

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”

TWIN FALLS, IDAHO  
Weston Plaza  
1350 Blue Lakes Boulevard

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION  
MARCH 8, 2000

TRANSCRIBED BY NANCY J. SMITH

RIDER & ASSOCIATES  
PO Box 245  
Vancouver, WA 98686

1 MR. CORNIE: Okay. My name is Robert Cornie, and I'm a water user  
2 and I'm a farmer on the Twin Falls Canal Company side here. I've lived in Magic  
3 Valley for 67 years. My dad started farming in 1934, and I'm the second generation,  
4 and I have sons that are farming now; that's the third generation.

5 And our operation depends on a constant supply of irrigation water from  
6 the canal company. And without the water to irrigate, we just wouldn't be able to  
7 farm this area.

8 This is a desert area. I'm here today to state my opposition to the use  
9 of water from the Twin Falls storage reservoirs for flow augmentation. And as I  
10 understand it, every alternative you are considering includes flow augmentation, and  
11 I urge you to remove it from further consideration. In the long run, flow augmentation  
12 threatens the firewater that we need for irrigation. When the water is taken from the  
13 reservoirs to send downstream, the amount left for irrigation is reduced. And this is  
14 critical in dry years. Now, we had a drought in the late '80s, and in that situation, we  
15 had to divide the water between two canals.

16 Now, it would have been disastrous if something like that was going on  
17 at that time. So it's not acceptable to our farming operation. The Bureau of  
18 Reclamation has built the Idaho reservoirs to provide water for farmers and for  
19 irrigation. And contracts were signed and promises were made. And the canal  
20 company has kept its promise for paying its share for the cost of building and  
21 maintaining the projects. The federal government needs to honor its commitments,  
22 too.

23 So as you move forward to select an option for salmon recovery, I urge  
24 you to reject flow augmentation. In the long run, it impacts our farm economy and  
25 our way of life, it is just too great. Now, I'm also very concerned about this threat of

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 breaching those lower dams because I think if they ever got to such a radical  
2 situation where they got this done, this would also -- and then it didn't work, and we  
3 have no science to prove it would, I'm very concerned that flow augmentation would  
4 be easy for you, then. So I'm very much opposed to the dam breaching, too. I thank  
5 you very much for your time.

6 MR. HANCID: My name is John Hancid. I'm a director on the board of  
7 for Twin Falls Canal Company. Up to this point, the scientists and government  
8 agents could not agree to a solution to the salmon problem. Idaho has supplied  
9 much water for flow augmentation in the past years with no positive results. An  
10 additional million acre-feet per year from the upper Snake would be devastating, not  
11 only to the farms, but also to the businesses and towns that depend on a healthy  
12 farm economy.

13 We're talking about farmland that cannot be dry farmed because of lack  
14 of moisture during the growing season. Without irrigation, this is a desert. I do not  
15 believe we can afford to disrupt the lives of thousands of people without having solid  
16 proof that we are doing -- that what we are doing will help the salmon. And this is not  
17 taking into account the detrimental effect this would have on resident fisheries,  
18 wildlife habitat, and recreation available now.

19 Studies have shown that over 90 percent of the listed salmon species  
20 are alive and well when barged to the mouth of the Columbia, yet less than one  
21 percent return as adults. Seems to me, common sense would have us take a look at  
22 what happens between the times the smolts arrive at the mouth of the Columbia and  
23 when the adults should return. Have we studied the effects of predators or  
24 unfavorable ocean conditions? Is it possible that the harvest of salmon is larger than  
25 it should be? Is it possible there is some other factor we have not yet discovered or

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 considered? I've read the salmon runs were in decline in 1938 when the dams were  
2 built. I hope that common sense prevails. There should be no breaching of dams or  
3 flow augmentation with irrigation water since there is no evidence to show that this  
4 would help the salmon. I feel that it should be unthinkable to adopt a plan that would  
5 disrupt or ruin a farm operation or business that people have spent a lifetime of work  
6 building on the slim hope that without proof or guarantee that the plan may work to  
7 help these salmon. I thank you for your time.

8 MR. BALIS: Hi. My name is Jim Balis. I represent ISSU, and I'm a  
9 concerned citizen. I was born in Sun Valley, Idaho, and I remember my first salmon  
10 fishing trip with my dad and I remember my last. I've caught salmon on the Salmon  
11 River and it was the thrill of a lifetime. I would like to take my two sons to have that  
12 same experience. My oldest son is almost 24. He was not quite two when the  
13 fishing ended here.

14 I was never able to take him salmon fishing as a boy like my dad took  
15 me. My other son is 15. He is still young enough for that experience, but if these  
16 dams are not breached, he may never get a chance to fish for Idaho salmon. We live  
17 in Idaho for all that it offers and we've come to expect in this great state.

18 Now it's slipping away. It's slipping away slowly, year by year. I bet that  
19 if we were to have it happen all at once, the salmon and steelhead runs to drop from  
20 millions to just a few fish a year, you would have heard all of Idaho run clear to the  
21 Oregon coast.

22 But it didn't happen all at once. We lost it slowly; just enough that you  
23 noticed but don't do nothing about it until it's too late. I don't want it to be too late for  
24 Idaho. We deserve our fish. Our children deserve these fish and our children's  
25 children deserve these fish. So that is why I demand the breaching of these dams, to

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 get our fish back in strong numbers, then work with water users as one to subsidize  
2 or whatever it takes to benefit all us Idahoans. Thank you.

3 MR. PRUDEK: I'm Jake Prudek from Buhl. I am a farmer on the Twin  
4 Falls tract, the Twin Falls Canal Company tract. Have lived in the Magic Valley for 76  
5 years, and it's the third generation coming up. We've been here since 1919. My  
6 operation depends upon a consistent supply of irrigation water from the canal  
7 company. Without water to irrigate my crops, it is not possible to farm this area. I am  
8 here today to state my opposition to the use of water from the Idaho storage reservoir  
9 for flow augmentation.

10 As I understand it, every alternative that you are considering includes  
11 flow augmentation. I urge you to remove flow augmentation from further  
12 consideration. In the long run, flow augmentation threatens the supply of water that  
13 we need for irrigation. When water is taken from the reservoir to send downstream,  
14 the amount left for irrigation is reduced. This is critical in dry years, like the long  
15 drought we had during the late 1980s and early 1990s. I'll share my personal  
16 experience.

17 At that time, we didn't have quite enough water in July and August to  
18 make a decent crop. Taking an additional one million acre feet of water out of Idaho  
19 would result in an Idaho reservoir being empty ten percent of the time in dry years.  
20 This is not acceptable for my farming operation.

21 The Bureau of Reclamation built Idaho reservoirs to provide water to  
22 farmers for irrigation. Contracts were signed and promises were made.

23 The canal company has kept its promise by paying its share of the cost  
24 to build and maintain the projects. The federal government needs to honor its  
25 commitment, too.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1           As you move forward to select an option for the salmon recovery, I urge  
2 you to reject flow augmentation. The long-term impacts to our farm and economy  
3 and our way of life are just too great. Thank you. How much time have I got? Okay.  
4 I'll just say this and let it go at this. Okay. Thank you.

5           MS. HOOPER: My name is Patty Hooper. I'm from Bliss, Idaho. I'm  
6 very concerned about a major economic impact to our society. What idiot came up  
7 with the idea to breach the dams? This is an insult to human intelligence. Are we  
8 supposed to be in favor of nuclear power, flooding and water shortages? Some  
9 people can daydream about a past that never was and never will be.

10           Look around. With our current population growth, we will never be able  
11 to have things as they supposedly were. Some day, our fossil fuel will be exhausted,  
12 and at that time, humanity will wonder why we even considered destroying an  
13 efficient method of energy production. Too many factors affect salmon survival.  
14 Predators, including man, and the warming of the ocean are major contributors. We  
15 can manage fish hatcheries to increase salmon numbers. No to dam breaching.  
16 Thank you.

17           MR. POMEROY: My name is Nelson Pomeroy. I live in Ketchum,  
18 Idaho. I'm here for only one reason, that is to vote against the dams being in. I'd like  
19 to be sure they remove them. Thank you.

20           MS. POMEROY: Betsy Pomeroy and myself. Are you ready? As an  
21 older citizen, heritage becomes more important. My husband and I lived in  
22 Washington and saw the endangerment of salmon in Lake Washington, and now as  
23 Idahoans, we are seeing it here.

24           By removing four easy dams, our economy will prosper and our salmon  
25 will return for future generations. This is our rightful heritage.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MS. ELKINS: My name is Melissa Elkins. My residence is Hailey,  
2 Idaho. And I just think -- I am for partial breaching of the dams. I think it comes  
3 down to economics and our pocket book. I think restoring the salmon and partially  
4 breaching the dams is what's going to bring a good economy back to Idaho. I could  
5 rattle off statistics that I've read. We've all heard them. The scientists say that's the  
6 way to go. That's all I have to say, but I really would like to see the salmon come  
7 back. Thank you.

8 MS. GOODYEAR: My name is Molly Goodyear. I'm from Hailey,  
9 Idaho. I have studied restoration of salmon in Idaho for ten years, and I feel very  
10 strongly that the best science is to breach the dams. And I hope that you all will  
11 consider the science in this issue. Thank you very much.

12 MR. MURPHY: Kinglsey Murphy from Ketchum, Idaho. I feel it's  
13 important to breach the dams in order to preserve the salmon. I think our society has  
14 gotten to the point where we can afford to do these things, and I think for the  
15 economy of Idaho, it would benefit them by bringing back the fisheries. And it would  
16 cost the government less money to breach than it would to maintain the dams.  
17 Thank you.

18 MS. KALIK: Ann Kalik representing self. I spent my childhood in the  
19 Sawtooth Valley, and grew up with a very excited father who, when the salmon came,  
20 took us to Red Fish Lake and all the inlets, and you could walk on the backs of the  
21 salmon, if you wanted. And I miss that. I feel that that is the way the earth is meant  
22 to be, and I want to see it restored. We are six billion people on this planet, and the  
23 salmon have a right to be free and do what they do.

24 MR. OSBORNE: My name is Dwight Osborne. I am a native of Idaho  
25 living in the Hagerman area. I oppose the breaching of the four dams in question for

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 a number of reasons. Before we even consider removal of the dams, we should deal  
2 with the natural predators, the terns, and the sea lions in particular. We need  
3 accurate information on exactly what the conditions in the ocean are in regards to  
4 changing water temperature, feed conditions and the effect of the fishing, both  
5 commercial and sport fishing. Three: We need to get more accurate information on  
6 the effects the Indians have on the returning numbers of fish. And if the harvest is as  
7 large as it appears, we should deal with it.

8           Four: The Northwest Power Planning Council just last week released a  
9 report stating that there is a power shortage looming in the next three to five years.  
10 The people advocating dam removal contend that the power these four dams  
11 produce is insignificant in the overall picture. I beg to differ with them on this issue.  
12 The 37,000 megawatts these dams produce is approximately the amount of power it  
13 takes to service all the 1.9 million homes in Idaho and Montana. Also, these 37,000  
14 megawatts is more than Idaho Power's total production.

15           Five: Another point I'd like to make is with the restrictions on new dam  
16 construction. We will have to turn to natural gas or coal-powered generators with all  
17 the air pollution involved versus hydropower producing no air pollution. Also, the cost  
18 of coal or natural gas generation is much more costly than hydropower generation.  
19 This will affect us all, particularly industry, and in my case, the irrigation pumpers.  
20 Hydropower, our nation's leading renewable resource, costs approximately \$10 per  
21 megawatt hour to produce compared to natural gas at \$30 and coal at \$45 per  
22 megawatt hour.

23           Six: New Marine Fisheries Service data show the survival of the fish  
24 through each dam is now at 95 percent, which is as high as it was in the '60s and  
25 '70s before these dams were built. Also, in addition, no matter what the critics say,

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 barging the smolts is working. In closing, I would like to say, predator control, habitat  
2 improvement and harvest improvement can provide greater benefits more quickly  
3 than dam breaching possibly could. Thank you.

4 MR. BENTZINGER: I'm Walter Bentzinger from Jerome. I live at 214  
5 North Road, which is about two and an eighth north on a 24-acre farm. I have two  
6 son-in-laws, one that teaches school and lives on a 40-acre, and one that custom  
7 farms -- custom farms and farms about five -- four to 500 acres. We're all for saving  
8 our water. We do not want any of it going on down the river. I would be for  
9 restricting, especially foreign, fishing in the ocean, and if the canals -- or if the dams  
10 have to be left or can't be left or have to be, they should put maybe a fresh-water  
11 canal for the salmon.

12 I do believe that if I was -- the dams were breached and my water was  
13 taken, that in ten years from now, I would not be able to catch a salmon in Idaho.  
14 Thank you.

15 MR. SWIHR: Yeah. I'm Dan Swihr. I'm not representing any specific  
16 organization. I've served on the Mid Snake Water Commission for eight years. I'm a  
17 real estate broker in the area and also own some farms. To preface my statement,  
18 why, I think people should count. Until NMFS or the Corps of Engineers steps up to  
19 the table and says that breaching these dams will ensure that no more Idaho water  
20 will be taken for flow augmentation, why, I am not for breaching those dams. There  
21 are too many people's lives that are involved there, both in customers, both in  
22 recreation with the dams, because boaters and older fishermen like myself use those  
23 types of bodies of water to fish on.

24 I do have concerns that the salmon are disappearing, but they're  
25 disappearing also in streams that don't have dams. Until this nation steps up to the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 plate and says, well, we've got to limit fishing both in the ocean and commercially and  
2 the Indian fishing, the poor survivors that are left, why, will dwindle down further in  
3 the area. So I hope that you take these comments into consideration. I am an avid  
4 steelhead fisherman and salmon fisherman, but people have to count, too. Thanks  
5 for your time.

6 MS. HUGHES: My name is Kathleen Hughes, and I live in Idaho, and  
7 I'm here to speak not just for myself, but also for friends who were not able to attend  
8 because of work and family obligations.

9 I'm also here to speak for my son, for his future children, and for other's  
10 future children, grandchildren and other generations. I believe that we have no right  
11 to cause any further extinction of any animal. From what I understand on a National  
12 Geographic program last Sunday, only one of 1,000 salmon are able to return to their  
13 spawning grounds, and I believe that's before the dams come into play.

14 I also speak humbly for nature and for the salmon. As humans, it's our  
15 responsibility to be intelligent and not to simply do what is in our best interest. I'd  
16 also like to state that I've seen the salmon returning in the fall, and it's the most  
17 magnificent and spiritual experience.

18 They're absolutely stunning, and it's awe-inspiring. It also makes --  
19 made me think about perspective and where I fit into the world and life when I looked  
20 at these beautiful creatures. So I speak for the salmon and I speak for our souls.  
21 And I implore you to please breach these dams. Thank you.

22 MS. SWART: Caroline Swart from Ketchum. We cannot interfere with  
23 the course of nature without suffering the consequences.

24 Our history of interference shows that we do not have a good track  
25 record with as many as 17 species of plants and animals and insects going extinct

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 almost every single day. We have a chance to save one species. Please breach the  
2 dams. Thank you.

3 MR. CHRISTENSEN: I represent Ken Christensen and Floyd  
4 Kauffman. There are several reasons why the dams should stay intact. First, I think  
5 it is not very smart to even think of breaching the dams. If I want to go fishing, I go  
6 where the fish are. I don't expect the fish to come to me. Second, the loss of  
7 irrigation below the dams will cripple the economy of the Northwest. Third, there will  
8 be higher energy costs to the farmers operating sprinklers. Fourth, my children's  
9 heritage is not tied to the salmon. The dams provide natural cleaning of the  
10 sediment.

11 I have farmed and ranched for 52 years and have always taken care of  
12 the environment. This is both on irrigated land and federal land. Ken Christensen  
13 and Floyd Kauffman.

14 MS. SHULZ: My name is Vanessa Shulz and I'm a representative from  
15 Ketchum. My feelings are that we've destroyed so much of the planet, any chance  
16 that we have to redeem ourselves of that, we should be grabbing that chance, and  
17 breaching the dams should not even be a question.

18 MR. SWANSON: My name is Bill Swanson. I'm from Ketchum, Idaho.  
19 And I believe that the salmon are like a canary telling us that the whole ecosystem is  
20 in trouble, and the first thing we should do about it is breach the dams. We also  
21 should mitigate for people who are injured in the process. And I believe that there  
22 should be a total management process created by the government so both humans  
23 and salmons can live together peacefully. Thank you.

24 MR. SCHMITZ: Jim Schmitz, and I'm representing the outfitters  
25 associations. I just wrote something here. I should probably speak in here. Okay.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 This is my story. We have complete control over the situation. We are lucky enough  
2 to decide the fate of these species. In the past, species have reached extinction due  
3 to our ignorance. We are not in the dark this time. The fact that we are informed  
4 means that the fate of these fish is our choice. We can choose to save these fish or  
5 kill them. Killing them is unacceptable. Breaching the dams is the only acceptable  
6 method of saving these fish. All other methods are simply more Band-Aids, not the  
7 cure. We have tried the Band-Aid approach. It doesn't work. Let's do the right thing  
8 right now before time runs out for these fish, for our generation can't take the blame  
9 for their demise.

10 Any more time wasted studying, researching, surveying would be time  
11 these fish don't have. The biologists that know the best have made a very clear  
12 ultimatum; breach the four dams and save these salmon and steelhead. If we  
13 choose to let these fish become extinct, we are letting our future generations know  
14 that threatened species can only be saved if big industry allows it.

15 I would never have thought that saving Idaho salmon and steelhead  
16 would turn into a debate. These fish must be allowed to live, for if we choose to kill  
17 them, the only winners in this decision will be the big industry, a minority. Idaho  
18 citizens, primarily sportsmen and women, Native American tribes, countless small  
19 businesses and our children will be the losers.

20 Idaho without salmon and steelhead would be like our nation without  
21 the bald eagle. Let's do the right thing. We have the chance to amend the damage  
22 already done. Let's show Idaho, our nation and the world what our native fish means  
23 to us. If we don't do the right thing, which is breach the earthen portion of these four  
24 dams, we have sealed the fate for these and all other species that become  
25 threatened. And that's it.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MR. BAHAN: my name is Neil Bahan. I'm from Ketchum, Idaho, and  
2 I'm here to represent myself. I'm a firm believer that the dams need to be breached  
3 in conjunction with other ecosystem changes including the grazing of cattle that affect  
4 basic water rights. I further believe that we have a moral obligation to uphold the  
5 treaty rights that were granted to the Nez Perce Indians among other tribes in the  
6 1855 negotiated treaties which gave them the rights to fish these areas in perpetuity.  
7 And by essentially decimating the fishing populations, we're opening ourselves up to  
8 condemnation morally, and also tremendous financial risk because of the damages  
9 that might be assessed to compensate the various tribes for the loss of these fishing  
10 rights.

11 I further believe that it's very important that any change that we make to  
12 the dam system and to the ecosystem, that we provide adequate funds to take care  
13 of those people who are adversely affected, which I think is an economic necessity,  
14 and it's certainly doable economically. Thank you.

15 MS. RACHMANN: Susan Rachmann. I'm a concerned citizen. I'm for  
16 the breaching of the dams because I believe this will greatly increase the amount of  
17 fish to Idaho, which is good for the tourist industry and food chain. I understand the  
18 farmers' concern about water, but I think they're misinformed to believe flowing the  
19 dams will decrease their water. If the salmon are listed as endangered and the dams  
20 remain, the farmers' water will suffer greatly or even more. Therefore, breaching will  
21 protect the agriculture water supply. Finally, more salmon will bring in healthy fishing  
22 for people, and eventually food supply for people. Thank you.

23 MS. DAHLGREN: I'm Julie Dahlgren. I'm only representing myself. As  
24 a seventh grade middle school teacher at Wood River Middle School, I've polled  
25 most of my students in a soft science manner. Most of the kids think that letting the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 chinook become extinct because of four dams blocking their passage is an  
2 outrageous oversight. How could adults let that happen? Although these students  
3 haven't done much research, they feel knocking out a little portion of the dam to save  
4 these fish -- and basically the dams serve nothing but to generate some electricity  
5 which they feel could have an alternate source, and irrigation for 13 ranchers and  
6 transportation that could be converted to trucking and rail -- they say, gosh, that's  
7 easy. Just breach them. At least they could save the fish.

8           One thing that scares me is that the Idaho delegation seems dead set  
9 against considering breaching. After millions of dollars spent in scientific studies on  
10 how to help these fish, our delegation says it doesn't fit their agenda. Study it more.  
11 Let's spend more taxpayer money on studies. It's silt and ocean conditions, Larry  
12 Craig says. I think that's baloney. I feel our politicians are taking money from the  
13 paper timber pulp industry, big money, and that's the reason that scientific input is not  
14 being considered. It just doesn't fit their political agenda, especially that of Craig,  
15 Kempthorn, and Crappo. Simpson has shown more reason and seems to back the  
16 idea that if more water is flushed through, southern Idaho would lose their water. He  
17 is actually considering breaching.

18           Meanwhile, a whole species goes extinct. It's a disgrace. From elected  
19 officials who do not represent all of us that we care about the things other than  
20 economics. I think a good compensation package for any misplaced worker from the  
21 breaching should be an essential part of the federal mitigation pact. Let's mitigate  
22 the worker, not the fish. The poor fish cannot get another job. Many of the displaced  
23 workers, and it doesn't seem to be a whole bunch of them, could get jobs in tourism,  
24 fishing and other careers created by saving the species and increasing the species  
25 numbers.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MR. PENCE: Okay. I'm ready now. Okay. My name is Lou Pence.  
2 I'm from Gooding, Idaho. Reside at 1960 Highway US 26. Zip code, 83330. And I  
3 guess everybody represents somebody, so I represent the right thing to do. First of  
4 all, I'd like to start out by saying that I think we need to understand why those four  
5 dams were constructed. And basically, they were constructed so the Army Corps of  
6 Engineers could prove to themselves, society and God that they could put in an  
7 inland seaport as far upstream as Lewiston. And let's talk about those dams for a  
8 minute.

9 Those dams are what they call run-of-river dams. Therefore, they are  
10 full all the time. They provide no function for irrigation, water storage, no flood  
11 control, minimum amount of recreation. They've destroyed more recreation than they  
12 provide. And they produce five percent of the hydroelectric power in the Pacific  
13 Northwest, which, true, is quite a little bit of power, but in the big picture is not very  
14 much at all.

15 Let's talk about the controversy of using water to flush salmon. Many  
16 say that they will take the water regardless of whether the dams are removed or not.  
17 One thing I know for certain is that they're going to take the water if we don't remove  
18 the dams. And I do have 60 acres and raise landscaping trees, and I wouldn't want  
19 those to dry up.

20 Let's talk about economics for a little bit. They say that the barging is  
21 the cheapest way to move commodities. I think if the statistics are studied properly,  
22 rail is more economical than barging.

23 I don't think that if the dams were removed, that all the economics in  
24 the Pacific Northwest will go to pot. In fact, we'll lose some jobs, but there will be  
25 others created. I do know for a fact that the economic situation in Custer and Lemhi

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 County is a disaster, of which if we could get a good salmon run back, it would help  
2 those people.

3 I also know for sure that if the dams remain and they take the water out  
4 of the upper headwaters of the Snake River, we will have an economic disaster. I  
5 guess we also have to realize if we remove the dams, the salmon won't immediately  
6 come back. We have to implement other measures to mitigate that. So I guess a lot  
7 of people say that people who are in favor of removing the dams is a vocal minority,  
8 and I just hope that when the next election comes around, we can show the  
9 politicians just how big of a majority the minority actually is. Thank you for the  
10 opportunity to make some comments.

11 MS. MURPHY-KENDALL: My name is Megan Murphy-Kendall, and I'm  
12 from Ketchum, Idaho. I'm also an artist, and recently I've been reviewing all of the  
13 treaties that the native -- that we wrote to the Native Americans. And I've realized  
14 that we've managed to break about every one of our treaties that we wrote, and I'd  
15 like to see us stand and at least make one of them correct. And I'd like to see us just  
16 save part of our heritage and breach the dams. Thank you.

17 MR. HUETLIG: I'm Myron Huetlig. I live in Hazelton, Idaho. I'm a  
18 farmer and I love fish. In 1967 to 1969, I lived near and fished the Alsea River in  
19 western Oregon. In the fall, we caught salmon, and throughout the winter, we caught  
20 steelhead.

21 Recently I visited with Kevin Goodson who is the fish biologist with the  
22 Oregon Fish & Game Department who is responsible for the Alsea, Siletz and  
23 Siuslaw River fisheries. He related that fall chinook spawning returns are at 50-year  
24 highs which is very good. However, the coho returns to their hatcheries are very low  
25 when compared to the time I was there.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 Two hundred fish returned compared to several thousand 30 years ago.  
2 The steelhead numbers have also declined from 12,000 harvested fish by anglers  
3 down to one to 2,000. Since these rivers do not have any dams, other factors are  
4 responsible for the declines in the numbers of steelhead and coho while the Chinook  
5 are faring very well. Kevin suggested several areas they are looking at as solutions  
6 to their problems such as habitat, predators. Harbor seals were not a problem 30  
7 years ago but are a major problem today; ocean conditions and hatchery operations.

8 My point is that more than just the Snake River dams could be the  
9 cause of the decline in fish returns to Idaho rivers. I think there is a solution to the  
10 Snake dams that will benefit everyone. Build a new river or canal from Lewiston to  
11 Pasco to bypass the four dams. An approximately 130-mile stream could be built  
12 parallel to the existing river above the current canyon, or it could go on a direct route  
13 from Lewiston to Pasco. The new stream could carry smolts past the four dams in a  
14 stream that would be similar to the Snake prior to dam instruction.

15 Existing water from the Clearwater and the salmon and Snake Rivers  
16 would be sufficient to carry the smolts. A system to divert the smolts into the new  
17 river would have to be developed. This river could be constructed in a much shorter  
18 time than what it would take to breach the existing dams and fish returns would be  
19 immediate as compared to the alternatives. I hope you will seriously look into this  
20 alternative plan. Thank you.

21 MR. DOUB: This is David Doub. I represent Lost River Outfitters. We  
22 have complete control over this situation. We are lucky enough to decide the fate of  
23 these species. In the past, species have reached extinction due to our ignorance.  
24 We are not in the dark this time. The fact that we are informed means that the fate of  
25 these fish will be our choice. Can we choose to save these fish or kill them? Killing

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 them is unacceptable. Breaching the dams is the only acceptable method of saving  
2 these fish.

3 All other methods are simply more Band-Aids, not the cure. We have  
4 tried the Band-Aid approach. It doesn't work. Let's do the right thing right now  
5 before time runs out for these fish, or our generation can take the blame for their  
6 denials. Any more time wasted studying, researching, surveying, would be time these  
7 fish don't have. The biologists that know best have made a very clear ultimatum.  
8 Breach the four dams and save salmon and steelhead.

9 If we choose to let these fish become extinct, we are letting our future  
10 generations know that threatened species could only be saved if big industry allows  
11 it. I would never have thought that saving Idaho salmon and steelhead would turn  
12 into a debate. These fish must be allowed to live, for if we choose to kill them, the  
13 only winners in this decision will be a big industry minority. Idaho citizens, primarily  
14 sportsmen and women, Native American tribes, farmers, countless small businesses  
15 and our children will be the losers.

16 Idaho without salmon and steelhead would be like our nation without  
17 the bald eagle. Let's do the right thing. We have a chance to amend the damage  
18 already done. Let's show Idaho, our nation and the world what our native fish mean  
19 to us. If we don't do the right thing and breach the earthen portion of these four  
20 dams, we have sealed the fate for these and all other species that have become  
21 threatened.

22 MR. WELLS: I'm John Wells, and I'm a farmer in Twin Falls County.  
23 There are a lot of people who would like me to believe whatever they say is the truth  
24 when it comes to dealing with the salmon recovery issue. What I know, I've read and  
25 heard from both sides of the debate. From those discussions, I've observed that both

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 sides admit they don't have a sure solution to guarantee salmon recovery. It is also  
2 apparent that the approach that the dam breaching folks are taking is emotional while  
3 the water users are struggling for scientifically-based answers.

4           Instinctively, I distrust people who attempt to propose emotional  
5 solutions to scientific problems. In my experience, that approach rarely ends with a  
6 real solution to whatever kind of problem. As a water user, it appears to me that the  
7 mere thought of removing the four dams on the lower Snake River elevates the value  
8 of salmon population in the Pacific Northwest to a higher importance than humans.  
9 Personally, I take offense to the notion that a fish is more important than me.

10           If all possible recovery measures are taken, I will have to find a new  
11 profession because irrigated agriculture will no longer be an approved livelihood in  
12 southern Idaho. If 20 million acre feet of water per year is already being used from  
13 Idaho rivers to provide flow augmentation for the purpose of helping salmon move  
14 naturally to the ocean with no documentable benefit, how will it benefit me or the  
15 salmon to commit more water to that purpose. It won't. And the idea of even  
16 considering that is outside of sane reasoning.

17           If recovery of the Pacific Northwest salmon population is so important,  
18 why has nothing been done to reduce depredation and fishing? That's a no-brainer.  
19 We already know how many salmon -- live salmon are being delivered to the ocean  
20 and we know how many are not returning.

21           Therefore, we know how many we're losing in the ocean. The fact is  
22 that a major portion of our salmon numbers are lost there.

23           How about dealing with that issue? That can be done now without  
24 losing thousands of jobs and ruining the economy of a significant portion of the  
25 Pacific Northwest.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1           As for the smolts migrating to the ocean, how about protecting them?  
2 Why is it that we sit idly by and watch sea lions, seals, terns, eat their fill near the  
3 mouth of the Columbia while entertaining complaints that the declining salmon  
4 numbers are the fault of Idaho irrigators, barge operators and the existence of dams.  
5 I would like to know why water users on the Columbia River system should give up  
6 facilities we have worked for when there are declining populations of salmon in rivers  
7 in the Pacific Northwest that have no dams on them. To me, that would indicate that  
8 dams are not a factor in declining salmon numbers.

9           Two weeks ago, my family and I had a delicious salmon fillet for lunch  
10 that fed six people. It was bought in Kamiah, Idaho from Indians who have a treaty  
11 with our United States government to fish for salmon. That fish was netted as it was  
12 attempting to swim upstream. Okay. I've made my point. What did you say?

13           Two weeks ago my family and I had a delicious salmon fillet for lunch  
14 that fed six people. It was bought in Kamiah, Idaho from Indians who have a treaty  
15 with our United States government to fish for salmon.

16           That fish was netted as it attempted to swim upstream to spawn  
17 between 500 and 1500 eggs.

18           Why is it that we allow this fish that is endangered to be netted out of a  
19 river and prevented from spawning only to be sold by the pickup load to anyone who  
20 is willing to pay. That is unbelievably wrong.

21           My suggestions are, repeal Indian salmon fishing rights, eliminate the  
22 terns, sea lions, seals at the mouth of the Columbia, discontinue offshore fishing, and  
23 make negotiations with international fishing regulations, employ state-of-the-art  
24 salmon barging around the dams on the Columbia River system, and discontinue  
25 Columbia River flow augmentation. Make it unlawful for anyone to possess or take a

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 salmon taken from the Pacific Northwest waters just as eagles and endangered  
2 species are now.

3 MR. O'CONNOR: I'm John O'Conner. I live at 1794 East 4000 North in  
4 Buhl, Idaho. I own -- my family owns property that we have had ownership of since  
5 1896. I'm the fourth generation, and three areas of the state of Idaho. I think that ag  
6 economy is the basis of the entire system. And the water rights in southern Idaho is  
7 the basis of all ag production, and I believe that taking away of water rights for farm  
8 property is the worst solution that could be demonstrated. I believe that we should  
9 immediately stop all harvest of salmon so that the population does not have us as a  
10 predator first, and try to increase the populations by reducing other predators and  
11 see what affect that has.

12 I don't have enough information to know whether or not taking the dams  
13 out on the lower Snake will affect the salmon population. I haven't seen enough  
14 information that convinces me one way or the other, so I don't know if that's the  
15 solution or not. It seems to me when you've got things that are worth millions of  
16 dollars that all the taxpayers built in the first place, you should take a look at  
17 everything before you remove what's already been spent. So I guess I don't feel like  
18 the subject has been researched to the point where a final decision can be made,  
19 and I'd like to try the things that affect the population the most first, like removing  
20 predators.

21 And I am extremely against trying to take away water rights from farm  
22 property because there's no indication that that does anything to help the salmon.  
23 So I guess that's the main thing. That's all I've got.

24 MR. EDSON: My name is Greg Edson. I appreciate the opportunity to  
25 testify. I'm an Idaho native and a resident of Twin Falls, Idaho. Professionally, I've

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 been a guide in Idaho on most of the major Idaho rivers for the past 24 years, and  
2 I've been an Idaho outfitter on the Middle Fork of the Salmon River for 16 years -- for  
3 the past 16 years. I'm currently a board member of the Idaho Outfitters & Guides  
4 Association, and I'm the past president of the Idaho Outfitters & Guides Association.

5 I would like to point out and go on record as saying that the Idaho  
6 Outfitters & Guides Association supports the notion of dam breaching and has  
7 passed a resolution in 1998 to that effect. As past president of the Idaho Outfitters &  
8 Guides Association, I've spent considerable time in Washington D.C. with our  
9 congressional delegation as well as with the Idaho legislature. I've been on many  
10 mitigating issues surrounding this salmon issue, and I've come to the conclusion that  
11 logic defies politics.

12 I believe that the science is in. In fact, the Northwest fisheries scientists  
13 support dam breaching. When I look at the heart of this issue, I have to look at the  
14 law. We have to live with the Endangered Species Act. And the law states that we  
15 are to make every effort to return salmon fisheries and endangered species to  
16 recoverable levels.

17 I believe that through the years, as I have observed and participated in  
18 this issue, that beyond a shadow of a doubt in my mind that the most logical thing to  
19 do to uphold the spirit and intent of the law is to breach the four lower Snake River  
20 dams. Thank you.

21 MR. SIELE: My name is Dr. Stephan Siele, and I'm really interested in  
22 seeing these dams come down for the life of the salmon, and for quite a number of  
23 other reasons as well. With regard to all aspects and all points considered  
24 concerning this issue, the only solution that makes any sense at all is to breach these  
25 dams for all parties concerned and all in the community.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 I have spiritual reasons behind this, moral reasons, biological reasons,  
2 agricultural reasons, recreational reasons, and economical reasons. When all  
3 aspects are considered with regard to whether or not we keep these dams or not, it  
4 makes no sense whatsoever for anyone to consider keeping these dams in place.  
5 Thank you.

6 MR. WEBB: My name is Chuck Webb, and I'm representing myself. I'd  
7 like to go on record to say that I agree that we should breach the dams. And some of  
8 the comments that I would have is that in paraphrasing the Idaho Fish & Game  
9 Commission, it is the only natural option that we have in saving our salmon and our  
10 fishery there.

11 Also, the Army Corps of Engineers has stated that it's not a matter of if  
12 we breach, it's when we breach. My feeling is that if we're going to save this fishery  
13 and these fish from extinction, which I think we should, then we need to do  
14 something.

15 Breaching the dams seems to be the only logical way to do this at this  
16 point. I would also like to point out and would suggest that in addition to breaching,  
17 that the state of Idaho would then plant 40 to 50 million fingerlings at the headwaters  
18 of all of these rivers and give it a five-year trial period. At that point, within three  
19 years, we would know whether we were doing something that was really going to  
20 work or not.

21 Therefore, I think we can breach. I think that if it doesn't work, we can  
22 always put it back. It seems like it's the only good solution at this point, and it's a  
23 solution that I think the people of the state of Idaho should look at very seriously.  
24 And I think it's also a solution as citizens and persons of the state of Idaho should  
25 feel that we should in fact be good stewards of the land. We should in fact try to save

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 these fish from extinction. The economic value of this, I think, has already been  
2 stated.

3 I grew up in this state. I've fished the Middle Fork of the Salmon when  
4 we did have the runs up there. There's no doubt about it. It will jump-start the  
5 economy in that upper part of the Salmon River. Thank you.

6 MR. JOHNSON: My name is Charles Johnson Hagerman. I was raised  
7 in Rogue River, Oregon, above two dams. The Boy Scouts with milk cans would  
8 salvage fingerlings from high-water ponds and ditches where they were stranded. I  
9 worked for a salmon cannery where low warm river water turned fish gray and soft  
10 before starting their migration, and we worked 16 hours, seven days a week to save  
11 them. I've fished mouths of rivers where sea lions released partly-eaten fish to  
12 pursue others. I've seen all water from Upper Billingsly Creek diverted to the Bar-S  
13 ditch with none left for minimum stream flow. I've seen spring water that should be  
14 purifying two commercial trout pond operations switched from an allotted six-inch  
15 pipe to one twice as large.

16 Multiply all of the above mentioned by 1,000 and what do you have?  
17 Water temperatures above dams should be considered. Upstream and side areas of  
18 turbines should be studied for diversions such as different pitched sounds, extreme  
19 lights, mirrors, certain colors, cool attracting lights, colors to the sites and towards fish  
20 ladders. All factions mentioned should be studied and monitored by all agencies and  
21 others involved.

22 MR. KENDALL: Hi. My name is John Kendall. I live here in southern  
23 Idaho, native of the Pacific Northwest, and an avid sportsman. I feel that the issue at  
24 hand here is recovery of our anadromous fish into the salmon and Snake Rivers, and  
25 I feel in order to do that, we need to breach the lower four dams. For a number of

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 reasons, I feel it's good. One: We've violated a lot of Indian treaties by not having  
2 salmon in the rivers for the natives.

3 Two: It would make more economic sense to remove the dams  
4 because they haven't produced much power, they don't produce any flood control.  
5 They're somewhat obsolete in the dam world compared to the big ones of the  
6 Columbia, anyway. I think by removing them, we're going to increase our economics  
7 tremendously in the sporting industry, along with fishing, whitewater rafting. There  
8 are 64 named rapids underneath those four dams. That's going to increase. We just  
9 need to give back what we've taken. We've taken so much and we've controlled all  
10 we can do it. Now it's time to give a little back. We're affluent enough, and I think it's  
11 our duty to set this precedent before these species are completely gone.

12 We are a wealthy enough nation that I feel we can find alternatives to  
13 transportation, especially from Lewiston. Agricultural needs of water and what have  
14 you, I believe we're able to fix, so let's put our heads together, honor these treaties,  
15 and remove these lower four dams on the Snake River. Thanks very much.

16 MR. FLANERY: My name is Bill Flanery. First, I want to thank you  
17 federal officials for coming to our city as well as many other cities in the Northwest to  
18 listen to our concerns and hopes. It is a difficult decision you have to make, but the  
19 consequences will be great for our region. If we fail to take the correct and  
20 appropriate action, we will lose a fish resource that has been a vital part of the Pacific  
21 Northwest culture and economy. We will also find ourselves in deep trouble paying  
22 reparations to the Indian tribes whose fisheries will have been destroyed.

23 On the other hand, if the dams are breached there will be, no doubt,  
24 some adverse economic impacts. These include increased costs of shipping grain to  
25 ports, an accelerated need for new power plants to replace lost hydropower.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 However, these adverse impacts can be mitigated. Farmers can be subsidized for  
2 increased shipping costs. Unemployed workers can be retrained for other jobs in our  
3 growing economy. And sooner or later, we are going to need to build increased  
4 electric generating capacity in this region, anyway.

5           The consensus with scientific opinion is that the dam breaching is  
6 necessary if we are to save the salmon. Politicians equivocate and hesitate but they  
7 should be encouraged and supported to make the right decision. Failure to act soon  
8 will have disastrous consequences. Of course, it will take time to accomplish the task  
9 of breaching the four lower Snake River dams, but we should get started on the  
10 process as soon as possible. In the meantime, all other measures that could be  
11 helpful should be undertaken without further delay including flow augmentation,  
12 predator control and stricter fish harvest regulations.

13           You have in your hands the opportunity to make a historic decision to  
14 save the salmon and steelhead runs on the Snake River. Generations to come will  
15 praise your farsightedness if you do so.

16           Generations to come will condemn your shortsightedness if you fail to do  
17 so. May you and our elected officials as well have the courage and wisdom to save  
18 our threatened salmon and steelhead. Thank you.

19           MS. GERTSCHEN: My name is Christine Gertschen. I represent  
20 education. I'm affiliated with Idaho State University. If I am able to present my -- I'm  
21 presenting my views in this way because I need to get on the road. Declining  
22 numbers of all salmon runs continue despite all of our efforts so far.

23           Good science research, that of every respected peer-reviewed scientist,  
24 tells us that the only way to save the salmon is to restore a free-flowing Snake River.  
25 It is time that the citizens of our state and others in the Pacific Northwest make the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 necessary concessions and adjustments and force our politicians to listen to the  
2 majority of us who want to save the salmon.

3           For far too long, our state and national representation has been held in  
4 the stranglehold of special interests: Big business, agriculture, mining and forest  
5 products industries. But it is time for the larger body of citizens who are willing to do  
6 what is necessary to bring back the salmon. Not only is it critical to the long-term  
7 economic health of our state, but it is the right thing to do and our obligation as  
8 ethical citizens of this planet. We have tried everything, and salmon continue to  
9 decline. Let us now take this critical step before it is too late. Sincerely, Christine  
10 Gertschen.

11           MR. WESTON: My name is Kelly Weston. I'm from Hailey, Idaho. I'm  
12 testifying in favor of breaching the dams. I believe that the consensus of the scientific  
13 information is that breaching the dams is the best solution to recovering salmon. I  
14 also believe that it has economic benefits that far outweigh the benefits that now  
15 accrue to the dams as they are presently. I'm also in favor of the John Day dam  
16 becoming a free-run dam, free run-of-the-river. That's all I have to say.

17           MS. MASON: Hello. I'm Jan Mason. I'm representing myself. After  
18 living in Idaho for 20 years, I feel I can now express my strong opposition to the dams  
19 that roadblock the salmon going and coming. Please remove them as soon as  
20 possible. The science is behind the dam removals. Thank you very much.

21           MR. JONES: I'm Bill Jones and I live in Hagerman. I am against dam  
22 breaching. What is being done about the Caspian tern that eat millions of salmon  
23 smolt? Nothing. What is being done about the fishing of the salmon? Nothing. Now  
24 that they have listed the Dolly Varden endangered, these big lunkers will get their  
25 share of the salmon smolt. I am against taking Idaho water. If Idaho water is taken,

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 towns like Gooding, Wendell, Jerome, Rupert, Burley will dry up. Even this town of  
2 Twin Falls will dry on the vine.

3           If you really want to help the salmon, there are ways to do so. Continue  
4 barging. The Army Corps of Engineers has done a good job. If you really want to  
5 increase the survival of salmon, there is a plan. Columbia River bypass channel  
6 presented in August 1991 by Dr. E. Brannon, University of Idaho, M. Satterwhite,  
7 Trout Unlimited, and C. Keller, Bureau of Reclamation. I will quote their final  
8 recommendations.

9           "We believe the best resolution to the salmon crisis and to the  
10 competing water needs in the system is to remove the smolt from the system and  
11 provide a safe, biological, compatible migration route to the sea that more specifies  
12 their historical experience.

13           We believe a migratory bypass channel will provide for, one, natural  
14 migratory behavior and rate of transit consistent with historic patterns. Two,  
15 elimination of the passage mortality. Three, elimination of major losses from  
16 predation. Four, avoidance of gas super-saturation problems. Five, elimination of  
17 high flow requirements for migration and conservation of water to meet other water  
18 resource needs."

19           Please, members of the federal caucus, get to work on this. This will  
20 save the salmon and not harm the citizens of Idaho. Thank you.

21           MR. MARVEL: My name is John Marvel. I live at 316 East Bullion  
22 Street in Hailey, Idaho. I'm here to represent myself and Idaho Watersheds Project,  
23 a nonprofit conservation organization with more than 1,000 members in Idaho. I'm a  
24 30-year resident of Idaho. I've lived next to the Salmon River for many of these  
25 years. I'd like to provide these comments.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1           In regard to the draft lower Snake River migration feasibility EIS, I  
2 support the breaching of the four lower Snake River dams. This is an opportunity for  
3 the Army Corps and the other agencies to finally meet the requirements of Indian  
4 treaties and their obligations under the Endangered Species Act. It also is an  
5 opportunity for the agencies and the people of the United States to change a long-  
6 term attitude about human beings' relationship with nature and the need for working  
7 harmoniously with natural systems by reopening this migration route to the salmon  
8 and other species of river fish.

9           I'd like to support, also, and provide these comments on the John Day  
10 drawdown phase one study to support a drawdown of the John Day reservoir to  
11 natural river level by modifications of that dam. I'd also like to provide these  
12 comments on the All-H, the federal caucus paper, in that the agencies at this time still  
13 have not provided sufficient leadership in the management of habitat and headwater  
14 streams which provide spawning habitat for salmon, steelhead, sockeye salmon and  
15 indigenous native fish.

16           These areas need to have strongly directed regulatory action to affect  
17 positively habitat which has been severely altered by water diversions, water  
18 withdrawal, livestock grazing and other inappropriate practices. I would also like to  
19 comment on the BPA issues and alternatives for fish and wildlife, implementation  
20 EIS.

21           And I suggest that it's well past time for the BPA to start funding habitat  
22 protection and regulatory action in regard to livestock grazing in central Idaho and  
23 other portions of the Columbia River system where this degradation continues to  
24 occur. No more funding of livestock projects, please. Thank you for this opportunity  
25 to comment.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MR. MARCANTONIO: I'm a private citizen. I'm from Twin Falls, Idaho.  
2 I support the proposed bypass of the four lower Snake River dams. There's several  
3 reasons why I feel this way. After careful consideration, I believe that dam removal  
4 appears to be the option which would least impact irrigators and others involved in  
5 agriculture in southern Idaho.

6 In fact, I believe right now from everything that's presented that the  
7 bypass proposal is the best option to protect southern Idaho irrigation water. More  
8 importantly, I think, or as is important, it's a chance to restore salmon and steelhead  
9 fisheries that have been decimated and that we're much concerned about. And this  
10 gives us an opportunity, an economic one, to restore the fisheries and generate up to  
11 200 million dollars in recreational opportunities up and down the Snake River and  
12 Salmon River drainages in Idaho, so it would be a big plus to the gem state.

13 The other options would require more restrictions on logging, mining,  
14 grazing. A lot of important industries in Idaho. And those additional restrictions, I  
15 don't know if they'd be palatable, if you could get a consensus among everybody  
16 involved.

17 And it would cause a lot more hardship on the bypass proposal. So in  
18 summary, the bypass proposal makes the best economic sense, has the least  
19 impact, and would restore part of our heritage which I think is important, also.

20 MR. PRUDEK: My name is Jack Prudek. I think it's important to not  
21 make a multi-generational decision based on the needs of a current generation. I  
22 think a lot of the power, and to some degree, even the agricultural concerns that are  
23 being raised are not going to be issues in a generation from now. I think the  
24 hydropower and that will become less and less of an issue as the power demands go  
25 up and we're forced to use other means for power. I think it would be a terrible

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 mistake to ruin salmon for multiple generations in the interest of this generation's  
2 needs.

3 MR. WIESMORE: My name is Kenneth Carl Wiesmore, II, and I am  
4 representing Idaho Rivers United -- I mean, Idaho Whitewater Association. And I'll  
5 keep my comments brief because I'm sure you're hearing most of them and it will be  
6 a favor to you. And I am a voter and I am opposed to -- I mean, I am in favor of  
7 breaching the dams. I feel it will create more jobs in the long run. And I feel that the  
8 irrigation is not really an issue, because if you irrigate much more property, land,  
9 acreage in the Magic Valley than what is irrigated off of the lower Salmon dams, and  
10 even with approximately 5,000 cfs of water, and you're looking at minimum flows at  
11 any time of the year of the lower Salmon -- or the lower Snake River is 9,000 --  
12 8,000, 9,000, and there's always ample water in there, always will be for irrigation. I  
13 don't feel that's an issue, either. I feel that the salmon is extremely important, and I  
14 feel that the job issue is extremely important, and there will be more created in the  
15 long run. That's pretty well all I have to say. Thank you.

16 DAN TILLER: I'm not particularly representing any organization. I do  
17 belong to several; Idaho Rivers United Conservation League, Idaho Conservation  
18 League, that is. More than anything, I'm speaking as a private citizen. I've never  
19 really fished for salmon or probably never really even seen one. However, I have  
20 worked for the government for about 20 years, and from what I've read, we've got a  
21 lot of hand-wringing going on, people real nervous about whatever decision is going  
22 to be made. And I can understand the concern of a lot of people.

23 I've thought about this a lot. I tried to place myself in the position of the  
24 people 100 years from now, how they'll be looking at whatever decision is going to be  
25 made is made. I would like to think that 100 years from now, people will look back

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 and be eternally grateful for the fact that we had the foresight to make the right  
2 decision, and go beyond some relatively -- in the whole realm of things, minor things  
3 such as economic, social impacts, things like that. Make the right decision and  
4 breach the dams and allow the salmon the best chance of recovery. I just think it  
5 would be unconscionable to choose a decision other than that one.

6           It's not going to be an easy decision, nor is it going to be a popular  
7 one, however, not all decisions are popular or easy. There are going to be some  
8 people hurt, but in the long run, I think everybody will either make due or come out  
9 ahead, and certainly the salmon will. And I think with the salmon, we're going to  
10 have a ripple effect on other species. So I'm asking you to make the right decision,  
11 the only decision, and to go ahead and breach the dams and let's move on. I thank  
12 you very much for this opportunity.

13           MR. CACCIA: My name is John Caccia. I'm not representing an  
14 organization, just myself and my family, who would like to see the salmon returns  
15 much stronger. We'd like to see total salmon recovery. And I think the best way for  
16 that to happen is the removal of the four lower Snake River dams, as many people  
17 have proposed. It makes sense that the salmon -- the survival of the salmon is far  
18 more important than the state of Idaho having a seaport. The survival of the salmon  
19 is far more important than the subsidized businesses that occur along the river. And  
20 in regards to that, I think what the next step should be is different governing bodies of  
21 the agencies should look at how the people -- when the dams get removed, how the  
22 people that will be affected adversely should be compensated and slowly phased into  
23 other employment so that their discomfort and suffering is taken -- put to a minimum.

24           I think that's the next step we should looking at, is what we can do to  
25 help the people who may potentially economically suffer from the removal of the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 dams. And whatever assistance can be provided them, that process should be in the  
2 planning stages and well thought out and a consideration that is of utmost priority.  
3 But I repeat, the dams should be removed and the salmon, I'm sure, will then survive.  
4 Thank you.

5 MR. BLICK: Rob Blick, and I'm just here for myself. On this issue, I  
6 feel that once again, the environmentalist community is attempting to pit two groups  
7 of citizens against each other to accomplish their goal. These groups are the inland  
8 Port of Lewiston shippers and the southern Idaho irrigators. I feel rather than splitting  
9 farmers and shippers, we should unite to fight this environmentalist onslaught. That I  
10 feel, if it continues, will eventually ruin our way of life on our own private property.  
11 How I reach this conclusion is knowing the track record of the environmental  
12 movement.

13 Example: The logging industry was stopped from logging old growth  
14 forest because of the spotted owl. Yet once the enviros accomplished that goal,  
15 have they left the loggers alone? We all know that answer is no. We still read of this  
16 industry's fight to log in forests that have been logged two, three, to four generations,  
17 and some of this is on private property. I could continue on with mining, ranching and  
18 farming, which are always under the enviros' microscope. This is why I feel that no  
19 matter what we do in these natural resource industries, it will never be enough until  
20 we are all run off our land and financially ruined.

21 So once again, all of us in the resource industries must stick together to  
22 fight the many so-called environmentalists. I use this term because most of them go  
23 home to their wood house on their concrete foundation, turn on their lights and sit  
24 down to a meal, all the while condemning every resource industry that supplied these  
25 necessities. This is absolute hypocrisy, yet it continues.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1           It's true to this point: We are an affluent enough nation that even if we  
2 shut down one of the largest irrigation projects in the world so we can save  
3 something we can all buy in a can, we could still buy food to eat. But what happens  
4 to poor nations that struggle daily for food? By taking 350,000 acres of high-yield  
5 farm ground, somewhere goes without. You may not see their face, but they will  
6 starve to death just the same.

7           Who is going to stand up and happily take credit for this? In closing, I  
8 just want to say that as a fourth generation Idahoan that loves his country and what it  
9 stands for, I will not give my water away.

10           MR. BULKLEY: My name is Mike Bulkley. I'm a local southern Idaho  
11 farmer here at the Twin Falls meeting. I'm a third generation farmer in the valley with  
12 the fourth, my son coming up, and I'm very concerned about the implications of  
13 breaching the dams. Although I don't believe they will immediately directly affect me  
14 if they are taken out, I believe it sets a dangerous precedent as a solution for dealing  
15 with endangered species. From what I've read, I don't believe it's a good solution  
16 anyway. I believe that it's an extreme and drastic measure that's being proposed  
17 without enough thought and study on the total impacts for not just the state of Idaho,  
18 but for the whole Northwest.

19           Several points that I want to make have to do with what this breaching  
20 could lead to, one of which I believe is just one step towards requiring more dam  
21 breaching to save other areas, or other Snake River salmon runs. So I'm concerned  
22 about that. More water being required for augmentation is another concern. Being a  
23 southern Idaho farmer, we stand under the threat of augmentation to the tune of 1.1  
24 million acre feet, which stands to dry up 600,000 acres in this area of farmland,  
25 productive farmland. I don't think that's the answer. I think the impact there is going

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 to be devastating to Idaho families and communities, the state in general, and the  
2 whole nation with this precedent.

3 I'd like us to use a little common sense before we make any decision,  
4 and consider all these impacts, use good science, look at some of the other factors  
5 that are involved in salmon depredation: Offshore factors, municipalities, pollution  
6 factors, habitat downstream from the dams, and that all those avenues be explored  
7 before we take a drastic measure such as this. I think that as we look back in the  
8 past, I'd like us to remember that opportunities were created for people with initiative  
9 in the early days when the west was a frontier, and that building the dams and  
10 settling this area were a part of a whole different spirit that was a part of a vision in  
11 those days of opening up the west.

12 And it was seen by members of congress and federal officials as an  
13 opportunity to both benefit not just those individuals in the west settling the area, but  
14 the nation as a whole through economic impact and the like. Thank you for listening  
15 to this. I hope it's given good consideration.

16 MR. BARLETT: My name is Robert Barlett. I'm an attorney who lives in  
17 Hailey, Idaho, and I'm a member of numerous environmental groups. I favor the dam  
18 breaching because I think that the EPA requires we attempt to save the salmon, and  
19 that seems to me logically the only real possibility. And also, I think equally  
20 important, if the dams are breached, Idaho would have a far better chance at  
21 protecting the water that is vital to the economy of this region, southern Idaho, the  
22 Snake River plain.

23 If the dams are breached, I would bet that our congressional delegation would  
24 fight like the devil to prevent any of our water being -- any more of our water being  
25 taken. It would seem to me, also, that there is a real possibility that if the dams are

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 not breached and the salmon are allowed to go to extinction, the federal government  
2 would face a huge lawsuit from Indian tribes under the 1855 treaty.

3 I would finally urge that the report on this recommend strongly to the  
4 congress that if the dams are breached, that decent protective measures be taken for  
5 those few industries and their employees and owners who would really be adversely  
6 hit by this. If necessary, we'd have to buy out those 35 farms that are being irrigated,  
7 perhaps by some of the barges, or give the owners some of the money that they  
8 have invested in them, and obviously, those who work in the industries that would be  
9 damaged or destroyed by breaching the dams should allocate the federal funds for  
10 retraining. That's all I have. Thank you very much.

11 MR. CURTIS: My name is Richard L. Curtis. I am a small family farmer  
12 in southern Idaho. I also manage a grain elevator in Gooding, Idaho, and breaching  
13 of the dams is going to directly affect me and my family and my neighbors and the  
14 community that I live in. It's going to increase the cost of transportation for grain that  
15 is produced in my county. It's going to eliminate -- if the dams are breached, it's  
16 going to eliminate a navigable river and it's going to eliminate a competitive  
17 marketing point at Lewiston for our grain.

18 We will lose three buyers, and we are already at below cost of  
19 production levels on our wheat and our grain, and we can't afford any increased cost  
20 in transportation. This breaching of the dams is not going to just affect farmers or a  
21 few commercial entities in Lewiston, it's going to affect all of the farmers in Idaho  
22 because the grain does flow naturally towards the Lewiston, which is an inland port.  
23 Also, it's going to cause considerable more usage of diesel fuel, because the trucks  
24 that haul grain to Lewiston also haul lumber back into southern Idaho, eastern Idaho  
25 and western Idaho, so it's going to increase the truck traffic going from the Idaho

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 points over to Portland, and it's going to increase the cost of the transportation,  
2 because barges can haul grain a lot cheaper than trucks can.

3 I just want to continue -- or I just want to say that I am affected  
4 personally. I didn't come here on a bus with an agenda, an environmental agenda. I  
5 would like to see the fish saved. I'm not against the fish, but I think that we need to  
6 look at alternatives other than breaching, because the dams, if we lose the navigable  
7 river, it's going to cause increasing hardships on the producers of our food and fiber  
8 in the state of Idaho. Thank you.

9 MR. DAVENPORT: My name is Lewis Davenport. I live in Gooding,  
10 Idaho. I'm a farmer and I operate a bean and grain warehouse. And I am very much  
11 opposed to breaching the dams. I don't believe that's the answer for the fish, and it  
12 certainly is not the answer for the region. There will be huge economic losses and  
13 huge displacement of people if the dams are taken out. I'm certainly not against the  
14 fish. I'm all for the fish. I just believe that there are many methods that are untried  
15 and unproven that will get the same results as breaching the dams would. I think it's  
16 a serious mistake to consider destroying infrastructure, especially anything as  
17 complex as a dam system. It's a very important system to produce electricity, to  
18 produce transportation, to produce flood control, to store water, and gives huge  
19 recreational sources as well.

20 As far as my business is concerned, it would suffer tremendously if the  
21 dams are breached, but more importantly, the region as a whole will suffer. Many  
22 people think that breaching the dams will be good for sportsmen and users of our  
23 forest regions and whatnot, but I believe that those people are next on the list. To my  
24 way of thinking, this is not a fish issue, this is a control issue. And many people here  
25 tonight, while they are fish advocates, don't realize the final impact of this. And the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 people that are out to control the water and our forests and public lands and whatnot  
2 have dispelled a great deal of misinformation.

3           And I just hope that the truth comes out before anything as drastic as  
4 breaching the dams takes place. I notice lots of pictures of fish at various booths. I  
5 have not yet seen a picture of a starving child. On this very day, 40,000 children  
6 starved to death and died of preventable disease in the world. And as we destroy  
7 methods of producing food, that figure will rise. At some point in time, the food  
8 produced in the world will not be sufficient for the population. And I think that we  
9 need to look long-term at this situation and make some very wise choices at this time.  
10 Thank you.

11           MR. INFANGER: My name is John N. Infanger. I live in Gooding,  
12 Idaho. I don't represent any particular group. I have a small farm and am a self-  
13 employed individual. I would like to give my testimony. I'm very much against  
14 breaching the dams. I believe that they really don't have enough scientific study to  
15 support breaching the dams at this point, and there isn't any particular silver bullet. I  
16 do want to see a clean environment. I'm not against fish and would love to see  
17 salmon and steelhead in the rivers.

18           But I believe that when we look at the economic and social impact of  
19 breaching the dams, I think it's in our best interests not to do that. I think that there  
20 are so many things that we could look at prior to breaching the dams that we haven't  
21 done, and I think we need to spend some time and energy in doing that. I think it's  
22 very important for us as people in this country that we look at being able to produce  
23 food for the world and take care of the farmers who have done an excellent job of  
24 being able to raise food in the country. And they're having such a hard time right  
25 now; it just seems ludicrous to want to breach the dams.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 I've been on the river. I know that there's a real problem with all the  
2 gillnets. And also, we have a lot of predators. I know the terns are getting a lot of the  
3 smolts going back to the river. I just think that we need to look at the big picture, and  
4 the big picture to me says definitely don't breach the dams. Thank you.

5 MR. HIRAI: My name is Jack Hirai. I'm a farmer on the North Side  
6 Canal Company tract, and I was born in Idaho and I've lived in the Magic Valley for  
7 about 38 years. And before that, I was in eastern Idaho and in second generation of  
8 farming. I'm here today to tell you that I don't support the flow augmentation, using  
9 the water from Idaho -- the Idaho reservoirs. The impact to our economy would be  
10 great. Thousands of acres would be taken out of our production, and jobs would be  
11 lost or an entire way of life would be changed. A lesser-known impact of flow  
12 augmentation would be loss of recreation and fishing opportunities. But the  
13 reservoirs that were built by the Bureau of Reclamation provide recreational  
14 opportunities for boaters, water-skiers, fishermen and resident fishing have been  
15 established which may -- many people have grown to depend on. Removing water  
16 from Idaho reservoirs for flow augmentation only threatens irrigation. It also  
17 threatens these recreational opportunities and resident fishing.

18 The Bureau of Reclamation has studied the impact of providing water  
19 from Idaho for flow augmentation. The results are significant and must not be taken  
20 lightly. Our economy and our way of life is at stake. I strongly encourage you to  
21 leave flow augmentation behind when you make your decisions. That's all. Thank  
22 you.

23 MR. WILCOX: I'm Harry Wilcox of Richfield, Idaho. I've lived in the  
24 greater Magic Valley all of my life. I'm about 60 years old. Anyway, I care about the  
25 environment and the wildlife and their well-being and nature and people. God

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 manages. But we're not here to discuss that specifically. With reference to the fish  
2 and the river, I believe that we need to do everything that's reasonably possible to  
3 save the salmon and steelhead and other fish if they be -- that are transiting through  
4 the Snake and Columbia River system. Especially of particular concern is the  
5 upstream migration. It seems that you may have some -- there may be some  
6 alternatives on transport downriver, but real problems, perhaps, coming upriver for  
7 the more adult fish returning to their spawning grounds, so to speak, or areas.

8           And this is of particular concern to me at this time, and I believe that if  
9 breaching the dams -- the four dams on the lower Snake, as I understand it, would  
10 facilitate the return of the adult fish, this is something we need to take a very close  
11 look at. We can probably adjust for the economics of such a move in other ways, but  
12 there's only -- there may be only a very few ways that offer high probability of saving  
13 the fish. And so for those -- for that reason and others, habitat generally and the fish  
14 ultimately, that I definitely favor breaching the four lower Snake dams. And I believe  
15 that it may be necessary in order to -- it very possibly -- very possibly may be  
16 necessary to do that in order to bring the probability to somewhere near 100 percent  
17 with reference to saving these species of fish, be they salmon or steelhead or any  
18 other endangered fish in the lower Snake -- or the Snake-Columbia system. So I  
19 very much favor the breaching of the four lower Snake dams, the four dams that are  
20 and have been referred to during this study. Thank you.

21           MR. BLICK: I'm Phil Blick, and I oppose breaching of the lower -- four  
22 lower Snake River dams and the additional one million acre feet of water for flow  
23 augmentation. Additional water would dry up more than 600,000 acres of now  
24 productive farmland at an estimated cost of over \$430 million and the loss of  
25 thousands of agricultural jobs. There have been many scientists who believe a big

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 problem with the salmon return lies with ocean conditions and its predators. I believe  
2 there should be more studies done on these to see if there's more feasible ways to fix  
3 this.

4           A number of terns and other endangered species are a very big threat  
5 to smolt -- salmon smolt as well as returning adults. I think we should curtail  
6 commercial fishing and look at ways these people are affecting the number of fish  
7 returning upstream. I'm not sure, but I do not believe there is any other endangered  
8 species you can buy in the store. There is now a decline of salmon up and down the  
9 Pacific coast, and many of these places do not have dams and do not have flow  
10 augmentation. Maybe this proves the conditions in the ocean are deteriorating.

11           There have been people trying to make us believe recreational fishing  
12 in Idaho would bolster our economy. I do not believe the numbers that they project. I  
13 would think that it would be for their own reward, even if it would not come in this  
14 lifetime. The forefathers of our valley had a great vision and made this a very  
15 productive and fertile valley. We descendents of theirs are hundreds of miles from  
16 the perceived problems and only remotely connected to suffer for a big problem we  
17 did not create. Flow augmentation in the numbers suggested will severely impact our  
18 communities.

19           This is not dry farm climate, so family structures cannot survive. Maybe  
20 federal biologists should look at zero augmentation as another option. I believe it is  
21 impossible to determine the full impact.

22           As water users, we will do whatever it takes to protect our heritage and  
23 our lifestyles. In closing, I suggest we stop commercial fishing, remove or relocate  
24 terns, look at ways to bypass the four lower Snake River dams, and look at ways to  
25 make our oceans more fish friendly. Thank you.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MR. EYRE: My name is Joe Eyre. I live in Jerome, Idaho. 122 West  
2 100 North, 324-5367. I spent 20 years in banking in the Pacific Northwest. I am now  
3 a private investor. I've got a 500-acre ranch up out of Dubois. I'm an avid fisherman.  
4 I have fished the Pacific Ocean, the Salmon River, and I've lived in the Pacific  
5 Northwest most of my life, however, I've had the fortune of traveling all over the  
6 United States and all over most of the world with the military because I spent 38  
7 years with the Army Reserve. But my comment, sir, is I think it's ludicrous. I think it's  
8 unthinkable that we would think about removing those four beautiful assets on the  
9 Snake River.

10 I know it's a shame that the salmon may be in danger, but I think there's  
11 other ways to look at the problem other than removal. I appreciate the opportunity to  
12 have my say. Thank you.

13 MR. CAVENER: Yes. My name is Harold Cavener. I'm from Paul,  
14 Idaho, and I'm a retired farmer, and I'm not representing any organization. Okay.  
15 And I wanted to thank you for holding this hearing. I hope what is said here will have  
16 a strong bearing on the future of these four dams. And we are in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and  
17 not Lewis and Clark days. These dams were built for a good reason, and that reason  
18 is still valid. The chief reasons were for economic power and to provide a seaport in  
19 Idaho. I, too, hope the salmon can be saved, but not at the expense of the dams.

20 So I urge you all, you dam haters, to come into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and  
21 while we're doing it -- while we're doing so, let's send the damn wolves back to  
22 Canada. Thank you.

23 MS. RICE: My name is Jima Rice, and I represent myself and am a  
24 resident of Ketchum, Idaho. I moved out to Idaho about seven years ago because

25

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 it's such a beautiful place. I moved from a very crowded east coast environment  
2 where I had lived most of my life.

3           When I first came out here, I participated in a study to look at reds on  
4 Marsh Creek right up near Stanley, Idaho. And the reds -- we saw some reds, but  
5 they were substantially diminished over numbers that had existed just even two or  
6 three years before. And recently, looking for reds last summer, I couldn't find any at  
7 all.

8           The net result is that I have seen about six deteriorating salmon in my  
9 entire seven years in which I've spent in Idaho, and I think that's upsetting. There's a  
10 long history of culture and recreation that encourages tourism and economic  
11 opportunities that come about through having a successful fishery, and we have  
12 effectively done away with that, or almost done away with that. We still have a  
13 chance to correct our situation.

14           I know that when I first came out here in 1970, I was told that the fish  
15 had just started -- well, had started to decline about five to six years earlier. And I  
16 remember thinking, what a beautiful place, but why -- we can catch trout, but we can't  
17 catch any salmon, which is the main reason we came out to the area on a river trip.  
18 So I do believe that we can -- I won't call it go backwards; I'll say go forward.

19           That we can recognize that putting in dams has -- was meaningful at  
20 the time, but now is adversely affecting our environment, and that it's time to realize  
21 that, acknowledge -- I won't say our error, because we didn't know any better at the  
22 time, but to acknowledge that there may be a better way of doing things now and  
23 move forward on that.

24           So I would like to see the dams breached. I'm in favor of alternative  
25 four. I was reading today about Governor Kempthorn's comments that we really

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 shouldn't breach the dams, we should look at new screening processes, new  
2 turbines, the effect of the terns on the fish population. And it's like rearranging the  
3 deck chairs on the Titanic.

4           We've got a dying system. And by fiddling around at the periphery and  
5 the really unimportant aspects, we're not really addressing the problem. But I do  
6 believe that by taking out the dams, we will be moving forward. The human species,  
7 as well as all natural flora and fauna have a remarkable way when they're given a  
8 chance to survive of being able to do it. And so I think by taking out the dams, we will  
9 move forward economically, recreationally in terms of our appreciation for nature,  
10 spiritually, and it's a forward thinking move to do it. It's not a backward thinking move  
11 to do as some people claim. And just as an additional note, I'm glad to say that when  
12 the rivers are free flowing, we won't need to draw down any more of Idaho's water or  
13 affect our agricultural base by using additional waters to supplement fish flows. So  
14 thank you very much.

15           MR. HEINS: My name is Harold Heins. I live on the north side of that  
16 project, that A & B Irrigation District out north of Rupert, Bureau of Reclamation  
17 project, and my testimony is such. In as much as water is critical to the Northwest, it  
18 appears to me we should be looking for more suitable construction sites for more  
19 upstream storage dams rather than contemplating the removal of some already in  
20 place which are generating much-needed electricity.

21           I have not personally researched the Rogue River in Oregon, but I  
22 understand it is still a wild river. No dams. And the fishing isn't what it used to be  
23 there, either, as well as other free-flowing streams in the Northwest. This leads me to  
24 believe much more research needs to be done before we contemplate some drastic  
25 action. Before the Europeans first came to what is now the United States, reportedly

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 there were between one and two million Indians living here, and now the same land  
2 sports approximately 275 million people who probably have the lowest priced food in  
3 the world.

4           We need to be careful not to screw that up. We also need to remember  
5 that the reservoirs are well used for recreational activity as well as fishing. Note also  
6 that these activities create jobs as well as those jobs created by the shipping industry  
7 in Lewiston and Clarkston. We're right now experiencing what happens when we get  
8 dependent on offshore oil.

9           If we get dependent on imported food, we could find ourselves in the  
10 same sad condition as many other starving countries. As I see it, this just comes  
11 down to who or what is more important, the fish or the already established farms,  
12 shipping, jobs, property and way of life that we have struggled hard to obtain from a  
13 harsh land which has become one of great bounty in a big part thanks to the dams.  
14 Thank you. Harold Heins.

15           MR. OLMSTEAD: My name is Brian Olmstead. I'm a farmer south of  
16 Twin Falls, fourth generation farmer. Our water rights on the Twin Falls tract date  
17 back to 1903, I believe. I think -- I think flow augmentation based on the willing  
18 buyer, willing seller as it has been done the last few years is an acceptable method  
19 for helping the salmon. Any increase in flow augmentation that would be based on a  
20 taking of irrigation rights, I think, would be devastating to the farm economy and, well,  
21 to the whole economy of southern Idaho.

22           I think as far as breaching the dams on the lower Snake River, that's  
23 just an experiment, and I don't think you can experiment with the livelihoods of  
24 thousands of people. So I think that idea is crazy unless there's a lot more evidence  
25 that can be produced in favor. That's it.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 MR. SZEZEPKNOWSKI: My name is Philip Szezepknowski. And I'm  
2 here to testify in regard to the removal of the four lower Snake River dams which I am  
3 in favor of. I am in favor of the removal or the breaching of the dams because I think  
4 that's the only realistic alternative in restoring the salmon runs. And the reason I  
5 want to restore the salmon runs is because I think the salmon are a symbol of much  
6 of what is wild and unique and independent in this region.

7 And I think that this region is somewhat identified by the salmon, and it  
8 would be a very tragic event if they went completely extinct. I have worked on rivers  
9 and in the national forests and have seen and experienced the return of the salmon  
10 up until last year when there were no returns. And it was one of the saddest things  
11 that I could imagine at the time. And I still think that there is hope for restoration of  
12 the Chinook salmon in the Idaho watersheds. And as I said before, I think the only  
13 realistic way of restoring those populations is to remove or to breach the four lower  
14 Snake dams.

15 I also think that there should be some economic mitigation for the areas  
16 and the people and the industries that will be most affected by the removal or the  
17 breaching of the dams, and I think that that economic assistance should be up front  
18 and it should be offered as a form of helping the people who would be adversely  
19 affected by the breaching. I personally have no problem with paying a little higher  
20 electricity bill, and I also think that if we can make the restoration of the salmon runs  
21 the highest priority, that there is a way to make that a feasible event and happening.  
22 And that's all I have to say for right now.

23 MS. RODMAN: My name is Julie Rodman, and I was born in Idaho and  
24 I have lived here my entire life. I am here today because I am concerned for the  
25 salmon. They were here when I was born, and I want them to be here when I die.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 As far as I can tell, people are smarter than fish. So far, the fish haven't learned how  
2 to reproduce without the Salmon River. They haven't changed how they've lived in  
3 order to accommodate our dams. They have just quit reproducing, quit living.

4 Now, as the smarter species, we are being asked to change our ways  
5 to learn how to manage without the dams. Can we be smarter than a fish and make  
6 the decision to let them swim free? Breach the dams. Extinction is forever. Thank  
7 you.

8 MR. RODMAN: My name is Bob Rodman. I'm a resident of Camas  
9 County, Fairfield, Idaho. I've lived here since 1970, and have seen the conditions of  
10 the salmon before the completion of the four lower Snake River dams. I'm here to  
11 put my opinion in that I think the dams should be breached. I think that all the  
12 scientific evidence supports the breaching as an alternative that might work.

13 I think that it's important to acknowledge that science is not such a God  
14 as we thought it was back in the 60's and 70's, and that we may have made a  
15 mistake on the dams. The partial removal of the dams, if it turns out to be another  
16 mistake, it can be replaced. We're not proposing to tear down the whole  
17 infrastructure, but simply to try bypassing and see what that effect has. I believe that  
18 that alternative represents the most reasonable choice.

19 I'd also like to go on record as expressing my disappointment with the  
20 officials of the state of Idaho. Their obvious political motivations are almost  
21 embarrassing. They are embarrassing to me as a resident of this state, that they  
22 would sell out so easily and so blatantly and so publicly to such a small number of  
23 citizen interests. I would also like to ask the question why, in the period of time that  
24 the study has been going on since the placement of those four dams, we've lost two  
25 species of salmon in the upper basin area, where as those same species have

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 thrived and survived below the dams in similar kinds of habitat. It becomes so clear  
2 that the dams are a problem, I find it unconscionable to think that the state of Idaho  
3 and the people of the United States would sacrifice another species of fish, while still  
4 denying the obvious truth of the mistakes that we've made. Thank you very much.

5 MR. TOLLEY: My name is Justin Tolley. I'm a resident of Twin Falls  
6 County, and I'm here just representing myself and what I believe. I work in the farm  
7 community and I do not support the breaching of the dams. First of all, there's no  
8 proof that the breaching will work. Even if the dams are breached, there's a lot of  
9 sediment behind those that will make the rivers not very healthy for salmon. Plus it's  
10 going to be an eyesore. When all that water is drained out, it's going to -- there's not  
11 going to be any cover there. There's no trees, there's no bush, there's no cover  
12 whatsoever to keep the riverbed -- the riverbanks from eroding and causing even  
13 more sediment in the water. So I do not support the dam breaching.

14 There's already -- the water is already scarce. The farmers are  
15 struggling to survive. And my job depends on the farmers. And if they don't survive,  
16 I don't survive. And as much as I love salmon and I love fishing, I'm not willing to  
17 trade my job and my livelihood for the salmon. I don't believe there's anybody that is  
18 willing to do that. And there must be a different alternative. Why not halt fishing for a  
19 while. I know the tribes say they depend on the salmon for their livelihood, but try  
20 stopping it for a year or two, see what happens. I mean, they're catching a lot of fish,  
21 and what do they need them for? You can only eat so many fish.

22 So that's basically about it. It's just tough trying to make your living on  
23 a farm when everything is going against it, the economics are bad. Now they're  
24 trying to take water away from us. And it just gets tougher and tougher. I love the  
25 salmon as much as the next guy. I'd love to have the salmon back. But we need to

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 put people first. We're Idahoans. We live here. I think we should take care of  
2 ourselves before we take care of anybody else. That may be kind of selfish, but we  
3 have to look after ourselves if we're going to survive. So that's all I have to say.  
4 Thank you.

5 MR. SCHEVING: Hi. My name is Mark Scheving. I'm a resident of  
6 Hailey, Idaho in Blaine County. I'm here to make a comment to the EIS. I'm in favor  
7 of breaching the four dams on the lower Snake River. I've tried to be informed and  
8 kept abreast of both sides of the issue, and it seems to me that ultimately, the only  
9 way to save salmon from becoming extinct is to breach the four dams.

10 I had the good fortune four years ago to be on Big Creek, which is a  
11 tributary of the Middle Fork of the Salmon River in September. I saw two chinook  
12 salmon while I was fly fishing for cut throat trout. I thought to myself then, if there's  
13 two now, how many more years would pass before there's none. And I don't think  
14 that we as residents of this great country should allow for a species as magnificent as  
15 the fall chinook to become extinct. If we can save them by breaching the dams, I  
16 think we should go ahead and do so. Thank you.

17 MS. ROTH: My name is Charlene Roth. I live in Hailey, Idaho. A  
18 former student of mine who is now in fifth grade at Hemingway Elementary School  
19 wrote this letter and entered it in a state-sponsored Write on Idaho contest. Her  
20 writing was chosen to hang on the walls of the state capitol building. I'd like to share  
21 a piece of this letter that she dated 2050. She wrote it to her future granddaughter.

22 "My family and I owned a ranch in a nearby town named Mackay. I had  
23 always wanted to live in the 1800s, but I was a little bit late. Mackay is the closest  
24 thing to that century with the homemade log cabin, a teepee and a fast, slow river  
25 right beside it. I loved it there in the summer. I would play in the river all day long.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 We even have a 60-pound beaver that chewed up my favorite fallen tree that  
2 overlooked red kokanees and wild brown trout fish. It was heaven in Mackay. 'Save  
3 the salmon,' that was my dad's, your great-grandpa's main goal.

4 Beautiful chinook four feet long and red sockeyes were being  
5 threatened back then. Oh, how gorgeous. The quest to save the salmon never  
6 rested. In the summer I spent hours in the car driving to the Sawtooth fish hatchery  
7 in Stanley, Idaho to see the salmon runs and make friends with the rangers. It was  
8 quite a life."

9 When I asked this eleven-year-old girl if she thought the salmon would  
10 still be around to show her grandchildren, she answered, "I think so, because I want  
11 them to be." She said that she was in awe of their size, and to a child they look really  
12 huge, something she'll never forget. For me personally, the salmon issue begs us to  
13 look at the bigger picture, a picture which includes a future for that which is truly wild.  
14 The salmon, grizzly bear, wolf, caribou and the habitat they deserve. It is our  
15 connection, our oneness with all beings that nurtures the lifeblood of our beloved  
16 planet earth. Saving the salmon is more than just breaching a few dams; it's about  
17 changing our attitudes toward domination over animals and landscape. It's about  
18 searching our souls and knowing deep within that what truly sustains our well-being  
19 and spiritual connection is a survival of a complete and whole ecosystem.

20 MS. GILL: Yes. My name is Sarah Gill. I'm a student at Twin Falls,  
21 Idaho, at the College of Southern Idaho. Currently I'm studying to be an  
22 environmental scientist, an educator, so this issue has a little bit to do with what I  
23 plan on working with in my life. And I feel that a lot of the, you know, different issues  
24 here, they make good points, but I just feel that as a whole, people need to -- people  
25 need to protect our wildlife and our nature areas because, I don't know, being young,

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 I want to be able to see it when I grow up, and my children's children to be able to,  
2 you know, go out in the wild and be able to see deer and fish.

3           You know, a lot of people say, well, it's just fish. But, you know, if you  
4 stop -- if you start with fish, you know, then you're going to continue and continue.  
5 And I think that you need to consider the Endangered Species Act and follow what  
6 we started and continue to protect our endangered species and our earth. And I'd  
7 just like you to consider that. And thank you for your time.

8           MR. DIEHL: My name is Ted Diehl. I've been manager of the North  
9 Side Canal Company for the past 30 years. I've got a lot of history in Idaho. My  
10 grandfather came to Twin Falls Canal Company tract in the early 1900s to farm. My  
11 father started farming on the north side of the canal company tract in 1926, and  
12 farmed until he retired.

13           I can remember the short water years before North Side Canal  
14 Company contracted for reservoir space. North Side Canal Company owns more  
15 reservoir space than any other space holders in the upper Snake Basin. Over the  
16 years when different reservoirs were being built, the North Side Canal Company  
17 leaders were very active in promoting the building of reservoirs in the upper Snake  
18 River Basin.

19           The company's board of directors were also very active in rebuilding of  
20 American Falls and Jackson Lake reservoir. The canal company owned reservoir  
21 space, 312,007 acre feet in Jackson Lake, 116,600 acre feet in Palisades, and  
22 438,360 acre feet in American Falls for a total of 866,967 acre feet of storage space.  
23 When you read the history of the North Side Canal Company, look at the work and  
24 the hard times the company had acquiring reservoir space needed for the company  
25 to supply enough irrigation water for 160,000 acres in the north side canal tract, it is

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 not acceptable for the company to give up water for downstream augmentation flows  
2 to solve a problem downstream that we did not create.

3 I'm also against removing the four dams because there is no guarantee  
4 that water from Idaho will not be needed. Regardless of the claims of the tribes and  
5 environmental groups, all of the options proposed by the federal government except  
6 one includes existing levels of flow augmentation from Idaho. The environmental  
7 problems caused by removal of the dams will take a longer period of time for salmon  
8 recovery than what we are presently doing.

9 Besides, in a few years, we'll need the electricity production from these  
10 dams to supply the power for our farm sprinklers. North Side Canal Company  
11 farmers are converting to sprinkler irrigation fast and need the power to operate their  
12 irrigation equipment. I hate to let my predecessor down by not fighting to keep the  
13 storage they fought so hard to obtain. I urge you to remove flow augmentation  
14 without any further consideration.

15 MR. FULLMER: My name is Dave Fullmer. I'm from Kimberly, Idaho.  
16 I'm 44 years old, a fourth generation farmer from Kimberly. My great-grandfather  
17 traveled to Idaho in a covered wagon at the turn of this century. He came to this area  
18 because of opportunity created by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation irrigation projects.  
19 Millions of people now live in areas like this due to the success of these projects.

20 Like my great-grandfather, many other people came to live in the  
21 Pacific Northwest to raise their families here because of opportunities that didn't exist  
22 elsewhere. These opportunities have not come without great costs. Risking  
23 everything, my ancestors worked to build homes and businesses where nothing  
24 existed before. As a farmer, my family and I rely on water from the Snake River.  
25 Without water, the land will return to desert. It cannot be dry farmed.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 First, though, there would be a rapid devaluation of land if this water is  
2 taken. This is our tax base. Communities would die, as schools, churches and  
3 businesses fade away. The infrastructure of our economy will be dismantled by  
4 economic forces that do not care about people or families or the future. Proposed  
5 flow augmentation is not supported by science.

6 The government has taken 20 billion acres of feet of our Idaho water  
7 without any documented evidence that such practice will recover fish. To take an  
8 additional one million acre feet of flow per year will dry up more than 600,000 acres  
9 of productive farmland costing at least 400 million, not counting the lost job factor on  
10 our economies. Resident fisheries and wildlife habitat will be sacrificed if more water  
11 is taken. No scientific assurance exists in support of flow augmentation even if all the  
12 water in Idaho is taken. No modeling has been conducted that considers zero flow  
13 augmentation.

14 Despite the assurances by advocates of dam breaching, there is no  
15 guarantee that our water will not be taken. While previous testimony at these  
16 hearings centers on dam breaching, it is clear to me that the federal agencies and  
17 environmental groups involved believe that flow augmentation must continue even  
18 after dreams are breached. Our courts are already clogged with lawsuits that seek to  
19 reallocate our water resources. These lawsuits will not go away.

20 Many in the scientific community believe a large component of fish  
21 recovery lies in the ocean conditions that constitute a majority of the fish's lifetime.  
22 These conditions have only received minimal study and much more work should be  
23 done. We know conclusively that more than 95 percent of the salmon stocks reach  
24 the mouth of the Columbia alive, while only one percent of adults return. How foolish  
25 it would be to take extreme measures in the Columbia and Snake River systems now

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 only to discover in years to come that the ultimate majority of problems lies in ocean  
2 conditions that were not addressed.

3           Whatever is mandated regarding fish recovery efforts, those who are in  
4 authority should know that water users will do whatever is necessary to protect the  
5 heritage and lifestyle that our families depend on. Taking our water is not the  
6 answer. Removing dams and dismantling public infrastructures will injure those who  
7 can least afford it and cannot serve the welfare of the public of this region or this  
8 nation.

9           MR. MOYES: My name is David Moyes. I'm from Murtaugh, Idaho. I  
10 represent myself as a self-employed farmer. Several years ago, the endangered  
11 species that was in the news was the spotted owl. I do not ever remember being  
12 able to buy that meet in a store. I don't remember ever being served in a restaurant,  
13 and yet I can buy salmon in a grocery store. I can buy it in the restaurant here in the  
14 hotel where we're located right now. How endangered is this species if we are still  
15 fishing it and buying it in stores? I have a son who lives in Portland who is continually  
16 after me to go up and go salmon fishing with him.

17           It seems to me like it is not a case of that we need water to flush them  
18 down, we need dams removed or anything else; we need to stop the over-fishing.  
19 We need to stop the natural predators. I think there's plenty of things that can be  
20 done to stop the extinction of the salmon without what we're trying to do. If we  
21 remove these dams, then we're going to have to replace that power with something.

22           Everyone is increasing their need for electricity in their homes with  
23 more and more things that they've put in. This power has got to be replaced by  
24 something that's going to cost us more. I don't like to pay more for something  
25 because someone else wants their special little interest. Gasoline prices are

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 astronomical right now because we can no longer offshore drill. We can't explore  
2 gas in forestland or anything else. We've pretty much ruined our domestic supply, so  
3 now it must come in from other sources and they're controlling it.

4           Electricity will be the next item that way. We're being controlled by  
5 someone else, and yet, I enjoy the lower power rates that we have here, and I think  
6 that if some -- if there's people who are passionate enough about this power rate -- or  
7 the taking of the dams to save the salmon, then they ought to be able to go on record  
8 as such, and then when we run out of power or the rates go up, then they can raise  
9 those rates to themselves, pay for that, or they can just be shut off from power.

10           And then that way I can keep my power, and my family doesn't have to  
11 suffer because of the wants of someone else in this issue when, as I said, we seem  
12 to be doing nothing to stop the natural predators.

13           They just said that 98 percent of the smolts reach the ocean, but we  
14 don't know why they return. Well, it seems to be fairly obvious they don't return  
15 because they're being over-fished. The terns, the sea lions, all of these things.

16           There are things that can be done without flushing the fish, without  
17 removing dams that will save the salmon. It's not that we have to lose the salmon,  
18 that there are things that can be done without affecting so many people. Thank you.

19           MR. PENNINGTON: My name is Larry Pennington. I am testifying on  
20 both sets of papers, the 4-H and the EIS. A little background on myself.

21           Both sets -- I have two sets of great-grandparents that came to southern  
22 Idaho in the early 1900s and two grandfathers started farming in the Magic Valley  
23 area in the 19 teens. Therefore, by the end of this decade, my family will have been  
24 farming in the Magic Valley for a century. My testimony is that I do not support flow  
25 augmentation.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 Over the last ten or so years, we have been delivering 200 -- pardon  
2 me -- two million acre feet of water down the Snake River for flow augmentation for  
3 salmon. And in that time, there has been no discernable impact in spring and  
4 summer chinook, and a very questionable, marginal impact on the fall Chinook.

5 Early in the 1980s when we first started considering the flow  
6 augmentation, the experts told us at that time that if we had flow augmentation, the  
7 salmon runs would return. Now, ten years later after we have had a contentious flow  
8 augmentation program, we find that the salmon are still in the same dire straits that  
9 they were in the 1980s. This experiment in flow augmentation has miserably failed  
10 and I think it should be ceased.

11 MR. MARSHALL: My name is John R. Dick Marshall. I am currently  
12 involved in farming in the Jerome area, and I am a director of the North Side Canal  
13 Company which furnishes water to 160,000 acres of farmland in southern Idaho.  
14 North Side Canal Company depends primarily on stored water for its water supply  
15 that it delivers to its farmers. These farmers in turn use this water to produce the  
16 crops that are necessary for them to stay in business.

17 To ask for additional water for salmon recovery would be devastating to  
18 farmers in certain years. This would be an undue hardship to farmers who are  
19 already struggling to survive under current economic conditions. An additional  
20 burden of any sort is hard to cope with when farming is so marginal. Extra water  
21 from farmers that need this water to raise their crops would dry up many thousands  
22 of acres of farmland in Idaho.

23 This seems hardly the right thing to do in light that there's no guarantee  
24 that extra water will help recover the salmon. Until there is better evidence that  
25 additional water or dam removal will help the recovery of the salmon, further studies

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 should be deducted to ensure that indeed this is the proper course to take. Jobs will  
2 be lost, energy will be lost, farmers will be put out of business all in the name of  
3 salmon recovery.

4 Too little has been done on what has happened to the salmon in the  
5 ocean to proceed with various plans that have little chance of succeeding in the  
6 recovery of salmon. Additional evidence on harvest, predators, et cetera, needs to  
7 be verified before such drastic measures as additional waters from Idaho and dam  
8 removal are pursued. Thank you.

9 MR. BALLARD: My name is Ron Ballard. I'm a farmer on the Twin  
10 Falls Canal Company tract and have lived in Kimberly for 60 years. My family has  
11 farmed the same land since 1917. I am the third generation, my son is the fourth  
12 generation, and my grandson could be the fifth generation. My operation depends  
13 upon the consistent supply of irrigation water from the Twin Falls Canal Company.  
14 Without water to irrigate my crops, it is not possible to farm in this area.

15 I am here today to state my opposition to the use of water from the  
16 Idaho storage reservoirs for flow augmentation. As I understand it, every alternative  
17 that you are considering includes flow augmentation. I urge you to remove flow  
18 augmentation from further consideration.

19 In the long run, flow augmentation threatens the supply of water that we  
20 need for irrigation. When our water is taken from the reservoir to send downstream,  
21 the amount left for irrigation is reduced. This is critical in dry years, like the long  
22 drought year we had during the '80s and early '90s. Taking an additional one million  
23 acre feet out of Idaho would result in Idaho's reservoirs being empty ten percent of  
24 the time in dry years. This is not acceptable for my farming operation. The Bureau of  
25 Reclamation built Idaho's reservoirs to provide water to farmers for irrigation.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 Contracts were signed and promises were made. The canal company has kept its  
2 promise by paying its share of the cost to build and maintain the projects.

3 The federal government needs to honor its commitment, too. As you  
4 move forward to select an option for salmon recovery, I urge you to reject flow  
5 augmentation. The long-term impacts our farm economy and the way of our life --  
6 and our way of life are just too great. Thank you.

7 MS. COWAN: My name is Robbie Cowan. I'm from Hailey, Idaho.  
8 Please do whatever you have to do to save the salmon. If that means breaching the  
9 dams, then that's what needs to happen. I would like to see my daughter be able to  
10 see a salmon in the wild. She's here attending tonight, and she's two and a half and  
11 doesn't know what's going on here, but some day she will. And it's very important to  
12 save the salmon. My grandfather homesteaded in Idaho, and we still have our  
13 original homestead. And as children, we used to go to high mountain streams to see  
14 wild salmon. And if you've ever seen a salmon -- a large fish in a high mountain  
15 stream in the wild, it's just a very spectacular sight. So please do what you have to  
16 do to save the salmon. Thank you.

17 MS. KLAHR: Thanks. My name is Trish Klahr. I live in the Wood River  
18 Valley in Idaho. I've been in Idaho for about 17 years, and I realized as I was  
19 preparing for this hearing how frustrated and angry I was getting that once again, I  
20 was being called upon to testify at another salmon hearing. I've been feeling like I've  
21 been doing this for about 17 years, and I realized I needed to find the resolve, like the  
22 salmon, to come back again and again as long as it takes in order to restore Idaho  
23 salmon.

24 Each time I speak, I usually say one thing. It doesn't take a rocket  
25 scientist to know that fish need a river, fish need a natural river. Our fish have

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 evolved for 10,000 years with the free-flowing river. There are many factors that are  
2 suppressing salmon, but the only factor that is driving them to extinction are the four  
3 dams on the lower Snake River. The data have clearly proven this. So I am in  
4 support of alternative four and removal of the dams. I'm also against any additional  
5 flow augmentation or additional water taken from southern Idaho that has been  
6 proven to be incredibly ineffectual. And it doesn't make sense to take water and  
7 increase flows during the late summer season when a natural river would in fact be  
8 decreasing.

9           The Endangered Species Act mandates that the ecosystem upon which  
10 these fish depend must be restored. The science says this means a normal river.  
11 And finally, the complex interaction of the return of salmon to Idaho and the nutrients  
12 that they provide to the ecosystems in Idaho is barely understood. These fish are  
13 feeling the force and feeling the habitat in central Idaho. We have now resorted to  
14 artificial fertilization of Red Lake as yet another Band-Aid attempt to try to recreate a  
15 natural process that went on for thousands of years. The economics of salmon  
16 recovery say that blatantly returning the river to its natural flows will fuel the  
17 economy, fuel jobs and save the incredible subsidies that we have been spending on  
18 the dams and the barging and the dredging to maintain the current unstable system.  
19 Again, I'm in support of alternative four and partial removal of the lower four Snake  
20 River dams. Thank you.

21           MR. VERNIA: My name is Ron Vernia. And as my friend Trish Klahr,  
22 director of science and stewardship for the nature conservancy has stated to me  
23 before, we have excellent fish habitat and spawning grounds in Idaho, but we have  
24 no fish. And we have no fish because of the dams on the lower Snake River. I've  
25 personally witnessed since 1966 a decline in salmon in the headwaters of the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 Salmon River, and I truly feel that the answer is breaching the dams. Without that,  
2 anything short of that is just a folly. Thank you very much. It was short and sweet.

3 MR. HUBBARD: Hello. My name is Peter Hubbard. I'm from Bend,  
4 Oregon. I'm an environmental engineer by schooling and occupation, and an avid  
5 outdoor enthusiast. I am leaving these comments in support of alternative A, for dam  
6 removal of the -- for the federal caucus All-H Paper, and also supporting alternative  
7 four, dam breaching in the draft EIS done for the Corps of Engineers.

8 In implementing these alternatives, I suggest we consider the following:  
9 Consideration with all affected parties, that includes supporting those materially  
10 impacted by a limitation of these options; namely, dam breaching. Water  
11 conservation and efficiency programs should be implemented as well as energy  
12 conservation and efficiency programs. Implementation of the Endangered Species  
13 Acts should follow as required by law. In addition, following through on the vast  
14 scientific information that's been made available over the last decade that is involving  
15 recovery of the wild salmon stocks. You must act now in accordance with the laws,  
16 the ESA and others to prevent extinction. I feel the true character of a person is often  
17 the ability to admit a mistake and learn from it. That can also be said in measuring a  
18 society's character.

19 It's time to admit as a society that some dams are too harmful to  
20 ecosystems and human survival to be allowed to operate. It's time to implement the  
21 science and free the river for fish. Breaching the dams is the best alternative. Thank  
22 you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Of all the girls I've ever known,  
24 there will never be one quite like you. You came into my life. I'd like you for my wife,  
25 of all the girls I've ever known. How about that? Of all the girls I've ever held. I

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 really long for your touch. I long so very, very much for that tender touch of all the  
2 girls I've ever held. That's the end. Okay. I'll do my comment now. Okay. Fine.

3 I have mixed emotions about this salmon thing. I was fishing for  
4 salmon many, many years ago, probably back in 1954 is when I first started seeing  
5 the salmon coming to the Salmon River with a lot of us old codgers up there. I loved  
6 them. They were fun to see. My only concern is with the breaching of the dams and  
7 with all the other things it's going to come by. We have to figure out where the buck  
8 is going to stop. Someone's got to make the decisions, and I guess it will have to be  
9 made in congress.

10 The other thing that I'm really concerned about are all the female  
11 mother salmon, the females that go down the river. What's happening to them? And  
12 I've talked to a lot, a lot, a lot of people and they can't tell me what happens to them.  
13 They get killed by the terns in the Columbia River below the Bonneville. The seals  
14 take a lot and so does the foreign governments. I'm all for breaching the dams if that  
15 would solve the problem and it would bring them back up into the Columbia River on  
16 up into the Salmon Rivers, but I don't know if that will work. And I think it's going to  
17 take a little more study. But, you know, all the studying in the world is not going to  
18 bring them back if someone doesn't make a decision what to do and stand by it.  
19 Thank you.

20 MR. TEWS: My name is Gerald Tews, farmer, rancher, Filer, Idaho.  
21 We use a lot of water. It's important to us. The salmon are important. What's the  
22 answer? What's the issue? To me, it's people. Fishing, predators, fishing as you  
23 come up the river and more people. Breaching the dams is not the answer. There's  
24 other things that can be done like a bypass canal needs to be tried. We're wasting a  
25 lot of money doing what we're doing here, three or \$400 million a year. I've been to

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 dozens and dozens of these hearings on all kinds of issues. And it's a political issue  
2 and congress will settle it. Everyone in this building will be dead before they ever  
3 breach a dam. Thanks.

4 MS. PETERSON: My name is Sue Peterson, and I'm with the Idaho  
5 Conservation League. I support the breaching of the dams as the best option for  
6 saving the salmon. My major concern is the time factor. I'm afraid by the time we  
7 bypass the dams, there won't be any fish left to save. I, therefore, urge you to stop  
8 studying and take action now.

9 MR. WYATT: My name is Grant Wyatt. I represent the Southwest  
10 Irrigation District out of Burley. I'm a farmer, businessman. I've looked at -- listened  
11 to this for probably the last 25, 30 years, the problems that we have with the salmon,  
12 and what to do with them. And I don't have the solution to what to do with them. But  
13 I would ask the question of all those who are so sure that breaching the dams is  
14 going to solve the problem is that what happens if, as they tell us in 25 to 40 years,  
15 which they'll know if it works, and if it doesn't work then -- and if the runs on all of the  
16 Pacific Ocean rivers are drastically reduced, even those that don't have dams in, and  
17 they're not really sure why -- no one is really sure why the fish don't come back.

18 But they say that taking out four dams will solve the problem. If it  
19 doesn't, what's the next alternative? We take out the rest of the dams below there?  
20 What if that doesn't work? Then what do we do? Do we start at the headwater of the  
21 Snake and restore the Snake River to its original state? What do all the people who  
22 essentially depend upon the waters, the Snake River and so forth and the water from  
23 the dams, what do they do in all this time?

24 It's a solution that really no one has the answer to. Someone has come  
25 up with this idea that -- or enough of them have come up with the idea that breaching

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 the dams will solve the problem. But no one is really sure that it's the dams alone  
2 that is the problem. Maybe it's the quality of the water; maybe it's the temperature of  
3 the water; maybe it's the flow of the water. The fish definitely were there before the  
4 dams were put in but they're not there now.

5 But it's very possible that none of these single solutions will restore that  
6 salmon flow, and we will have done the breaching and all the other things for not in  
7 the end. Thank you.

8 MR. WHITTAKER: I'm Jim Whittaker, farmer, director of Big Wood  
9 Canal Company, 498 East 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Dietrich, Idaho 83324. March 7, 2000.  
10 Please note the following statement is that of myself, Jim Whittaker, and may not  
11 necessarily represent the opinions of the Big Wood Canal Company. My farm was  
12 taken out of sagebrush by Earl Saunders in 1930 under the New Lands American  
13 Falls reservoir district. The New Lands construction fund debt is now paid in full.  
14 Seventy years of sweat and tears. What pioneers were these people that settled the  
15 west. They came west to a new land with no transportation, electricity, schools or  
16 much of anything else. Many milked a few cows and shipped the cream to Salt Lake  
17 on railroad. What they did raise was strong family ties and patriotic American values.  
18 We owe our freedom from Japan, Germany and Italy to these Americans. They gave  
19 their all in World War II, a cause that allows the stars and stripes to continually fly  
20 over this great nation.

21 Big Wood Canal Company and American Falls reservoir district delivers  
22 their irrigation water to 98,944.89 acres. The principal crops are hay, grain, potatoes,  
23 sugar beets and beans, as well as the lifeblood for all aspects of the livestock  
24 industry. From this canal system, the communities of Gooding, Shoshone, Dietrich,  
25 Richfield and Hunt have developed, a population of roughly 20,000 hard working

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 agriculture-oriented people. Without water, these people would be displaced along  
2 with milk haulers, potato processors, grain handlers and many other agriculture-  
3 related pursuits. Water is the lifeblood of these people. Flow augmentation will drive  
4 families from this land. How many salmon will it take to replace the production from  
5 98,000 acres?

6 My friends, you're looking at starvation. On television we see children  
7 in third world countries drinking and playing in sewers. Soon these children could be  
8 your grandchildren and great grandchildren if we dismantle the efforts of the past  
9 century. Do not be misled. The new world order will so drastically reduce our  
10 agriculture and industrial production that we will be a third world nation.

11 All this will easily be accomplished by pursuing a wilderness,  
12 endangered species and clean water and clean air acts which have gone far beyond  
13 the intent of those who conceived them. Remember, the new world order intends to  
14 cut the world production in half. If you intend to survive, chances might be better in  
15 China. They're building new dams. With our technology and sophistication, is  
16 destruction of these great facilities the best solution to achieve the best result -- end  
17 results? God bless American agriculture. They feed the people and more. Jim  
18 Whittaker.

19 MR. FIFE: Okay. I'm Ernest Fife. I'm speaking for myself on the  
20 salmon issue. Everybody has talked about breaching our dams which no one will  
21 give the benefit -- another benefit of other wildlife besides salmon that our dams  
22 benefit.

23 They should think of the recreational value that these give, not only  
24 transportation, but all the avenues that this has done. And there are other alternates  
25 to returning our salmon. I'd love to see our salmon return to Idaho and be like they

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 were, but that's like going back and trying to live back in the 1800s when we're in the  
2 20<sup>th</sup> century now.

3           Let's face facts and try to do the best we can, and let our Corps of  
4 Engineers do their job as they're trying so well to do, to restore the salmon and go  
5 on. And it's shown that no matter where we go, from Alaska, all inlets, the salmon  
6 population is down. So it's more problems than just our dams for not having our  
7 salmon. There are predators. We need to look at what they're doing to our salmon.  
8 But also, there's the commercial fishing may be doing it. But what is the main  
9 problem? Is it the water temperatures?

10           No one has come and said the real cause. They blame the dams, but  
11 they're blaming one source. Let's work together and come up as a unit and do  
12 what's the best for everybody and for our salmon because they're very important.  
13 The natural resources are always important. We have had to give up many of them  
14 for progress. Do we want progress or do we want to go back to the 18<sup>th</sup> century?  
15 Thank you.

16           MR. BATES: My name is Paul Bates. I'm here representing my two  
17 young children who when we talk about this, can't understand why some things take  
18 so long when some answers seem so right.

19           We all feel as a family that alternative four, the breaching of the dams, is  
20 the best and quickest response to a situation that's become incredibly critical. It's  
21 taken -- it's taken you now nine years since the listing of the sockeye, which I noticed  
22 at this meeting gets -- is mentioned very little, if at all, as if it no longer exists, which it  
23 may well not.

24           We're on the verge of the chinook runs going the same route. I don't  
25 think that we have the right to determine that we can let those fish go. I think the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 economics of the situation is a moot point. There will be some suffering. Everyone  
2 has to share in the loss.

3           The dollar numbers, I think, are very confusing. What things cost to  
4 solve the problem, what the loss in revenues, et cetera, are -- all of these are small  
5 little matters relative to saving the fish that I want my children to see some day. I  
6 hope that this process is -- leaves the political arena as soon as possible, because  
7 the politicization of it is what has brought us to the point where we are today, and let's  
8 get on with bypassing the dams. And I prefer to see no more Idaho water  
9 downstream. The flow augmentation, I think, has proven to be just about as  
10 successful as barging, and we need to do the right thing. Thanks.

11           MR. SUHER: I'm Franklin Suher from Paul, Idaho. I've been listening  
12 to your comments inside. It's kind of interesting. There's one thing that I noticed real  
13 quick. It seems that faith and religion or something has to do with these fish, and I  
14 really didn't know that we were -- had got to a nation where we worshipped fish. I  
15 think that should be tabled right quick. Now I've got another thing I'd like to talk to  
16 you a little bit about.

17           I live in a place where -- well, I used to -- when I went out one door, it  
18 was sagebrush. I picked up a .22 and I could shoot jackrabbits real steady. Then  
19 during hunting season, during the fall, I could pick up a shotgun and walk out the  
20 other door, and I'd have a pheasant real quick. And through the process of time, the  
21 sagebrush is gone north of my house, and south of my house, all the little ditches  
22 and nooks and crannies and grass spots have been eliminated, so there's no place  
23 for the pheasants anymore.

24           Now, as I look over this situation, I can see no way of bringing back the  
25 jackrabbits. There's no place for them anymore. Another thing, I can see no place

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1 that will ever restore pheasants like there used to be, which truly I enjoyed. I might  
2 tell you, I guess, I'm a little older than most around this place. But I enjoyed both, the  
3 jackrabbits and the pheasants. And I counted one night about 100 sage hens fly  
4 over the top of my milk barn, went down into my field, went from north down to the  
5 south. They seem to be eliminated.

6 I feel like we're fighting for something that to get salmon back is another  
7 waste of time and energy and money. It just will not work. And I thank you very  
8 much.

9 MS. MURPHY: My name is Suzanne Murphy. I'm from Castleford,  
10 Idaho. We live near salmon -- can I start over again? Okay. Anyway, I'm writing this  
11 as another endangered species, the small family farmer, but this is the tale of another  
12 species. The salmon of the Snake River drainage is on the verge of becoming only a  
13 legend; the ghost fish gone like my husband's grandfather who used to load the them  
14 with a pitch fork at Balance Rock crossing into his wagon.

15 If these fish are to survive and thrive, it will take efforts and sacrifices of  
16 many. First, the dams must go. Since their initiation, they have never made any real  
17 attempt to accommodate the fish. The dams were primarily built to accommodate the  
18 city of Lewiston, the seaport of Idaho. Well, as a southern Idaho farmer, that doesn't  
19 help me get my grain to market.

20 But if our irrigation water is used for these pretend fish flushes, well, we  
21 will be gone with very little sustenance results. Removing the dam is, of course, the  
22 first and most important step. Others need to be addressed such as improving our  
23 riparian drainages for the fish gravel beds for their -- what do they call it -- nesting.  
24 And over-fishing the fish at the ocean also needs to be attended to. I guess I've kind  
25 of run out of where I've written, so -- anyway, I do believe the first and probably the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 most economical approach is to remove the dam, but there's a lot more work to be  
2 done. Thanks.

3 MR. RAMSEYER: Hi. I'm Dave Ramseyer. I'm a farmer in the Filer  
4 area. I've farmed for about 20 years. My major concern is not necessarily with the  
5 dam breaching, although I'm not in favor of it, but with the flow augmentation. I don't  
6 feel that this is a viable option. Anybody with common sense can see that when you  
7 run water into a reservoir, it's going to slow down. And it would take the amount of a  
8 100-year flood to make enough water to make a difference in the flow past those  
9 dams.

10 Therefore, I think flow augmentation should not be done and should not  
11 be considered as an option. Whenever you talk about taking more water, and  
12 especially from the upper Snake region, you're talking about farmers' livelihoods.  
13 And the economics of that is much more far reaching than at first glance, because  
14 you not only take out the farms, you take out the people who live in the communities,  
15 you take out the schools and the kids who go to the schools.

16 I guess in conclusion, I would like to say that in all the debate that I'm  
17 hearing on this dam issue, I think that they need to widen the scope of the whole  
18 thing instead of having just four options. I believe they need to consider all the things  
19 up and down the river, and probably there's not going to be any one solution that will  
20 meet the needs of everyone. But I think people have to work together to try to make  
21 the situation work for not only the salmon but for the people that live along the river  
22 from top to bottom. That's all I have. Thank you.

23 MR. JONES: My name is Calvin Jones, and I am a farmer, and I'm just  
24 representing myself. And I would say, are the dams the problem? It is my  
25 understanding that silver salmon and steelhead are in extremely low numbers in the

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 short damless streams around Tillamook, Oregon. The figures on salmon in the river  
2 -- in the Columbia and Snake River showed a sharp drop before the dams were built  
3 in the '30s. The building of the dams leveled out the amount of return for many  
4 years.

5           This area needs the clean, low-cost power from the dams. Sixty-six  
6 percent of our power comes from the four dams in the lower Snake, and that is  
7 according to Idaho Power. And we would be -- would that power be replaced by coal  
8 or atomic power plants? Already we are threatened by brownouts, possible  
9 brownouts this summer, they tell us, because of the increase in housing and industry  
10 of 18 percent. Either way, the power price will increase dramatically with adverse  
11 affects on homes, industry and farms. The cost for irrigation would double. A farm  
12 with a well -- with a pump at 380 feet depth would be -- is now paying around \$70 an  
13 acre. That would increase to \$140 which would be quite prohibitive.

14           Also, the cost of dam breaching. We are told at the meeting tonight that  
15 the cost would be over \$3 billion. That would be very expensive, especially if it failed  
16 to help the salmon recovery. Also, if this nation got to a point that food was in short  
17 supply, I do not believe that there would be anybody that would even want the dams  
18 removed. That's my opinion there. The best way -- the cheapest, by far, may be to  
19 build a second channel with part of the water, and that would be adjacent to the  
20 present river and high enough to bypass the dams with a natural flow. Let the smolts  
21 go down the stream and let them have a natural flow around the dams in the  
22 Columbia and also the dams in Idaho.

23           Then also, we need to -- need to know about how bad the predators --  
24 or what kind of a problem they're causing. The seals are numerous in the ocean.  
25 They feed on the salmon. And when they're full, they play with the salmon and they

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 kill them, bat them around. And that just seems to be more for recreation than  
2 anything. How about the terns? How many smolts do they eat? I guess that's all I  
3 have to say. Thank you.

4 MR. COINER: I'm Charles Coiner, Twin Falls, Idaho. Third generation  
5 farmer representing maybe 20 of the irrigators of the Twin Falls Canal Company,  
6 American Falls reservoir district. After listening to much of the testimony, it kind of  
7 astounds me what people think and how they think and how they miss some of the  
8 points. I think while we're still fishing for the salmon, we can't decimate local  
9 communities and local economies that have taken 100 years to build and depend  
10 upon the water and the facilities that are there.

11 When we have salmon runs in Oregon and Washington on rivers that  
12 are not dammed, it seems to me that part of the problem is what's going on in the  
13 ocean with the harvest and the El Nino effects. We spent, it seems to me, much  
14 more money studying the effects of the river -- trying to get flows in the river when I  
15 think the problem is at the other end of the run. So my alternative would be pretty  
16 much status quo; improving getting the salmon up and down the rivers in whatever  
17 way we can mechanically without using more water, without removing dams, and  
18 spending more money and time studying the harvest, controlling the harvest and  
19 figuring out what's going on in the ocean. Thank you.

20 MR. SILVERSTER: Sherril Silvester, Twin Falls, Idaho. I'm a farmer  
21 out here on the south side of Twin Falls. I'm not well acquainted with this dam  
22 breaching. What I do know is these dams -- anytime there's irrigation involved, it's  
23 vital to any community. The fish are important, yes, but life and families and  
24 communities are way more important than fish. I think we ought to save the fish if  
25 there's any way possible in doing it, but I don't think we ought to destroy any

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 communities or any business, too, for the fish. I've been a resident of Idaho for 35  
2 years, and I know what impact agriculture has on the state. It's number one in the  
3 state. It's number one in the nation if you take agriculture as a whole.

4           So if you start taking dams out in Idaho, they'll start taking dams out all  
5 over the United States, and pretty soon we'll be in trouble. We'll be buying food from  
6 foreign countries, and food will become more expensive if we have to do that.  
7 There's a lot of impact that we need to think about as far as future generations. We  
8 need to have a stable agriculture economy for our future generations. It would be  
9 nice to have a stable fishing environment, too. We need that.

10           We can't do it at the expense of agriculture. It's just impossible to do  
11 that because we'd all be on subsidies of one kind or another if we destroy the  
12 agriculture base of America which is our water. There's many more things we can  
13 talk about, but I for one am very close to the soil and feel that we need to make sure  
14 we have adequate an supply of water. The rest of the world wants our water, and if  
15 we aren't careful, they'll end up with it. So that's my testimony.

16           MR. SCARROW: My name is Jim Scarrow. I represent myself as a  
17 farmer and dairyman in southern Idaho. And I'm deeply concerned with what I see in  
18 the hearings. It seems to be almost like a bunch of parrots saying the same thing,  
19 realizing that we have a problem. And I love salmon as much as anyone. I used to  
20 catch them by the dozens. I'm 56 years old, and my kids have enjoyed catching  
21 salmon. I go to Alaska and catch salmon and I love the fish very much.

22           I think there are other options besides breaching the dams, and I've  
23 heard options of making a canal around the system which seems to be a very viable  
24 solution to me. It would probably take no less time to build a canal than it would be to  
25 breach the dams, and we would have something with no maintenance to speak of,

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

1 and would do the same thing as breaching the dams, and it wouldn't have the ill  
2 effects that is going to be caused by breaching the dams.

3 I think we have to address all the other problems in the ocean and in  
4 the lower system. And I appreciate everyone listening to the comments, and I would  
5 like to see something besides tunnel vision on the overall problem. Thank you.

6 MR. LEVEE: My name is Scott Levee. I made the film Red Fish, Blue  
7 Fish. I've had -- this is my life testimony as I ran out of time today. One thing that I  
8 wanted to make sure that we look into, is it necessary for congress to actually  
9 appropriate the money.

10 As I understand it, BPA has never received appropriations from  
11 congress. The cash reserves are more than enough to implement the breach.

12 If congress decides they need to send some money for road repairs  
13 and things like that, that's another issue. I think we need to get on the ball on this  
14 whole thing. Delay is definitely to the detriment of the salmon. The question is, it's  
15 an executive -- the way it is, is that this is the judicial department part right now.

16 It's Judge Marsh. He asked for an executive order from the executive  
17 branch of the government, so I don't see how the legislative department has anything  
18 to do with this. As you can understand from listening to the testimonies, the people  
19 overwhelming are for option four with the agreement that flow augmentation doesn't  
20 increase.

21 The majority of the people that talk early in the testimonies are the  
22 politicians, and they're the ones that are opposed to breach. If we allowed the  
23 congressmen to continue to delay, Slade Gorton and many of the northwestern  
24 delegates have said that they will continue to filibuster, then this salmon will go  
25 extinct. So we need to do what we can to keep it out of the hands of congress.

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

(360) 693-4111

1           And it doesn't seem that it's legal the way it's written, being in the  
2 judicial department asking for an executive decision. It doesn't necessitate the  
3 congress has anything to do with it.

4           Do I have a minute? Okay.

5           For example, if I owned the dams -- if Scott Levee owned the dams and  
6 the federal government made an executive decision by the president and said you  
7 have to remove these dams, I can't go to my board of directors, my congress, my  
8 board of directors and say, no, we're not going to or we're going to talk about it for 20  
9 more years or five more years or things like that. I have to follow the law of the land.

10           The statement that brigadier general gave some introductions that the  
11 money is going to have to come from congress, is not necessarily true. That's  
12 something that I think we need to be very careful about, is being careful of further  
13 delay. Thanks very much for your time and all the hearings. All your efforts are very,  
14 very important. Thank you.

15           MR. WALKER: My name is Ben Walker. I'm from Ketchum, Idaho. I  
16 used to be a businessman up there. And I've been around for quite some time. Now  
17 I'd like to talk first -- contrary to what some of the people have said, that the salmon  
18 are much benefited by having a free-flowing running stream.

19           What I refer to mostly is what Bill Bradley said the other night on  
20 television in relation to the Sacramento River tributary. And the dam removal there  
21 allowed a run of 20,000 salmon in 1998 against, would you believe it, only 44 before  
22 breaching in 1998, which certainly indicates the value of a free-flowing river.

23           Next I would like to state the major faults of the present four dams on  
24 the lower Snake River. One of the major faults is the power production. The power  
25 production that is supplied by the dams is only five percent of the needed power, so it

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

