

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
SEATTLE CENTER
200 THOMAS STREET
SEATTLE CENTER PAVILLION

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION
FEBRUARY 29, 2000
2:00 P.M.

REPORTER: ELSE M. JOSUND MEEK
RIDER AND ASSOCIATES
COURT REPORTERS
P.O. BOX 245
VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON 98666

1

.

2

.

3

MODERATOR: Before we start, we will start

4

with public officials today, but let me go over how

5

we'll deal with the testimony. I'm going to call your

6

name and ask you to come up to the microphone based on

7

the lottery sign-up sheet. I'm going to call the name

8

of the person who is up next. Then the person

9

following them, and then the person who is on deck. So

10

I'll give three names. When you hear your name, if you

11

could, jump up and take one of these seats up here.

12

I've got 21 public officials and 75 folks on my list

13

from the public folks, so, if you can -- you can see

14

that it will be very difficult to get through those

15

numbers by five, so your speed in getting to the

16

microphone would be appreciated.

17

When you're ready to speak, watch the lights

18

in front of you. We have a green light that means

19

speak. We have a yellow light that means you have 60

20

seconds remaining. And then we have a red light which,

21

guess what it means? Stop. Also with the red light we

22

have a nice bell so if you're reading something you

23

will know that it's time for you to stop. And I will

24

again work with you to stop at that point.

25

Because the meeting is being transcribed, if

1 you could state your name for the record and the
2 organization that you might be with, please do that
3 when you begin. And also if you're talking about the
4 Corp's Environmental Impact Statement or the All-H.
5 If you don't know which one or you're talking about,
6 we'll be able to siphon through those things and get
7 them to the proper agency.

8 Let's begin with the elected officials. Is
9 everybody up there ready for public testimony to
10 begin? Yes? All right.

11 For -- let me remind you of the ground
12 rules. Treat each other with respect. Try not to --
13 no, don't interrupt folks and please don't clap so we
14 can get everybody up here.

15 So let's begin with your elected officials.
16 I'd like to begin with Harold Belmont. Number two,
17 Steve Ruben. Number three, Thomas Joseph Senior.

18 So Harold Belmont, are you here? Could I
19 ask you to come up to the microphone? If anybody needs
20 help with the microphone, if you would like me to bring
21 it to you I have a cordless I can bring to you. So
22 Steve Ruben and Thomas Joseph Senior, if you could be
23 ready to go on deck.

24 >>: My name is Harold Belmont. I'm a
25 registered member of the Suquamish tribe. I work as a

1 cultural specialist and spiritual advisor. I want to
2 thank the Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission
3 for the respect I've received from Steve Hudson. Out
4 of respect for Chief Joseph let me say -- (speaking in
5 tribal tongue). In the spirit of Raymond Yellow
6 Thunder, Chief Sealth, and David So Happy, let me offer
7 this expression. (Singing in tribal verse).

8 Watch out child. Watch out child. Babylon
9 is falling down. Falling down. Remember who you are.
10 Remember where you are. Remember what you are. Watch
11 out child.

12 Remember the struggle in the spirit of David
13 So Happy. He was tried and convicted; sentenced to
14 five years in a federal penitentiary. Edwin Meese said
15 that if you promise not to fish again and you apologize
16 for what you've done, we'll let you go. He said, "No
17 way."

18 Let's stop the rape and exploitation of our
19 Mother Earth. Think about the people and the treaty
20 rights and the salmon. I hope for my relations.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Steve Ruben
22 follow by Thomas Joseph followed by Tom Davis.

23 >>: (Speaking in tribal tongue) Steven
24 Rubin. Nez Perce tribal member. I myself thank you
25 all for being here. And to make the decision of which

1 way to go. Just as the salmon travels. In the early
2 days we had wild salmon. But now the fish are dead.
3 They have metal inside of their head, just like we do.

4 As the elders said, we are like the salmon,
5 we are full-blooded Nez Perce. And as we go through
6 the century, we change. We mix with different blood.
7 And that is the same way with the fish. They are
8 hatchery fish. They are not wild any more. There are
9 very few wild salmons, just as there is full blooded
10 Indians. So today we make our decisions on the salmon,
11 how to live, which way to flow with the water. We
12 decide how the fish shall live. What they shall eat.
13 Thank you very much.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Thomas
15 Joseph Senior followed by Tom Davis followed by John
16 McMahan.

17 >>: I want to thank my brothers who have just
18 spoken to you for being here today. I also thank all
19 of those people who are putting out this magnificent
20 effort and all this talk about the salmon and about
21 this beautiful country where we reside.

22 I want you to go back in your minds to the
23 beginning. I heard the story about these two people
24 called Adam and Eve. They had to make a choice. They
25 made a good choice. And that choice was that we could

1 be here today. Life, I know I'm not talking to
2 children, is always full of choices. We have to make
3 them every day.

4 Today I hope we seriously, and I know some of
5 us are contemplating a great choice that involves my
6 fellow creation, Brother Salmon. I'm honored today to
7 talk on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Salmon that couldn't be
8 here today. But I hope that we will recognize the fact
9 as we are all made by the same creator, as we are all
10 brothers and sisters because of this great creation,
11 Mr. and Mrs. Salmon have the same rights we do, and
12 that is to live.

13 We do not have the right to act like a god.
14 We do not have the right to change things the way they
15 are. When we do, this will upset the great spirit our
16 creator. When your ancestors first came to this
17 country, my ancestor said, come, you're welcome here.
18 I'll show you how to take care of yourself. I'll show
19 you how to live here. Don't take too much. If you
20 have to use something, put it back. Don't accumulate.
21 Do not waste. When you do this you're no longer
22 welcome.

23 I know the great creator is watching us
24 today. I know he is concerned about what we do with
25 the water and what we do about the air we breathe. We

1 have become so arrogant we think that we don't make
2 mistakes. We as human beings today find it hard to
3 change and to admit that maybe we are wrong.

4 You see dams are wrong. Dams do not belong
5 in a free river. You see, when somebody takes your way
6 away, you're no longer free. You do not have ability
7 to choose. That is illegal. We are a free people.
8 The waters need to run free. I know that we are
9 polluting this earth. I know that we have to learn to
10 obey law. That there is a greater law above us all who
11 rules all and we have to learn to listen.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thomas --

13 >>: When we no longer listen, that's when we
14 become confused and that's when this metal my brother
15 talks about messing up our thinking.

16 THE MODERATOR: I hate to interrupt you.

17 >>: Thank you for this time. I hope we all
18 make a good choice, because if we don't the creator
19 will choose to clean it up himself his way. Thank you.

20 THE MODERATOR: Tom Davis, followed by John
21 McMahan, followed by Richard Conlin.

22 >>: Good afternoon. For the record, I'm Tom
23 Davis. Research analyst with the Washington State
24 House of Representatives, representing the 49 state
25 members. They requested that I present the following

1 letter to you.

2 .

3 (INSERT TEXT. HARD COPY DELIVERED TO
4 COMMITTEE.)

5 .

6 THE MODERATOR: John McMahan, Richard Conlin,
7 and Steve Ruben.

8 >>: Thank you. My name is John McMahan. The
9 breaching of the four Snake River dams and the flow
10 augmentation have very little chance for success, and
11 it may destroy and not help the runs in question.
12 These are huge expenses, and are risky experiments.
13 You must remember these are experiments. Don't be
14 misled. Don't believe the results are predictable. I
15 know you have models, but I don't believe the results
16 are predictable, and neither do a lot of people. They
17 must seem certain and they are not.

18 From past experience of the past twenty years
19 we've seen costs of millions of dollars and very
20 minimal benefit for the dollars spent. Some things
21 work. Some things don't work. Remember it takes about
22 four years to verify the results of any experiments.
23 The past records of the agencies and the Corps of
24 Engineers, the Power Planning Counsel and the tribes,
25 it is not a success story. The results do not justify

1 the dollars spent in the past.

2 The science should be proven. This is
3 difficult because of the many variables. The dollar
4 costs are huge, and the social and economic impacts are
5 far greater than you've estimated in your data.

6 The small cities of Eastern Washington will
7 be forced into a death spiral. You've heard that term
8 before. We have no industrial tax base. All of our
9 infrastructure and operating expenses are paid by
10 property and sales taxes. Our residents are public
11 employees, service industry employees, and retired
12 individuals. They count. They are the first to feel
13 economic downturn due to increased electric bills and
14 spending in the area.

15 The dams are our life blood. Any breachment
16 of the dam studies should be stopped and the monies
17 used to identify and verify solutions that are
18 technically and theoretically sound.

19 The parameters involved in the improvement
20 are extremely complex. There are no shortcuts like
21 breaching the dams. Dam breaching is an unproven
22 shortcut. If we've learned anything it must be that we
23 should rely on science to verify the data, and don't
24 expect quick fixes. Thank you.

25 >>: Richard Conlin, Dick Zimbelman, Joseph

1 Bogaard.

2 >>: Thank you. My name is Richard Conlin,
3 member of the Seattle City Council.

4 Twenty years ago Congress passed the Pacific
5 Northwest Energy Planning and Conservation Act. We
6 were promised at that time that there would be a
7 restoration and revival of salmon in the Columbia
8 River. Twenty years later the runs are little better
9 off, in some cases worse. Why is that? Because we
10 haven't used the science that we know is correct.
11 Treat the river as an ecosystem and make the
12 investments that we need to make.

13 Let me talk about that with another river,
14 the Skagit. City Light has three dams located around
15 the places where natural barriers prevent migration of
16 salmon. Twenty years ago City Light began discussions
17 about its impact on salmon, developed a plan,
18 implemented it cooperatively, and made major
19 investments. We're still implementing and making
20 investments, and we've had results. The healthiest
21 Chum stocks in the lower 48. Back to near pre-contact
22 levels. Also a stable Chinook stock, although it needs
23 more work in order to recover fully.

24 What the Skagit proved is that it can be
25 done. It's possible with investment, cooperation,

1 science, and commitment. The same is true for the
2 Snake.

3 The Northwest can't afford to bypass these
4 four dams and not restore salmon runs. We can't afford
5 the cost of extinction. Breaking tribal treaties, the
6 loss of the symbol of the Northwest.

7 The cost is less than a dollar a month for
8 most rate payers. Some will have greater impacts. The
9 farmers and merchants of Eastern Washington. We know
10 change is hard. This is about all of our futures and
11 that we must commit to supporting the impacts needed.
12 I think the impacts are less than feared, but whatever
13 they are we need to address them.

14 Eighty years ago we were able to fulfill a
15 dream, but that dream is at a price. Our job now is to
16 cover the cost of the mistakes of the dream, make the
17 repairs, fulfill our responsibility, protect and
18 restore the web of life we're all part of. Future
19 generations will ask us whether we used barges or mail
20 for grain. They won't ask us what it cost, but what we
21 accomplished.

22 THE MODERATOR: Dick Zimbelman, Joseph
23 Bogaard, Deborah Moore.

24 >>: Thank you. I'm Mayor of the City of
25 Quincy. I feel I'm not speaking just as a mayor but as

1 an individual. By speaking to the community I find
2 that 90 percent feel much as I do. This is a drastic
3 measure, to take out these dams. There are
4 alternatives out there.

5 I hear horror stories about how the salmon
6 are being killed and dumped into trenches because there
7 are only so much to do with those that migrate. We've
8 proved we can get them up there. We have to look at
9 our jobs and communities when we're there.

10 Quincy was a desert when I was born there.
11 260 people, and it's a thriving community now. Without
12 water and electricity, which these dams give us, Quincy
13 will become a desert. We're not talking about just a
14 few jobs on the Snake. This is not the end, if we take
15 out these dams, pretty quickly we wouldn't have any
16 water. I'm very concerned about this.

17 And I hate to -- I think we have other
18 alternatives out there. We need to look at our sea
19 lion and seal populations. They're down there eating
20 our salmon. I know the Corps of Engineers is working
21 on this, and I appreciate this, but there are lots of
22 other factors. We have rivers coming off of the ocean,
23 just down in Oregon, there's no salmon running up them
24 either. There are no dams. There are a lot of
25 causes. I think a lot is environmental, our

1 temperatures and so forth. We need to take a hard
2 look. We may do more harm than good by taking out
3 these dams, by the silt going down the river.

4 THE MODERATOR: Joseph Bogaard, Deborah
5 Moore, Dan McShane. Joseph Bogaard? Deborah Moore,
6 followed by Dan McShane, followed by Mark Booker.

7 >>: My name is Deborah Moore. I live near
8 Moses Lake, Washington, and I'm a farmer and a Grant
9 County Commissioner. There are approximately 70,000
10 residents in Grant County that I represent.

11 Today I would like to go on record opposing
12 the breaching of the dams on the Snake River. I would
13 like you to know that not one of my constituents that I
14 have spoken with have been in favor of removing the
15 dams. I am in favor of the All-H Papers' intent to
16 honestly look at improving habitat, hydroelectric
17 power, and to aid in salmon recovery.

18 However there needs to be a comprehensive
19 plan based on the best available science and not a
20 risky scheme. On a clear day I can look out the window
21 of our farm house and see Mount Rainier. We have some
22 of the cleanest air and water in the Columbia basin.
23 The dams on the Snake and Columbia Rivers provide a
24 clean and renewable green electricity, and efficient
25 transportation that allow us to enjoy our air and

1 water. If dams are removed we'll need alternative
2 sources for electricity and transportation which will
3 have a damaging effect on the environment.

4 It is estimated that 700,000 tons and 120,000
5 more railcars will be needed to transport our products
6 to market. Our clean source of electrical energy will
7 need to be replaced by burning toxic coal, gas, or
8 diesel. Wind or solar power won't begin to make up the
9 loss. Fossil fuels spew thousands of tons of carbon
10 dioxide, sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxide in the
11 air. These have been identified as the major sources
12 for acid rain.

13 The dollars needed to improve would be better
14 spent by predation of birds and marine mammals and
15 studying the impact in the estuary and the ocean,
16 especially since the Corps study doesn't contain any
17 verifiable biological or scientific data which can
18 prove that the removal of the dams will restore salmon
19 runs.

20 Removal of the dams will result in loss of
21 jobs in an area already economically depressed. The
22 people I represent don't need another ploy to their way
23 of life simply because the federal government is
24 looking for a quick fix to the salmon problem. The
25 problem can be accomplished without sacrificing our

1 economic future or way of life.

2 THE MODERATOR: Dan McShane followed by Mark
3 Booker followed by Raul Diaz. And if someone in the
4 house can put the over head up for us we would
5 appreciate it.

6 >>: Thank you. Dan McShane, County Council
7 member from Whatcom county, about 90 miles north of
8 Seattle.

9 I've witnessed over the years the slow but
10 steady erosion of our economic base in the fishing
11 industry, particularly in the Bellingham and Blaine
12 areas. Many of my constituents have been hurt
13 financially over many, many years. But I want to go
14 back over time and I think what you mentioned, Colonel,
15 about a big picture is important.

16 I grew up in Eastern Washington. In 1964 I
17 took a field trip. I was lowered into a cave and saw
18 some of the incredible forces that took place in those
19 turbines. I came away from that, perhaps because my
20 father was an engineer at Hanford, back in the 40's and
21 50's, we thought with big ideas and we built some
22 incredible structures. The dams on the Snake certainly
23 fall under that category.

24 But I think we're faced with the same thing
25 today. What you alluded to is thinking in big terms.

1 Thinking of doing big things. So thinking about taking
2 out the dams on the lower Snake is thinking in big
3 terms. You need to look at the science and listen to
4 what it tells you and do the right thing. I believe
5 that means taking the dams out. To take the courage to
6 do that and think big. Thank you very much.

7 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Mark Booker, Raul
8 Diaz, followed by Sue Miller.

9 >>: I'm Mark Booker. I'm glad you're here
10 today. I'm one of 17 Columbia irrigation directors.
11 There are ten thousand people that live in the district
12 I represent, all of them dependent upon Columbia River
13 water. I am here in the support of the Corps's EIS
14 alternate one or two with one caveat; all recovery
15 action must have significant benefit. I repeat, must
16 have significant benefit to salmon recovery. While
17 experiments are unacceptable.

18 In addition I oppose the breaching of the
19 Snake dams in both the Corps EIS and the All-H paper.
20 And also favor the ending of McNary Dam draw-down
21 studies. No more studies.

22 Back to the issue of wild experiments and the
23 reason we haven't made progress in salmon recovery.
24 The largest single salmon recovery effort is flow
25 augmentation. It comes to the amount of 100 to 180

1 million dollars each year. It accounts for about the
2 quarter of the total effort and there is no benefit.
3 Notice the overhead which will be handed in with my
4 statement. As the flow of areas in each of those
5 years, the survival rate stays the same. So there is
6 no benefit for salmon recovery. You're wasting one
7 quarter of the salmon recovery effort. I don't know
8 how much clearer it could be.

9 I believe it's really against the law to
10 waste resources. I know it is in water in the state of
11 Washington. I think you should head down the road that
12 only shows promise, proven areas of salmon recovery,
13 and forget the wild experimentation. The CRI Index
14 Paper that showed separate from the main pitfalls of
15 the past study, and that is based in large part upon
16 assumptions, not proven outcomes. The CRI is not worth
17 very much at all, or maybe not worth anything as far as
18 making decisions. It's something you look at when
19 you're thinking about going. Not when you go. You've
20 got a long ways to go.

21 I'm really disappointed in the Four-H paper.
22 I feel that many portions of it are subprofessional
23 standard. There needs to be a lot more work in all
24 areas. Thank you for your time.

25 THE MODERATOR: Raul Diaz, Sue Miller, Roy

1 Davis. We're doing the elected official testimony
2 right now. We're on number 12 of 21.

3 >>: Raul Diaz. With the cost of the dams
4 being breached we'll not have the opportunity to
5 transport our grain down the rivers. With farm
6 commodity prices already at all-time low, now the cost
7 of transportation will even lower the profit for our
8 farmers. It will affect our county, and small
9 communities. I see more small and large farmers
10 failing and filing bankruptcy. There will be even more
11 farm related bankruptcies if the dams are breached.

12 Even worse is now the new congestion of our
13 county roads if the dams are breached to transport our
14 products. We're talking about numbers. We'll lose
15 lives because of more traffic, not fish. We'll lose
16 children, not fish. We'll lose babies, not fish. A
17 two ton car with a full semi of grain doesn't stand a
18 chance on the roads. The more traffic the more it will
19 affect life. Please stop fishing totally for the next
20 ten years for reproduction of the fish and don't close
21 the dams.

22 This is the only scripture that our heavenly
23 father wrote how fish were made for man, not man for
24 fish. Genesis one, chapter 23. And the evening and
25 the morning were the 5th day and God said let -- cattle

1 and creeping things of the earth and God named the
2 beasts of the earth after his kind of and everything
3 that crept upon the earth after his kind and God saw
4 that it was good and God said let us make man in our
5 image and let them have domination over the fish of the
6 sea. And over the fowl of the earth over the cattle
7 over all the earth and of every creeping thing that
8 creepeth upon the earth. So God created him in his
9 image and God blessed him and God said under them -- ye
10 shall have domination over the fish of the sea and over
11 the fowl of the air and over every living thing upon
12 the earth.

13 Not one place in the scriptures does it say
14 the fish have domination over man. We need to work
15 together. As nations. We need to work together.
16 Don't do this. Thank you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Sue Miller, Roy
18 Davis.

19 >>: I am Sue Miller, Board of Administration
20 for Franklin County. My fellow commissioners and I
21 represent over 45,000 people in the small agricultural
22 county bordered by the Columbia and Snake rivers.
23 County residents are actively farming over 230,000
24 acres of irrigated land. The residents will be
25 drastically affected if alternative four dam breaching

1 is supported as a course of salmon.

2 The loss of hydropower generation impacts to
3 the farming community regarding irrigation, the
4 possible increase in electrical rates, the impacts on
5 transportation systems and costs, and the loss of local
6 employment opportunities make it impossible for
7 Franklin County to support.

8 We do support the All-H paper which examines
9 the area of hatchery, hydrooperations, and habitat
10 conditions. In addition the federal government has
11 stated that strong measures are needed in the near
12 future to reverse the decline of fish populations
13 throughout the region. While there is no immediate or
14 simple answer to this problem, Franklin County supports
15 an approach that does not solely focus on dam breaching
16 but does focus on issues affecting the declining runs.

17 In addition we encourage the continuing
18 evaluation of the stated alternatives one through three
19 and believe that four, dam breaching, would have a
20 disastrous effect on local residents. This would be a
21 tremendous step backwards. Our preferred course of
22 action is a resolution that does not focus on the issue
23 of dam breaching. I appreciate this. Thank you.

24 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Roy Davis,
25 followed by Nick Licata, and Jerry Williamson.

1 >>: Good afternoon. I'm Roy Davis. I'm a
2 Port Commissioner with the Port of Royal Slope. And
3 I'm also a farmer east of the mountains. I'm here
4 today to speak in opposition of the dam breaching.

5 The dams have continued to provide essential
6 benefits today. Inexpensive, clean hydroelectric
7 power, slack water navigation capabilities, and water
8 storage are some of the important factors that must be
9 considered by the powers that be. Any thought of dam
10 breaching is ill advised. How can you make a good
11 argument for such a stupid idea? There is little
12 evidence to support such a notion. In fact it would
13 likely have spawning beds buried by unremovable
14 sediment behind dams and would be washed down the
15 river. Thousands of acres would be effected by water
16 shortages, and that would devastate the lives of
17 thousands of hard working farm families.

18 Our efficient and economical barge
19 transportation system would no longer be available for
20 use, and many commodities, including fuel, grain and
21 lumber products, would be moved by inefficient and the
22 more expensive ground transportation.

23 The loss of cheap, clean, hydroelectric power
24 for our homes and industry would have to be replaced
25 with environmentally unfriendly coal or nuclear power

1 plants. The impact would be far reaching and
2 disastrous and must not be an option.

3 If salmon recovery is the issue, look to
4 factors that have completed the salmon numbers. Gill
5 netting, commercial and sport fishing using
6 technological advances such as electronic fish finders
7 probably have had a much larger impact on salmon runs.

8 I'm not opposed to salmon recovery, but
9 believe that breaching dams will not help the salmon
10 runs and would be a blow to the economic health of the
11 Northwest. Put the emphasis on logically proven
12 methods or salmon recovery. Dam breaching must be out
13 of the question.

14 >>: Thank you very much. Nick Licata, Jerry
15 Williamson, Anthony Gonzales. And if I can remind you
16 about the rules of the side conversations and also
17 respecting everybody.

18 >>: I'm Nick Licata of the Seattle City
19 Council. In favor of the removal of the lower Snake
20 dams.

21 First and foremost the liveability of our
22 communities. In the Northwest that includes salmon and
23 clean water. The environment we want our kids to grow
24 up in. Salmon would be part of our lives and our kids
25 future.

1 This is reflected in a survey we conducted.
2 We were surprised to see that all of the various
3 issues, including traffic and paved roads, saving
4 salmon came up number one. This secondly because of
5 that high concern there was a willingness to bear the
6 cost. We mentioned various costs and they all fell
7 within the rate that the BPA estimated. So there is
8 not just sympathy for the support, but willingness to
9 pay for those concerns.

10 Also regarding the costs, we believe that
11 because of our lower cost of electricity is part of the
12 deal of saving the salmon. This remains then that
13 basically there is a possibility that we could be
14 jeopardizing our low economic electrical rates.

15 Thirdly, we believe that basically we believe
16 that we're talking about salmonids jobs. Recreational
17 fishing provides thousands of jobs in large as well as
18 small towns. We believe that restoring the Snake will
19 bring anywhere from 91 million to 300 million
20 additional over the present economy in the form of
21 various activities.

22 And lastly we believe the scientific evidence
23 does support the removal of the dams, and that we have
24 the power to save the salmon in the state.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Jerry Williamson,

1 Anthony Gonzales, Lee Ray.

2 >>: I'm Jerry Williamson of the Grant County
3 Farm Bureau.

4 Some surprising facts. The Columbia River
5 enters the ocean at twice the size from the river.
6 However, all but two percent is discharged out of the
7 ocean, based on the U.S.D.S study.

8 Many believe based on reports calling for
9 full augmentation. The reality is that the river has
10 doubled in size and delivers to the ocean. Watersheds
11 without dams have -- (unintelligible) -- the Frazier
12 River and Puget Sound are two examples. Why all the
13 focus on dams?

14 This is an acknowledged fact. To the
15 contrary there is evidence. The Ballard Locks
16 destroyed more fish than any other dams on the Snake
17 and Columbia. On those more salmon are successfully
18 migrating than before they were constructed.

19 Idaho Fish and Wildlife could establish other
20 sport fish industries counter to the health of salmon
21 runs. What can we deduce from this? Salmon efforts to
22 date have failed. The facts and statistics have
23 largely exonerated them.

24 Idaho Fish and Wildlife bears more
25 responsibility for salmon declining. The recognition

1 of the most significant cause is illustrated by the
2 following examples. Six are lost to ocean harvest, two
3 to tribal, one is by predator, and one left to spawn.
4 95 percent are exclusive of the dams.

5 It doesn't take rocket science to identify
6 the problem here. Common sense and good science were
7 the first casualties of the salmon debate. Analyses
8 based on certain wild stocks. Make up is acknowledged
9 and good science (inaudible) existing stocks compared
10 to wild stocks. Hatchery salmon found. The Methow
11 River was dammed in the early part of the 1900s. For
12 at least three life cycles of salmon, they were not the
13 offspring of the salmon originally spawning. This
14 hypocrisy by fishery agencies is unconscionable. Thank
15 you.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you Jerry. Anthony,
17 Gonzales.

18 >>: My name is Anthony Gonzales, City of
19 Quincy.

20 We have approximately 4,000 people inside the
21 city limits and an additional 4,000 in Quincy Valley.
22 Recently there was an article in the Seattle paper that
23 our agricultural industry in the state of Washington we
24 came in number two export products in the state.

25 Quite frankly we have some of the most

1 fertile ground located not only in the United States,
2 but in the world, in the Columbia basin. Wheat, corn,
3 and all of this is supplied through irrigation water
4 from the dams along the Columbia River, as well as in
5 Idaho and the Snake dams that you're studying.

6 The thought of breaching those dams and
7 losing that water is frightening not only to myself but
8 to my constituents. Where is this going to be replaced
9 from? The City of Quincy was at one point just
10 scrubland with nothing but weeds and sagebrush. After
11 the dams were put in sagebrush was replaced by good,
12 fertile ground and healthy crops.

13 My concern is that by eliminating this
14 irrigation water, much of this land is going to go back
15 to sagebrush, and this irrigation for the crops would
16 be gone.

17 And at one point where are we? What are
18 going to be the effects? Everybody in this room is
19 touched by these communities. Breachment of the dams
20 is a real concern.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Leroy
22 Allison, Mike Conley, Manuel Ybarra.

23 >>: My name is Leroy Allison. Grant County
24 Commissioner and Secretary Treasurer of the Washington
25 State Association of Counties representing all 39

1 counties in Washington.

2 Ladies and gentlemen, esteemed federal panel,
3 thank you for the opportunity to comment. Today's
4 question is should infrastructure built to meet new
5 needs be sacrificed before exploring simple solutions,
6 that be at that time enhancement and run-specific
7 harvest limitations. I believe the answer is a very
8 clear no.

9 Your own studies to date point out that it
10 will be 50 years before we may, and I repeat may, see
11 an increase in fish populations if, and only if,
12 there's an actual improvement of fish returns below
13 Bonneville dam.

14 This begs the question why are we not
15 focussing on the returns below the Bonneville dam in
16 the first place before such risky proposals such as dam
17 breaching?

18 The destruction and devastation to the
19 river's habitat and life along the established river
20 corridor, not just by the removal of the dams in the
21 first year but each and every year thereafter by the
22 annual snow melt event, is well remembered by early
23 inhabitants here in the Northwest, including the
24 tribes.

25 It's hard to believe that we're even talking

1 about, let alone considering, what most would consider
2 a major step backwards. I believe we need to focus on
3 positive steps built on sound, proven, and tested
4 science. Especially on the magnitude of this scale.

5 I believe the public deserves a much more
6 common sense approach to the salmon survival issue. If
7 we have the technology to deliver 97 percent to the
8 point below the last salmon on the river with a clear
9 shot at the ocean, then shouldn't we be asking the
10 simple question why? Common sense would suggest that
11 we face the river involved in the river estuary and the
12 ocean. Not turning our backs and spending time and
13 efforts looking miles up river at hydropower
14 elimination and transportation destruction.

15 Ladies and gentlemen, I believe time is of
16 the essence and we must address simple less destructive
17 issues first. Not actions based on unproven hypotheses
18 which see examples of flow augmentation which has not
19 proven its hypothesis.

20 Please don't let dam removal be another
21 federal fiasco. With that I would like to submit the
22 resolution of the Washington State Association of
23 Counties in favor of suspending action on breaching or
24 drawing down dams on the Columbia and Snake.

25 THE MODERATOR: Mike Conley, Manuel Ybarra,

1 Tim Snead.

2 >>: Thank you distinguished panel. I'm Mike
3 Conley, an elected Commissioner with the Grant County
4 Public Utility District Number Two. I live in Moses
5 Lake. We're hydro-operators ourselves.

6 And the health and abundance of salmon that
7 we have in the Columbia basin has been a primary
8 concern for us. For decades we've been working to
9 protect salmon runs for the use and enjoyment of future
10 generations. As I said, PUD is a public owned utility
11 that operates two dams on the Columbia River. Together
12 these projects provide almost 10 billion kilowatt hours
13 of energy during an average year. More than enough to
14 supply the Seattle area.

15 We acknowledged long ago that our projects do
16 create hazards to fish and have worked to mitigate
17 those problems. Each year our utility invests nearly
18 \$50 million on salmon protection enhancement. We're
19 particularly proud of the part we've played to keep the
20 Chinook among the healthiest in the basin.

21 Their turn-around has been accomplished
22 through a cooperative effort through all projects,
23 working with concerned federal and state agencies, and
24 Indian tribes. We've had great success using this
25 approach to solving salmon problems. This is one

1 example. The effects of these processes is that
2 they're based on good science and willingness of all to
3 work together.

4 In contrast surrounding the Snake is
5 contentious, adversarial, and adrift in poor, and
6 often, conflicting science. This fragmentation has led
7 to polarized positions.

8 We would like to go on record as being
9 stewards of our environment, to being successful in
10 enhancing salmon runs, supporting the use of the best
11 scientific information available, and urging decision
12 makers to act responsibly by believing they must choose
13 sides.

14 We oppose the breachment of the dams. This
15 is a radical proposal which serves as a convenient
16 distraction.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you Mike. Manuel
18 Ybarra, followed by Tim Snead. And Tim is our final
19 public official. And Josephine Wright will be next.

20 >>: Manuel Ybarra, City Councilman for the
21 City of Quincy.

22 When I started out this whole thing I had a
23 speech written up. I'm not a public speaker. I'm just
24 an average guy, elected by people to represent them.
25 So I'm just going to come up and say what I feel.

1 I'll tell you right now, it's funny that we
2 use electricity up here for the lights there, we go
3 home and watch TV, people from the other side watching
4 TV with electricity being used -- produced by dams that
5 we're considering breaching. I don't see how that
6 works.

7 Now, there's some other things I don't
8 understand as well. Here we call salmon an endangered
9 species yet the President, Governors, ourselves are
10 going out and ordering salmon for dinner. Again,
11 something beyond me. I don't understand how this
12 goes.

13 I'm up here to tell you guys that we in the
14 community of Quincy are opposed to dam breaching. All
15 of the study that the U.S. Corps of Engineers has done,
16 looking at the dam breaching aspect of the option
17 number four of dam breaching, all the facts relate to
18 an adverse result for everybody. People, environment,
19 life styles, including fish.

20 When you talk about sediments that are going
21 to be coming down the river. For five to ten years
22 possibly there will not be enough food so salmon can
23 eat and reproduce. We're going to destroy salmon for
24 five to ten years. Indians who want to fish won't have
25 fish in five to ten years. We're making the wrong

1 decisions based on your facts. U.S. Corps of
2 Engineers.

3 Please, please, I urge you, think of the
4 facts that you've come up with. That other people have
5 come up with. So that we have a win-win situation. So
6 we have salmon, clean air, and clean power. Please, I
7 urge you for the City of Quincy and the community of
8 Quincy, don't take out these dams. Thank you.

9 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Tim
10 Snead, Josephine Wright, Douglas Fletcher.

11 >>: Good afternoon. Thank you. My name is
12 Tim Snead.

13 Talking to my constituents, it's very clear
14 to me that they're opposed to dam breaching. Generally
15 when I ask about this issue their response is are they
16 crazy?

17 I'm not going to talk about the devastation
18 to the economy or the infrastructure to Washington
19 State, but the damage to the environment. To our clean
20 industry. They produce electricity through the use of
21 a renewable resource, water.

22 President Clinton, your boss, in the State of
23 the Union Address expressed great concern for global
24 warming. Removing dams would only encourage global
25 warming. The loss can be made up only by coal, gas, or

1 nuclear generation. It would be totally irresponsible
2 for the U.S. Government to destroy dams and replace
3 them with industries that are not a renewable resource
4 and will also contribute to global warming.

5 The increase with truck/rail traffic will
6 also contribute to global warming. Winter solar
7 generation will not make up the difference in lost
8 power. Also conservation will not.

9 The population of the Pacific Northwest will
10 continue to grow. We need all the power generation we
11 can get. We must consider the long-term, over-all
12 effects. Destroying dams would have a negative impact
13 on our environment. The government should channel
14 their efforts to turbines, reduced harvest on nontribal
15 lands, and working with, not dictating to, local
16 government on habitat restoration.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. We're going to
18 start with the public testimony in just a minute. I
19 have one thing I need to discuss with the Colonel very
20 quickly.

21 Due to some exigent circumstances here,
22 Joseph Bogaard who was a no-show earlier was a no-show
23 because his wife was giving birth and has asked for
24 special dispensation to speak now. So if you would
25 step up. Thank you all.

1 For folks in the back I know we have a lot of
2 folks in the back. We have a lot of seats up front.
3 For those of you back there, if you can please keep
4 your chatter down we would appreciate it.

5 >>: Thank you. And she was 7 pounds 1 ounce
6 born at ten am yesterday. (Applause) I'll be leaving
7 soon after.

8 My name is Joseph Bogaard. I represent a
9 Community on Vashon Island. I'm elected Commissioner
10 of King County Water District Number 19.

11 It is my believe that government exists to
12 solve problems. I urge you to get on with the
13 business. As we've seen with other issues here in the
14 Northwest and elsewhere, delaying proffers greater harm
15 for the resource and the people.

16 Let me outline a few of the problems.
17 Problems you're aware of, but the audience will
18 benefit. We have Snake salmon extinct or on the edge
19 of extinction. We've spent huge amounts of dollars.
20 We have tried raising the antes. Abrogating treaty
21 obligations eight to twelve billion dollars.
22 Independent family owned businesses, tackle shops,
23 commercial fishing outfits on the Columbia River clear
24 to Canada and Alaska.

25 Our Northwest low cost energy is in peril.

1 We have lawsuits piling up. Challenging in one case,
2 for example, farmers access to water in Idaho. And
3 another the violation of the Clean Water Act on the
4 lower Snake itself.

5 We find ourselves today on a Northwest
6 crossroads. A symbol of healthy forest, clean water,
7 free-flowing clean rivers, a symbol of our home,
8 teeters on the edge. As a result part of us teeters
9 there as well.

10 We've got some problems, but we have a
11 solution. No one views dam removal as a silver
12 bullet. However this lies at the heart of any
13 effective least costly salmon program. I recognize the
14 transitions are difficult. While many people will
15 benefit, some will be adversely effected. Keep in view
16 the big picture and dam removal will make sense.

17 Large trappings jobs can be replaced with
18 truck and rail jobs. Government has to help that
19 transition occur. But to continue to delay this
20 because someone is hurt ignores all those who have
21 already been, and continue to be, hurt by this delay
22 and this failure of this government to solve problem.
23 Delay, denial, and further study doesn't make sense.
24 We need salmon, those dams don't make sense.

25 Get on with the business of good government

1 and of removing the four dams, assisting people through
2 the transition and building a healthier economy and
3 environment.

4 THE MODERATOR: Thank you everybody. That
5 wraps up the end of the public official, elected
6 official, testimony. We'll begin the public
7 testimony.

8 I'd like to take a minute to remind folks
9 that in order to move through this if you can keep your
10 clapping to no clapping. That would help very much.

11 This is the first time we've done a lottery.
12 And you've seen them passing some notes up here.
13 Apparently there's some confusion. If you have a
14 number assigned and you have another speaker that you
15 want to get in this afternoon instead of yourself you
16 need to let me know that. A couple of you have this is
17 going to be the only session where we're going to allow
18 that switching. So some of that has already happened.
19 If you work with the meeting coordinators to make those
20 changes.

21 Again, let me remind you. Please keep the
22 talking levels down. It's difficult to hear up here
23 when you're all talking in the back. Most importantly,
24 if you're next on deck, once you hear your name called
25 please come to the front so you can be in time for the

1 microphone. No clapping and please treat each other
2 with respect.

3 With that, of course I'm having a hard time
4 hearing myself over the talking. Josephine Wright,
5 Douglas Fletcher, Captain Mike Simenson.

6 >>: Hello. My name is Josephine Wright and
7 I'm a Nez Perce tribal member.

8 I've attended two other meetings discussing
9 wild salmon, and I emphasize wild salmon. I've
10 listened to people speak of loopholes and other natural
11 solutions. I agree we can not solve all of our
12 problems by breaching the four lower dams, but I
13 believe it's a very important first step that must be
14 taken.

15 You say be certain before you make a decision
16 and this is only an experiment and you've told my
17 people that the fishing would be protected if we agreed
18 to the dams. Obviously these don't work. The salmon
19 population continues to decline. Some concerns were
20 jobs, recreation, and economy. These things can be
21 replaced. I know it may not always be the most
22 inexpensive route to take, but if the salmon are lost
23 forever all the money in the world will not bring them
24 back.

25 It is proven that breaching is not

1 tremendously costly. It would be one third the amount
2 for the up keep of the dams. We're still trying to pay
3 for the dams. There are treaties between the Nez Perce
4 and the U.S. government that the fish would not become
5 extinct, and if they did we would receive
6 compensation. If you asked any Native American which
7 they'd rather have, it would be the salmon. They're
8 part of ourselves, our heritage, ancestry, and our
9 pride. They've been migrating to the ocean for
10 centuries. The temperature and the current of the
11 waters guide them to the ocean waters.

12 But these dams slow the current and back up
13 rivers for miles in which these young fish can get
14 lost. A journey that once took two weeks now takes up
15 to three months, severely affecting the ability to
16 adapt to the salt water. They become confused and lost
17 and are easy prey. I believe in the efficiency to get
18 to the ocean for adequate survival rates. Taking
19 months makes them susceptible to death.

20 The combined effects to reservoirs kill
21 between five to fifteen percent young fish. Most
22 Columbia and Snake salmon must survive four to eight
23 dams. These will kill 80 to 95 percent of the fish
24 which have to face all eight of them.

25 I would also like to say that no one in the

1 world can imitate Mother Nature, no matter how hard
2 they try. Wild salmon need their natural environment.

3 THE MODERATOR: Douglas Fletcher, Capt. Mike
4 Simensen, Boots Fischer.

5 >>: I'm Douglas Fletcher. I'm not
6 representing any organization. I'm a retired fish
7 biologist. I spent 36 years in the fish business, the
8 last 27 with the Washington State Department of Fish
9 and Wildlife.

10 This is of interest because of the amount of
11 controversy and conflict that it's generated. Doesn't
12 seem that it generated much understanding of the
13 issue. This is caused mainly because of one of the
14 options breaching the dams.

15 I would like to address the issue of what's
16 going on with survival of the juveniles. Right now the
17 Corps says that between loss to the cost of fish trying
18 to migrate through the dams and fish marched past the
19 dams, 95 percent of each survive the Snake, and 45 to
20 60 percent get through all eight.

21 If the dams were breached, the survival is
22 estimated to increase from the previous 95 percent up
23 to 99 percent past the point where each dam increase
24 has been. This is where it gets complicated, and I
25 think people are losing track of what's the actual

1 impact. There no longer would be any transportation of
2 the Snake fish around the Columbia River dams.

3 In other words, 100 percent would be forced
4 through the four lower dams on the Columbia River.
5 That's some of the most deadly area for smolts,
6 particularly the John Day pool. It's a bad one. So
7 what would the loss rates be? You can extrapolate
8 from some of the Corps's information. Looks like that
9 loss would be around 20 to 35 percent. That's when the
10 fish are barged around the dam, half of them. So it
11 tells us that the best chance for recovery -- however
12 there's a couple of flaws in the premise.

13 For one thing, two models used to make the
14 prescriptions were based on so many assumptions that I
15 don't think they have much good ability. Also they
16 were based on older data. Using these artificially
17 legal high estimates for fish mortality makes a case
18 for breaching stronger and other options weaker. What
19 the Corps said on this, they said the draft -- I asked,
20 the models generated very uncertain outcomes. They
21 also said it's unlikely that even breaching will allow
22 spring and summer Chinook to recover in the fall and
23 winter, increases by 20 percent over what it is now.
24 Is that time?

25 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

1 >>: Okay. That's good.

2 THE MODERATOR: Captain Mike Simensen --

3 >>: My name is Captain Mike Simensen, the
4 Natural Organization of Mates and Master. I am the
5 voice of labor on the Columbia River system. These
6 are federally authorized channels and I know that
7 everybody knows the facts regarding this issue.
8 Brothers and -- Colonel may I? Brothers and sisters
9 this is an emotional issue. It doesn't matter who you
10 are. My great grandfather was a keeper of the
11 Tillamook light house. My grandfather was allowed to
12 fish 265 days a year. Now we come to this. . This
13 there is a major campaign smear tactics. There is a
14 free E-mail service. It's paid by advisors. You click
15 on to the TV screen. This is what I saw in the last
16 two weeks. Save our wild salmon. Little billboard.
17 Clean Water, Healthy Rivers, Help Save the Pacific
18 Salmon. Then there's a tab that says Free. I clicked
19 on it. Help Save the Northwest Wild Salmon.

20 As you read this the fate of salmon hangs in
21 the balance. Today every run through the Snake River
22 is endangered or already extinct. There is hope.
23 Scientists say that salmon have 99 percent chance of
24 full recovery. Luckily, this is affordable.

25 Affordable? I'll tell you what, I start out

1 as a deck hand and I am labor. My negotiations put me
2 in this position. We sold one megawatt during peak
3 times of power needed by the State of California by the
4 United Power Trades Organization, when I listened to
5 Doc Casey explain his view. We sold one megawatt for
6 800 dollars. How much can we buy that back? What we
7 generated was for 21 to 26 dollars. That's a 700
8 percent gain. That's a good business. Salmon is an
9 issue and I am in course with the salmon and our
10 Northwest heritage. Let's continue on to this
11 misleading billboard.

12 So, now you get the big picture. And there's
13 a letter with my name because I signed on with this
14 advertising, has my address right there. It's going to
15 send a letter to Gore, federal agencies, we need
16 salmon, those dams don't make sense, I urge you to
17 remove four dams,.

18 THE MODERATOR: Time's up. Thank you very
19 much.

20 >>: Thank you.

21 THE MODERATOR: Boots Fischer Fischer, Steven
22 Bassett, Eric Espenhorst, I know it's -- I have
23 sympathy for our reporter here and also it's hard for
24 us to hear.

25 >>: Thank you very much for allowing me to

1 talk to you. I'm Boots Fischer, representing the
2 Washington Grange. The Director of the Legislative
3 Department asked me to come today.

4 The policies of the Washington State Grange
5 is in opposition to breaching the dams on the Columbia
6 River or the Snake. Agriculture is the largest
7 industry in the state of Washington.

8 The Washington State Grange has approximately
9 40,000 members. A good many of those live in Eastern
10 Washington depend on the water from the dams to provide
11 their farming. It would be devastating to the
12 membership of Washington State Grange. It would be a
13 serious impact on the finances of the State of
14 Washington and the localities that you've heard from so
15 many other people. I won't go into a whole lot of
16 people.

17 Another thing the Grange is concerned about
18 is the inexpensive clean power that we get from those
19 dams. It's enabled the farmers to have access to the
20 supernet and have all of the things they need in this
21 information era to properly work on their farms and to
22 conduct their business. It is a major business. It is
23 something that's very important to the state of
24 Washington.

25 I think every person in here is very

1 concerned about saving the salmon. But to the
2 Washington State are Grange and me especially,
3 breaching the dams, is a knee-jerk reaction. I think
4 it should be a last resort if there's nothing else that
5 can be done. I think everything else should be tried
6 first.

7 I've been around the corner a couple of
8 times. With we first came in 1936, I was from Kansas,
9 I had never seen a salmon in my life. A little town we
10 lived in there was a stream and in the fall it was full
11 of salmon. I was in awe. They're not there now and
12 there are no dams ahead of it. So there's something
13 else. I don't know what it is. But there is something
14 else that is causing the decline of the salmon. Thank
15 you.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Sara Patton? For
17 those of you who didn't hear, there is a tape recording
18 booth in the other room. Please feel free to utilize
19 that.

20 >>: My name is Sara Patton, head of the
21 Northwest Energy Coalition; 90 groups, including
22 utilities, consumer groups, renewable developers.
23 We're a regional coalition. We care about the regional
24 environment and the economy.

25 Both are at risk if we let Snake River salmon

1 and steelhead go extinct. We don't know what changes
2 the loss of salmon will reek on bears, small creatures,
3 and plants. But we know if we lose the nutrients from
4 the sea which salmon bring to the Northwest, if we lose
5 that ocean, that life, that look, we'll be much much
6 poorer.

7 For a much shorter period of time the
8 Columbia and the Snake have been affording the
9 Northwest another great gift -- cheap electricity.
10 That cheap power has been a main driver of our regional
11 economy. It is one of our homes. It has powered our
12 factories and kept our stores humming.

13 It's due -- but the good news from the Army
14 Corps of Engineers economic analysis is that we can
15 afford to restore by removing the four dams and still
16 have the low power from the Bonneville Power
17 Administration to keep our economy thriving along with
18 the salmon, trees and bears. But if we fail to save
19 the salmon, other areas will have what we need to take
20 away our Northwest details.

21 Congress members have already made good
22 progress in convincing their fellows that Bonneville
23 should sell not at cost but at market rates. They'll
24 make failure of salmon restoration the smoking gun. So
25 if we fail to take effective action to save fish, we'll

1 lose not only the salmon but also the cheap hydropower
2 on which our region economy dependents. Governor
3 Kitzhaber said in September, if the Northwest does not
4 propose a regional solution, these issues will be
5 guides for us. They'll be decided by a Congress that's
6 more interested in the value of power than in the
7 health of our environment.

8 Two conclusions; we need damming, and those
9 dams don't make sense.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you Sara. Jeremy
11 Brown, Jim Mulligan and a ten minute break.

12 >>: I'm a commercial fisherman. I have to
13 ask myself, first off, what the survival rate is of
14 federal officials in this process. Salmon, apart from
15 all the other things, salmon mean jobs. My job. And
16 the members of the organization from which I belong and
17 other commercial fisherman up and down the coast from
18 small jobs like Morrow Bay up to Alaska. It's an
19 international issue that affects Canadian fishermen as
20 well.

21 We've been under Endangered Species Act
22 management for ten years now. Severe conservation
23 management for three or four times as long as based on
24 the best available science. We feel that the
25 commitment we've made is an act of faith that the rest

1 of the process will continue and salmon can be
2 restored. And also believe that the science, the best
3 available science, I think the path process and the
4 independence -- I can't remember the name of all the
5 acronyms we've seen, but it's pretty incredible
6 science. It's not bogus. It points in one direction.

7 If we're going to uphold the law, and the
8 Endangered Species Act is pretty clear. If we're going
9 to uphold that law, then it's time to take some serious
10 steps, see some serious leadership. And unfortunately
11 for some people, breaching the dam is not an attractive
12 solution but we feel it is the last best hope we have.

13 I was born on a farm and I've worked in
14 marine transportation and I have a lot of sympathy for
15 the changes that those people are facing today. I
16 think it's incumbent upon us to address those issues
17 and make sure that whatever changes take place will
18 have a minimum social impact so their way of life can
19 be maintained. Just as people on the coast can have
20 some hope of a future too.

21 The Endangered Species Act train wreck has
22 not been averted. And what I see today is that a lot
23 of the agencies that still have tried to slow the train
24 down are frozen like deer in the headlights. And we're
25 just going to wind up as road kill. Thank you.

1 THE MODERATOR: Jim Mulligan? Followed by a
2 break and after the break we'll have LeeAnne Tryon and
3 James Rouch and Don Grebb.

4 >>: I'm Jim Mulligan. Executive Director of
5 Earth Ministry based in Seattle. It's a Christian
6 ecumenical environmental ministry. We represent -- we
7 work with constituents from fifteen Protestant
8 denominations and Roman Catholics. About 2,500 in
9 Washington state and an additional 2,000 from the rest
10 of the United States.

11 My expertise is not in science. Nor is my
12 expertise in economics. I would like to go in
13 probably, most closely with our Native American
14 brothers in speaking on behalf of the salmon in terms
15 of its religious significance. As a spiritual
16 component of American life.

17 Having announced myself as a novice about
18 economics and pragmatics, I would say on behalf of our
19 constituents the impression is clear that both
20 economically and scientifically, the evidence points in
21 favor of breaching the dams if salmon are to survive.

22 Other speakers have been much more
23 knowledgeable about that. Our constituents are
24 particularly touched by nature. And here in the
25 Northwest a number of species, a number of elements of

1 the natural environment particularly touch people's
2 lives. The rain forest, the seas, the whales, the
3 eagles, the whole variety of icons which represent the
4 fecundity of nature, of the gift of life. Central
5 among those are the salmon. The salmon have been an
6 icon of life in the Northwest for generations.
7 Generations of us white people and generations upon
8 generations of the native inhabitants.

9 If this passes and we weigh only the economic
10 influences, only the pragmatic influences, and we lose
11 forever salmon, we will not only have lost another
12 species that took millennia to develop, we will have
13 lost a resource that nourished us all.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. At this
15 point we've heard from 30 folks. Take a ten minute
16 break right now. I want to thank you very much. We'll
17 start LeeAnn Tryon, James Rauth, right after the
18 break.

19 .
20 (Ten minute break taken).

21 .
22 THE MODERATOR: All right. We'll start out
23 with LeeAnne Tryon, James Rauch and Tom Grebb.

24 Remind you of no interruptions, treating each
25 other with respect, no signs in the meeting room,

1 keeping your aside conversations and coming right up to
2 the microphone to get ready. Thank you. So, LeeAnne
3 Tryon, followed by James Rauch, followed by Tom.

4 >>: My name is LeeAnne Tryon. I'm the
5 Associate Director for the Save the Wild Salmon
6 Coalition. We're glad to have a chance to come to this
7 urgent critical decision, whether to remove four dams
8 or to share the Columbia basin.

9 We urge the federal agencies to move forward
10 with alternative four and alternative three. Save the
11 Wild Salmon is a coalition of more than 50 different
12 organizations, commercial fishing organizations,
13 business associations, environmental groups, and energy
14 activists. We come with many different perspectives.

15 As broad and diverse as our coalition is, it
16 doesn't overcome the 700 organizations, businesses, and
17 prominent individuals across the nation who support
18 removing four dams. I couldn't list all of those
19 industries but a few -- the Alaska Trollers
20 Association, American Rivers, The Association of
21 Northwest Steelheads, Columbia River, Earth Justice
22 Legal Defense Fund, Earth Ministry, Friends of the
23 Earth, Idaho Rivers United, Idaho Steelhead, The
24 Mountaineers, The National Resource Defense Counsel,
25 The National Wildlife Federation, Northwest Ecosystem

1 Alliance, Northwest Sport Fishing Organization, Oregon
2 National Desert Organization, Oregon National Resource
3 Council, Pacific Rivers Council, Pacific Coast
4 Fisheries Organization, Herd Chapters Across the
5 Nation, Puget Sound Gillnetters, Salmon for All, Save a
6 Wild Salmon, Spokane Audibon, Taxpayers for Common
7 Sense, Trout Unlimited, The Washington Environmental
8 Council, Washington Wildlife Federation, and The
9 Washington Trollers Association.

10 Just these groups alone represent over six
11 million Americans that support this issue. But that's
12 not all. Individuals from all over have been making
13 phone calls, writing letters, signing post cards, and
14 sending E-mails. The signatures on these blue banners
15 represent less than 6 percent of the 100,000 people who
16 say we need salmon. Let's not forget Governor John
17 Kitzhaber from Oregon who has endorsed taking up this
18 stance. More and more people are making their voices
19 heard every day. Thank you for your time.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

21 For those of you who are seeing the signs in
22 the room and wondering why they're here when I said
23 they couldn't be, I thought that we weren't allowed to
24 have them in because of the fire marshal rules.
25 Apparently that's okay. As long as there's no sticks

1 in them you can bring them in and out when it's over.

2 So I apologize for the miscommunication that I had.

3 James Rauch followed by Tom Grebb by Alice Parker.

4 >>: Thank you. My name is James Rauch. I'm

5 a resident of Mercer Island, Washington. I'm a

6 retiree. I'm an outdoorsman. A salmon advocate. And

7 I believe I'm a pretty good conservationist. However,

8 I am in opposition to option four, the dam removal. I

9 am for a strong and competitive economy for our Pacific

10 Northwest region and people who live here.

11 Last week I read an article about how the

12 huge increase in productivity in agriculture has been

13 overshadowed by the spotlight being on the high tech

14 businesses, et cetera.

15 The article went on to say that over 50

16 percent of our nation's agricultural products go to

17 markets overseas. And the areas drained by the Snake

18 and the Columbia are a huge part of that activity and

19 we participate largely in export markets. Barging now

20 is, most everyone knows, one of the most competitive

21 methods of moving agricultural products destined for

22 overseas markets. The removal of the dams in question

23 will eliminate barging on the Snake as I understand

24 it.

25 Now these agricultural commodities are very

1 price-sensitive products. And losing any of this
2 competitive edge, which is provided by the barging, is
3 going to have a negative affect on this vast
4 agricultural area and the people that live or are
5 supported by that.

6 Now, you know, the dams are here. If they
7 weren't that would be another story. The removal as I
8 understand will also have no guarantee that the four
9 threatened species involved will be restored. That's
10 not a given. Why should we destroy these facilities
11 that provide daily a competitive edge to our committee
12 and for the people living this this area?

13 The dams also provide reasonable
14 hydroelectric power for other industries. I just can't
15 see why we would give all this up on the hopes that the
16 dam removal is going to rejuvenate these four runs.
17 Thank you very much.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thank you James. Tom Grebb,
19 followed by Alice Parker. If you're wondering where we
20 are, we're on number ten.

21 >>: I'm Tom Grebb from Quincy. You've had a
22 number of people from Grant County and elected
23 officials up here speak. There will be several more
24 I'm sure.

25 It's obviously a very large concern.

1 Whatever happens to the river is the life blood of what
2 happens to us there. Quincy is only eight miles from
3 the Columbia River. I played in that. It was cold
4 before the Daniels and still cold. We have a number of
5 issues along with harvest. I think that in looking at
6 All-H, I think that's a concern to many of us. Looking
7 at what goes on in international waters.

8 I would like to see from my standpoint even
9 working with the Indian tribes as they are allowed
10 under law to harvest I think they need to be looked at
11 for their benefit and everyone's benefit as well.
12 Looking at the hatcheries, I believe they need to be
13 kept going as they have been. From what I see, our
14 public utility district, which has two dams on the
15 Columbia, we've had people speak to that here, they're
16 trying to work with hatcheries and we need to keep
17 those fish who are going to live if the area that we
18 have now. That the environment has changed somewhat.
19 So we need to work with that and deal with the ones
20 that are adaptable to the system that we have.

21 The hydroissue, I'm against the breaching of
22 the four dams. They are -- I do not feel that it shows
23 enough promise for what's there. There's also a
24 concern. I think the concern why so many people from
25 Grant County are here is that that could be a

1 precedent-setting thing for anything that happens along
2 the Columbia River. Agriculture is a very big part of
3 what we do. There are surpluses in the world, granted,
4 but the Northwest agriculture means a lot to the
5 nation. 80 percent of the french fries come out of the
6 Northwest. 60 percent from Washington State. So any
7 time you need a french fry, think of Washington State.
8 We could get them from other states. Other states
9 fluctuate a lot. The irrigation in the Northwest does
10 not. Currently we have surpluses because the other
11 states have had good years.

12 At any rate, I appreciate the comment that
13 you have. Any decision you make will affect us in
14 life. Currently a good chunk of it goes to salmon
15 recovery.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you Tom. Alice Parker?

17 >>: Thank you, panel members, and I'm very
18 pleased to be here today. I'm Alice Parker, the
19 Executive Secretary for the Columbia Basin Development
20 League.

21 My husband Ivan and I are retired farmers at
22 the Columbia Basin Project. Our membership is
23 comprised of individuals, businesses, and entities who
24 have interests in the basin project. We have an
25 invested interest in any policy that impacts the

1 Columbia Snake system.

2 We're very concerned with the policy that
3 addresses flow target and augmentation. The Bureau of
4 Reclamation currently is enforcing the moratorium on
5 the Columbia Basin Project. Water would serve
6 additional agricultural, municipal and other project
7 water uses. This water is also authorized by
8 consisting contractual authorities. Therefore we feel
9 the moratorium should be ended.

10 The need for that moratorium is based on
11 excessive flow augmentations that are hydrologically
12 unachievable and biologically unnecessary. The annual
13 quantity of water allocated to the Columbia flow
14 augment should be reduced to 4 million acre feet or
15 less. Consideration should be given to using this
16 water for late summer or early fall augmentation.

17 I have attached a paper written by Dr. Del
18 Olson and other people who are in the know to
19 supplement that information. And will confirm what I'm
20 saying.

21 Just a week ago a lawsuit was filed in the
22 U.S. District Court under the Endangered Species Act
23 asking that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the
24 U.S. of Reclamation are not meeting the minimum flow
25 set by the national fisheries. There is no significant

1 evidence that shows this is necessary. And I just
2 don't understand why we still have to keep filing
3 lawsuits and spending valuable time and money which I
4 think could be much better spent in looking at what
5 really would help salmon and salmon recovery.

6 And that includes All-H's plus the 5th H, the
7 human element. We hear so much about the tribal
8 entities and how they must be honored. But we as
9 individuals and businesses and entities have contracts
10 with the federal government also and I think they
11 should be honored also. I will give you a copy of my
12 testimony and I thank you for having this hearing.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Jean
14 Gerny (phonetic).

15 >>: Thank you I'm Jean Gerny (phonetic) from
16 Seattle. I have testimony which I will share with
17 you. But I also wanted to bring with me my grandson.
18 Arron Stroming (phonetic) has something he would like
19 to say first.

20 >>: In our library at school we read a book
21 about an Indian that said if the other Indian said
22 this, if you told me to the salmon would not exist he
23 would break his bow and arrow. Now it's our job to
24 make sure he's right.

25 >>: Thank you. It's the future and the

1 past. I found a quotation from Lewis and Clark.
2 William Clark's journal, October 17, 1805. The number
3 of dead salmon on the shores, this is the lower Snake
4 -- the number floating on the river is incredible to
5 say and at this season the Indians have only to collect
6 the fish, dry them on the scaffolds of which they have
7 great numbers. The journals go on about the great
8 number of fish. Will there be great numbers of fish in
9 2005? We must do all we can to make sure they
10 recover. Individuals and society sometimes make
11 mistakes.

12 In the 60's some of us were not convinced
13 that Lewiston needed to be a seaport. But when we find
14 we've made a mistake, the correct thing is to correct
15 it. These areas have some value but at a price that
16 was not recognized at the time. We must acknowledge
17 and correct that before the remaining areas of the
18 Snake salmon will become exextinct.

19 Also we need to monitor fishing and farming
20 practices, and our pollution from city people. I'm not
21 a scientist. You have many studies like this. But
22 there can be no guarantees. But we will must correct
23 past mistakes. Choose actions with the highest
24 success. Undoing those dams will allow salmon to
25 navigate to streams. Please help us save our salmon.

1 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Jacoba Johnson
2 John.

3 >>: Good afternoon. Thank you for hearing me
4 speak. I'm Jacoba Johnson, a resident of the Pacific
5 Northwest. I'm here in support of the removal of the
6 four dams. I'm here to testify that those dam
7 structures have a direct relationship to the decline in
8 the Snake salmon stocks.

9 This testimony is nothing new. We have a
10 legacy of 70 years of scientific observation in the
11 Northwest that recognizes that dams kill fish and
12 significantly impact the decline of the species.

13 Something many people may not know, but as
14 long as 75 years ago in the 1920's the Washington State
15 Department of fisheries recognize dams as a significant
16 killer of fish population. I quote from the 1924
17 report of the Washington State Supervisory Fisheries,
18 quote the damming of our larger streams, the ones most
19 frequented by the natural fish, is rapidly becoming a
20 problem to the existence of the fish.

21 Again in 1931 the Washington State Department
22 of Fisheries quote practically all established power
23 and irrigation projects have already taken a large toll
24 on fish life. No matter how carefully any fish-saving
25 device may be, damming changes the natural conditions

1 of any stream and depletes the fish life contained
2 therein.

3 Since the 20's we've had numerous scientific
4 studies that show that dams kill fish and have a
5 significant decline to our salmon populations. This
6 suggests that this is no longer about having scientific
7 evidence, but rather political.

8 The dams on the lower Snake River do not
9 offer flood control benefits. They offer irrigation
10 for thirteen farms along the lower part of the river
11 and navigation for barge transport. There is a win/win
12 situation in this. We know that we can lower the
13 irrigation pipes for those thirteen farms. There are
14 rail lines that -- what is currently being barged along
15 can switch over to rail. There is a win/win situation
16 in this. We're putting a lot of money into stocks
17 where we can provide subsidies for the farmers and the
18 barge traffickers to move the traffic over to rail.

19 I think what we're seeing is people who are
20 afraid of changing times and what the future may
21 bring. But we can work together and I believe come up
22 with a win/win situation. I think we're at a
23 historical decision making point. We have a choice to
24 make now, which is to forever see the extinct of our
25 salmon stocks or make a decision to retain wild salmon

1 for future generations.

2 THE MODERATOR: Shawn Cantrell, Norm Winn,
3 and then Kay Thode.

4 >>: I'm Shawn Cantrell, Northwest Regional
5 Director for Friends of the Earth.

6 I want to point out a couple of things for
7 you today. Few human actions have as significant
8 impact as the presence of a dam. As you decide how
9 best to restore Snake salmon and the ecosystems, they
10 depend on you to need to keep in mind our nation's
11 history of dam removal.

12 Some dams just don't make sense. Friends of
13 the Earth and Travel Unlimited American Rivers have
14 done research. We'll provide you with a copy of the
15 report. That report identifies more than 465 dams
16 across the country that have been removed successfully,
17 including 36 here in the Northwest. The results of
18 those removals are very promising as you look to make
19 your decision about the Snake dams. Those past
20 removals have provided significant ecosystem
21 restoration, fish and wildlife benefits, particularly
22 salmon. Also major water quality improvements and cost
23 savings over maintaining the dams and economic
24 community development for the communities around the
25 restored river.

1 One, the Army Corps of Engineers was
2 responsible for the dam, I have the explosion of
3 Lewiston Dam. I'll be happy to give you a copy of this
4 video. Some folks today have suggested that dam
5 removal is a risky or experimental or untested idea.
6 But the more than 46 a dams that have been removed
7 demonstrate that such concerns are not founded in
8 fact. The reality is that dam removal is a time
9 tested, biologically sound, cost effective method for
10 dealing with dams that don't make sense.

11 The question for you as you decide the future
12 of our salmon in the lower river is will you help
13 restore some balance to that system while removing four
14 dams and leaving in place the hundreds of other dams?
15 We can have salmon, we can have dams, but some don't
16 make sense.

17 >>: This norm followed by Kay Thode and David
18 Ortman. Two reminders. Please don't clap. And there
19 are booths in the other room. So if you get tired and
20 want to testify in the microphone.

21 >>: I'm Kay Thode with the Mountaineers, a
22 conservation organization with fifteen thousand
23 members. We are sensitive to the economic repast of
24 the Corps' decision. We're aware that it will have
25 impact on agriculture, barging, rail, and truck

1 traffic.

2 As a personal note, let me mention that I
3 grew up in a small farming community in Iowa dominated
4 by corn elevators. So I'm familiar with some of the
5 aspects of agriculture and transportation. We're also
6 aware that these dams do not soil water, they do zero
7 flood control, and provide five percent of the regional
8 power. We're aware that the irrigation pumps near the
9 ice harbor serve only a small number of farms and those
10 can be extended so the irrigation can continue. All of
11 the acts of removal we believe can be covered by
12 barging costs. But most important, general scientific
13 agreement that partial dam removal is necessary to
14 preserve the salmon runs.

15 The Yakima and Snake clearly indicate the
16 effect of Snake dams on salmon returns. We're aware
17 that there are other factors that effect the decline of
18 salmon harvest. With curtailment of commercial
19 harvest, and an action to protect salmon throughout
20 the basin. These actions do not mitigate against
21 action along the dams. We've been talking for twenty
22 years. Now is the time for action. Do the right
23 thing. Support partial removal of the Snake dams.
24 Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you Norm. Kay Thode

1 followed by David Ortman, Dewey Campbell.

2 >>: I'm not -- we're not really quintuplets.

3 There are many valid reasons to breach these dams.

4 We'll give you our take on it in song.

5 (Singing).

6 Oh, we're radical environmentists, we're
7 radical environmentalists, we like clean air and clean
8 waters just like the farmers daughters, we're radical
9 environmentalists.

10 We like our river without all those stands.
11 Without those awful jams. We like policies that help
12 our fish, we're radical environmentalists.

13 So, we're radical environmentalists who say
14 get rid of all those awful dams, lets set up a standard
15 system, one salmon can exist in. We're radical
16 environmentalists.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

18 >>: (CONTINUED SINGING).

19 Swimming out in the ocean, in the nice open
20 sea, swam a school of fishys as happy as can be, we're
21 going up the river where we began. But wait a minute,
22 they've got another plan boom boom diddy diddy oom oom
23 shoo, you'll never make it up the river to spawn.

24 It's happening to the herring and the cod,
25 it's happening to the salmon, don't blame it all on

1 God. The dams are killing salmon, and they've got to
2 go before the salmon go extinct and we have to go.
3 Boom boom oom oom shoo, boom boom diddy diddy oom,.
4 We've got to save those fish, remove the damned dams
5 before the salmon go squish.

6 Spawn salmon spawn! Spawn salmon spawn!
7 Spawn!

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. David Ortman.
9 Follow that up if you will. Followed by Dewey Campbell
10 and Katie McCrea.

11 >>: That's a tough act to follow.

12 >>: My name is David Ortman. I'm Executive
13 Director of the Wise Use Movement supported by private
14 property owners, on the use of public and private
15 lands. We support events to protect endanger species.

16 I reviewed the Corps of Engineers report and
17 EIS. The following comments are the views of our
18 movement. We support the breaching of the four lower
19 dams and recovery of salmon in the Columbia basin.

20 At a Congressional hearing last week,
21 testimony and evidence from the U.S. Army Corps of
22 Engineers that cooked his books and lied to
23 (unintelligible) -- we now know the Corps very
24 exception is alive and well.

25 In February 7th, 1999, for example, a front

1 page article ran documenting the firing of a wetland
2 specialist who objected to the Corps' filling wetland
3 permits. This is another example of the Corps ignoring
4 (unintelligible).

5 Yesterday the Walla Walla Corps district put
6 an ad in the paper announcing a public meeting.
7 Reviewing this, we came across an amazing number of
8 outright lies. First it says the roles in this study
9 is (unintelligible) -- under the Corps's, the entirely
10 Columbia River system has become broker and broker.

11 Next, the Walla Walla Corps web site says
12 that historically the runs have been impacted by over
13 fishing, general habitat depletion, poor ocean
14 conditions. Nowhere is there any mention on this web
15 site that upstream or downstream salmon migration
16 through or around the dams is in any way part of the
17 design. In fact, getting salmon up and over has been
18 solved successfully.

19 Systems fish program are in place at all four
20 of the lower Snake dams. And this indicates how best
21 to assist fish in their passage. But the Corps of
22 Engineers are (unintelligible) I -- the salmon love
23 fish ladders.

24 The Corps of Engineers approaches the excess,
25 what then is the purpose of the study except to cook

1 the books and what better way to doctor the books and
2 deceive the public than by falsifying the web site so
3 the public is led to believe number three. How does
4 the Corps do this?

5 Well, look at their web site and find out.
6 They do it by incorporating the alternative three for
7 comment it is made referred there and not attributed to
8 what. I think this is a scandal that the Corps should
9 correct soon on your web site. Thank you.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Very much.
11 David. Dewey Campbell, Katy McCrea. Tom Flint.

12 I would like to invite the folks in the back
13 to come on up front and have a seat.

14 >>: I'm a Nez Perce tribal member. I would
15 like to point out that over 200 natural tribal
16 fisheries, practical removal of the four dams is the
17 best biological option for the fish. They predict that
18 bypassing the dams will restore salmon within 24
19 years. That's a long time, but at least my kids and my
20 grand kids can enjoy fishing. I would like to read
21 it's a scientific no brainer. If we like to follow the
22 recommendations of science, we have to be prepared to
23 look in the mirror and accept the consequences. Thank
24 you salmon.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. All right. So

1 Katy McCrea, Tom Flint, Georgia Ann Hale.

2 >>: Good afternoon. My name is Katy McCrea
3 I'm an intern for Washington Conservation Voters, as
4 well as a student at Seattle Pacific University.

5 I just want to say that I am representing WCC
6 as well as all students, including myself, who support
7 the removal of the four dams on the lower Snake. We
8 need salmon and these dams are a huge hindrance to the
9 wild salmon population.

10 Salmon are part of the spirit of the
11 Northwest. Please do what is right for the region,
12 these fish, and our communities. Thank you.

13 THE MODERATOR: Tom Flint, Georgia Ann Hale,
14 Bill Arthur.

15 >>: Thank you for this opportunity. My name
16 is Tom Flint.

17 I'm a farmer from Central. I wanted to kind
18 of put some perspective to this. Today we've heard
19 about icons, we've heard about the tribal. Icon we've
20 heard about the salmon icon. And I also want to remind
21 you of the fact the icon of the family farmer. And
22 want to let you know that dams do count and they should
23 not -- you should not cut off the arm that feeds you.

24 Specifically I want to let you know that I
25 represent the Save Our Dams Coalition. We've provided

1 85,000 signatures in support of saving our dams. I
2 want to let you know that support, none of them has
3 come across as not helping salmon restoration. They
4 believe that we can have salmon and dams. And also I'd
5 like my comments to be addressed to the Endangered
6 Species Act. I'd like to let you know that we oppose
7 dam breaching. We oppose reservoir draw downs and
8 river flow augmentation. And we do support economical,
9 common sense salmon restoration.

10 I think today we've heard of a lot of
11 different alternatives. What I think we might want to
12 do is put things in perspective. If you support dam
13 breaching, what does that mean? That means
14 specifically that you have to come up with an
15 alternative power source to power all of Seattle or all
16 of Idaho and Montana, and the most logical replacement
17 pod for that would be either coal fire generation or
18 natural gas generation.

19 If this was coal fire generation, it would
20 take a coal drain 1.2 miles long every day to fuel the
21 generators. That would produce 14,500 tons of
22 hydrocarbon gases annually. We have the safest and
23 cleanest, and it's also natural resource based, free
24 energy that we can have. And why should we jeopardize
25 that? We have to give credit to the Corps for doing an

1 extremely good job and being able to get 95 percent of
2 the fish safely downstream.

3 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

4 >>: I'm Dorothy Ann Hale. I'm a dairy
5 farmer and a geologist. I work with scientific
6 methods. I work with statistics.

7 The science promoted by the dam breaching
8 advocates is filled with prejudice. Let me define.
9 Prejudice is an opinion beforehand without knowledge of
10 the fact. Pathology is to adapt from normal
11 conditions. Their science is this. I am for the fish
12 and I want their recovery. We need to do this by
13 developing a comprehensive plan based on facts. The
14 development model is to define the problem. The
15 problem is the risk of extinction of the salmon and
16 other fish. What about buffalo? Any way, then we need
17 to research the problem. Salmon aren't the only U.S.
18 problem.

19 I asked what about the Canadian fish? What
20 about the rivers with declining populations? But they
21 don't have dams. Could Snake and Columbia dams be
22 their problem? How about our ocean conditions? Again,
23 you have a dam problem. Of ten, six are caught in
24 nets, two are it taken by tribes, one by prey and one
25 is left. But of course, it's the dams. We need to

1 consider science.

2 Why don't we hear about Jim Anderson
3 University of Washington? In American we're fair and
4 we have law. Due process. I put for you the case of
5 the hatchery buffalo again. Why are they acceptable
6 but not hatchery salmon? Is this a dual standard?

7 Hatchery fish all came from wild fish.
8 Another analogy: The Nazi concentration camps.
9 Sometimes a German officer would shoot out people.
10 These people aren't guilty. Our dams or methofarmers
11 are like those prisoners. Breaching the dams and
12 taking away water rights will not recover the salmon
13 population. I want the population recovered and I want
14 the dams. We need a balanced solution.

15 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

16 >>: I'm Bill Arthur. The Sierra Club's
17 Northwest director. I represent the 30,000 members in
18 the Northwest and 600 thousand members nationally.

19 I appreciate the opportunity for many people
20 to testify. As we near the closing dates of these
21 hearings, I want to focus on a couple of key points.
22 One is the delay as it is deadly for the salmon and
23 danger for the economy. We've delayed and ducked the
24 issues for many years and it's time to take strong
25 actions. The process effects are real and mediate.

1 The CRI and path processes indicate that
2 we're on a critical path if we don't take changes to
3 address it. Bypassing or partial removal is a
4 fundamental action necessary for recovery. Folks have
5 said it's not a silver bullet. I would agree with
6 that. I would suggest it is a high velocity, high
7 impact action that we need to do. The CRI analysis has
8 not invalidated the pathwork.

9 Under the path process providing an 80
10 percent probability for dam removal, a hundred percent
11 probability for fall Chinook. Under the CRI analysis,
12 dam removal is the only option that has the potential
13 for achieving the target growth rates for all three
14 species. Yes, habitat protection and hatchery reform
15 need to be part of the equation. But we need to put 80
16 percent where the problem is it.

17 That still focuses on the lethal corridors of
18 dams we've created on the river. We've made the river
19 safe for wheat and the highway safe for salmon. We
20 need to restore the heart. We need a quantifiable
21 bypass. We need to free the lower Snake and restore
22 the habitat and create conditions that once again can
23 provide for healthy salmon runs in the state.

24 Next we must answer some questions. You must
25 define your recovery methods. The Army Corps of

1 Engineers, no offense, but are still managed by
2 damaholics. There's a four step, recovery process and
3 it might help the Army Corps. Much like the ancient
4 forests, you need to move the issue forward and
5 implement the laws. Governor Kitzhaber is to be
6 applauded for the leadership he has provided. Once
7 again the delegation has detailed the issue. Governor
8 Locke has decided that praying for rain and wishing for
9 the fish fairy.

10 I leave you with the final word, you are
11 going to have to it take the decisive action. You're
12 going to have to provide the leadership.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Bill. Connie
14 Kelleher.

15 >>: My name is Connie Kelleher. The myth is
16 that removing the Snake dams would be devastating to
17 Eastern Washington. I know many of you traveled here
18 to express your support for the dams. Your concern is
19 understandable given the misinformation that has been
20 used to stir up opposition to dam removal.

21 But the fact is that it need not be
22 economically painful. All of the benefits currently
23 provided by dams can be provided at an affordable
24 cost. At first a rail truck alternative exists. With
25 the right planning and investments, the infrastructure

1 can be improved to move grain and commodities at
2 competitive rates.

3 First, irrigation would keep the land in
4 production and prevent job loss. The Army Corps shows
5 that dam removal will create jobs in the long term.
6 Power can be replaced with a low market energy
7 conservation and nonpolluting for the same cost with
8 natural gas plants. The average monthly household bill
9 increase, around two dollars of the these facts are in
10 various reports. Many in the Army Corps EIS. There is
11 no evidence to support the claims that dam removal
12 would devastate rural communities. Yes for a few. For
13 example the dam operators. And we should do everything
14 with we can.

15 Let's not forget the economic benefits. It
16 is the only recovery option that would bring new
17 economic opportunities to the region. Primarily
18 recreation and associated business. It will make the
19 region more tractive to businesses which are
20 increasingly relocating.

21 Finally, and perhaps most important, the cost
22 to rural communities will be greater than cost of
23 removal. This bears repeating. The economic burden
24 would be harder on rural communities. The reason is
25 simple. Irrigationists throughout the basin would have

1 their use restricted to augment flows. Land owners
2 would have much larger restrictions. These actions
3 will have to be implemented throughout the basin
4 affecting much more people than by dam removal. So we
5 should direct towards maximizing the economic benefits
6 and making a smooth transition. That is where we need
7 leadership and we should demand that leadership from
8 our collected officials.

9 >>: Thank you. Joseph?

10 >>: Thank you. My name is Joseph Katrosyk
11 with the Green Party of Seattle. We have advocacy of
12 taking out the dams. I'm not going to speak in a
13 political sense, but I own ten acres out in the
14 Dalles. I've been to the Mary Hill Museum. In the
15 basement you'll find a bunch of rocks. In our area,
16 we've lived here in the great Columbia Basin for over
17 10,000 years. Constantly. When you look at the
18 pyramids, you're talking 5,000 years. Some of the
19 sites in China, 7,000 years. So when you look at that
20 kind of imperical evidence versus 60 or 70 years of
21 dams, that's saying a lot. Salmon is what they lived
22 on. That salmon is what they bartered with. When you
23 look at those kinds of things, all the numbers that we
24 crunch microscopically get thrown at the wall and we
25 see if they'll stick.

1 Essential fatty acids in our body, every
2 cardiologist knows that he's taking it so he can live a
3 little longer and enjoy it. When we're babies, we look
4 like fish; we have gills. We are not only separate
5 from the salmon, we're at one point in our life a
6 salmon. So in that respect, it's not us or them. It's
7 us. Period.

8 And last but not least, when the Columbia
9 River broke off and the Oregon Trail was there and they
10 knew how to get there, there was a sign. I know it's
11 somewhere that says this way to California, this way up
12 the Oregon trail. And the joke goes like this -- those
13 who could read took the Oregon trail.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Joseph. Rob
15 Musonis?

16 >>: Good afternoon. My name is Rob Musonis.
17 I'm Regional Director of Dam Programs American Rivers.
18 I appreciate the opportunity to testify.

19 I'll focus on four lower Snake dams because a
20 decision about these dams will dictate the future of
21 Snake salmon. Make no mistake about it. If the lower
22 Snake dams stay, the odds are high that we will never
23 again see healthy self-sustaining fishable populations
24 of Snake salmon and steelhead.

25 Let me briefly make the case for dam

1 removal. It's a known effective recovery strategy.
2 Over 465 dams have been removed in the U.S. since
3 1912. American success stories, which I'm holding in
4 my hand, which highlights the 25 success stories where
5 rivers and wildlife were restored. There are also
6 others from around the world. From the Loire Valley in
7 France. The dam removal is not a radical process.
8 It's a common sense recovery strategy. What is radical
9 is the way dams have in 25 years transformed the Snake
10 and designated her steelhead.

11 Two, scientific analysis has shown that dam
12 removal is the most recovery and least risky. Now is
13 not the time to gamble.

14 Three, dam removal is backed by reputable
15 fisheries scientists throughout region. The Oregon
16 chapter of the American Fisheries Society unanimously
17 endorsed removing the dams. To quote Dr. Tom Backman
18 this is no longer a scientist's debate, close quote.

19 Four, no other specific action to recover
20 Snake salmon has been identified. None, zero. There
21 is only speculation. Abandoning dam speculation is a
22 fools bargain.

23 Finally, despite all the talk of uncertainty,
24 one very clear relationship can be demonstrated from
25 the evidence. That is the relationship between the

1 number of studies and the number of fish. With each
2 additional study, Snake salmon move close toward
3 extinction.

4 So we call on you to stop studying the fish
5 to death and move forward with dam removal. The future
6 of Snake salmon and our quality life depend on it.

7 Thank you.

8 >>: Thank you.

9 >>: Good afternoon. I'm Joan Krooks
10 (phonetic), Executive Director of the Washington
11 Environmental Council.

12 The Washingtonian Environmental Council,
13 which is a state-wide coalition of 87 member groups and
14 thousands of individuals working to protect the
15 environment of Washington state since 1967. A variety
16 of efforts, including public education, working to
17 change state level policy. We've been working to
18 protect wild fish across the state.

19 WEC supports removal of the lower Snake River
20 dams for the following reasons. We believe that it is
21 our responsibility as a society to protect our natural
22 heritage. For this generation and future generations.
23 In Washington that includes -- that means saving salmon
24 from extinction and starting the recovery process. WEC
25 recognizes that saving salmon will take significant

1 financial investments, and changes at the state, local
2 and regional level. But just because removing the
3 lower Snake dams isn't the only thing we need to do,
4 that isn't an excuse for not doing it.

5 These four dams are the major problem for
6 certain -- they propose deadly indications for fish
7 migrating up and down streams. Removing the dams will
8 restore the river to a more natural state.

9 According to state, federal and tribal
10 fishery specialists, partial removal is the best option
11 for starting the recovery process.

12 We recognize that saving salmon will take
13 significant financial investment, but there are also
14 long-term benefits for our communities and future
15 generations. Restoring salmon populations to
16 harvestable levels will bring jobs to different jobs of
17 the state. Coastal fishing communities and small towns
18 where recreational jobs would be created.

19 We've spent millions of studies on things
20 such as barging, yet the fish continue to decline.
21 Face the facts. Significant changes are needed very
22 soon. Let's stop studying the problem to death,
23 literally. Stop wasting money on things that don't
24 work. Move forward with what we know will work and
25 what we know has the best chance of saving the fish;

1 that is, removal of the four lower Snake dams.

2 THE MODERATOR: Bill Robinson, Mary Lewis,
3 Lilisa Moses.

4 >>: Good afternoon. I'm the Executive
5 Director of the Washington Council of Trout Unlimited.

6 Trout Unlimited has a thirty year involvement
7 in the Snake River. We, along with the Washingtonian
8 Environmental Council and Sierra Club, in the late 60's
9 sued to stop the building of lower Grant. We lost but
10 we did stop the future building of the Asuki Dam. So
11 it wasn't a lost effort at all.

12 We support the breaching of the four lower
13 dams of the Snake. And we come to this position after
14 many years of reviewing the studies, working with the
15 scientific community members, and trying to develop and
16 option which would restore salmonid resources.

17 Our solution is that it can't be accomplished
18 without the breaching option. We don't have more
19 studies. More studies equal delay. The continued
20 decline of those icons of the Northwest must stop. We
21 will never have all the information we need, but we
22 have enough to act now. The DREW work group
23 underestimated the positive impacts and overestimated
24 the negative impacts of dam removal. It failed to
25 recognize that the economy of the Pacific Northwest is

1 evolving and many of the resources and economies have
2 been in a decline for many years.

3 The creation of jobs in more stable
4 industries will allow local economies to benefit,
5 resulting from regional and world global forces. The
6 economic positive impacts of breaching the lower Snake
7 will -- (INAUBIBLE) -- free Snake.

8 DREW failed to accurately quantify the value
9 of Snake to American Indian tribes, which does not
10 account for ceremonial existence. It also failed to
11 accurately calculate benefits and void the benefits
12 from Oregon to Alaska for recreational things.

13 It failed to accurately calculate
14 recreational benefits to the local benefits. It
15 accounts only for tourist dollars spent on gas, not to
16 the food and lodging dollars.

17 The DREW economic analysis of the impact of
18 the lower Snake dam woefully, I think, is accurate at
19 worst. The region which has been asked to make
20 critical questions deserves the best information
21 available. The DREW analysis falls well short of
22 this.

23 One last thing, what would it cost to include
24 the breaching of the four dams? If we don't, if we
25 don't -- and aren't successful, the extinction is going

1 to come at a significant price, which quite frankly
2 history will look at us in one light probably, but not
3 nearly in the negative light that we'll look upon the
4 issue and the lack of moving toward restoration that
5 we'll do.

6 THE MODERATOR: Meriwhether Lewis, follow by
7 Lilisa Moses, followed by William Monto.

8 >>: Correctly my name is Meriwhether Lewis
9 (phonetic).

10 .

11 (SCRIPT PROVIDED TO THE PANEL. READ INTO THE
12 RECORD).

13 .

14 THE MODERATOR: Lilisa Moses.

15 >>: I'm Lilisa Moses. As inspiration, some
16 towns are faced with six-figure price tags for
17 repairs. The Department of Natural Resources says 30
18 dams may be raised in the next five years. Reduces the
19 channel depth and can make the water way unsafe for
20 mechanical sources are used to deepen and deposit the
21 sediment. Why not dredge while we're working on
22 breaching the dam? There has too many dams that have
23 been breached. The sediment did not ruin --
24 (inaudible) -- there was also water and rain in June
25 and July and the fisheries increased. The sediment has

1 not done as much damage. The effect on industry is
2 marginal.

3 Industries outside the Northwest pay 1,000 to
4 24,000 more per month for kilowatt hours. The rate
5 increases would not create barriers to businesses in
6 the Pacific Northwest. Increase will not increase as
7 high as people think.

8 These dams not only hurt the salmon, but the
9 eagles too. They set up electrical lines so the sea
10 gulls don't eat the smolt and the eagles go fishing and
11 get shocked by the lines and die too.

12 Some people say you want to save the salmon,
13 quit fishing. Put your gill nets out of the water.
14 That's what's killing the salmon. Nets are not the bad
15 guys. Especially the ocean nets. Look at the dam
16 losses and compare to the nets.

17 The dam breaching averages an 82 percent
18 relative probability of recovery population escapement
19 criteria, where as no breaching averages a 47 to 50
20 percent. And is hence the most risk adverse option.

21 The weight of scientific evidence shows that
22 while runs cannot be recovered under existing
23 conditions, enough time remains to restore them. But
24 only if the failed practices of the past are abandoned
25 and we move to restore the normative conditions from

1 which these fish evolved.

2 THE MODERATOR: William Monto, Tara Dehvers,
3 Leslie Beck. William Monto? Tara Dehvers? Are you
4 here? Leslie Beck followed by Jack Stewart followed
5 by Laura Thomas.

6 >>: Good evening. I'm Leslie Beck.

7 The Snake is a unique and important ecosystem
8 that is in danger of losing what's so outstanding. And
9 yet an ecosystem we still have an opportunity to
10 protect and restore.

11 I urge the agency today to take this
12 opportunity to protect this system by choosing
13 alternatives that chooses removing the dams. Keeping
14 them in place makes no sense to the economy. Your own
15 analysis indicates that the region would be better off
16 economically.

17 While keeping the dams in place would cost
18 500 million dollars a year, removing them would cost 50
19 million dollars a year less. Keeping 9 dams doesn't
20 make sense to the salmon. The chance for recovering
21 Snake River salmon would be to remove the dams. And it
22 shows that you can't recover all the salmon species
23 without removing dams.

24 The dams don't make sense for our culture.
25 The Northwest is known for its salmon. It's been used

1 to define our territory in the Pacific Northwest and,
2 we're here today to discuss whether to take an action
3 that saves this icon or let the fish go extinct. It
4 doesn't make sense. We need the salmon for our kids,
5 our jobs.

6 Finally, our country made promises almost 200
7 years ago to the native people in this region that they
8 would always have salmon to fish. We have broken those
9 promises. It's time we uphold them. We need to ensure
10 that the native people have what was inherent to their
11 very existence. To do otherwise is unconscionable.
12 Enough is enough. It's time to do what's right for the
13 salmon, our communities, economics and the tribes.
14 Only one alternative can do that. Removing the four
15 lower dams.

16 THE MODERATOR: Jack Stewart, Laura Thomas,
17 Doug Steuart. Folks in the back, if I can ask you to
18 keep your conversations down. It's getting a little
19 rumbley up here. Thank you.

20 >>: My name is Jack Stewart. I have houses
21 on Vashon Island where I live with my wife and two
22 sons. My comments are not technical but
23 philosophical. They contain very deep and old common
24 ground.

25 Our relations to nature, the creatures,

1 should not be disappearing as they are. Dams are a
2 major part of the problem. I come as a citizen to urge
3 that the four dams on the Snake be removed and the cost
4 of this removal and its consequences be borne
5 equitably.

6 Also not to view this too narrowly. This
7 question, issue, will arise again and again in the
8 coming years over other matters. With the salmon and
9 dams we're faced with the question not merely of
10 engineering and economics or fish biology, but whether
11 our culture will continue to lose its soul because it's
12 in love with its own works and has too little regard
13 for the works of God.

14 We descend from European tribes having
15 stories too. These stories agree about four points.
16 One, the world is not dead matter in motion, but a
17 magnificent creation. Each species is a masterpiece, a
18 creation assembled with extreme care and genius. Two,
19 humans are not separate from nature but part of it, and
20 they depend on millions of organisms we mostly consider
21 beneath our notice. The fundamental purpose of humans
22 is to serve and care for nature, this according to
23 Genesis 2. Human domination of the earth is
24 undeniable. It is equally clear that we have botched
25 it.

1 Three, the creatures, including salmon, are
2 not mere resources to be used or abused, wasted and
3 sacrificed to our artificial contrivances. They're to
4 be treated with respect and kindness as befits
5 creatures of intrinsic work.

6 Four, human devices and inventions must be
7 subordinate to and in harmony with God's work or chaos
8 is the result. We are to take pains and endure some
9 inconvenience to see that the proud works of human
10 hands do not hinder and harm the creatures and works of
11 God. We are to see to it that creatures flourish as we
12 wish to flourish ourselves.

13 It is therefore in the interest of our proper
14 humanity to remove these dams.

15 THE MODERATOR: Okay, Jack.

16 >>: We must not destroy the works of God for
17 the sake of a barge.

18 THE MODERATOR: Laura Thomas? Again, folks
19 in the back, it's really hard to hear when you're
20 having conversations back here. So if you could move
21 the conversations out to the hall.

22 >>: Many of the you know the song by Woody
23 Guthrie celebrating the damming of the Columbia River.
24 As we're looking at this I would like to sing a new
25 version of Roll on Columbia.

1 (Singing).

2 Some great river dams turned the world's
3 fishery into pulp mills and now our Sockeyes and Cohos
4 are gone, but roll on, Columbia, roll on, roll on,
5 Columbia, roll on.

6 On big Douglas Fir stumps where your channel
7 cuts through, reminds us of beauty our forbearers once
8 knew, but if you want to find wildlife look in the
9 zoo. So roll on, Columbia, roll on. Roll on,
10 Columbia, roll on. Once a free river but now a big
11 poison pond, but roll on, Columbia, roll on.

12 Your water use laws are a huge public con, so
13 in summer you become a huge public john, but roll on,
14 Columbia, roll on. Now your industries grind mama
15 earth into hash, creating extinctions to line pockets
16 with cash. And if we cry it's a crime, they say let's
17 not be rash, let's sing roll on, Columbia, roll on.
18 Roll on, Columbia, roll on. Roll on, Columbia, roll
19 on.

20 Once a free flowing river now a big poison
21 pond, so roll on, Columbia, roll on. Rain water will
22 keep forming until the law is reversed. Dams can be
23 unbuilt to show folks of a land where free rivers flow
24 on. It's industrial madness that one day shall pass.
25 Sweet Columbia is waiting for the day we all ask where

1 our beautiful river has gone. Roll on, Columbia, roll
2 on. Roll on, Columbia, roll on. Roll on, Columbia,
3 roll on. It's the time you were freed from the hell we
4 have spawned, roll on, Columbia, roll on.

5 (End singing).

6 THE MODERATOR: Doug Steuart followed by Tom
7 C. Thomas Schaefer. Doug Stewart. Are you here?
8 Thomas Schaefer followed by Tom Myrum followed by David
9 Miller.

10 >>: Good afternoon. I'm Tom Schaefer.
11 Originally I had planned to tell you the story of a
12 misadventure in Columbia land where every day reality
13 defies logic. With a seaport and desert 400 miles from
14 the sea. Where fish travel to the sea in trucks so
15 that we can travel to the sea in the river. But I've
16 decided to leave the story and to respond to some of
17 the remarks from people opposed.

18 It's been pointed out that hydropower is one
19 of the Four-H's, so why are some people dwelling on
20 that and insisting that it's done the most damage? In
21 the 60's, salmon runs in the state numbered something
22 like 100,000 fish each year. In the 1990's the runs
23 have declined to more like 10,000 fish each year. What
24 was the biggest change between the before and the
25 after? It was the dams.

1 Another comment we've heard is that removing
2 the Snake dams won't help because Snake salmon would
3 still have to negotiate four dams in the lower
4 Columbia. The Hanford reach the Columbia River still
5 has healthy runs despite the fact that the fish
6 spawning must negotiate the same four dams that the
7 Snake would have to pass. So four dams versus eight
8 dams.

9 I probably don't need to remind you we've
10 already spent over 3 billion dollars moving fish in
11 trucks and it has not worked. I probably also don't
12 need to remind you because other speakers probably
13 mentioned this, that one definition of insanity is to
14 repeat the same actions and expect different results.
15 More trucking of fish isn't going to solve the
16 problem.

17 So, Alice in Columbialand, will Alice wake up
18 and realize that was all just a curious dream? No, we
19 know it's not a dream. It's reality. The way the
20 story used to end is that we must bypass the four dams
21 and let salmon swim to the sea and back and keep our
22 promise to the salmon people. Thank you.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Dave Miller,
24 followed by Phil Cochran.

25 >>: I would like to thank you, the panel, for

1 giving us the opportunity to speak.

2 My first question is, do you know anyone who
3 has starved to death? That's because we have a very
4 productive agricultural system and transportation
5 system. I think it's really sad that we can put a man
6 on the moon but can't put a fish over a concrete
7 structure. I don't know if that's the Army Corps of
8 Engineers' problem to solve. But here we are today
9 trying to figure out who's right or wrong with the
10 facts.

11 It's simple, I think. Without the food, this
12 nation is a third world country. In 1917 a bushel of
13 wheat was valued at \$3.70. Today it's less than
14 \$3.00. Could any of you survive with a paycheck of
15 that kind? That's what we're faced with. If we had
16 enough money in the farming community we would pay for
17 salmon recovery. But economically it's not there.

18 But as I stand here trying to tell you how I
19 feel about this, I'll rely on my five-year-old son. I
20 told him I was coming over here. He said, dad, just
21 tell them that all we're trying to do is grow food.
22 Thank you for your time.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dave. Rebecca
24 Cochran, Judy Janett, James Bradford.

25 >>: My name is Rebecca Cochran, Cascade

1 Chapter of the Sierra Club, representing 20,000 members
2 in Washington State.

3 You're here to weigh the costs and benefits
4 of four 30-year-old dams. Those dams provide less than
5 five percent of our region's power. They provide no
6 flood control. Many of the region's top scientists and
7 the Washington, Oregon, and Idaho Fish and Wildlife
8 Departments believe that the removal of these dams is
9 the best option for recovery of the most economically
10 and culturally significant runs, and what's to be
11 gained? Restoration of fishing economies, honoring
12 tribal treaties, and protecting our low cost power.

13 Many have spoken in opposition of the wild
14 experiments and I agree. These dams and the process of
15 barging salmon has been a costly long-term experiment
16 that has failed. It is time to take the needed steps.
17 The Corps, NMFS and our elected officials need to show
18 leadership and vision and remove these dams. We can
19 have salmon and we can have agriculture. It's not an
20 either/or proposition. Removing dams would put fish
21 back in our rivers alongside agriculture. We can
22 protect those tribal treaties, if the Corps, NMFS, and
23 our govern continue to drag their feet, our salmon, our
24 region, our economy will lose because of this continued
25 inaction. Remember to keep this environment live. The

1 power can be mitigated. Transportation, can be
2 mitigated. Extinction is forever.

3 THE MODERATOR: Judy Janett, James Bradford,
4 Joe Kawahara. Help me out with the clapping.

5 >>: Good evening. Thank you for staying so
6 late. I know time is waning. I am from Royal City,
7 Washington. My husband and I have lived in Eastern
8 Washington all our lives. We have a farm interest.
9 Our sons grow part of this.

10 The future of farming is quite alarming
11 because the price that Dave Miller mentioned is so low
12 at the present time. And with the prospect of having
13 dams removed it seems like another nail in the coffin.
14 It's really difficult to survive. Each farmer now
15 provides enough food for 129 people. That is for each
16 day for a whole year. I really don't want to eat
17 salmon every day. I would really much prefer a varied
18 diet. There are 70 different crops we grow and a lot
19 would be lost if the dams are taken out. I hate to see
20 that.

21 The four dams, if they are removed, I think
22 you'll find in the documents that they provide
23 electricity for homeowners in Idaho and Montana. I
24 think that's a big percentage that would be lost.
25 Those people would pay a lot more, all of us would, for

1 the electricity.

2 There are lots of rivers in the state of
3 Washington that don't have too many fish in them any
4 more. We used to be able to catch bottom fish there.
5 There aren't even bottom fish there either. There are
6 lots of seals that eat the salmon. And they say the
7 ocean waters have increased in temperatures and the
8 river waters have increased. And I think a lot of this
9 is why there is a decline in the fish population. But
10 that's changing. I think a lot of it is in God's
11 hands. A lot will be corrected. I don't want to see
12 the elimination of salmon. I do thank you for your
13 time. I just want you to use common sense.

14 THE MODERATOR: Jim Bradford, followed by
15 Joel Kawahara and Peter Ovington.

16 >>: I'm Jim Bradford. I'm a retired Potlatch
17 Corporation employee from Lewiston, Idaho. I've spoken
18 before you a couple of times before. Since certain
19 events have taken place since I spoke to you last I
20 decided to come here today.

21 First of all, let me say that I strongly
22 favor breaching the four dams. We all know that the
23 best available science tells us that the breaching
24 option offers the best hope of saving our fish. This
25 is borne out by PATH, the Independent Scientific

1 Analysis Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Idaho
2 Fish and Game Department, and 206 imminent scientists
3 who sent their names to President Clinton recommending
4 breaching.

5 Last week, Governor Kitzhaber of Oregon made
6 a public statement in favor of breaching, as did 500
7 Oregon biologists. All of this in spite of NMFS and
8 CRI having been discredited by peer review.

9 I urge you to move quickly to recommend
10 breaching. At the same time I think it's time for the
11 various stakeholders in this issue to get together and
12 begin hammering out mitigation solutions to the
13 economic effects of breaching. We need to be sure. In
14 one element the economy suffers. We live in a vibrant
15 and diverse economy that deals with many inputs and can
16 solve many inequities. However, we should sponsor
17 public funding of any inequities that might remain
18 after previous initiatives are exhausted. We want our
19 fish back and our economy to remain strong. But most
20 of all, we need the will of you good people on this
21 panel to put this project into motion. Thank you very
22 much.

23 THE MODERATOR: Joel Kawahara followed by
24 Peter Ovington followed by Susan Morgan. If there's a
25 door back there that could be closed it would be

1 helpful to us. It's really hard to hear you talking.

2 >>: I'm Joel Kawahara thank you for allowing
3 me time to speak.

4 I'm a commercial fisherman in Washington,
5 Oregon, Alaska, and California. I'm a member of the
6 Washington Troller Organization and the Alaska Troller
7 Organization. I'm speaking in favor of breaching. The
8 loss of productivity has disrupted fishing communities
9 in all four western states and in British Columbia.
10 The commitment to the United States are endangered
11 because of this loss of productivity. We can no longer
12 meet our commitments to Canada, and we're really
13 screwing up as far as the treaty goes.

14 I am however not anti-farm. And I do favor
15 mitigation for those farmers who find themselves in
16 dire straits because of dam removal. I understand very
17 much the problems of changing economies, changing
18 markets, and what not. Those people need to be cared
19 for.

20 However I feel the fishing community has been
21 given the short end of the stick. Since 1975, 95
22 percent of all salmon productivity -- we have lost 95
23 percent of all salmon productivity on the Washington
24 coast. The state of Alaska fisheries have been cut
25 possibly 50 percent, although we're now on

1 abundance-based programs. Since 1985 we're suffering.
2 California and Oregon have suffered 30, 40 percent
3 because of the Endangered Species Act and restrictions
4 of Snake and fall Chinook. The fishermen seem to be
5 bearing the full brunt. I don't see farmers losing 95
6 percent of their income because of mitigation to the
7 river. I would encourage the farm community to
8 consider that fact. 90 to 95 percent of our income has
9 been lost because of the impact of the Snake. Thank
10 you very much for your time.

11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Peter Ovington,
12 followed by -- Susan Morgan is being replaced by John
13 Rosapepe, followed by Lisa Ramira.

14 >>: John Leary speaking for Peter Ovington.

15 THE MODERATOR: Is he here? Does he know?

16 >>: Yes. I'm executive director of the
17 Washington Wilderness Coalition. We have 5,000 members
18 in Washington State, covering nearly every county in
19 Washington. Our philosophy is that wilderness and wild
20 things have value. That's why we work to keep the wild
21 in Washington. That's why I'm speaking on behalf of
22 breaching the dams.

23 Environmentally and as part of our heritage,
24 we need healthy, sustainable runs of salmon and
25 steelhead. Obviously all of the issues should be

1 addressed. Reforms and hatchery observations and
2 harvest are needed. We believe that aggressive action
3 should be used to produce spawning.

4 But as much as I would like to advocate
5 wilderness destination for the millions of acres of
6 national forest, we can't avoid the conclusion that the
7 removal of the lower four dams is the only benefit for
8 all of the Columbia basin and Snake salmonoids. Dams
9 don't make sense. Thank you.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. John Rosapepe
11 followed by Lisa Ramira, and Pete Knutson.

12 >>: My name is John Rosapepe and my home is
13 Port Angeles, Washington.

14 Seventeen years ago I was a baby-sitter for
15 the Army Corps of Engineers. Wearing hard hat and
16 steel-toed boots I tended young on a barge down the
17 rivers. We barged because the rivers were no longer
18 friendly. Salmon runs in Idaho declined after dams
19 were built on the lower regions of the Snake. What
20 once had been a seven-day journey turned into
21 nightmare. The solution was to take the salmon out of
22 the river and transport them through and around by
23 barge and trucks.

24 I was eager at the time, caught up with the
25 truth that we were going to have to choose. I was

1 really proud to work with the Army Corps of Engineers
2 at the time. Our barge sported large signs letting the
3 public know that we were doing our part to save the
4 salmon. I monitored the right level of oxygen and
5 temperatures in the hold. It was always a relief to
6 come into the cool gorge with its cascading
7 waterfalls. When it came time to release the fish I
8 would say a prayer for their safe return.

9 Unfortunately salmon and steelhead numbers
10 have continued to decline, and returns are no better
11 than the fish that remained in the river and ran the
12 dams. It didn't work then and it doesn't work now.
13 Idaho Coho salmon went extinct in the mid 80's.
14 Sockeyes have all but disappeared.

15 So, why do we continue? Why are we holding
16 on so tightly to a failed barging experiment. I ask
17 that question every spring and summer as they make the
18 same journey that I did 17 years ago. I wonder what
19 the new generation of salmon baby-sitters think? Is it
20 just a paycheck or are they kidding themselves that
21 they're making a difference?

22 This is hard for society when we're undoing
23 monuments. Getting rid of the dams, however, gives us
24 the only chance to bring back the salmon. Our rivers
25 need to flow unimpeded as they did thousands of

1 generations as the salmon evolved a way of life.

2 THE MODERATOR: Lisa Ramira follow by Pete
3 Knutson, followed by Charles Hudson.

4 >>: Lisa Ramira. I'm from Seattle. I ask
5 that my comments be placed on the records for both
6 topics.

7 The Pacific Northwest is spectacular. The
8 trees so green, and the ecosystem so diverse. We're
9 lucky to be able to call this place home. Yet today
10 we're here to discuss whether or not we should take out
11 four dams in order to bring back one of the greatest
12 salmon runs. How can we be here asking this? Of
13 course we should free the river. Of course we should
14 bring back salmon so we can meet our legal and moral
15 obligations to native people. Of course we should
16 guarantee that our children and grandchildren have
17 salmon in their futures. Of course we should free the
18 river and maintain this vital ecosystem. We should
19 keep our spiritual well being intact and our allow our
20 natural systems. Please do what is right. Remove the
21 dams, free the river, and bring back the salmon and
22 steelhead of the Pacific Northwest.

23 THE MODERATOR: Pete Knutson, Charles Hudson,
24 and Steve Munson.

25 >>: Hi. My name is Pete Knutson,

1 Environmental Coordinator of the Puget Sound
2 Gillnetters Organization, representing 800 small boat
3 fishing families. Founded in 1949.

4 And since 1972 I've supported my family as a
5 commercial fisher. My group supports the recovery of
6 salmon in the Pacific Northwest and that means we
7 support the recovery of fishery habitat. We agree that
8 Washington rivers have become killing fields for
9 salmon. We don't want any more apologies, hatcheries,
10 and with all respect Army Corps of Engineers, Rube
11 Goldbergs. The truth is we are driving the fish to
12 extinction. Now maybe that's no big deal as Senator
13 Gorton said. Species go extinct all the time. Well,
14 Charles Darwin did not make exceptions for
15 homosapiens. If salmon go today, we're not far
16 behind.

17 We sympathize with small farmers. We're both
18 food producers as a farmer said a while ago. And
19 making a living from the dirt or from the sea is
20 tough. The prices from our products often don't pay
21 expenses. And our fleet at Fisherman's Terminal today
22 often fishes a few days a year.

23 We sued to invoke environmental protections
24 for salmon in Washington State recently. We don't have
25 much left to lose, but we're optimistic and we want to

1 bring back the fish. We sympathize with losses
2 suffered by the native Americans. You can't sustain a
3 fish culture without fish. But we don't have much
4 sympathy with the aluminum industry which has in the
5 past sucked up 45 percent of the power from the
6 Columbia. This bankrolled two initiatives in the past
7 years. An industry that would rather kill salmon than
8 raise their power cost. We don't give a damn about
9 Kaiser or Alcoa.

10 On the other hand, we don't want to see
11 family farmers thrown out of work. But farmers have to
12 understand that fishers have been thrown out of work by
13 dam constructions. Water is life and the ancient
14 Egyptians believed that stealing water from free
15 flowing water was a crime. If you want to get into
16 heaven you have to swear an oath that says I have not
17 messed with food supplies, and I have not built a dam
18 on free flowing water. Thank you.

19 THE MODERATOR: Charles Hudson and then we'll
20 be at 5:30.

21 >>: I'm with the Columbia River Tribal Fish
22 Association. This is I think my fourth hearing. And
23 they've been top notch. I've told your moderator as
24 much as well.

25 We represent the Yakima Nez Perce. I would

1 like to say that the tribal circumstances report
2 includes a very important element about the loss of
3 salmon. The loss of economic opportunity due to the
4 loss of salmon. But importantly the future loves
5 opportunity for those tribal members impacted as they
6 seek employment off the reservation in communities that
7 are not open to them. And the people of Seattle have
8 been wonderful, but that has not necessarily been the
9 case in some of the other locations. I think there is
10 evidence of that animosity, I know some of which has
11 been directed to you. I think that's inappropriate and
12 despicable. Thank you.

13 THE MODERATOR: My watch is showing a little
14 past 5:30. But the hearing was set to end at 5:30.
15 How would you like to deal with this?

16 THE MODERATOR: First of all I want to thank
17 you who stayed all afternoon. I want to thank you,
18 including those who left, for all that. Clearly
19 there's some deeply held opinions on both sides. There
20 are life styles that will be directly affected by this
21 decision. And the fact that folks who come here and
22 talk and show the respect that you've shown with each
23 other, and in some cases dealing with it with a little
24 humor, I want to thank you. Thank you for your time
25 and attendance and those of you sticking around for

1 tonight, see you then.

2 THE MODERATOR: We'll be resuming at 6:30.

3 Thank you all very, very much. We'll see you later or

4 talk to you now.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25