Thank you.

4 THE MODERATOR: All right. Go.

5 MS. CLANAHAN: My name is Jennifer Clanahan. My comment would
6 simply be that I would prefer to see the dams breached rather than to attempt a
7 patchwork of smaller efforts to save the salmon.

8 I don't see any other options that are more feasible that will adequately
9 address the issue. Thank you.

10 MS. TRENOR: My name is Eden Trenor. I'm 17 years old, and I'm a
11 citizen of Washington state. Although I choose not to eat salmon, I still value their
12 existence and recognize the importance of all salmon as an indicator species.

13 If the dams on the Snake River are causing a decline in their population,
14 that decrease is symbolic of only deeper troubles to come due to these dams.

15 I'm doing my part to not buy or eat salmon. We should all be willing to
16 take this step toward revitalizing the salmon population in another way, by removing
17 the dams that so heavily inhibit their survival.

18 MR. ZADROZNY: Hello. My name is John Zadrozny. I'm a student at
19 the Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington, and I'm here with the
20 WashPIRG organization. I believe salmon are an indicator species for the well being
21 of the Pacific Northwest ecosystems.

22 If they're allowed to go extinct, it will have untold effects on these
23 ecosystems. Unfortunately, there will be some losers if we breach the dams, but I
24 believe it will be for the greater good of mankind, as well as for the Pacific Northwest
25 ecosystems. I recommend maximum protection. Thank you.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MR. HEWES: Patrick Hewes, H-e-w-e-s. I'm Patrick Hewes of Seattle.
2 Remove these four dams. I will pay for more electricity and a regional tax if
3 necessary. I will purchase higher cost wheat-based products if it means there is an
4 increase in survival of these depleted fish stocks.

5 I want to distinguish between human and economic costs. A way of life,
6 quote unquote, based on massive multi-decade subsidy in an engineered landscape
7 cannot flourish under any circumstances. But we can quantify until the cows come
8 home. There is, however, a higher purpose than being counted. It is responding to
9 our natural environment's needs with solutions that will work, including bringing the
10 concrete down.

11 My grandfather rode ponies along a swift Columbia River near
12 Goldendale in Klickitat County in 1911. He spent his working life addressing rural
13 economic development and promoting a useful and relevant federal government.
14 Today he would welcome a chance to make the natural wealth of our region flourish
15 along with functioning and sustainable non-urban human communities.

16 My closing comment, therefore, is that we can achieve the goal of fish
17 species health and economic development with dam breaching because we've
18 achieved ambitious goals before. Thank you very much.

19 MR. HARTFORD: Hi, there. My name is Ken Hartford, and I live in
20 Seattle, lifetime resident. And I've been participating with a group called R.E.A.L.,
21 Rescue Elwha Area Lakes. And we believe that fish ladders should be built,
22 especially on dams that don't even have them.

23 And the dams on the Snake should have larger fish ladders in the
24 intakes down below the dam for the fish coming upriver, should be away from the
25 dam, and then further upstream of the dam.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 These would be very practical. And when the baby salmon are going
2 downriver, they can be diverted to these. And the dams should be shut off; the
3 generation should be stopped during baby salmon migration. You say you don't
4 need the electricity. Fine. Two months out of the year when the salmon are going
5 downstream, shut off the dams, especially at critical times. Unindigenous [sic.]
6 species I brought up a couple years ago at a meeting.

7 And a guy said, oh, there's probably 100 unindigenous species in the
8 system. Maybe so, but bass, small-mouth bass, large bass, especially walleye and
9 shad, are predatory on the salmon. They're paying, I think, \$6 apiece to catch
10 squawfish. I don't even know if squawfish are an indigenous species to the
11 Northwest, but they're catching those and paying people to do it. They ought to
12 catch walleye and bass and these shad.

13 Anyway, another thing of why the salmon are going down, I think
14 there's still a high seas piracy, electronics navigation with satellite, global positioning,
15 satellite -- temperature of the water. Here they've got all this equipment. They can
16 see the fish with satellites and where they're at. The fish are being intercepted at sea
17 still. And this technology factor should be put in, the computer age and electronic
18 age, with wesmar (phonetic), sonars and all this kind of stuff. The fish don't got a
19 chance.

20 And fish ladders are the way to go. They need to make them bigger,
21 not just a ladder. Make a whole man-made river. A tourist bus comes to the one in
22 Ballard. You know, they bring busloads of tourists. They put windows in it. People
23 come to pay to look through the windows to see the fish. They're a revenue maker,
24 especially for the Elwha tribe. If they had a fish hatchery -- I mean, a fish ladder with
25 windows just off of Highway 101, man, people would be coming in there to see the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 fish going up the fish ladders. When they take out those dams, there ain't going to
2 be nothing there but mud for 25 years. Anyway, that's -- I believe in common sense.
3 Just build fish ladders and then operate the dams in a fish-friendly way.

4 THE MODERATOR: You ready to start again? Sorry about that.

5 MS. FULTON: My name is Moira Fulton. I'm a resident of Seattle and
6 have been for the last 20 years. And for many of the 30 years prior to that, I spent
7 my summers in the Northwest. This is an important issue to me. I've looked at it
8 from many points of view. And it's clear to me that breaching the dams is the right
9 thing to do, both environmentally and economically, as well as ethically and
10 spiritually.

11 Yes, there will be difficult consequences for the people living in the
12 area. These consequences can be mitigated. We can do that. We ought to do that.
13 But the correct decision and the courageous decision is to breach these four dams.
14 Thank you.

15 MR. DANEKER: My name is Lee Daneker. I live in Seattle, and I want
16 to support alternative four, which is dam breaching, and alternative D, which is the
17 maximum protection alternative. I think -- you know, I can envision a Northwest
18 without these dams. They're insignificant in terms of their economic impact. But I
19 can't envision a Northwest -- a quality environment without the salmon.

20 I think that -- I am sympathetic to the farmers whose way of life will
21 suffer, but I'm confident that we can find a cost-effective way to mitigate their losses.
22 I don't think that we can find a way to mitigate the loss of salmon. And that
23 concludes my comments. I just strongly urge the involved agencies to listen to their
24 scientists, to put their money where the biggest bang is, and the biggest bang in
25 terms of recovering salmon is the dam breaching alternatives. Thank you.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MR. DRAKE: Okay. My name is Joshua Drake, and although I'm a
2 member of the Sierra Club and the Washington Public Interest Research Group, I'm
3 here tonight on my own terms and not speaking on behalf of those organizations. I
4 am in favor of maximum protection for the salmon in the Snake River, and the
5 breaching of the four Snake River dams that are under consideration right now.

6 I am a backpacker and I love getting out in nature. And one of the
7 reasons why I appreciate backpacking so much in the Northwest is that our
8 ecosystems are so intact, and that so many of the species that have been here, have
9 been here for so long, the great trees, the wonderful birds and wildlife species that I
10 see out there. And I consider it to be a great tragedy when a species goes extinct.

11 The salmon are endangered, and we need to do whatever we can to
12 protect them. They've been here a lot longer than we have, and we owe it to them to
13 not kill them off. I'm also a compassionate person, and I just think it's plain wrong to
14 take over an ecosystem for ourselves at the exclusion of the needs of other creatures
15 that are sharing the space with us. Thank you.

16 MR. COOK: My name is Langdon Cook, and this is a vote for
17 breaching four dams on the lower Snake River. First, the Endangered Species Act
18 mandates the federal government take action. And studies after studies have shown
19 that the only hope for saving inland west salmon from extinction is dam removal.

20 Furthermore, the dams just don't make sense. To-wit: They were a
21 cold war era pork barrel project that offers no flood control, irrigation for only 13
22 farms, and minuscule hydropower production. The future is not with the lords of
23 yesterday, the greedy resource extractors, and environmental abusers.

24 The future is with healthy ecosystems, a gift for all time. If that's not
25 enough for some bureaucrats, consider the economics of dam removal. In 1993, the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

