

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TWIN FALLS, IDAHO

Wednesday, March 8, 2000, 6:57 p.m.

THE MODERATOR: We're going to start our oral testimony now. Let me go over with you again how this works. First I'll call your name to come to the microphone based on the sign-up sheet.

I don't know if you noticed or not, but next to each line was a number. They go across the sheet. So there was number one on one sheet, number two on another sheet, number three, that way. So I don't know if you had a chance to note where you are, but you should come up pretty much according to the number, after our public officials speak.

So I'll call your name based on your number, and I'll call who is up and who's up next and who's on deck. So please be ready and get to the closest microphone, so that we can move right to you.

We use a light system to let you know how much time you have, and that's right over here. So you need to watch the lights in front of you. And the green light means speak, the yellow light indicates that you have 60 seconds to wrap, and the

1 red light means stop. And I'll help you out there
2 if you fail to look up.

3 At the end of your time, please leave
4 the microphone so the next speaker may begin. We
5 want to try and accommodate as many of you as want
6 to speak tonight. Again, that's our goal. I don't
7 know if we'll get there or not, but that's our
8 goal.

9 Because the meeting is being
10 transcribed, please indicate whether you're
11 commenting on the Corps EIS or the Federal Caucus
12 All-H paper or both. If you don't know, that's
13 okay. We'll make sure we get your comments to the
14 appropriate federal official. Be sure and state
15 your name at the beginning of your testimony and
16 the organization or agency you're representing, if
17 any.

18 I want to go over -- oh, and one more
19 thing. If you have your comments written down,
20 even in handwriting, even cursively, it's helpful
21 to hand those in, in case the -- sometimes when
22 people are trying to fit their testimony into three
23 minutes, they talk very, very fast, and the court
24 reporter can't get everything down.

25 So it's helpful to have even the

1 handwritten notes to pick up pieces that might get
2 dropped. So if you have that, you can hand them to
3 Nola right here, and she'll collect those from you
4 as you make your comments.

5 I want to go over the ground rules one
6 more time before we get started. Again, I'm going
7 to ask you to refrain from clapping, booing,
8 cheering, gestures, anything like that. Just so
9 that we can keep people moving along.

10 I'd ask you to keep your comments
11 respectful, please. And be courteous, and please
12 stop speaking when your time is up. That makes it
13 a lot easier for all of us.

14 So with that -- oh, and one more time
15 let me request, because we have so many people who
16 want to speak tonight, if the panel has heard from
17 you in the past at any of the other meetings, if
18 you would consider when your name comes up
19 withdrawing your name or moving it to the end of
20 the list so people who haven't been to any of the
21 other hearings can get their comments in, we would
22 really appreciate that. So I'd just ask you to
23 consider that and see if that's something that you
24 can do.

25 With that, we're going to start with our

1 because of dams. Not the four lower Snake River
2 dams, but the first dams that were put on to the
3 Snake River. For what? For mining purposes.

4 Now we have to deal with the results of
5 what has occurred. The fish are gone from this
6 particular part of the river. The four lower Snake
7 River dams are in the process of eliminating the
8 remaining runs that come into the Snake River. My
9 mike's given out. It's dropping. Maybe I'm
10 talking too hard.

11 But I want you to know that those fish
12 that were in this river just outside of the
13 building here, down the road, was a major source of
14 the fish for my people.

15 And today, those fish are gone. They
16 have not been replaced; they have not been
17 recovered in any way. We'd like to see them
18 recovered. We'd like to see the rivers returned to
19 the clean, pristine way they were.

20 Today, I'm afraid that the many things
21 that are occurring, the recovery efforts that have
22 been mandated by Congress are not working,
23 primarily because you have not been doing your
24 jobs.

25 And it seems to me that we, the first

1 Americans, are going to have to take you to task.
2 And it's going to be a lot more costly if we lose
3 the natural runs of our fish. They're spiritual to
4 us, a spiritual tie to us. They don't mean that to
5 you. But to us, it's our natural connection with
6 the creator. To you, it's sport and recreation.

7 So with that, I leave that with you, and
8 certainly hope that your dreams and your visions
9 will be for the fish. Thank you.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lionel.
11 Ted Howard, Curtis Mendenhall, and Doug Manning.

12 TED HOWARD,
13 appeared and gave the following statement:

14
15 MR. HOWARD: Yes, this is Ted Howard of the
16 Shoshone-Paiute Tribes. The natural commissions
17 and the natural river ecosystems have always been
18 the position of the tribes. The fundamental
19 realities are continually not being addressed.

20 This includes the domination by the
21 region's largest energy companies who do not bear
22 responsibility to the public or the tribes, and who
23 walk away with the region's benefits, leaving the
24 rest of the nation's tribes and tribes bearing the
25 burdens.

1 Uses of the rivers must be compatible
2 with restoration and protection of natural and
3 cultural resources, instead of those resources
4 being reduced to mitigation measures.

5 All costs of operating the energy
6 system, including subsidies to irrigators, large
7 operators, and foregone energy revenues need to be
8 held accountable, with as much scrutiny as the cost
9 of fish and wildlife protection restoration.

10 Extreme changes that the tribes have
11 endured in the recent past are unacceptable when
12 the animals, lands, and waters are wiped out.
13 Providing toll-free barge transportation costs far
14 more than the benefits provided. This ratepayer
15 and taxpayer subsidy is enjoyed by very few
16 citizens at a cost to the rest of us.

17 Alternative transportation, such as rail
18 and trucks would restore free enterprise employment
19 benefits to many more people in the existing
20 system. In order for the barge companies in
21 Lewiston to earn \$4.5 million per year, it costs
22 the taxpayers \$45 million per year.

23 The four dams produce 1,000 megawatts,
24 4.6 percent of the region's electricity production.
25 It costs more to produce the electricity than the

1 energy benefits provided. This is a ratepayer and
2 taxpayer loss. It is not a benefit.

3 It's been 200 years since the arrival of
4 the Euro-American people, and our ecosystem is in a
5 bad way. I mentioned this morning, we need to
6 focus on what we're leaving for our children, those
7 yet unborn, because we are taking and not putting
8 anything back, and we need to start looking at
9 that.

10 And also, as Lionel mentioned, you know,
11 they have a religious meaning to us. And also in
12 the presentation by the colonel there, he mentioned
13 losses in regard to jobs and dollars, with no
14 mention of tribal losses, cultural, traditional,
15 religious. How do you put dollars to that?

16 Thank you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ted.
18 Curtis Mendenhall, Doug Manning, and on deck is --
19 I think it's Keith Tinno.

20 CURTIS MENDENHALL,
21 appeared and gave the following statement:

22

23 MR. MENDENHALL: Curtis Mendenhall, Burley
24 City Council president.

25 THE MODERATOR: Could you speak little closer

1 to the mike, please, Curtis?

2 MR. MENDENHALL: Yes, I can. I have a cold.
3 Panel, it's great to get the information from you
4 firsthand, instead of just being left out to read
5 it in the newspapers. This is a very emotional
6 issue. And at this point, we cannot stand by and
7 let the environmental zealots and the news media
8 push for the dam breaching, without some common
9 sense.

10 As I see it, and as the constituency we
11 have, we have three options. One is do nothing,
12 two is improve the dams and make it more fish
13 friendly, and three is to breach the dam. We
14 support the possible saving of the salmon runs, but
15 we do not support the breaching of the dams.

16 Most of the information was covered
17 firsthand about the economical differences that we
18 may have in this, and so it does not need to be --
19 I won't waste the time at this point.

20 One thing on the draft report, this
21 report does not address all necessary steps for
22 salmon recovery, just a short term. This report is
23 inadequate and incomplete. We do need a complete
24 report on all options for the completion of the
25 salmon recovery.

1 Also, the recent reduction, this refers
2 to economics, the recent reduction in oil
3 production and crude is 5 percent worldwide, and
4 has led to an increase of over 25 percent. The
5 loss of clean electric hydropower will create
6 similar increases to electric rates in this region.
7 And I thank you for your time.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Curtis. Doug,
9 Keith, and then J.J. Wadsworth.

10 DOUG MANNING,
11 appeared and gave the following statement:

12
13 MR. MANNING: Doug Manning, I'm the mayor of
14 Burley. I want you to know I appreciate the time
15 and the opportunity to be here this evening, as I'm
16 sure you all do, and I have great respect for this
17 forum, where we can exchange opinions, even though
18 they may differ from each other.

19 Firstly, I do not feel that dam
20 breaching addresses the full spectrum of this
21 complete issue. I have concerns that there is not
22 enough scientific and biological facts to support
23 any one salmon recovery program.

24 I am also concerned about some reports
25 that estimate that approximately 75 million cubic

1 yards of sediment have built up behind these four
2 dams that we're talking about, some of which,
3 perhaps, could contain heavy metal buildups.

4 If they are released downstream, that
5 could create environmental chaos, even worse than
6 some of the problems we face now. I'm very
7 concerned about that. Have any engineering reports
8 addressed those?

9 THE MODERATOR: We'll get your question
10 answered, thanks.

11 MR. MANNING: Also, I think if we're dealing
12 with endangered species, well, put a moratorium on
13 fishing from the mouth of the Columbia River up the
14 river for a while, see if that increases the
15 numbers at all.

16 I also worry about the water predators,
17 the terns, the sea lions, things like that that, I
18 think, need to be managed better. Maybe in the
19 terns case, moved and eradicated altogether to
20 boost the non-consumption of the smolts.

21 The potentiality of increased air
22 pollution should concern all of us as well, if the
23 barging is reduced. I understand what the
24 situation there is, but it does increase the number
25 of trucks on the highway, it increases fuel

1 consumption. I don't think we need any more dirty
2 air in large populous areas or anywhere else.

3 As the mayor of Burley, I represent over
4 3,000 households. And although I don't know how
5 each of my constituents feel about dam breaching, I
6 do know they do not want higher electrical rates,
7 which are probable if dams are breached.

8 I'd like to quote Mr. James McClure,
9 former senator of Idaho, if I may, who said, "Today
10 we must focus on actions that are feasible. It is
11 fruitless to discuss options that cannot happen and
12 will not revitalize wild fish runs. We must devote
13 our time and resources to improving techniques that
14 are working, and finding new actions that we can
15 take now that will have the best chance to save our
16 salmon."

17 I support and pray for salmon recovery,
18 but I do oppose breaching the dams. Thank you.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Doug. Keith and
20 then J.J. and then Lynn Kincannon.

21 KEITH TINNO,
22 appeared and gave the following statement:

23
24 MR. TINNO: Good evening. My name is
25 Keith Tinno, member of the Fort Hall Business

1 Council for Shoshone-Bannock tribes, Fort Hall,
2 Idaho. More or less I'd like to comment here today
3 on regards to both the EIS and the H papers.
4 First, for over 12 years now I have been in
5 meetings and caucuses and salmon summits with each
6 of your agencies in Portland and throughout the
7 northwest.

8 Now, for that many years, we have been
9 trying and trying to find a way to plan a proposal
10 with regards to recovery of the salmon runs. With
11 regards to improving the dam, the spillways, the
12 way the salmon, more or less passageways for them.

13 Now, for how many years we have been
14 meeting, but yet, not come up with a plan, but
15 study after study for every year, each year a new
16 different study in regards to how we could improve
17 and save the salmon. But yet, we're still studying
18 today. The hearing tonight is here to gather more
19 information to put into this study.

20 Now, how long is it going to take in
21 order to realize, and all the information that you
22 guys have gathered already, you guys have before
23 you, in regards to the smolts going down. You're
24 collecting down there and not coming back up. Why?

25 You guys should know the information.

1 It's the dams that are there in place, and we need
2 to go back to the natural river state in order to
3 recover the salmon runs and let salmon to be back
4 and coming back.

5 I have been frustrated for years in
6 attending these meetings, in regards to how we're
7 going to implement different plans, in regards to
8 what we're going to do. But yet, nothing has been
9 done.

10 Congress has been doing nothing about
11 it, in regards to being something to do about it.
12 We have been meeting with Congressmen. I even met
13 with President Clinton, 1994, and talked to him in
14 regards to directing his federal agencies in
15 implementing some kind of plan in regards to
16 recovering the salmon. But yet, nothing has been
17 done.

18 Congress has done nothing, state
19 agencies have done nothing, and even the federal
20 agencies has done nothing. It's time that we do
21 something. And moving the dams now, today, is the
22 first step in recovering the salmon runs. And
23 tomorrow, maybe we'll remove the other four down
24 river.

25 Maybe that's why the smolts aren't

1 coming back up, because they realize they have to
2 go down through four turbines, and realizing all
3 the frustration and problems they have to face
4 going down, they don't want to come back up
5 through the dams. I wouldn't either.

6 But now is the time, and today, or
7 tomorrow is the time to remove those dams. At
8 least that's the first step in recovery of the
9 salmon, because otherwise study after study, and
10 the studies are going to continue on, and nothing
11 will be done.

12 So now is the time to do something, and
13 today is the day to do it. Thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Keith. J.J. --
15 can I ask you to hold your applause, please?
16 Thanks, I appreciate it. Keith, thank you. J.J.,
17 then Lynn Kincannon, and then Larry Bagley is on
18 deck. Is J.J. around?

19 Okay, Lynn, are you around? Great.
20 Larry Bagley and then Alvin -- help me out.
21 Chojnacky. Thank you. Go, Lynn.

22 LYNN KINCANNON,
23 appeared and gave the following statement:

24

25 MS. KINCANNON: Thank you. I'm here to read

1 a letter from the Blaine County commissioners.

2 THE MODERATOR: Can you state your name,
3 please?

4 MS. KINCANNON: Lynn Kincannon. This is a
5 unanimous letter from the commission, and it is in
6 support of alternative four of the draft EIS and
7 the All-H paper, alternative A. Our board
8 appreciates the complexity of the issue before you.
9 As public officials we are often called upon to
10 decide difficult issues ourselves, so we fully
11 understand that decisions such as these will impact
12 the environment, as well as the people who have
13 interests on both sides of the discussion.

14 In order to limit the length of our
15 comments in this letter, we would like to
16 incorporate by reference the Boise Statesman
17 special series on dam breaching that was published
18 in 1997.

19 The Statesman concluded, as we do, that
20 the multiple benefits of partial removal far
21 outweigh the few isolated deficits. We also concur
22 with their recommendation that the few deficits be
23 compensated through other programs so there are
24 only winners in the partial removal process.

25 When the cost to-date, \$3 billion of

1 trying to protect the endangered salmon with
2 barging, trucking, fish riders, etcetera is
3 compared with the cost, \$1 billion-plus, of partial
4 dam removal, there is no economic justification to
5 leave the dams in place.

6 When the evaluation of the
7 more-expensive dam preserving alternative is
8 measured in terms of the level of present salmon
9 population in the affected area, the record is
10 clear that all the dam-saving alternatives have
11 resulted in an absolute failure to preserve the
12 species in the area affected by these four dams.

13 The economic benefits of a healthy
14 environment and a tourist economy that comes to
15 Idaho for fishing and recreation is substantial.
16 The benefits of this tourism economy enrich the
17 entire state and bring large amounts of money to
18 local communities, as well as to the whole state.

19 Our own county is a destination resort
20 for hundreds of thousands of visitors each year.
21 They come for many recreation activities, it is
22 true. However, fishing in general and the
23 attraction of the Redfish area is of particular
24 interest to our visitors. Many other counties
25 prosper as well from the benefits of sport fishing

1 and related activities.

2 As county commissioners, we are also
3 concerned that the failure to accomplish the
4 partial removal of these four dams may lead to
5 irrigation water diversions as an alternative
6 method to help save the endangered salmon. Such a
7 diversion would not affect our farming community
8 directly, but would sharply affect other rural and
9 agriculturally based counties.

10 In support of our agricultural friends
11 and neighbors, we ask that the partial removal of
12 the four named dams be accomplished as soon as
13 possible.

14 Sincerely, Marian Micks, Blaine County
15 commissioner, Len Harling, Blaine County
16 commissioner, and Dennis Wright, Blaine County
17 commissioner. Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lynn. Okay,
19 Larry, Alvin, if you could get on deck two, and
20 then after Alvin is Audrey Dewhirst. Larry, are
21 you here, Bagley? Okay, you're on, Alvin. Audrey
22 and then David Erikson.

23 ALVIN CHOJNACKY,
24 appeared and gave the following statement:

25

1 MR. CHOJNACKY: I'm Alvin Chojnacky, Jerome
2 County commissioner and farmer. I'm the second
3 generation on our farm, and I'm currently working
4 my two sons, who represent the next generation on
5 our land that we have brought, and that we are
6 renting.

7 My parents used our water through the
8 great depression and the periods of drought and a
9 few good times. My parents paid for their water
10 through everything, and our sons and I have paid
11 for our shares and any repairs that were necessary
12 on any dam that supplies water to our farms.

13 Water is the lifeblood of our farms, and
14 without it, we would not be here today. When water
15 started flowing in our valley, it -- farming
16 started every community in our valley. Today we
17 see all our communities growing and a demand for
18 water is increasing for all of them.

19 It is wrong to ask people hundreds of
20 miles from the perceived problem to suffer disaster
21 for a problem they didn't create. Science does not
22 support flow augmentation and Idaho has supplied
23 over 20 million acre-feet of water for flow
24 augmentation over the last 10 years.

25 There is no proof that this added water

1 has assisted spring and summer chinook runs and
2 investigations relating to fall chinook shows only
3 a marginal increase, which generally are considered
4 to be the result of temperature, rather than flow.

5 To take an additional 1 million
6 acre-feet of water for flow augmentation from the
7 upper Snake River Basin would dry up more than
8 600,000 acres of productive farmland. This would
9 result in an annual loss of \$430 million, and cause
10 the loss of thousands of agricultural jobs.

11 In addition, this could greatly impact
12 Idaho's largest agricultural industry, the dairy
13 industry. They use a lot of water and depend on
14 these crops of hay, corn, and barley that are
15 produced on neighboring farms and periods of
16 drought would increase the losses for everybody.

17 I oppose any flow augmentation because
18 of the severe impact this would have on our farms,
19 industries, and communities. Our crops require
20 peak water during June, July, August for maximum
21 production.

22 Don't look at the salmon issue through
23 tunnel vision, like you've been doing, but sit down
24 and look at all conditions, actions, and practices
25 that affect salmon on their trip to the ocean and

1 their eventual return, if they're lucky to be in
2 that small number.

3 I am a water user and will do whatever
4 is necessary to protect our light, our industries,
5 and our communities. I thank you.

6 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Alvin. Audrey and
7 then David Erikson is on deck, and then we start on
8 our list. And our first person is Dile Monson.

9 AUDREY DEWHIRST,
10 appeared and gave the following statement:

11

12 MS. DEWHIRST: Audrey Dewhirst, mayor of
13 Rupert. We depend upon the dams for lakes and for
14 irrigation. There are more fish and wildlife, such
15 as the ducks and geese and deer and snails too
16 numerous to count in Idaho, than ever before in
17 history.

18 The salmon's predators are being
19 protected by environmental and endangered species
20 laws. In other words, the whales, the sea lions,
21 and other countries fish for salmon in countless
22 numbers in international waters. Breaching the
23 dams could in no way bring back the number of
24 salmon to keep up with all these odds against them.

25 We need to propagate and raise them

1 commercially, which is already being done, except
2 do it on a larger scale to help them gain back the
3 numbers that have been lost.

4 Our forefathers built those dams with
5 their sweat and blood, and we can readily see what
6 all they have done for us. We have prospered and
7 gained a much better life because of them. Let us
8 not destroy that which has been done for us.

9 We cannot afford to rebuild the dams for
10 the benefit of saving some salmon, which wouldn't
11 happen for several years anyway. It would be
12 devastating to our economy to lose those dams.
13 They are a good thing, so let's keep them all.
14 Thank you.

15 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Audrey.
16 David Erikson and Dile Monson, and on deck is
17 Lawrence Schoen. If you can get to the mikes, it
18 really helps. Thanks.

19 DAVID ERIKSON,
20 appeared and gave the following statement:

21
22 MR. ERIKSON: I'm David Erikson. I'm a
23 citizen of Twin Falls County. I represent this
24 region on the Idaho Water Resource Board. I'm here
25 this evening to request that flow augmentation be

1 removed from the recovery option list.

2 I have followed the evolution of the
3 premise of flow augmentation from its original
4 naive inauguration called the fish flush. I
5 remember the early simplistic euphoria that Idaho
6 and Montana could simply donate their water
7 resources to create enough water velocity in the
8 lower Snake River system to flush young salmon
9 smolts to the ocean.

10 That simplistic notion was laid to rest
11 by studies done by the Idaho Department of Water
12 Resources, and later confirmed by the Idaho
13 Department of Fish and Game.

14 Here we are ten years later, and after
15 sacrificing millions of acre-feet of Idaho water to
16 experiment with flow augmentation, the premise in
17 the promise of flow augmentation are no stronger
18 than when we started.

19 The premise of flow augmentation as a
20 meaningful solution presents a costly diversion to
21 the complex and lengthy list of recovery
22 strategies. I believe that it is entirely
23 insufficient for salmon recovery officials to
24 propose a fully defined strategy without full
25 exploration and disclosure of the potential damage

1 that flow augmentation could inflict on the
2 region's resources and its citizens.

3 The damages include many components of
4 economic and social values. Projection of simply
5 removed irrigation acres from production to
6 sacrifice the flow augmentation presents an
7 incomplete.

8 The very fabric of south Idaho's economy
9 rests on stored water for drought protection.
10 Drought protection, by the way, that provides
11 security for a wide variety of fish and wildlife
12 species in their habitat.

13 To cite a single example, how valid is
14 it to relegate water for flow augmentation without
15 assessing collateral damage to other listed or
16 threatened species, such as the bull trout or white
17 sturgeon?

18 I will conclude by summarizing what has
19 not been done to justify a conclusion of flow
20 augmentation as a salmon recovery strategy.

21 Now, with respect to the implementation
22 of flow augmentation, here's what has not been
23 done. Salmon population recovery by virtue of
24 previous flow augmentation has not been documented.

25 Secondly, comprehensive science-based

1 models demonstrating scientific and positive
2 effects have not been done. The potential for
3 aquatic habitat and wetland devastation has been
4 ignored.

5 The potential for damage to the region's
6 threatened endangered species has been ignored.
7 Plans for flow augmentation have ignored the
8 effects of drought. A comprehensive economic
9 evaluation has not been done. I see my time is up,
10 and thank you very much.

11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, David. I
12 appreciate you wrapping up. Dile and then
13 Lawrence Schoen and then Richard Meiers. And I'm
14 going to make an assumption here that J.J. and
15 Larry gave up their spot. They have testified
16 before, and I want to recognize that and thank
17 them.

18 DILE MONSON,
19 appeared and gave the following statement:

20
21 MR. MONSON: I'm Dile Monson. I'm local and
22 native Idahoan. After reviewing the seven
23 alternatives and the council's "Hear the Decision"
24 pamphlet, I commend the council on its attempts to
25 seemingly pit one group or part of states against

1 another. I assume that the goal must be to create
2 so much discord and lack of consensus that the
3 decisions about the Northwest will be made back
4 east.

5 Fortunately, most of our legislators and
6 governors are wise enough to have already given us
7 their opinions of how not to proceed. Most have
8 openly stated their lack of support for either
9 breaching of dams or additional water for fish
10 fleshies. May I suggest some reasons that indicate
11 that theirs is the correct approach.

12 I've been told that there are 26 of the
13 west coast runs of salmon and steelhead that are
14 listed as endangered or threatened with another
15 eight varieties that are candidates for listing.

16 Of those 34 runs, only four pass through
17 the lower Snake River dams. Some don't have to
18 pass through any dams at all. And yet, they are
19 struggling to survive. Obviously, ocean conditions
20 have a lot more to do with salmon populations than
21 may have been previously thought. Dams must not be
22 the total cause of their shrinking numbers.

23 In reality, the four lower Snake River
24 dams may be the saviors of the salmon and steelhead
25 that pass through them. I say this because dams

1 allow us to count and tag the fish passing by them,
2 both hatchery and natives. How else would we
3 accurately know how much trouble the salmon are
4 having?

5 And those four dams are the state of the
6 art, the best built for fish friendliness. I
7 visited Lower Granite. I have listened to and
8 viewed the Army Corps of Engineers' presentation on
9 fish screening, tagging, barging, and ladders.

10 It was impressive to me that they were
11 able to get fish past the dam with less than one
12 half of 1 percent of the fish injured or killed.

13 If this technology were just applied to
14 the other dams, then that would mean less than 2
15 percent mortality for passing through all the dams
16 being considered for breaching, and even the rest
17 on the lower Columbia. And if the smolts were
18 barged to the ocean, even natural predators in the
19 river would have a difficult time reducing their
20 numbers.

21 Compared to the Caspian terns, which by
22 the way are not endangered, the dams are relatively
23 harmless. These terns eat, it's estimated, between
24 25 and 30 percent of the salmon smolts coming down
25 the Columbia River, as evidenced by the fish pit

1 tags found in the bird droppings on Rice Island.

2 Let's see, 2 percent for the dams,
3 25 percent for the birds. Which should we correct
4 first? And the dams actually help to keep the
5 water temperature cooler, which is healthier for
6 the fish.

7 Another false statement --

8 THE MODERATOR: You need to wrap up, please.

9 I need you to wrap up, please.

10 MR. MONSON: Okay. We want our salmon and
11 steelhead, we want our dams for helping fish,
12 barging, electricity, and irrigation. We want our
13 water for irrigation and recreation.

14 We can have all of these things if we do
15 what we can quickly and cooperatively, instead of
16 trying to pit one another against each other.
17 Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dile.

19 Lawrence Schoen, Richard Meiers, and on deck is
20 Guy -- I think it's Urena.

21 LAWRENCE SCHOEN,
22 appeared and gave the following statement:

23

24 MR. SCHOEN: You got it, if I can get this
25 mike down first. My name is Lawrence Schoen. I

1 farm and manage about 1,000 acres in the Picabo
2 area north of here. I count myself among the
3 ever-increasing number of farmers who see
4 themselves not just as rugged individualists, but
5 as part of a bigger picture. This doesn't make me
6 a dam communist.

7 I have relationships with my suppliers,
8 with other irrigators who share the same creek as I
9 do, and with consumers, wherever they are, who buy
10 the end products made from my crops.

11 I also have relationships with the land,
12 the wildlife and the human beings affected by my
13 farming activities, and who affect mine.

14 I want America to know, many of us who
15 farm and ranch take great pride in trying to better
16 understand these relationships. We take great
17 pride in trying to be producers for the
18 21st Century, and not the 19th.

19 I want America and the world to know,
20 because they are watching us as we deliberate the
21 fate of one of the greatest natural resources this
22 continent and the world have ever known, Pacific
23 Northwest salmon, and I care about that.

24 The idea is logical, defensible, and
25 heavily supported by the broadest spectrum of

1 knowledgeable people. Removing four lower Snake
2 River dams provides the best chance we have of
3 restoring Snake River salmon runs.

4 Opponents refuse to accept this course
5 of action; many for understandable personal
6 reasons, others for ideology. Only leadership will
7 solve the problem. Sadly, we have none of that in
8 Idaho from the powers that be.

9 Lacking leadership, the people must be
10 empowered with the ideas that can make this
11 proposal work. First they must be empowered with
12 the idea that restoring salmon runs is the right
13 thing to do. Happily, this is the most widely
14 accepted concept.

15 After thousands of years, the salmon
16 runs began their terrible declines only recently,
17 after these dams were built. No amount of kicking
18 and screaming changes this.

19 A second big idea is that we, the people
20 of the modern era, can admit our mistakes, and we
21 can fix our mistakes and move on. A third powerful
22 idea is that the economics of dam removal, though
23 complex, are not insurmountable. In fact, they are
24 encouraging.

25 It is also fair, just, and affordable

1 for us to compensate the families directly affected
2 by dam removal, though they may never be
3 compensated personally for society's broken
4 promises. This is the single most wrenching factor
5 in the debate.

6 Fourth, we have so many available
7 choices in power generation. Again, all it takes
8 is leadership. As just one example, I'll quote
9 Time Magazine December 15th, 1997. "Studies show
10 that covering the existing flat roof space of many
11 cities with solar cells could meet half to
12 three-quarters of their energy needs.

13 "In the U.S., North Dakota, South
14 Dakota, and Texas together are swept by sufficient
15 winds to meet the electricity needs of the entire
16 country." Idaho lacks neither sun nor wind nor
17 private landowners willing to contribute to the
18 power grid.

19 Each choice we make has costs, but the
20 loss of these salmon runs is the most costly. It
21 is inconceivable to me that we could allow this to
22 happen. I urge you members of the hearing
23 committee to support breaching these dams and all
24 other measures that will help restore healthy
25 populations of these magnificent wild fish. That

1 would be alternative four, maximum protection. The
2 time for excuses is gone; the time for action is
3 now. Thank you for your time.

4 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lawrence, thank
5 you. Richard Meiers, Guy Urena. Ben Collins
6 is on deck.

7 GUY URENA,
8 appeared and gave the following statement:

9
10 MR. URENA: I am for breaching, but I
11 definitely want no water removed from Idaho, or
12 specifically this region. The popular vote, as I
13 see it, is going toward breaching.

14 THE MODERATOR: Can you speak a little closer
15 to the mike please, Guy?

16 MR. UREMA: You bet. The popular vote is
17 going for breaching. Never will there be a
18 consensus on this situation. It is going to have
19 to come to a government decision. Otherwise, we're
20 going to have lawsuit after lawsuit after lawsuit,
21 and possibly augmentation.

22 Augmentation is very costly. It's going
23 to cost millions and millions, possibly billions of
24 dollars. It's going to bring back a minute amount
25 of fish and very little monetary value.

1 Breaching is the cheapest. It's going
2 to bring back the highest number of fish returns.
3 It also will keep Idaho -- or keep the water in
4 Idaho reservoirs.

5 The majority of scientists state that
6 breaching will work, and there's a 90-percent
7 chance, if they don't breach, they will take more
8 water. When I say "take," I mean give to the
9 government.

10 Replacement, I can replace
11 transportation, I can replace power. There's no
12 way in the world that I can replace water. This is
13 too big a risk, and considering the state's stand
14 here, looking at the wolf recovery, the lumber
15 industry situation, I think it is time for the
16 state and the government to start getting together,
17 the federal government, and start mitigating;
18 spread the cost across the region and compensate
19 others. Thank you.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Guy. Okay,
21 Richard. Appreciate your cooperation there.
22 Ben Collins and Scott Shinby, I think, or Shinnenby
23 is on deck.

24 RICHARD MEIERS,
25 appeared and gave the following statement:

1

2 MR. MEIERS: My name is Richard Meiers, and
3 I'm representing myself. I am a former member of
4 the Idaho Fish and Game Commission, having
5 completed my term of office in July of 1999.

6 While on the commission, the existing
7 policy was established by unanimous vote of the
8 commission May 8th, 1998. I'd like to read just a
9 little bit of this.

10 "In accordance with Idaho Code 36-104, the
11 commissions reviewed available information
12 concerning the State of Idaho's anadromous fish and
13 found that the mainstream dam and reservoir system
14 in the lower Snake and Columbia River was a primary
15 factor in limiting recovery of Idaho's wild salmon
16 and steelhead.

17 "The commission considers the natural
18 river option to be the best biological choice for
19 recovery of Idaho's wild salmon and steelhead.
20 Available information indicates that the natural
21 river option is the only option that can meet
22 commission recovery standards."

23 That was the policy passed in 1998. All
24 biological information since that time has done
25 nothing but reinforce that decision. The Oregon

1 Fish and Game Commission has endorsed this
2 position. Washington Fish and Game has endorsed
3 the path process. Recently, Alaska Fish and Game
4 has stressed the need to address the lower four
5 dams on the Snake River.

6 I want to stress to you the policy of
7 the natural river option is the policy of the Idaho
8 Fish and Game Department. I believe it is based on
9 the best biological information available; it is
10 our best chance for recovery of the salmon and
11 steelhead.

12 And I support the policy and urge you to
13 make a recommendation of breaching the lower four
14 dams. Thank you.

15 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Richard.
16 Ben Collins, then Scott, and on deck is John Broz.

17 BEN COLLINS,
18 appeared and gave the following statement:

19
20 MR. COLLINS: Okay. My name is Ben Collins.
21 I represent the Magic Valley Fly Fishers here in
22 Twin Falls, and I address my comments to the EIS
23 and the All-H paper.

24 The hot topic of southern Idaho today is
25 a controversy over Confined Animal Feeding

1 Operations, or CAFOs. Ironically, there's a strong
2 corollary in the acronym that has a direct
3 relationship to the plight of the salmon and
4 steelhead controversy.

5 Substituting anadromous and fish in the
6 acronym, one comes up with Confined Anadromous Fish
7 Operations. It's amazing how well this describes
8 the current philosophy concerning the Snake and
9 Salmon River runs of salmon and steelhead.

10 Maybe some of you don't know, but the
11 Twin Falls area used to abound in salmon and
12 steelhead. Believe it or not, these fish used to
13 run up to Shoshone Falls and all the tributaries
14 below them.

15 There were excellent runs up Rock Creek,
16 that runs right through Twin Falls, Salmon Falls
17 Creek, Bruneau and Owyhee rivers, the Boise,
18 Payette, and Weiser rivers. Now they are confined
19 to the lower Snake, Salmon, and Clearwater rivers;
20 more than half of their former range in Idaho.

21 Those that have survived in this
22 confined environment now have to run the gauntlet
23 of dams on the Columbia and Snake rivers in an
24 attempt to get to their ancestral spawning grounds.

25 The offspring of the ones that make it

1 are faced with an even more formidable downstream
2 migration. The young smolts are further confined
3 during their downstream migration by hundreds of
4 miles of slack water behind the dams, and confined
5 to barges to augment passage through the hazards of
6 the dam turbines. It's time to let them swim free,
7 at least partially.

8 I've heard scientists, fish biologists,
9 laypersons, and yes, even politicians, admit that
10 salmon are one tough and resilient species. The
11 difference is that scientists and fish biologists
12 know that if given the free-flowing river option,
13 the species have a better than 50 percent chance of
14 recovery over a 25-year period.

15 The politicians, on the other hand, base
16 their opinions on rhetoric and want their cake and
17 eat it too. They cry, "Don't breach and don't use
18 full augmentation, but save the salmon."

19 The fact is that any option that
20 doesn't include breaching gives the salmon less
21 than 50 percent chance of recovery. The science is
22 clear, and there's no doubt of the cause and
23 effect. The dams are the cause, and the effect is
24 the near-extinct population of salmon and
25 steelhead.

1 appeared and gave the following statement:

2

3 MR. SHINBY: My name is Scott Shinby. I am
4 speaking in support of alternative four and on the
5 All-H paper.

6 I own an outfitting and fishing guide
7 service in Ketchum, Idaho. I've been a trout and
8 steelhead guide in Idaho for over 25 years. I
9 employ 35 part-time and full-time employees who
10 depend on the healthy fisheries in this state.

11 Steelhead fishing and guiding has been
12 an important resource for a business. Even with a
13 mostly artificial fishery that's mainly hatchery
14 returns, we have clients who fly in from all over
15 the country to fish for steelhead. They come from
16 Texas, New York, California, Michigan, just for the
17 experience of catching a steelhead in Idaho waters.

18 At the same time, our Idaho fishermen
19 are going to Alaska to fish for salmon while the
20 Idaho opportunities shrink. I can't really imagine
21 what would happen with the recovered wild steelhead
22 and salmon fishery. Steelhead fishing alone
23 accounts for 2,700 jobs and \$900 million to Idaho,
24 and to its riverside communities, and that's today.
25 Salmon and steelhead are renewable resources in

1 appeared and gave the following statement:

2

3 MR. BROZ: I'm Dr. Broz, retired pathologist
4 in Twin Falls.

5 THE MODERATOR: Can you speak a little closer
6 to the mike, please?

7 MR. BROZ: Colonel Bulen and caucus members,
8 thank you for holding these hearings. We
9 appreciate it. I'd like to share some of my
10 thoughts with you in regards to the salmon
11 breaching problem.

12 It seems everyone has a dog in its
13 fight, from Catholic bishops to the poor Indian
14 sitting on the rock wondering why he has an empty
15 fish net. He knows, and I think we all know.

16 In-between we have ourselves and the
17 politicians. One politician says there are plenty
18 of salmon in cans, they see them in the grocery
19 store. Another senator says the dams are important
20 for irrigation and flood control. We've talked
21 about this for half a dozen times.

22 Our governor's hung up with
23 fish-friendly turbines, improved barging, and
24 bypassed schemes. I think we have to start with a
25 head-start program with the politicians: Salmon

1 Dams 101.

2 Several years ago a friend of mine, an
3 Indian fishery biologist, summed it up. It's
4 extinction by micro-management. We constantly are,
5 in the last 20-30 years, making a situation fit a
6 plan, instead of a plan fit a situation. There's a
7 vast difference, and that's what we've done.

8 Well, the Indian fisherman, fisheries
9 biologist is right. We've spent \$3 billion, and
10 we've bumped a billion fish down that river. No
11 return. Virtually no return. Three-tenths
12 percent.

13 We wouldn't be here tonight if we had
14 had any results. Now your studies are about
15 completed, perhaps we can crawl out of this mess.
16 The solution is elementary: Breach the dams. And
17 it's paramount to address the other three H's.

18 The dams are a constant unrelenting and
19 lethal factor in these fish. Don't ever think it
20 isn't. How to get there is the problem. It's a
21 people problem, not the fish. We know what to do
22 for the fish.

23 In this book, "Salmon Trout Rivers," it
24 says, "We talk about things that connect humans to
25 humans, not humans to salmon." And that's exactly

1 what's happening. It's a political battle. It's
2 not about salmon anymore. We talk, write, plan,
3 but don't listen to what the land, rivers, and
4 salmon say.

5 For the past three years we've tinkered
6 with this and tampered with that, bypass schemes;
7 barging is not working, they never will. Anything
8 other -- any other fix besides breaching leaves
9 140 miles of slack water with predator fish,
10 thermo-nitrogen pollution.

11 We worry about Caspian terns. In 1986,
12 biologists reported 60,000, 60,000 squaw fish in
13 the Bonneville pool.

14 THE MODERATOR: I need you to wrap up now,
15 please, John.

16 MR. BROZ: A brief word on barge fish, their
17 slow indication timing is off, the barge noise is
18 horrendous, they have poor survival skills, and
19 most of all, they are packed together in a barge,
20 and the possibility of cross-infection
21 contamination is real. Thank you.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, John. Frank and
23 then Laverne Bronco and Curtis Webb is on deck.

24 FRANK PAPSE,
25 appeared and gave the following statement:

1

2 MR. PAPSE: My name is Frank Papse, and I'm
3 from Fort Hall, tribal reservation, and I'm not
4 used to being a volunteer worker all these years.
5 So I traveled all the way from Pocatello down here
6 to have an input on this breaching of these dams.
7 But we hope to bring back the salmon by my
8 testimony here.

9 My testimony would be on the migration
10 of the salmon and steelhead up to our headwaters.
11 Those fish, they come up from the ocean to spawn in
12 the headwaters up in the forests. And when they
13 come up there and migrate up there, they find a
14 spawning bed; pick this nice, soft little gravel
15 portions of the river, and they spawn.

16 And when they spawn, those parents, the
17 parent salmon, they turn white after they get
18 through spawning, they turn white. That means
19 they're aging. And after they turn white, they die
20 off right there in the river, after they do their
21 spawn -- lay their eggs.

22 Okay, the main portion of that, the
23 creator, he made it to be this way. That's his
24 creation, to have these fish migrate upstream and
25 go back to the ocean, and after four years, come

1 back up again, do the same. All right.

2 We know that the fish dies. You've seen
3 them out there in the headwaters, in the creeks,
4 after they've spawned. They turn white, then they
5 die there at the stream, and they -- they rot,
6 right there at the edges of the rivers.

7 Some of them float downstream, and their
8 bodies, the fish body particles begin forming. The
9 salmon turns to particles, which is the food for
10 them fingerlings; the smolts, as we call them.

11 They hatch up there, upstream at the spawning bed,
12 and they float downstream. And that particles of
13 the parents is the feed purpose of that downstream
14 migration of the smolts.

15 And now we talk about those four dams.
16 We want to breach them. And I'm for that, because
17 when that water -- those particles reach that still
18 water above the dams, tend to sink into the mud,
19 which turns to starve them fingerlings that's going
20 to be able to make it over the dam.

21 THE MODERATOR: I need you to wrap up now.
22 Thanks.

23 MR. PAPSE: And then the next dam will do
24 some worse. And then the downstream dams, the
25 forts can be sunk into the ground. And that's --

1 little fingerlings will have no fish, and they'll
2 starve to the rest of the over 100 miles to the
3 ocean. This is why we're losing our salmon.

4 THE MODERATOR: I need you to wrap up now.
5 I'm sorry, Frank. Your time's up. Thank you.

6 MR. PAPSE: This is what I want to say.
7 Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.
9 Laverne Bronco, Curtis Webb, and then
10 Jonathan Stoke.

11 LAVERNE BRONCO,
12 appeared and gave the following statement:

13
14 MR. BRONCO: Good afternoon. My name's
15 Vern Bronco, Shoshone-Bannock tribal member.
16 Natural resource with the tribe, natural resource
17 liaison for the tribe. When you guys listen to
18 these comments, pay strictly close attention to the
19 federally recognized treaty tribes.

20 I like what the colonel said. That will
21 take an act of Congress to breach the dams. Well,
22 the treaty tribes, their treaty was approved by an
23 act of Congress and signed by a president before
24 the dams were even put in. This is why we're
25 losing our culture, we're losing our tradition,

1 we're losing our fish, our way of life.

2 So when you do make those decisions,
3 think of the treaty tribes and what they're losing
4 first. They're the first natural
5 environmentalists. It's drilled into us. It's
6 inherited into us.

7 Like I says, think of our treaty, the
8 federally recognized treaty. There's a trust
9 responsibility that the federal government has to
10 these tribes for the lands that they gave up.

11 So when you guys make those decisions,
12 think of the treaties first, because the treaties
13 were established before the dams were put in. And
14 it's going to take an act of Congress to get rid of
15 those.

16 But the treaty tribes, the treaties will
17 not go. We will refuse to have our -- have
18 Congress relinquish treaty. So the treaties do
19 come first, when it comes to the federal trust
20 responsibility. Thank you.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Laverne.
22 Curtis Webb, Jonathan Stoke, and Mark Wilson.

23

24 CURTIS WEBB,
25 appeared and gave the following statement:

1

2 MR. WEBB: Thank you. I'm addressing both
3 documents today. My name is Curtis Webb. I'm a
4 fourth generation Idahoan. I practice law in
5 Twin Falls, Idaho. I am on the board of the Idaho
6 Rivers United, and I speak for myself and for that
7 organization as well.

8 THE MODERATOR: Curtis, if you could step up
9 a little to the mike. The people in the back need
10 to hear you as well.

11 MR. WEBB: I'm sorry. First, we cannot
12 maintain the status quo. I think that's obvious
13 from your paper. But let me just say a few things
14 about that. The status quo is a museum population
15 of salmon.

16 First the economy of central Idaho; it
17 hurts recreation for those of us that enjoy that
18 country, and it costs millions of dollars, millions
19 of dollars that are wasted. The current approach
20 simply is a waste of money.

21 Second option: Extinction. Not
22 available. It's not available, because it would
23 cost hundreds and perhaps thousands of jobs in
24 central Idaho. It would cause a dramatic loss of
25 recreational opportunity, it's prohibited by the

1 Endangered Species Act, and by the federal
2 government's obligations to the Nez Perce people,
3 the Shoshone-Bannock people, and other tribes in
4 the Pacific Northwest.

5 Fourth, I oppose flow augmentation.
6 This apparently is a big part of alternative three.
7 At high levels, flow augmentation will severely
8 damage south Idaho economy. I don't think that's
9 adequately addressed in the EIS; the cost in jobs
10 will be thousands and in dollars, millions, perhaps
11 tens of millions of dollars. It is not acceptable,
12 and the loss, the water we pay for, the jobs will
13 be lost by the ordinary people in south Idaho. And
14 secondly, it does nothing for the salmon, little or
15 nothing for the return of salmon.

16 So I support alternative four. I
17 specifically support bypassing the dams on the
18 lower Snake River. One, it will restore a healthy
19 population of salmon. Please understand the
20 difference between keeping the fish alive and a
21 healthy population. I think it's missed.

22 The only way we can have a healthy
23 population, a truly restored population, is the --
24 economic benefits to Idaho recreational benefits,
25 reduced regulation, and we won't need the spending

1 money or have augmentation.

2 Finally, let's not fool ourselves.
3 Fish-friendly turbines, removing predatory fish,
4 all those things, improved ocean conditions, won't
5 help the salmon. They won't do it. We have to do
6 something else.

7 Briefly, I want to read this statement
8 that Idaho Rivers United has given to our local
9 legislatures. Idaho Rivers United believes that
10 the salmon recovery strategies, that including
11 breach of four dams on the lower Snake River, the
12 one million acre-feet of additional water proposed
13 and the 427,000 acre-feet of water currently
14 provided from southern Idaho storage reservoir is
15 unnecessary for salmon flows.

16 Accordingly, Idaho Rivers United
17 supports taking the 427,000 acre-feet off the table
18 in any salmon recovery plan that removes the four
19 dams in southeast Washington state.

20 In other words, we don't need any flow
21 augmentation from the upper Salmon Basin, from
22 southern Idaho, if we breach those dams. We should
23 breach the dams. Thank you.

24 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Curtis. Jonathan,
25 and then Mark Wilson and Ron Hicks is on deck.

1 JONATHAN STOKE,
2 appeared and gave the following statement:

3
4 MR. STOKE: My name is Jonathan Stoke, and
5 I'm speaking on behalf of the Idaho Conservation
6 League, a southern Idaho salmon coordinator. Idaho
7 Conservation League supports alternative four in
8 the Corps EIS. Any decision on the All-H paper
9 should include, as its foundation, removal of the
10 earthen portion of the four lower Snake River dams.
11 We need salmon and steelhead, and those four dams
12 just don't make sense for people or for fish.

13 We would like to take this opportunity
14 to state clearly our position on southern Idaho
15 water, as there has been some misrepresentation.
16 Idaho Conservation League would support a
17 legislative solution that does two things
18 simultaneously.

19 One, bypass the four lower Snake River
20 dams; and two, take off the table any additional
21 southern Idaho irrigation water. Clearly, the more
22 than \$400 million annual economic impact to
23 southern Idaho's economy is the worst possible
24 solution to this dilemma.

25 The obvious solution is to partially

1 remove the dams while keeping whole agricultural
2 and transportation in eastern Washington and the
3 Lewiston-Clarkston area.

4 The final EIS should put forth a plan to
5 invest in the people and infrastructure effect by
6 natural river restoration.

7 For agriculture, irrigating from the
8 pond ditch behind the lower dam, extension of the
9 intake pipes to the natural river level, and
10 increase in pumping capacity should be examined.

11 For shipping Idaho's commodities,
12 investments should be made in railroad
13 infrastructure. The small amount of lost
14 electrical generating capacity can be easily
15 replaced, and this is cheaper than paying a huge
16 social and economic debt if the salmon go extinct.

17 We firmly believe that Idaho's economy
18 will be stronger after we restore a free-flowing
19 river with healthy salmon and steelhead fisheries.
20 Extinction is forever; these dams are not.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jonathan.
22 Mark Wilson, Ron Hicks, and on deck is Thad Barnum.

23 MARK WILSON,
24 appeared and gave the following statement:

25

1 MR. WILSON: Okay. My name is Mark Wilson.
2 I'm a member of the Shoshone-Bannock tribe. I
3 would like to say, I want to -- actually, I want to
4 get rid of the salmon dams, Snake River dams,
5 because they do not have fish safety passways, not
6 the colonial river dams. They have fish safety
7 passways.

8 I want to see the fish jump in the old
9 rivers, and people come out with family to catch
10 fish, and have fun with the -- yeah, have fun in
11 the old ways. Now, almost no family are coming,
12 because they know why the dams -- they know why.
13 The dams are killing the fish. Not all dams, but
14 the Snake River dams.

15 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mark. Ron, Thad,
16 and then Bruce Elmquist is on deck. If you can get
17 to the mike when you hear your name, that would be
18 great. Thanks.

19 RON HICKS,
20 appeared and gave the following statement:

21
22 MR. HICKS: My name is Ron Hicks. I'm a
23 Twin Falls business man. I used to own a taco shop
24 here in the '70s, but I had to close it down after
25 our last commercial salmon season. I'm here

1 representing myself and my family.

2 The issue of preserving wild fish stocks
3 in Idaho is largely one of morality and ethics.
4 Man has the moral obligation to himself to be a
5 steward of our natural resources. To allow the
6 extinction of any vast natural resource is to rob
7 ourselves and our children of unknown treasures,
8 and it's very bad stewardship.

9 We have become extremely greedy and very
10 shortsighted. In this context, I strongly favor
11 the overwhelming science that recommends breaching
12 the four lower Snake River dams, alternative number
13 four, aggressive breaching.

14 As usual, the argument is reduced to
15 economics, but there is a moral side to this as
16 well; namely, people and jobs. The economics of
17 survival. I want to look at some economic points.

18 The four lower dams were built with one
19 purpose in mind, to make Lewiston a seaport, and it
20 is successful. Power generation, flood control,
21 irrigation, and recreation are of minor economic
22 importance. Shipping is primary, but it is not
23 economically self-supporting, being heavily
24 subsidized by taxpayers at a very high cost.

25 Other costs include salmon mitigation

1 and other tax subsidized by other power users,
2 basically a \$3 billion failed experiment, and a
3 huge cost paid by the economies of Lewiston,
4 Orofino, Riggins, Salmon, Challis and Stanley in
5 lost recreation dollars. This is a high and is
6 becoming of more significant importance.

7 The actual economic value of wild
8 anadromous fish in Idaho is difficult to determine,
9 but it is very high, and I believe that the Corps
10 needs to reexamine its figures. They're grossly
11 underestimated.

12 Lots of people spend approximately
13 \$10,000 to fish for these kind of fish in Russia.
14 They could just as well do it here and help our
15 economy. We are not unique in evaluating fish
16 stocks. We need to realize this.

17 From the gulf to the northeast, people
18 have recognized this asset is valuable, and not a
19 liability. Many jobs -- not a liability, but
20 they've taken drastic steps just like dam breaching
21 to ensure survival.

22 Many jobs were changed and created, and
23 healthy fish stocks have brought healthier
24 economies than before. This is a win-win
25 situation.

1 If the dams are not breached, southern
2 Idaho will be asked to support another experiment
3 of questionable results, that being flow
4 augmentation. In other words, you will require
5 southern Idaho farmers and our local economy to pay
6 for fixing a problem created in the lower Snake
7 River. We can't afford it.

8 Gravity irrigation usually means family
9 farms, and family farms have been hit hard enough
10 already. Corporate takeover is waiting in the
11 wings for this to happen. Though there is no
12 simple solution to this problem, the simplest, most
13 cost-effective one is to breach the dams. It is
14 the best solution, the simplest, and the most
15 cost-effective. Thank you.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ron. Thad,
17 Bruce Elmquist and then Kent Laverty is on deck.

18 THAD BARNUM,
19 appeared and gave the following statement:

20
21 MR. BARNUM: My name is Thad Barnum, and I'd
22 like to speak for a special interest group that
23 hasn't been mentioned in any of the cost breakdowns
24 I've seen.

25 I'm a building contractor in the

1 Wood River Valley, and I see a huge boom in
2 construction once the salmon and steelhead are
3 brought back to fishable numbers. I am in favor of
4 option four, starting with removing the dams as the
5 first and most obvious step to recovering our
6 salmon and steelhead runs.

7 In the Wood River Valley we are seeing
8 the strongest economic boom ever, and it isn't
9 because of the cheap electricity or strong
10 industrial base. It's recreation that drives our
11 economy.

12 I'm not suggesting that Idaho needs to
13 be dotted with a lot of little Ketchums, but people
14 don't need much of an excuse to buy a piece of
15 property and put a cabin on it. I'm sure that the
16 lure of catching ocean run salmon and large numbers
17 of steelhead would appeal to many people a whole
18 lot more than skiing for \$50 a day.

19 If you look at the money being made in
20 the stock market, it's easy to see why our
21 recreation economy is thriving. And what these
22 people are looking for is what money can't buy them
23 in the cities where they live and make that money.
24 What's most prized is wilderness and some diversion
25 while they're enjoying it, such as cross-country

1 skiing, snowmobiling, hunting, mountain biking or
2 dirt bikes.

3 But there is something special about
4 living on or close to some great fishing water that
5 people love. Land on Silver Creek sells for five
6 times as much as on adjacent land not on Silver
7 Creek. The same is true for land on the Big Wood
8 River and the Big Lost River. There is no other
9 explanation for the development on the Madison
10 River below Quake Lake, other than the fishing.

11 The part of Idaho's economy that needs
12 the most help is the rural areas that have always
13 depended on extractive industries for their money.
14 These are the very same areas that would benefit
15 most from sport fishing-related building booms.
16 Towns like Clayton, Challis, and Salmon, and we're
17 not talking about jobs flipping burgers or selling
18 bait.

19 We're talking about the heart of the
20 community. The carpenters and apprentices,
21 plumbers and electricians, heavy equipment
22 operators, lumber yards, hardware stores. I find
23 it unbelievable that no economic benefit in the
24 construction sector was tallied on the side of
25 breaching.

1 There are thousands of miles of river
2 and tributaries that will be affected by better
3 fishing. And I would guess that a conservative
4 estimate might be 500 buildings a year from cabins
5 to ornate residences, as well as commercial
6 buildings.

7 At an average of \$50,000 per building,
8 that comes to \$25 million a year. That's a quarter
9 of a billion dollars in ten years, in the heart of
10 our depressed rural areas. I think that's an
11 economic factor worthy of note. Thank you.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Bruce Elmquist
13 and Kent Laverty, and Dick Dahlgren is on deck.

14 BRUCE ELMQUIST,
15 appeared and gave the following statement:

16
17 MR. ELMQUIST: My name is Bruce Elmquist, and
18 I'm a river guide in the Riggins area on the Salmon
19 River. I think that the livelihood of my family
20 and my community are as important as anyone else's,
21 and they depend on harvestable levels of salmon and
22 steelhead.

23 I have heard a lot of ideas expressed
24 since these hearings first began. Some, quote,
25 "facts" still stand out as the best guidelines on

1 this issue. The best science available
2 overwhelmingly points to the bypassing of four
3 lower Snake dams as the best chance of the
4 endangered salmon and steelhead have of recovering
5 to harvestable levels, as required by laws and
6 treaties.

7 All costs considered, it is the cheapest
8 option on the table. If the dams are not bypassed,
9 regulations mandated by the Endangered Species Act
10 will be more restricted to water-related
11 industries, including farming. The financial
12 hardships of those directly affected would be
13 mitigated.

14 I have heard many people say that we can
15 have dams and fish. Of these people, most of them
16 don't believe the fish are in danger of extinction,
17 or they think that hatchery fish will suffice in
18 the stead of wild fish.

19 Given the empirical and scientific
20 evidence before us, one has little choice but to
21 call this denial. The predators and environmental
22 conditions and cycles have existed for millennia.
23 What hasn't are the dams and the exploitative
24 extractive resource practices at the watershed.
25 The numbers are there and the science is there.

1 The government will be looking at the
2 bottom line, and I believe that is what will tilt
3 the scales in favor of the fish and the people who
4 depend on them. But to me, it goes much deeper
5 than that. It is the spiritual, moral, and
6 responsibility issue.

7 Ultimately, technology without wisdom
8 backfires on us. We have seen that a lot these
9 days, and it has become abundantly clear in this
10 situation.

11 The dams should never have been put in.
12 If the many people who would be affected the most
13 by the loss of the fish, the Indians, were regarded
14 as equals instead of second-class citizens, these
15 dams would never have been put in, and we would be
16 far more advanced in the development of low-impact
17 alternative sources of energy, such as solar, wind,
18 low-impact, small hydro, and efficient
19 cost-effective forms of transportation, instead of
20 the artificial system now set up which gives cheap
21 transportation to big business subsidized by the
22 U.S. taxpayer and the environment.

23 As one of those taxpayers, I am
24 vehemently against watching a fellow species become
25 extinct because we are too stupid or lazy to avoid

1 it, all the while paying into someone else's
2 profit market. We must take responsibility and
3 attempt to undo the damage we have done now. We
4 are lucky that we have an option that allows us to
5 do that.

6 We now know that the measures we have
7 taken to stem the decline of these fish haven't
8 worked. We should have realized that a long time
9 ago and started this process then. Now we have
10 precious little time left. We must do the most
11 effective thing now.

12 What is best for the people as a whole?
13 Clean, free-flowing, healthy rivers. If we let
14 these fish go, a piece of my spirit will go with
15 them, and whether you're aware of it or not, a
16 piece of yours will too.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Bruce.
18 Kent Laverty, Dick Dahlgren, and then Roy Aikens is
19 on deck.

20 KENT LAVERTY,
21 appeared and gave the following statement:

22
23 MR. LAVERTY: My name's Kent Laverty. I'm
24 executive director of the Idaho Wildlife
25 Federation. Idaho Wildlife Federation was formed

1 in 1936, Idaho's oldest statewide conservation
2 organization. We have 24 affiliates and 5,000
3 members throughout Idaho.

4 We are at a crossroads. Real
5 substantial efforts must be made to save Idaho's
6 salmon and steelhead. We can't tweak the system
7 anymore. We can't barge the fish around the dams
8 anymore. It's failed miserably. And the results
9 speak for themselves.

10 Six years ago a federal judge ruled that
11 the hydro system needs a major overhaul. That has
12 brought us to this point. The Idaho Wildlife
13 Federation favors partial removal of the four lower
14 Snake River dams in Washington, and the science is
15 overwhelmingly behind this option.

16 But we think the bigger question that
17 this region faces, the Magic Valley and southern
18 Idaho, is what happens if we don't remove the dams.
19 The cross-hairs are on Idaho water, as much as 1.4
20 million acre-feet of Idaho water.

21 The Bureau of Reclamation analysis says
22 that this could dry up 250,000 to 750,000 acres of
23 southern Idaho farmland. And the most likely
24 alternative to breach is aggressive action without
25 breach to uphold the federal judge's ruling.

1 And I quote from the 4-H paper brochure
2 when it talks about aggressive non-breach. And it
3 says, "The decision on breaching the lower Snake
4 River dams would be deferred, and the region would
5 pull out all the stops to implement other actions
6 to recover listed stocks."

7 And it also says under this option,
8 "Hydropower actions would include increased flows,
9 especially in the Snake River, and increased
10 spill." This would also necessitate aggressive
11 actions and habitat protection as well.

12 But these actions would not restore our
13 fishery. At best, we'd get a museum-piece fishery.
14 The Idaho Wildlife Federation supports breaching
15 without southern Idaho water. Southern Idaho water
16 must be taken off the table.

17 We are for saving people in rural
18 communities, saving Idaho water, and saving our
19 majestic fish. The economics of a restored fishery
20 are clear, but they absolutely must be more fully
21 explored in the draft EIS.

22 And with a commitment to invest in the
23 rail and highway infrastructure of the Lewiston to
24 Tri-cities corridor, we can create jobs, invest in
25 people, and compensate for the loss of 135 miles of

1 barge traffic.

2 This is not a scientific debate. This
3 is a social debate. With a commitment to work
4 together, we can save the fish and we can take care
5 of people. Bypassing the dams is not radical.
6 It's radical not to do it.

7 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Kent.
8 Dick Dahlgren, Roy Aikens, and Tom Stewart. For
9 your information, Tom would be number 19.

10 DICK DAHLGREN,
11 appeared and gave the following statement:

12

13 MR. DAHLGREN: My name is Dick Dahlgren. I'm
14 in support of alternative number four. I want to
15 talk to you today about a major flaw in your
16 studies about electricity and the cost of
17 electricity to irrigators.

18 This is today's Wall Street Journal, and
19 it daily quotes the rates of power, wholesale power
20 costs across the country. For your information,
21 the most expensive cost of electricity, as of
22 today, if you buy it off-peak, is the mid-Columbia.
23 You could buy electric power through the
24 Oregon-Nevada grid right now 30 percent cheaper
25 than you can in mid-Columbia.

1 Now let's talk about on-peak, during the
2 day. You can consistently buy power cheaper in
3 Chicago, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Today in
4 Chicago, it is cheaper to buy power, 30 percent
5 cheaper to buy power there than the mid-Columbia.
6 In Pennsylvania, New Jersey, 12 percent cheaper.
7 This is consistent day after day.

8 Now, some folks in southern and eastern
9 Idaho know about this. There's a group of rural
10 farming communities with rural electric companies,
11 which include Raft River Rural Electric, Lost River
12 Rural Electric, Salmon River Rural Electric,
13 Clearwater Rural Electric, and eight others in
14 central Oregon, one in Montana, who are buying
15 their power at wholesale rates from a company
16 called Pacific Northwest Generating Cooperative in
17 Portland, Oregon.

18 They are paying -- I called them, and
19 their website, for anybody's interest, is pngc.com.
20 I called up and talked to them. I said, "Can you
21 guys beat BPA's power?"

22 They said, "Consistently. We don't buy
23 from them. We beat them by 10 to 15 percent at the
24 very worst." So these guys are doing something
25 else.

1 The other thing I would like you to
2 consider in your study and re-address this is fuel
3 sales. That time is here. It is here. And
4 especially, if we're talking about taking out the
5 dams, and take ten years to do this, ten years from
6 now fuel sales are going to be a lot cheaper.

7 Bonneville Power Administration spent
8 \$3.5 million buying 110 fuel cells from Idaho
9 Corps' subsidiary, Northwest Power Systems, just in
10 the last month or two. 100 of them were for
11 residents, the other ten were for commercial use.
12 Instant Power in Washington is doing the same
13 things. So we've got some other choices out there.
14 You know, I sure would like you guys to address
15 that as well. And that's all I have to say.

16 I do have here 96 written comments from
17 people in supporting alternative number four that
18 are working folks in the southern part of the state
19 that couldn't make it tonight. I'd like to submit
20 those as well. Thank you very much.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dick. Roy Aikens,
22 Tom Stewart, and then Keith Hutchings.

23 ROY AIKENS,
24 appeared and gave the following statement:

25

1 MR. AIKENS: My name is Roy Aikens, and I
2 live in Riggins, Idaho and work as a steelhead
3 fishing guide, but I was raised in Jerome, Idaho.

4 As a youth, I had heard about salmon. I
5 had heard stories about the Snake River looking
6 crimson red underneath the BRIME bridge only about
7 a mile away from here, and how those unstoppable
8 creatures could swim all the way to the Nevada
9 border via the Owyhee River, Rock Creek, and Little
10 Salmon Falls Creek.

11 I can also remember asking my parents,
12 "How come I can't see salmon when I look out off
13 the BRIME Bridge?" I don't remember their
14 explanation or if they even had one for me. I can
15 remember, however, being told that if I wanted to
16 see salmon, all I needed to do was to go up north
17 to Stanley, visit Redfish Lake, then up to Shoup
18 and over to Panther Creek, and if that don't work,
19 just move downstream to the little Salmon River
20 near Riggins. "You'll see salmon," they told me.

21 This all made perfect sense to a boy my
22 age. As I grew older, many opportunities unfolded
23 to live and work and recreate in these places. And
24 still I hadn't seen any salmon. It was the early
25 1990s when it all became clear to me that with the

1 amount of free-flowing miles of the Salmon and the
2 acres of spawning bed still available, the problem
3 must lie downstream.

4 Now, if you remember at this time, the
5 Army Corps of Engineers and Bonneville Power blamed
6 the decline of our fisheries on everything but the
7 four lower Snake River dams. This was the first
8 red flag I had seen raised, and I knew this had to
9 be a farce.

10 So I got involved with the salmon
11 recovery, with my primary concern being the sockeye
12 salmon, realizing at the time, though, all Idaho
13 salmonoid species needed help dearly. So in 1995,
14 we decided to prove that Idaho's rivers were not
15 the problem, and that the dams on the lower Snake
16 River were.

17 To do this, three other men and myself
18 chose to duplicate the migration of sockeye smolt
19 from Redfish Creek to Lower Granite Dam on the
20 Snake River. This journey took us from the
21 free-flowing headwaters of the Salmon to the
22 fuel-tainted waters of the Great Snake Lake, and
23 finally, to the tombstone called Lower Granite Dam.

24 This experience brought me very close to
25 brother salmon, and made me tremble at the

1 destructive force these dams have put on our
2 rivers.

3 Since the Sockeye Survival Swim, I have
4 chosen Riggins, Idaho as my home. I work as a
5 whitewater guide in the summer and as a steelhead
6 fishing guide in the winter. I am now 28 years
7 old, and have finally seen three wild chinook
8 salmon in Idaho, and I feel very, very lucky to
9 have seen these.

10 It makes me sad to think economics will
11 decide the fate of this important creature that
12 should be so much a part of our lives. So please
13 make the right choice and fix the four lower Snake
14 River dams, and let the river run and the fish swim
15 free, so future kids from Idaho don't have to hear
16 about the salmon but can see them in their own
17 backyards, and be fed and enlightened by the
18 greatest visible tribute to life on our planet.
19 Thank you.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Roy. Tom Stewart,
21 Keith, and then Marsilene Boyer.

22 MR. STEWART: I'll yield to the end.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much, Tom.
24 Appreciate that very much. Keith, you're up.
25 Marsilene Boyer, and then Ardele Hanson.

1 KEITH HUTCHINGS,
2 appeared and gave the following statement:
3

4 MR. HUTCHINGS: My name's Keith Hutchings.
5 I'm an anadromous fish biologist with the
6 Shoshone-Bannock tribes. I've been an anadromous
7 fish biologist on the Columbia River for 12 years.
8 For the last at least seven years, we've been --
9 I'm not nervous. I'm real excited, because for the
10 last seven, at least seven years, we've been
11 presenting testimonies and comments in favor of
12 moth-balling the four lower Snake River dams. And
13 I considered waiting until later, but have gone for
14 way too many years with that message falling on
15 deaf ears.

16 I'd like to just provide a few sound
17 bytes from over the years. Back in 1993 at the
18 barging hearing in Boise: Build a pipeline for the
19 turbines, not for the fish. Go ahead and build
20 that conduit for the smolts, only instead of
21 putting the smolt in that big pipe, put the
22 turbines on it to generate electricity, so then you
23 can take the dams out and turn the river back over
24 to the fish.

25 Fix the rivers, not the dams. You've

1 tried to fix the dams for 25 years. Maybe, even
2 with enough technology to put men on the moon, the
3 dams cannot be fixed. It's time to quit trying to
4 fix the dams, and instead, fix the river.

5 Columbia, Snake River, or lakes. The
6 river, it's still called as such on maps, and the
7 pools behind the dams are called lakes.
8 Lake Sacajawea, Lake Herbert T. West, Lake Bryant,
9 Lake Lower Granite. But, I mean, a six-year-old
10 knows it's neither. They're reservoirs.

11 Garden of Eden versus the desert.
12 Senator Craig has stated that the irrigation system
13 in the Snake River has turned an inhospitable
14 desert into a Garden of Eden. In reality, what was
15 once a Garden of Eden of native plants, springs,
16 wildlife, and indigenous peoples, is now a desert
17 of monocultured agro-business.

18 Since 1995, not another nickel, do not
19 spend another nickel on studies and capital
20 improvements to the lower Snake River dams, less
21 those expenditures preclude taking the dams out in
22 1999, when that decision was supposed to have been
23 made. In the meantime, over \$100 million has been
24 spent on those improvements on the lower Snake
25 dams.

1 "If you take the dams out, we can't
2 barge the salmon." Our suggestion is to park those
3 barges at areas like Pittsburgh Landing and use
4 them as acclimation facilities for smolts.

5 What was once the world's largest run of
6 salmon is now the world's largest hydroelectric
7 system, and the world's largest and most expensive
8 restoration effort. What more needs to be said?
9 Save Idaho water, breach the four lower Snake dams.
10 Thank you.

11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Keith.
12 Marsilene Boyer, Ardele Hanson and Reed Burkholder.

13 MARSILENE BOYER,
14 appeared and gave the following statement:

15
16 MS. BOYER: My name is Marsilene Boyer, and I
17 am a member of the Shoshone-Bannock tribes of
18 Fort Hall, Idaho. The Shoshone-Bannock tribe's
19 policy is to pursue, promote, and when necessary,
20 initiate efforts to restore the Snake River salmon
21 and affected unoccupied land to a natural
22 condition. This includes the restoration of
23 component resources to conditions which most
24 closely represent the ecological features
25 associated with a natural river ecosystem.

1 The four-legged, the fish, and the
2 winged are our brothers, and cannot speak for
3 themselves. It is our responsibility to speak on
4 behalf of them. In the past, it was not necessary
5 to do so.

6 But now, at this day and age, it has
7 become a necessity. There are many living things
8 that have become extinct due to man's progress.
9 Whatever happens to them will also happen to man.
10 It is inevitable. Our forefathers have cautioned
11 us of it.

12 The time is fast approaching when we
13 continue to sacrifice living creatures in the name
14 of progress. It now becomes necessary to breach
15 the dams, and if I had it my way, I would breach
16 all dams. But that is unrealistic.

17 Restoring the natural river levels in
18 the lower Snake River reduces the need for Snake
19 River water for flow augmentation in the Columbia
20 River, requires 5,000 acre-feet of Snake River
21 water during 10 percent of the time of the year.

22 Restoration of the natural river levels
23 in the lower Snake River provides the best chance
24 of recovery of endangered salmon, steelhead,
25 lamprey, sturgeon, and trout, and leaves the large

1 storage reservoirs at stable and full levels.

2 Regarding the economics, restoring the
3 natural river levels in the lower Snake River
4 provides a significant annual economic benefit and
5 reduces the taxpayers and ratepayer's burden of
6 navigation and inefficient electricity production
7 costs associated with the four lower Snake River
8 projects.

9 I also want to say that the
10 Shoshone-Bannock tribes have long advocated that
11 there should be no harvest of salmon in the
12 mainstem Columbia River and the ocean, except for
13 minimal ceremony and subsistence. Instead, harvest
14 should occur in those tributaries that support it.

15 The legacy we provide to the future
16 generation is to provide protection of the
17 environment and our creator's creatures. Our
18 forefathers have protected and saved them for us.
19 Let us do the same for our descendents. Thank you.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Marsilene.
21 Ardele Hanson, and Reed Burkholder's on deck.

22 ARDELE HANSON
23 appeared and gave the following statement:

24

25 MS. HANSON: Hello. My name is

1 Ardele Hanson. I'm from Twin Falls and
2 representing the Magic Valley Fly Fishers. I
3 believe the only solution to restore Snake River
4 salmon and steelhead to self-sustaining and
5 harvestable levels is the removal of the earthen
6 portion of the four dams on the lower Snake River.

7 THE MODERATOR: Ardele, can you speak a
8 little bit more into the mike, please?

9 MS. HANSEN: I'll try. \$3 billion taxpayer
10 dollars have already been spent on failed recovery
11 methods. Contrary to a lot of popular thought,
12 removal of the earthen portion of these four dams
13 will actually eliminate the need for additional
14 water from southern Idaho.

15 If more water is taken from Idaho for
16 flow augmentation purposes, and as much as
17 1 million acre-feet per year has been suggested, it
18 could lead to 650,000 acres of southern Idaho
19 agricultural land being taken out of production.
20 That can translate to loss of over \$400 million a
21 year to southern Idaho farmers.

22 And if that isn't enough to convince
23 you, there are laws and treaties that mandate that
24 Snake River salmon be saved. Extinction will
25 almost guarantee the taxpayers tens of billions of

1 dollars in reparations to the north American Indian
2 tribes.

3 The math is out there. You've got to
4 figure out what makes sense. The dams do not make
5 sense for fish or for people. Thank you.

6 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ardele.
7 Reed Burkholder?

8 REED BURKHOLDER,
9 appeared and gave the following statement:

10

11 MR. BURKHOLDER: Hi, my name is
12 Reed Burkholder. Of course I favor breaching the
13 dams in the lower Snake. Good grief, Idaho
14 benefits. We benefit by returning fish, increased
15 recreation; our state becomes more attractive for
16 businesses to move to because we have finer rivers
17 and finer fish runs.

18 We also benefit in Lewiston by
19 deconstruction jobs. Where do you think they're
20 going to turn to when they take out Lower Granite
21 Dam for labor? They're going to turn to the
22 nearest town. That's Lewiston. Lewiston benefits.

23 I'd like to just say a few things about
24 electricity. What happens to our power rates if we
25 breach the dams? Well, I pay Idaho Power. My

1 power bill, and I suppose most of the people in
2 this room do as well. What happens to our power
3 rates at Idaho Power if we breach the four lower
4 Snake River dams?

5 Well, the answer is nothing. Nothing
6 happens to our power rates. Here's why. We get
7 our power from Idaho Power's privately owned
8 generating facilities, like, Jim Bridger, Brownlee
9 Dam, Hells Canyon, Oxbow, C.J. Strike, Bliss,
10 American Falls, Lower Salmon, Upper Salmon,
11 Swan Falls.

12 Now, I just read you the top ten. That
13 first one, by the way, is a huge coal-fired plant
14 in Wyoming. From the lower Snake River dams, as I
15 understand it, we get about one-sixth of one
16 percent of our power. But we live in an era where
17 power is cheap. It comes from many sources.

18 I encourage everyone in this room,
19 including the panelists, to go through a
20 self-education process on electricity. You don't
21 need to believe me that nothing is expected to
22 happen to our power rates. Why don't you just ask
23 some electricity experts? And let me give you a
24 few examples.

25 At the Idaho Public Utility Commission

1 office in Boise we have electricity experts. One
2 is Bill Eastley. Call him up and ask him. At the
3 Idaho Power Company we have electricity experts.
4 Ask an economist there. One of them's name is
5 John Church.

6 At the Northwest Planning Council office
7 in Portland we have electricity experts. That's
8 all they do. Dick Watson, John Fazio, Jeff King.
9 Call them up. Talk to them about electricity. Ask
10 them what happens to our power rates.

11 Pick up an annual report for the Idaho
12 Power Company. Go to the Wall Street Journal.
13 It's available every day. It will tell you what
14 the price is in Chicago. And you'll find out that,
15 good grief, in the last four months, power is
16 cheaper in Chicago than it is in Idaho on the
17 wholesale level.

18 Ask some questions. But find out about
19 this issue. Let's not go through this darned
20 breaching issue in the dark when it comes to
21 electricity. Educate yourselves, please. Thank
22 you very much.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. , Reed. Let's do
24 a quick check in here, folks. First, let me say
25 thank you very much for abiding by the ground

1 rules. It makes for a very nice meeting, to be
2 able to listen to everyone and hear what they have
3 to say, so thank you very much for that.

4 Reed was speaker number 23. And again,
5 we have over 140 signed up. So let me do a couple
6 things. Let me encourage you to please take an
7 opportunity to get -- to make your comments by tape
8 out in the room out here, and/or written comments.
9 Again, all comments are treated equally.

10 Also, want to again ask people who are
11 signed up tonight who have already addressed the
12 panel at some other meeting to pull their name off
13 the list entirely or to be willing to jump to the
14 bottom of the list and see how we get -- how far we
15 get before we all are comatose.

16 And we're going to take about a
17 10-minute break now. And if you're curious about
18 where you are or how long that will take, I'll be
19 glad to help you out. Ten minutes, we'll be back
20 at quarter to. Thanks.

21 (Recess.)

22 THE MODERATOR: Okay, we're going to get
23 started again. Our first speaker up is
24 Ester Boyer, and then Marquette Bagley, and then
25 Lynne Stone. Okay, Esther, you're on. Could we

1 have it quiet in the room, please? Thanks.

2 ESTER BOYER,

3 appeared and gave the following statement:

4

5 MS. BOYER: My name is Ester Boyer, and I'm a
6 member of the Shoshone-Bannock tribes. Last night
7 I attended the hearing held in Idaho Falls. I took
8 my six-year-old son with me. He wasn't too sure
9 where he was going. All he knew was that he was
10 going to Idaho Falls.

11 He began asking why we were going to
12 Idaho Falls. I told him we were going to a salmon
13 meeting. He thought we were going to eat some
14 salmon. He got all happy because he and his
15 cousins love salmon. He kept asking, "Where's the
16 salmon at?" I tried to explain to him that it's a
17 meeting where we're going to try and save the
18 salmon.

19 It was hard for him to comprehend the
20 fact that the salmon might not be anymore. Even
21 for me this is hard to understand. He has had the
22 opportunity to see some salmon return to the south
23 fork of the Salmon River, but what I'm concerned
24 with is for how long.

25 I fear he will never be able to witness

1 the salmon returning to where I used to go with my
2 family as a little girl, to the Yankee Fork, the
3 Herd Creek, East Fork, Baker Flats, and Bear Valley
4 and watch the salmon in the spawning beds. Will
5 any of our future generations be able to witness
6 salmon in any of these areas again? At the rate
7 the so-called recovery process is going, I fear
8 not.

9 I don't want for his legacy of the
10 salmon to be through old pictures or museums with
11 salmon stuffed hanging on a wall, or heaven forbid,
12 walking down the aisle at the grocery store and
13 purchasing a canned salmon from Alaska that we
14 heard was so abundant at last night's hearing, and
15 his equivalent to praying for and spearing a salmon
16 is opening a canned salmon with a can opener.

17 The Shoshone-Bannock tribes ask that the
18 regions consider the changes that were made in the
19 past 35 years in the lower Snake River, and weigh
20 the benefits and cost of those changes in order to
21 make a well-informed decision. : Whether to allow
22 progress to take the necessary steps toward
23 long-term sustainability of not just the fish and
24 wildlife resources, but of our own survival and the
25 survival of our children and their children.

1 Restoring the natural river levels in
2 the lower Snake River completely eliminates the
3 need for flow augmentation in the Snake River. If
4 the lower Snake River dams are not breached, then
5 at least one million additional acre-feet of water
6 will be needed from the middle and upper Snake
7 River.

8 The extreme changes that have been
9 endured in the past are unacceptable, and when the
10 animals, lands, and water are wiped out, uses of
11 the river must be compatible with the restoration
12 and protection of the natural and cultural
13 resources, instead of those resources being reduced
14 to mitigation measures. I support alternative 4.
15 Thank you.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ester. Okay,
17 Marquette Bagley, and then Lynne Stone and
18 Garth Towersap is on deck.

19 MARQUETTE BAGLEY,
20 appeared and gave the following statement:

21
22 MS. BAGLEY: Can you hear me? Okay. Hello,
23 my name is Marquette Bagley. I am the current
24 Miss Shoshone-Bannock, and I am also one of our few
25 tribal fisherman women, and I represent the

1 Shoshone-Bannock tribe and the Fort Hall Indian
2 Reservation.

3 A long time ago, before the dams were
4 built, the salmon were plentiful, having easy
5 access to and from the ocean. After the dams were
6 built, each year we have seen the salmon run
7 populations decrease.

8 The pure fact is these fish are just not
9 going to come back by themselves. They need our
10 help. Their habitat was altered, the dams, this is
11 the problem. I feel the dams should be breached,
12 and let the river run its natural course. Return
13 the river back to nature, as it once was.

14 I don't want to see these salmon become
15 extinct, because they have a traditional value to
16 my tribe, as well as many of the lower river
17 tribes. And you as well as I know that if anything
18 isn't done, these fish will be gone forever.

19 Being a woman who practices our tribal
20 traditions, I know how important it is to pass down
21 these traditions on to the next generations. I am
22 very concerned, because if the salmon populations
23 keep decreasing, what am I going to teach my
24 children and my grandchildren? They won't be able
25 to feel and know how it is to respect the power of

1 the salmon.

2 To be in the river with the spear pole
3 in hand, to work for your food. If the salmon are
4 not there, then there will be nothing to teach
5 them. And knowing that they might not one day be
6 there makes me sad.

7 The fish are a big part of our past, as
8 well as our future and beyond. That is why I am in
9 favor of breaching the dams, and I speak not only
10 for myself, but for my ancestors of long ago and
11 all of my people. I'd like to thank you for this
12 time, for listening to me. Thank you.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Marquette.
14 Lynne Stone, Garth Towersap and on deck is
15 Kyle Denney.

16 LYNNE STONE,
17 appeared and gave the following statement:

18
19 MS. STONE: I am Lynne Stone from Ketchum.
20 I'd like to begin by thanking Governor
21 John Kitzhaber from my native state of Oregon for
22 his support and genuine desire to save wild salmon
23 and steelhead. I thank him for his commitment to
24 breaching the four dams in Washington state.

25 But there's one other dam I would like

1 to talk about here today, the John Day. I disagree
2 with your decision to not go to phase 2. I believe
3 you have overestimated the cost and underestimated
4 the benefits. Growing up in Oregon, I watched
5 The Dalles and John Day dams being constructed.

6 I was 12 years old when Vice President
7 Richard Nixon dedicated The Dalles in October 1959.
8 The Dalles Dam buried Celilo Falls, an ancient
9 fishing and gathering grounds on the Columbia.
10 What a tragedy. I hope I live long enough to see
11 Celilo come back.

12 As a teenager, I water-skied on the
13 Columbia when there was still a current. Other
14 times we floated on inner tubes, and went along the
15 shoreline, feeling the strength of that mighty
16 river. But the river stopped flowing in 1968, the
17 year that John Day Dam was finished.

18 My dad was a county commissioner when
19 Vice President Hubert Humphrey came west to
20 dedicate the John Day. My family was at that
21 event. Little did we know then, that what a killer
22 that the John Day hydro-project would turn out to
23 be. This dam and its over 78-mile long slack water
24 pool it created kills more juvenile fish, I'm
25 told -- and I know it's debatable -- than any other

1 on this system.

2 I urge you not to dismiss considering a
3 draw down of the John Day Dam. Maybe not right
4 away, but in the future. Lowering the John Day Dam
5 pool would benefit juvenile fish migration and
6 restore historic spawning grounds.

7 I know that breaching the four dams in
8 eastern Washington and lowering the John Day pool
9 will require changes in river commerce, namely with
10 the barges. I'm well acquainted with barges. I
11 hauled grain to the Arlington elevator for ten
12 summers. My family still trucks the grain to Biggs
13 Junction or into Arlington.

14 But if we had the will and technology to
15 build eight dams, then Northwesterners can
16 certainly figure out a way to move grain and other
17 projects.

18 A word about barging fish. When I
19 return to Oregon and go down the freeway and see
20 the barges with our fish, I feel sick knowing most
21 of them will be dead by the time they reach
22 Astoria.

23 I'd like to say a word about our Idaho
24 politicians. I am outraged with you. I am
25 disgusted. You're letting our great salmon runs go

1 extinct. I hear you mumble about fish friendly
2 turbines, whatever that is. It's a contradiction,
3 at best. For advocating more barging, or
4 Wildwaters-type water slide, or getting rid of the
5 terns.

6 Give me a break. Our endangered salmon
7 don't need a ride. They need to stay in the river,
8 in a river that flows like a river. Breaching the
9 dam, lowering the pool at John Day, will help
10 achieve this. Thank you.

11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lynne. Okay,
12 Garth, and then Kyle Denney, and then
13 Ann Christiansen is on deck.

14 GARTH TOWERSAP,
15 appeared and gave the following statement:

16
17 MR. TOWERSAP: Hello. My name is
18 Garth Towersap, and I am also a member of the
19 Shoshone-Bannock tribes as well.

20 Briefly, I previously discussed about
21 the health benefits and stuff like that of how the
22 salmon and our relationship with the salmon, as
23 Native Americans, provides a mutual kind of
24 synergy. But now I want to talk about some other
25 things.

1 What I wanted to talk about primarily is
2 cost. Specifically, we've heard a lot of comments
3 about the cost. We've heard costs of breaching the
4 dam. We've seen the spreadsheets, we've seen the
5 presentations that were done. But there's a couple
6 things that need to be covered.

7 Firstly, there is the loss of the
8 tribe's culture. Previously this has been
9 discussed before, so I won't gloss over it, other
10 than to say that first of all, how does one assess
11 a value on a particular culture? I am certainly
12 certain that you don't know and neither do I,
13 because I have no idea.

14 Second of all, we talk about -- after
15 that, we talk about the loss of the tribe's health.
16 Previously I had mentioned that when we were
17 relocated down to the reservations, one of the most
18 obvious things that occurred is we lost access to a
19 lot of the cultural aboriginal lands and the game
20 and the fish and the plants that we had previously
21 subsisted on. And now, consequently, we are seeing
22 a serious epidemic of health-related diseases and
23 metabolic-related diseases, such as diabetes.

24 If you need to validate that, just
25 simply contact anybody at the Indian Health

1 Service. They will tell you all the information
2 that you would need to know about that.

3 Finally, as a result of diabetes and
4 these other diseases, consequently, the tribe as a
5 whole, and Indians as a whole, have a problem with
6 staying viable, because obviously, diabetes is a
7 disease that does tend to cut one's lifetime. And
8 then, how do you measure the cost of that again, as
9 well? Again, I don't know.

10 Finally, there is the cost of
11 litigation. You've heard the cost of litigation by
12 the Columbia River tribes and all the other
13 associated tribes as well. Certainly that would be
14 great.

15 But you also have to consider litigation
16 by other entities. You look at the outfitters, for
17 example. You look at the tourist industry of each
18 state. You look at the local and national
19 environmental groups. You also look at the fishing
20 organizations. They've already made their --
21 stated their point here and are continuing to speak
22 their say tonight. You also look at the northwest
23 states as well.

24 All these parties, all these entities,
25 will certainly be looking towards some type of a

1 reparation and remuneration for the loss of this
2 salmon. Certainly this will be a case that will be
3 unrivaled in scope, breadth, and, unfortunately,
4 cost. Thank you.

5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Garth.
6 Kyle Denney, then Ann Christiansen and
7 Lilisa Moses.

8 KYLE DENNEY,
9 appeared and gave the following statement:
10

11 MR. DENNEY: My name is Kyle Denney, and I am
12 a member of the Shoshone-Bannock tribes. I am here
13 to give my comments on the 4-H papers, habitat,
14 harvest hatcheries, and hydro.

15 The habitat we have is not the best, but
16 enough remains to accommodate more fish than are
17 returning to spawn and produce in the next
18 generation. The harvest on fish has been happening
19 for centuries. Something needs to be done to
20 ensure that current and future restrictions are
21 upheld by the gill net fisherman, both nationally
22 and internationally.

23 Hatcheries are prolonging the time for
24 the anadromous fish that are returning in declining
25 numbers every year. The hydroelectric dams are

1 killing millions, if not billions of salmon and
2 steelhead smolts every year.

3 The barging does not work. You wonder
4 what is happening to them after they are let loose
5 below the dam. Let me tell you what's happening to
6 them. They come out disoriented and confused,
7 making them prime targets for predators.

8 Above the dam, the slack water makes
9 them easy targets with no current to take them
10 swiftly downriver. They are easily picked off. We
11 know the major problem is dams. We need to take
12 out the four lower Snake River dams.

13 All my life I have been taught to hunt
14 and to fish, ever since I was old enough to walk.
15 It makes me feel good inside to see the animals and
16 the fish do their thing. My dad taught me
17 everything I know about my culture, and I would
18 like to have that opportunity to teach my kids.

19 I'd like to teach them how to hunt and
20 to fish. I'd like to share the same experiences
21 that I experienced with my dad and my family. I
22 want to pass on who we are to my kids. I would
23 like to show them where I learned to fish for
24 salmon, and that's on the Yankee Fork River and
25 Stanley Basin.

1 I can't fish there anymore because the
2 numbers are so low that if I speared one fish out
3 of that river, it might be the last one to ever go
4 up that river. It's not often in life you can
5 correct such a devastating wrong like making a
6 species go extinct.

7 Let's stop the wrongs before they
8 continue and we lose the chinooks and the
9 steelheads forever in Idaho. Let's not forget, if
10 they go, so does the bull trout, and so on.
11 Everything's intermixed. The effects will go
12 around and everything will be affected.

13 Let's help the salmon and the steelhead
14 to come back. There are so many things that will
15 disappear culturally and spiritually for you, me,
16 and my people if the salmon and the steelhead go
17 extinct. So I support the full breaching of the
18 dams so my culture and my spirituality can survive.
19 Thank you.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Kyle.
21 Ann Christiansen, Lilisa Moses, and Lowey Graves.

22 ANN CHRISTIANSEN,
23 appeared and gave the following statement:

24

25 MS. CHRISTIANSEN: My name is

1 Ann Christiansen, and I'm here tonight to represent
2 Taxpayers for Common Sense. Taxpayers for Common
3 Sense is an independent watchdog for the taxpayers
4 of today and tomorrow. The organizations on this
5 endorsement list -- and this list endorses the
6 removal of the four lower Snake River dams -- are
7 almost 1,000 different organizations; regional and
8 national and international groups, newspapers,
9 tribal groups, fishermen, businesses, scientists,
10 you name it.

11 But they represent a combined membership
12 of about 6 million people. They want the dams
13 removed, because the dams are damaging to the
14 taxpayers of the United States. This isn't their
15 only issue, but this is their biggest issue right
16 now. They've studied it from that aspect, from a
17 taxpayer's aspect, and they consider it a big
18 boondoggle. So please, remove the dams.

19 For myself, I think everything's been
20 said that needs to be said. We know why our fish
21 have gone extinct. Go to any hatchery in the state
22 of Idaho, and there it is, right up there on the
23 panels. These hatcheries are here to mitigate for
24 the dams. It's there, everybody knows it.

25 So what we need is our politicians. Are

1 they too afraid of the political consequences of
2 dam breaching to make salmon recovery a reality?
3 Our governor likes to say that we've been
4 concentrating on dam breaching for too long and
5 should consider other options.

6 It's taken years to get the dam
7 breaching option on the table, and it didn't get
8 there until every other solution had failed. I
9 encourage you to remove the four lower Snake River
10 dams. Thank you.

11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ann.
12 Lilisa Moses, Lowey Graves, and Doug Christiansen
13 is on deck.

14 LILISA MOSES,
15 appeared and gave the following statement:

16
17 MS. MOSES: Hi, I'm Lilisa Moses. And first
18 off I'd like to apologize. This is my fifth
19 hearing and I'm not passing it up, because I drove
20 seven hours to get here and I am taking time off of
21 work, and I have to drive seven hours back tonight
22 so I can make it to work in the morning.

23 Okay, the people who want to keep the
24 dams, I think, are scared of change. A change of
25 habitat, different roads, bridges, supposedly

1 higher electricity bills, different irrigation
2 methods, etcetera.

3 There is change every day. Ten years
4 down the road there will be numerous changes. Are
5 you scared of those changes? No. So there should
6 be no reason to be scared of breaching.

7 There is nothing that stays the same.
8 There will always be change. The water will still
9 be there if the dams are breached. You do not need
10 dams to irrigate farmland.

11 A long time ago, even before horses, the
12 Nez Perce nation and many other nations would
13 travel all over for fishing, hunting, digging
14 roots, gathering berries, etcetera. The
15 Nee-Mee-Poo nation would travel anywhere from
16 Rapid River to Celilo Falls.

17 We used to have a fishing chief who
18 would decide when he thought it would be a good
19 time to fish. If the runs were bad, he would tell
20 us to wait. If they were good, we were still only
21 allowed so much. We never took more than what we
22 needed.

23 We would always use all the fish that we
24 caught. We would use the fish head for soup, the
25 salmon eggs for more fishing or for soup too, the

1 back bones as combs. We are not wasteful and we
2 are not greedy.

3 In interpreting these 1855 treaties,
4 federal courts have established a large body of
5 case law that supports certain fundamental
6 principles, the conservation standards. One is for
7 the state and federal government regulations of
8 fishing rights to be permissible, it must be
9 demonstrated that the regulation is reasonable and
10 necessary for conservation of the resource.

11 Two, that the regulation and its
12 application to Indians is necessary in the
13 interests of conservation. Three, that the
14 regulation must not discriminate against Indians
15 exercising treaty rights, either on its face or as
16 applied, and four, that all measures must be taken
17 to restrict non-Indian activities before treaty
18 rights may be regulated.

19 Because tribal populations are growing,
20 returning to the pre-1855 levels, the needs for
21 salmon are more important than ever. A drink of
22 water, the aroma of roasting salmon or a bite of
23 crispy callous root are special reminders that
24 humans are nature's dependents.

25 Salmon are an indicator species. As

1 water becomes degraded and fish populations
2 decline, so do the elk, deer, roots, berries, and
3 medicines that sustain us. It is sacred for us
4 native people. Like when you go to church and have
5 communion with your bread and wine, this is ours.

6 At our feasts we use fish, roots, meat,
7 berries, and water. We do not want to lose a part
8 of our communion, in your terms, as you wouldn't
9 want to lose any part of your communion at any
10 church you may go to. Thank you.

11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Lowey Graves,
12 Doug Christiansen, and Timothy Pinkham.

13 LOWEY GRAVES,
14 appeared and gave the following statement:

15
16 MS. GRAVES: I am Lowey Graves here to speak,
17 to read a statement for a friend who is physically
18 unable to be here. My name is Ginger Harmon. I
19 live in Ketchum. I am here to represent Wildlife
20 Damage Review.

21 Wildlife Damage Review is a national
22 organization of about 3,500 members. It is an
23 educational nonprofit organization advocating an
24 end to the practices and attitudes that are
25 detrimental to native wildlife. I am a member of

1 the board of directors.

2 Wildlife Damage Review is deeply
3 concerned with saving the endangered salmon, and to
4 that end, we support bypassing the four dams of the
5 Snake River. Our concern goes beyond salmon, to
6 all the other wildlife who depend upon salmon as a
7 food source to survive, such as bears, eagles,
8 scavengers, and many marine species. Taking down
9 the dams is the best thing we can do to bring back
10 our anadromous fish population and to protect all
11 species dependant upon fish.

12 Scientific research supports this
13 position. Many issues associated with dams are bad
14 news for species and species habitat. There are
15 water temperature changes due to dams. Toxins
16 collect behind the dams due to runoff. Natural
17 flooding no longer re-supplies nutrients to river
18 bottom soils or help to clean out invasive species.

19 Dams impact the food change and the
20 ecological health of the entire river system.
21 Wildlife Damage Review supports alternative four of
22 the Army Corps' EIS. Wildlife Damage Review does
23 not support any decision on the All-H project
24 unless it includes partial removal of the four
25 lower Snake dams. The time has come to bypass

1 superfluous dams and restore our rivers, our wild
2 rivers.

3 And now I speak very briefly for myself,
4 as a concerned citizen for all natural species,
5 including all of us, the humans.

6 I was privileged about ten years ago to
7 witness one of the last, if not the last pair of
8 spawning chinook salmon in the shallow waters of
9 Valley Creek and Stanley. They were big and brave
10 and beautiful. I want in my lifetime to see this
11 happen again, and we better hurry up a bit.
12 Breaching the dams is a reasonable way to do this.
13 I thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lowey. Okay,
15 Doug, and then Timothy, and next is Lee Brown. If
16 you can get up to the mikes for us please, it would
17 really help. Thanks.

18 DOUG CHRISTIANSEN,
19 appeared and gave the following statement:

20
21 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Thank you for the
22 opportunity to speak with you folks. Is that close
23 enough?

24 THE MODERATOR: That's great.

25 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Great. In the conduct of

1 these hearings, it's my understanding that the lead
2 federal agency addressing this salmon recovery
3 program is the National Marine Fishery Services,
4 usually referred to as NMFS.

5 In 1975, when the Lower Granite Dam had
6 been put into operation as the last of the four
7 lower Snake River dams, the then-regional director
8 of NMFS stated publicly that the completion of
9 these dams would assure larger salmon return to the
10 upper Snake River. His statement promised the
11 return of large salmon populations to that
12 ecosystem.

13 25 years later, we see the reality of
14 what those four dams have meant: A failed recovery
15 program. 90 percent of our wild Snake River salmon
16 are gone. Coho extinct, sockeye virtually extinct
17 as to wild stocks. Spring and fall chinook, wild
18 spring and fall chinook, fewer each year. Hatchery
19 fish are not wild fish.

20 I am a retired carpenter, and I'm
21 convinced that adoption of alternative four,
22 retirement of the lower four Snake River dams, will
23 bring long-term benefit to the working people of
24 Idaho.

25 I also speak in support of the 1855

1 treaties with the Native American tribes of the
2 northwest. Bypassing the four lower Snake River
3 dams will restore 140 miles of free-flowing river..
4 The need for flow augmentation with southern and
5 eastern Idaho water will be minimized.

6 With the 1855 treaties, these nations
7 ceded over 40 million acres of their land to the
8 federal government of the United States. The
9 treaties, in their language, granted the tribes a
10 right in perpetuity to take fish in all usual and
11 accustomed places.

12 The U.S. government dams have flooded
13 many of these places, including the sacred Celilo
14 Falls. The four lower Snake River dams have meant
15 the final loss by the tribes of their salmon.

16 THE MODERATOR: I need you to wrap up,
17 please, Doug.

18 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: The salmon have for
19 thousand of years been crucial to the tribes as
20 food source, and for traditional spiritual
21 inspiration.

22 THE MODERATOR: I'm going to cut you off now,
23 Doug. Your time's up.

24 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Thank you for the
25 opportunity to address you. Make the right

1 decision for the people.

2 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Doug. Timothy and
3 Lee Brown, and then Bill Chisholm.

4 TIMOTHY PINKHAM,
5 appeared and gave the following statement:

6
7 MR. PINKHAM: Hello. My name is
8 Timothy Pinkham. I'm here to testify on behalf of
9 the future generations of Nez Perce children and
10 salmon, because they cannot be heard.

11 Fishing is very important to my people
12 and the animals that eat salmon flesh. My body has
13 grown accustomed to salmon flesh. My body needs
14 it. When I eat salmon, I remember the times that
15 I've had fishing with my loved ones, and now it
16 seems those times will no longer exist in the
17 future. Salmon brought more than just a meal. It
18 brought me closer to nature, my loved ones, and to
19 my creator.

20 Do you believe that if the salmon
21 becomes extinct that another animal is not close
22 behind it? If we lose the salmon, we will all
23 lose. If you remove the dams, you will remove
24 yourself from having to repay my people for lost
25 salmon. What is going to cost less?

1 I believe the dams will eventually be
2 removed. It is just a matter of when. This is
3 just a part of the democratic system. It is time
4 for a change. Quit trying to control something
5 that cannot be controlled.

6 Admit to your mistake. Clean up your
7 mess. Let mother earth take over. She's fed my
8 people for thousands of years, and how long did it
9 take for the dams to bring the salmon to
10 extinction? How long did it take before it was
11 understood that dams kill salmon?

12 We fed Lewis and Clark when they were
13 starving. Now return the favor. If my ancestors
14 would have known that this was going to happen,
15 Lewis and Clark would never have made it.

16 I'd just like to finish up by quoting my
17 father out of his book. "Sometimes I try to get
18 people to compare plant and animal species with
19 their own body parts. For instance, the buffalo
20 would be a finger, the passenger pigeon another
21 finger, the peregrine falcon another finger. The
22 wrist would be the sockeye salmon."

23 If you relate these body parts to these
24 species, how many would you eliminate before you
25 say stop? You can get along pretty well if you

1 lose a finger, but if you keep on doing that, when
2 is it going to be enough?

3 I've learned this philosophy from my
4 elders. Even Joseph himself said, "I am of the
5 earth." Well, if you consider yourself part of the
6 earth, you won't sacrifice those body parts. Thank
7 you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Timothy. Lee
9 Brown, Bill Chisholm, and then Paul Todd is on
10 deck. Now, Bill, if you can get up and be ready,
11 that would be helpful, and Paul Todd then. Great.

12 LEE BROWN,
13 appeared and gave the following statement:

14
15 MR. BROWN: Good evening. The constraints of
16 180 seconds makes it kind of compressed, so I'll be
17 pretty fast and concise. My name is Lee Brown.
18 I'm a resident of Blaine County. I represent
19 myself.

20 I hope the following doesn't sound as
21 ostentatious to you as it does to me. But I am a
22 water scientist. I'm a professor emeritus and a
23 consultant. In the 1970s I was the director of the
24 United States Department of Energy Institute for
25 Water and Energy.

1 In the 1980s I was the lead consultant
2 for the Texas Department of Water Resources as they
3 rewrote their master plan to the year 2040. And in
4 the 1990s I was a Ford Foundation consultant for
5 similar problems on the upper Sacramento River with
6 some of the pumps and problems they had there.

7 All of that's background to the
8 following. And that is, I've reviewed the
9 literature, I've examined the methodology, I've
10 read the BC analyses, and I came to one single
11 conclusion.

12 And that is, alternative four, to me,
13 best achieves the objective of sustaining the
14 target species. There's a wonderful habitat up
15 where I live. If we can just get the fish to them,
16 I think they'll thrive. Thank you very kindly.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lee. Okay, Bill,
18 and then Paul Todd, and on deck is Thia Konig.

19 BILL CHISHOLM,
20 appeared and gave the following statement:

21
22 MR. CHISHOLM: Having just lost a loved one,
23 I'm here tonight with a heavy heart.

24 THE MODERATOR: Bill, can I get you to state
25 your name for the record, please?

1 MR. CHISHOLM: Bill Chisholm. Having just
2 lost a loved one, I'm here tonight with a heavy
3 heart. But my heart would be far heavier if I
4 didn't come here tonight and add my voice to those
5 speaking for the salmon, which have no voice in
6 this process.

7 The issue is not just about the survival
8 of salmon. It is also about us and what kind of
9 species we are, and whether we believe our gross
10 over-consumptive lifestyle is justification for
11 pushing another species of life to extinction.

12 Albert Einstein once said, "We cannot
13 solve our problems at the same level of thinking at
14 which we created them." Technological fixes don't
15 work in a natural world. They only act as a
16 band-aid and create the illusion of long-term
17 solution.

18 Breaching of the four lower Snake River
19 dams is the only viable, long-term option. Bargaining
20 fish down a river is ludicrous, and dam
21 modification is merely old problems of creative
22 thinking and poor level economics for those that
23 created the problem in the first place.

24 Today's Times-News carried a full page
25 ad trying to paint the breaching issue as a job

1 issue. "Do you care about Mike?" Yes, I do care
2 about Mike, and I believe that if we truly change
3 our level of thinking, Mike and future generations
4 of Idahoans can have good jobs that are part of the
5 solution.

6 Grain can be shipped by rail more
7 reliably and less expensive. Those that load
8 barges can load freight cars. There are great
9 opportunities in alternative energy conservation
10 and energy efficiency. There are also economic
11 opportunities, chances at self sufficiency in the
12 maturing of natural salmon stocks and free-flowing
13 rivers.

14 I want to go on record that I support
15 the breaching the four lower Snake River dams,
16 alternative four. I am against augmentation using
17 southern and eastern Idaho water. But if that
18 became necessary, I'd say you should take that
19 water from the livestock concentration camp
20 industry, also known as CAFOs industrial dairies
21 and hog factories. Thank you.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Bill. Paul Todd
23 is number 36, for those of you counting, and then
24 Thia Konig and James Turner is on deck.

25 PAUL TODD,

1 appeared and gave the following statement:

2

3 MR. TODD: My name is Paul Todd, and I'm from
4 Hailey. And I'm here representing myself, and also
5 the Idaho Conservation League, of which I am a
6 board member.

7 I have five points to make, and I'll be
8 really brief. The first is that I support
9 breaching of the four lower Snake River dams.
10 Second is I support alternative four in the Army
11 Corps EIS. Third, is any decision on the All-H
12 paper must include partial removal of the four
13 lower Snake dams.

14 Four, I care about people too, and I
15 support investments in agriculture in eastern
16 Washington and improved railroad infrastructure to
17 ship grain from the Lewiston area. Five, the dam
18 removal will create a free-flowing river and
19 additional southern Idaho water will not be
20 necessary.

21 And finally, we have a clear opportunity
22 to keep the Snake River salmon and steelhead
23 species from becoming extinct. I vote we do it.
24 Thanks.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Paul. Thia Konig and

1 James Turner, and on deck is Tom Pomeroy.

2 THIA KONIG,
3 appeared and gave the following statement:

4
5 MS. KONIG: Hi, my name's Thia Konig, and I'm
6 in support of option four and on the H paper, the
7 removal of four lower Snake dams.

8 How embarrassed and ashamed I will be if
9 I have to explain to the next generations to come
10 that, "Oh, sorry about the salmon. Yeah, we had
11 all these hearings and all that, you know. We had
12 a chance to save it, but I don't know, we just sat
13 back, shrugged our shoulders, and watched this
14 species go extinct."

15 We're not doing a very good job of
16 stewarding this planet. We have not inherited the
17 earth from our fathers, but we are borrowing it
18 from our children.

19 Breaching the dams: One, it's the only
20 way to save the salmon; two, it's the law; and
21 three, in the long run, it's the cheapest solution.
22 We've already spent \$3 billion unsuccessfully
23 trying to barge the salmon, put them through the
24 turbines and all that sort of stuff. You know
25 what? It doesn't work. And by the year 2017,

1 they're going to be extinct.

2 The hatcheries, all the fish there, you
3 know, they become diseased. It's like a daycare
4 center. One of them gets a cold and it just
5 spreads. And they're all in-bred. They're
6 traveling around in schools, but they're all
7 morons.

8 The fish need a current. They need a
9 current to restore the runs, and the only way to do
10 that is to remove the dams. Not only a good idea,
11 but it's the law. We signed this treaty back in
12 1855, you know, with the Indians. And we traded.
13 They gave us some land, and we said, "In return,
14 we'll let you fish the salmon forever." Now, if
15 for some reason the salmon go extinct, we're not
16 going to be able to live good on our treaty.

17 And how does a whopping \$10 billion
18 lawsuit sound? Because that's what will happen.
19 And I'll support them, you know what I mean, if
20 they do that. And I know Congress doesn't really
21 pay attention, or politicians don't pay any
22 attention to the spiritual wealth of things, but
23 yeah, money talks. So how about a \$10 billion
24 lawsuit?

25 Right now we have grain in the river and

1 fish in the trucks. How about we use the trucks
2 and the rail for the grain and the paper, and we
3 let the salmon have the river. It will only cost
4 one cent more per ton. Right now we're subsidizing
5 the river transport, \$1.10. It will only be one
6 cent more a ton to put the grain on the trucks.
7 Hmm, another one cent a ton, \$10 million lawsuit.
8 Okay.

9 There will be some other subsidies we
10 have to do. We pay people not to grow, we pay
11 farmers not to grow crops so we can come up with
12 some other subsidies. I think we'll have to put an
13 irrigation pipe in somewhere along the line. But
14 you know what, whatever the cost it takes, we have
15 to do it, because it's cheaper in the next
16 extinction.

17 Salmon are the spiritual piece to the
18 puzzle. What good is a puzzle if you're missing
19 some pieces? The most costly thing we can do is
20 nothing. And we can afford to lose the dams, but
21 we can't afford to lose the salmon.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Thia.
23 James Turner, Tom Pomeroy, and Shelly Braatz.

24 JAMES TURNER,
25 appeared and gave the following statement:

1

2 MR. TURNER: My name's James Turner. A
3 recent economic study performed by Ken Casavant and
4 Eric Jessup of the Department of Agriculture and
5 Economics at Washington State University has a
6 report to the Idaho Wheat Commission, and it's
7 right here.

8 It shows that the combined cost of
9 trucking grain to Snake River ports and then
10 barging it to Portland is actually greater than
11 taking it to a railhead and shipping it by train.
12 The study shows that with some minor regional
13 variance, rail rates with 25 to 26 rail car
14 loadings are considerably cheaper than truck barge
15 rates for all regions.

16 It goes on to question with this cheaper
17 rate, one may speculate why a larger volume of
18 wheat is not transported via rail. It also states
19 that rail car shortages are known to exist during
20 certain time periods, which may direct wheat to
21 barge truck that would otherwise move via rail.

22 The port of Lewiston moves on average
23 approximately 750,000 tons of what they describe as
24 wheat and barley shipments annually, which equates
25 to 7 percent of the total grain moved through

1 Portland.

2 Idaho agricultural statistics state that
3 Idaho alone grows over three million tons of wheat
4 annually, and approximately 4.5 million tons are
5 produced in Washington per year. Of the roughly
6 7.5 million tons of wheat produced annually between
7 the two, not to mention wheat from the surrounding
8 states, these numbers indicate that just a small
9 percentage of this region's commodities are
10 actually moved through the port of Lewiston.

11 These figures seem to suggest that the
12 American taxpayer is being asked to pay millions of
13 dollars per year for an inefficient barge
14 transportation system.

15 It also seems to demonstrate an arrogant
16 unwillingness and uncompromising greed on the part
17 of a minuscule number of farmers to give up this
18 sparse subsidy, i.e. free money, and fully utilize
19 a transportation system that has proven from state
20 to state to be quite effective, and promises to be
21 even more so with a bit of investment.

22 As somebody that comes from one of the
23 richest wheat producing regions in the
24 United States, the Montana high line, I wonder how
25 the farmers there have managed to stay in business

1 this long without direct access to a 140-mile long
2 waterway to ship their product to market.

3 Of the roughly 60 million tons of wheat
4 produced there annually, only a tiny amount,
5 approximately 5 percent, is moved through Lewiston
6 by barge.

7 The same can also be asked of farmers in
8 the most prolific wheat producing state in the
9 country, North Dakota. And how, for that matter,
10 did Idaho and Washington farmers do it before the
11 four lower Snake dams were built?

12 The answer? They moved and continue to
13 move a majority of their product by rail and truck,
14 even in places like Ohio, Illinois, and Tennessee,
15 states with extremely effective and well-utilized
16 barge transportation systems. Trucks and trains
17 are very often turned to for moving agricultural
18 commodities and other products to market, depending
19 on the cost at any given time.

20 I know we all have to feed our families,
21 and I'm also aware there is a fierce loyalty among
22 the ag communities in the west, and that the powers
23 that be have once again succeeded in polarizing the
24 populous.

25 We must cultivate a common ground to

1 assure that affective, though fair, resolution is
2 achieved. Bypassing the four lower Snake River
3 dams makes far better sense for a greater amount of
4 people.

5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, James. Tom and
6 then Shelly and Andy Munter is next.

7 TOM POMEROY,
8 appeared and gave the following statement:

9
10 MR. POMEROY: Hello, you guys. My name's
11 Tom Pomeroy, and I grew up in Puget Sound and I
12 moved to Central Idaho in 1974. I'm here to speak
13 up for salmon tonight and support alternative four.
14 I also hope being here tonight helps, because I'm
15 starting to lose some -- I believe in government
16 still, but I'm starting to lose faith.

17 I've written countless letters, I've
18 gone to many, many public hearings, tried to work
19 for good candidates, and we're losing. We're
20 consistently losing on this effort.

21 And I don't trust the politicians in
22 Idaho. They're not leaders, they're stallers, and
23 we need -- you guys are hearing the facts; you know
24 the science. You need to speak up for what's
25 right.

1 then Andy, if you can be at the next mike, and then
2 Susan Roman is on deck.

3 SHELLEY BRAATZ,
4 appeared and gave the following statement:

5
6 MS. BRAATZ: Hi. My name is Shelly Braatz.
7 Amy Irvine said, "We have opened the door to a new
8 millennium. We must choose what we will carry with
9 us into the future and decide how much human greed
10 and machinery we can bear to shoulder on that
11 journey. Will we take wilderness or just its
12 memory?"

13 I support alternative four in the Army
14 Corps EIS and alternative D for maximum protection
15 in the All-H paper. I believe that in the days
16 that these dams were built, we were largely unaware
17 of the impact that they would have on our
18 ecosystem.

19 Now we realize that the extinction of
20 these salmon could occur as soon as 2017. I hope
21 that removing these four dams will not only allow
22 the fish to return, but will bring back a healthy,
23 natural flowing river and ecosystem.

24 As a river instructor for a nonprofit
25 organization called NOLS, which stands for the

1 National Outdoor Leadership School, I talk to kids
2 in the wilderness. I talk to them about leaving no
3 trace. I talk to them about using our enlarged
4 brains and our opposing digits to maybe protect and
5 respect the environment, as opposed to exploiting
6 it.

7 One of the rivers that we run is the
8 Salmon, and it would be shameful to have to tell
9 these kids that there are no more salmon in the
10 Salmon River.

11 I think that if we work together as a
12 community, that we human beings can adapt to the
13 loss of these dams. The fish, on the other hand,
14 unfortunately, have not been able to adapt to the
15 dams.

16 We have the ability to undo the harm
17 that we have inflicted upon this ecosystem. The
18 question is, can we convince the politicians to
19 protect the environment, instead of protecting the
20 economic needs of some special interest groups? I
21 hope so for the sake of future generations.

22 We must be the change that we wish to
23 see in the world. Thank you.

24 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Shelly. Andy and
25 Susan, if you can be at the mike, Susan Roman, and

1 then next is Lynn Kincannon.

2 ANDY MUNTER,

3 appeared and gave the following statement:

4

5 MR. MUNTER: My name is Andy Munter. I'm an
6 Idaho Rivers United boardmember and businessman in
7 the Wood River Valley. In the summer of 1979, my
8 seven-year-old son was fishing on the Salmon River
9 for the first time with his uncle.

10 He came home so excited because a fish
11 this big swam between his legs. He has never
12 forgotten it, and I have never forgotten the look
13 on his face. Giving up on saving these magnificent
14 fish is not an option for me.

15 You're being asked as a society to make
16 some difficult decisions that boil down to either a
17 fish recovery strategy or fish maintenance
18 strategy, until the political climate changes and
19 the dams come down. I support option four on the
20 4-H paper.

21 Leading the politicians that say that we
22 can have the four Snake River dams and fish runs is
23 signing up for maintenance of token fish runs. We
24 can probably maintain most of these runs for a long
25 time if people from the northwest are willing to

1 sacrifice.

2 We are hearing that maintenance means
3 cutting out all harvest from Stanley to Alaska,
4 stopping all grazing and logging on all Idaho
5 salmon streams, more extreme float boat
6 restrictions in Stanley, billions more on barging,
7 hatcheries, and dam modifications, and almost
8 assuredly more southern Idaho water, all to protect
9 a few special interests in northern Idaho and
10 protecting only a token run of fish.

11 This discussion is about four dams, four
12 bad dams. Progress is realizing we made a mistake.
13 I support breaching, compensation for effective
14 users, and no more southern Idaho water. The
15 science is in. Now we must deal with the
16 politicians.

17 I suggest that now we all work at
18 changing our politician's minds. And if that
19 doesn't work, we must work at changing our
20 politicians. Thank you.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Andy. Susan?
22 Susan, are you with us? Okay. Lynn? I think we
23 heard from Lynn earlier. Are you going to speak
24 for yourself this time, Lynn? Is that what's going
25 on here?

1 MS. KINCANNON: Yes.

2 THE MODERATOR: All right, thanks. And then
3 Sarah Michael, and then Karen Fisher is up next.

4 LYNN KINCANNON,
5 appeared and gave the following statement:

6
7 MS. KINCANNON: Thanks for letting me speak
8 for myself. I didn't really want to speak for the
9 commissioners that much. I am Lynn Kincannon. I
10 work for the Idaho Conservation League. That's
11 Idaho's oldest and largest statewide conservation
12 organization. We're 27 years old.

13 I've been with the group for ten years,
14 and I came here prepared to make policy statements
15 like we usually do at these kind of hearings, but a
16 lot of other people have done that better than I
17 would.

18 So I'm just going to speak personally,
19 that I favor breaching the dams. You've already
20 heard ICL's position on that from Jonathan earlier.
21 So I'm just going to speak for a second as a
22 parent, because I don't think that group's been
23 represented here tonight. I mean, it has, but no
24 one's spoken about that in particular.

25 And as a parent, I'm concerned about my

1 neighbors, and that means my neighbors in north
2 Idaho and in southern Idaho, and what effect
3 restoring salmon runs will have on them. And so I
4 would say, as ICL has said, let's mitigate for
5 those problems by improving the infrastructure on
6 the railroads and by saving Idaho's water and not
7 giving anymore of Idaho's water, because we won't
8 need to if we take the dams out.

9 I also think jobs will be replaced.
10 This is a capitalist system. That's what happens.
11 People lose their jobs and then new jobs come
12 along. Around a half million oil workers lost
13 their jobs in the '80s, and they seem to have found
14 other jobs. So I think other people can do that
15 too.

16 We can replace power, we can conserve
17 it. As a parent, I tell my children about these
18 things a lot, and they understand that we can't
19 replace wild salmon. You folks are in a position
20 to make decisions that could allow that to happen,
21 so I hope that you will. Because what I'm really
22 concerned about is the message that we're giving to
23 our children, which is we need to focus on
24 economics almost exclusively, and that isn't the
25 way it should be.

1 We're teaching them that we should focus
2 narrowly on what's best for me today, and we're
3 teaching them to fear the future and to fear change
4 and to say that we can't change anything. And
5 that's the wrong message to give to them, because
6 our Native American neighbors have said that there
7 are spiritual reasons to save the salmon.

8 And I would say that for European
9 Americans, which is most of us that are here, it is
10 a moral, spiritual, religious responsibility to
11 take care of everything on the earth, including the
12 salmon. These are amazing creatures; we need to
13 protect them. So please do.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lynn. Sarah and
15 Karen Fisher, and then Jim -- I think it's Slanetz.
16 Thanks.

17 SARAH MICHAEL,
18 appeared and gave the following statement:

19
20 MS. MICHAEL: My name's Sarah Michael, and
21 I'm on the board of directors of the Sun
22 Valley-Ketchum Chamber of Commerce. I support
23 alternative four.

24 Everybody has pretty much said what I
25 wanted to say tonight. I feel it's the time to

1 breach the dam and save the salmon. Salmon -- and
2 it's time to develop a strong economy based upon
3 environmentally sound practices. So we hope you'll
4 support alternative four.

5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Sarah. Karen, and
6 Jim, and then Sue Peterson.

7 KAREN FISHER,
8 appeared and gave the following statement:

9
10 MS. FISHER: My name is Karen Fisher. I'm a
11 medical health professional and businesswomen up in
12 the Wood River Valley. The journey that ended me
13 up in this room tonight started in a sea kayak up
14 in Alaska a number of years ago. And I am the kind
15 of person who doesn't fish much, doesn't care to
16 fish much, and probably could eat my fish out of a
17 can.

18 But anyway, with a group of friends of
19 mine, we went up to Alaska for adventure and to see
20 the grizzly bears, which I thought was going to be
21 the big topic. And what happened was we were there
22 at the beginning of the salmon run. And let me
23 tell you, I was awestruck. And right after I was
24 awestruck, I was sick, because I realized that when
25 I grew up in the Sacramento Valley, that's what the

1 Sacramento River had at one time. And in my adult
2 growing up up here, that's what we had at Redfish.

3 And I thought, what in the heck have we
4 done? And why can't a bunch of people from the
5 lower 48 come up and see what I saw? It was
6 magnificent. So I want you to know that I support
7 breaching of the dams; I support anything you need
8 to do to get these fish back to us.

9 And I don't care about paying more for
10 electricity; I don't care about paying more of my
11 taxes to help retrain these people that are --
12 their jobs are taken away. Whatever we need to do,
13 we need to do it, and we need to do it soon. Thank
14 you.

15 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Karen. Jim and
16 then Sue Peterson and then Sally -- I think it's
17 Donart.

18 JIM SLANETZ,
19 appeared and gave the following statement:

20
21 MR. SLANETZ: Hi, my name is Jim Slanetz,
22 and I'm from Ketchum. After looking at the
23 alternatives presented, alternative four breaching
24 of the dams definitely seems to make the most
25 sense. Not only does it give the salmon and

1 steelhead a fighting chance of survival, it also
2 has the least impact on water for Idaho farmers.

3 The minimal number of salmon returning
4 attests for the fact that barging really isn't
5 work. Ing. As far as the port of Lewiston, is it
6 really a port or a town on the river that we tried
7 to make a port in the name of progress, and at
8 immense cost to the taxpayers? That taxpayer cost
9 can be used to lessen the impact on the commerce in
10 that area.

11 Bypassing the lower Snake River dams and
12 whatever else we can do to help the Snake River
13 return to its free-flowing state is the least we
14 can do to help the steelhead and salmon return to a
15 healthy level. Thanks.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jim. Sue and then
17 Sally, and then Wiley Ellis. Sue, are you here?
18 Sue Peterson? Are you Sally? Okay, great. Go,
19 Sally. Thanks.

20 SALLY DONART,
21 appeared and gave the following statement:

22
23 MS. DONART: My name is Sally Donart, and I
24 am here to support the alternative four in the
25 Corps' draft EIS, the removal of the earthen

1 portion of the dams.

2 I've lived in Idaho 50 years, in Weiser,
3 and now in the Wood River Valley. My husband was
4 an attorney, and his specialty was water law. And
5 I learned very early how important water is to the
6 state of Idaho.

7 Over the past 50 years, we've had many
8 projects that have used Idaho's water. We have to
9 ask at what cost. Remember the coal-fired plant
10 they were proposing outside of Boise? It was
11 defeated because it used too much water.

12 But free flow is not flow augmentation
13 fleshing. When those dams were built, oh, yes, one
14 of the speakers said -- we were told how great it
15 was. We had the fish ladders, we had barging, we
16 had flushing, and etcetera. , to the tune of
17 \$3 billion. That's money out of our pockets.

18 We only need to look at the fish flows
19 below those four dams. The fish have healthy flows
20 in their streams below the dams. How long do we
21 have to admit we've made a mistake? You know, if I
22 hit my thumb with a hammer, I would quit hammering
23 my thumb, wouldn't I?

24 We've all made mistakes and had to maybe
25 adjust, maybe pay a little bit more in order to

1 correct the mistake. But we don't want to do --
2 take water from the farmers here in the lower --
3 the upper Snake River Valley. That's very certain.
4 But we do want to continue the flow of the river.
5 Otherwise, the salmon, the interrelated
6 connectedness of life will be jeopardized.

7 I appreciate your time and your
8 attention. I appreciate all the people who have
9 spoken today, and I hope that you will see that it
10 is the courageous thing to do, to breach the dams.
11 Thank you.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Sally. Wiley and
13 then Philip, I think it's Popner, and then
14 Dan Casali.

15 WILEY ELLIS,
16 appeared and gave the following statement:

17
18 MR. ELLIS: My name is Wiley Ellis. I have
19 no political, religious, or economic affiliation or
20 agenda. I live in this biosphere. I'm not going
21 to address fact, figures, treaties with indians,
22 loss of jobs or economics, as these are already
23 addressed in the literature and people's comments.
24 My message is more idealogical.

25 I belong, we belong, to the human

1 species, which has been around for about 5 billion
2 years. I also belong to a group known as
3 homosapiens, which have been around for about
4 150,000 years. I'm not very proud of my
5 membership.

6 If you've read some books on
7 anthropology, you learned that we got here mostly
8 by luck and chance. At birth, every member of our
9 species inherits the duty of guardianship and
10 caretaker of the other species. Why? Because we
11 arrived at this point as humans not only by luck,
12 chance, and natural selection, but by some
13 intelligence as well. But we are not so smart. We
14 are consuming and misusing habitat of other
15 species.

16 During my short life I've lived and
17 worked in a few parts of this country. I've also
18 traveled alone to other continents, lived and
19 worked in the bush and the jungles with the
20 indigenous people and other species. I've found
21 that most homosapiens are arrogant, egocentric,
22 greedy, and controlling species, compared to the
23 others.

24 This is especially true with a subgroup,
25 three or four subgroups within our species, which I

1 am also a member of: The Anglo-Saxons; the fat
2 cats. Look at what we've done to the
3 Afro-American, the American Indian, the Eskimos,
4 the Aborigines, all of whom I've lived with.

5 We foul our very own water, air, and
6 soil. We think that the American dream of more,
7 more, more; faster, faster, faster, improves our
8 quality of life. We even spent billions convincing
9 the rest of the world that our way is better. Why
10 are we talking about the moon and now Mars, about a
11 possible place to relocate? No, I'm not that proud
12 to be a member.

13 My message is this. I implore each and
14 every one of you to reevaluate your lifestyle, your
15 wants, your needs, your values, for the sake of
16 this biosphere and other species. I have.

17 I ask you to live simplistically, slow
18 down and simplify, so that other species may simply
19 live, even if it means backing up and having less.
20 I have. Many of us here tonight say that you can't
21 start over or change, but you must. Remember, we
22 belong to the most intelligent species. The
23 salmon, once gone, cannot start over.

24 Several years ago I fished commercially
25 for salmon as a summer job. I'll never forgot what

1 my skipper said to me while we were picking the
2 salmon out of the nets rolling in over the back
3 drum, as if gasping for air. "What if they could
4 scream?" And they're screaming now.

5 In summary, I do not believe that most
6 people think on their own. Usually people listen
7 to their mom, dad, sister, brother, wife, husband,
8 neighbor or neighbors, who usually have incorrect
9 information in telling them about what to think.
10 Heck, most of you could not describe the difference
11 between the republican or democratic platform, and
12 you're getting ready to vote for the next
13 president.

14 Research the facts yourself from sources
15 that have no political or economic agenda, and see
16 where the facts take you. Let's stop this analysis
17 paralysis and responsibly breach the dams. Thank
18 you very much.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Wiley. Philip,
20 Dan Casali, and then Gene Harding.

21 PHILLIP POPNER,
22 appeared and gave the following statement:

23
24 MR. POPNER: I am Phil Popner, a professional
25 engineer and part-time farmer in Blaine County. I

1 support breaching the dams as the major item in any
2 plan to save the salmon. The best is alternative
3 four. This we must do. Salmon are an unrenewable
4 resource.

5 45 years ago, I worked on the Brownlee
6 Dam in Hells Canyon and saw that salmon run end.
7 The barging of smolts around the dam did not work.
8 It still doesn't work, any of it. When will we
9 learn?

10 I don't want my irrigation water taken
11 to speed up the trip of young salmon headed for the
12 ocean. It won't work. The first study years ago
13 said breach the dams; do it. That is still the
14 most important part of any plan to save the salmon.
15 Breach the dams. Thank you.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Phillip. Dan, and
17 then Gene, and then Debra Kronenberg.

18 DAN CASALI,
19 appeared and gave the following statement:

20
21 MR. CASALI: Hi, my name is Dan Casali. I'm
22 a resident of Blaine County. The science is clear.
23 The lower four Snake dams must be breached if the
24 Salmon are to recover. Breach the dams.

25 20 years and billions -- billions -- of

1 dollars have been spent on barging dams and dam
2 modifications, and they've proven a failure. We
3 wouldn't be here if they weren't a failure. Breach
4 the dams.

5 The salmon are going. We're failing
6 them now. We know what to do, but we lack the
7 courage to act. Breach the dams.

8 The salmon are leaving; we're failing
9 our children. We're failing our heritage. It's
10 time to breach the dams.

11 Are we going to allow Redfish Lake to
12 become Deadfish Lake? Do we have to rename the
13 River of No Return? What, the River of No
14 Commitment, the River of No Courage, the River of
15 Political Expediency, or more simply, the River of
16 No Fish. It's time to breach the dams.

17 You'll be remembered for your decisions
18 that are ahead in the next few years. Will you be
19 remembered with pride? Can you look your children
20 in the eye and say, "I made a difference at a
21 critical time"? Please, breach the dams. Thank
22 you.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dan. Gene, and
24 then Debra, and then Hugh Fice, I guess it is. Go
25 ahead.

1 GENE HARDING,
2 appeared and gave the following statement:

3
4 MR. HARDING: I'm Gene Harding. I live in
5 Ketchum. I'm a whitewater rafter and kayaker. I
6 support alternative four and am in favor of
7 breaching the dams.

8 I believe that the beautiful waters, the
9 beautiful summer waters that are so crystal and
10 clear would be more beautiful and more exciting
11 with the fish for which the river was named. I
12 hope that the river will return for the fish.
13 Thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Gene. Debra, are
15 you with us? Great, thanks. Debra and then Hugh,
16 and after Hugh is Harold. I'm having a hard time
17 reading the last name, but I think it's
18 H-e-u-p-e-r, or H-e-l-p-e-r; I'm not sure which.
19 Go ahead.

20 DEBRA KRONENBURG,
21 appeared and gave the following statement:

22
23 MS. KRONENBURG: Thank you. I'm
24 Debra Kronenburg. I'm a lawyer from Ketchum,
25 Idaho, located in the Wood River Valley in Blaine

1 County. On occasion, I represent Fish and
2 Wildlife.

3 I was struck with the sense of awe and
4 disbelief, frankly, when our human population
5 numbers reached 6 billion. At such a stratospheric
6 figure, our obligation to the other species on this
7 planet is both magnified and intensified.

8 At stake here is the extinction of
9 salmon. Salmon are a species whom many of us on
10 this planet consider sacred. Salmon are the totem
11 of the Pacific Northwest; and salmon, some would
12 say, my friend the professor particularly, define
13 our region.

14 At stake also are our uncontrolled
15 behaviors, whether reproductive or consumptive. ,
16 are behaviors which will lead to our own extinction
17 as well. Since I truly believe that we, as a
18 species, have the capacity to moderate our
19 behaviors and find a considered balance where we
20 are not destroying this planet ourselves and the
21 other species who share this earth with us, I
22 support the immediate breaching of the four lower
23 Snake River dams. I support the return of a
24 natural river. The scientific justification is as
25 clear as the moral imperative.

1 It may not be enough. On my worst days
2 I fear it is not enough. It may not be that silver
3 bullet we've heard about a couple times here today,
4 but it is a start, and a good one. It won't bring
5 back the falls and the fishery at sacred Celilo,
6 but it may bring back the salmon to Idaho.

7 I obviously am speaking for maximum
8 protection. Breaching the dams, and I also am
9 speaking for the draw down of the John Day Dam, or
10 the pool behind the John Day Dam.

11 I think we've reached the time in our
12 history where we just have to take a stand. I
13 don't know how much more any of us can say. We've
14 all been saying it; I've been saying it; I think
15 some of you have been saying it. I hope the
16 message to Congress is clear, and I thank you for
17 staying up with us tonight.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thanks. Thanks, Debra.
19 Hugh, and then Harold, and then Duane Reynolds.

20 HUGH FICE,
21 appeared and gave the following statement:

22
23 MR. FICE: My name is Father Hugh Fice. I'm
24 a benedict monk and resident of Jerome County. I'd
25 like to see what contribution of that perspective

1 might make for discussion.

2 So I'm going to begin with a story for
3 my tradition, or culture. It's a story about Saint
4 Cuthbert, an Anglo-Saxon monk. He was traveling
5 one time with a helper, and they were hungry and
6 didn't have any food.

7 They saw an eagle catch a salmon, and
8 the helper took the salmon, but Cuthbert made him
9 give half the fish back to the eagle. Then the two
10 men arrived at a farmer's hut. The lady of the
11 house cooked the fish and they shared it with her.

12 There are four points I'd like to draw
13 from this story, the first of which is that
14 Cuthbert and his companion are hungry. They're
15 vulnerable. Provision of the fish for the eagle
16 and for the saint and his companion is a good gift
17 emanating from a realm of history.

18 The fish, the river, the earth,
19 constitute a creative wonder that manifested its
20 beauty and its savagery, the creator of whom
21 through we live and move and have our being.

22 The second lesson is that Cuthbert sees
23 the eagle not as a rival for the fish, but as a
24 companion. Though human beings have a special
25 place and a special responsibility in nature, they

1 share the bounty of their ecosystem with all the
2 other creatures.

3 Thirdly, Cuthbert and his helper shared
4 the fish equally with the lady who cooked it.
5 There is no absolute human right to the proofs of
6 the earth or to the earth itself. Love of
7 neighbor, the integrity of the earth, now and for
8 future generations, and the needs of all people
9 present and future, supersede any property right.

10 Fourthly, the story shows some
11 acquaintance with the behavior of an eagle now long
12 extinct in England. We know a lot more about
13 eagles and salmon now than Cuthbert knew, but we
14 don't know everything, so we're going to have to
15 make some choices on partial data.

16 But not to make part and informed
17 choices now or wait until there is more facts and
18 more opinions is to do away with the wild salmon.
19 The choices facing us are not simply economic
20 choices or choices which concern only the people of
21 our state, or even the whole watershed. Our
22 choices concern an environmental web that only
23 unites us with all the people in the world and with
24 generations to come.

25 Our goals should be the common good and

1 the good of the commons which are ethical,
2 aesthetic, and spiritual, not just economic.

3 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Hugh. Harold, and
4 then Duane Reynolds, and then Rob Blick.

5 HAROLD HUYSER,
6 appeared and gave the following statement:

7
8 MR. HUYSER: I am Harold Huyser from
9 Shoshone. I am an endangered species. I haven't
10 heard only one or two other people speak here; I'm
11 a farmer. I raise wheat, potatoes, corn, cattle.
12 I have a feed lot. We fatten about 5,000 cattle a
13 year. I haven't heard another cattleman speak here
14 tonight. I am an endangered species.

15 I hope you save me with some of these
16 idiotic things that have been said tonight. Number
17 one, if they're going to breach the dams, and I
18 want you panel to hear this. They've done it for
19 five years; why haven't more salmon come back than
20 what has? We've sent 10 million acre-feet of water
21 down there, and salmon have not increased that
22 much. If you breached the dams, you're going to
23 want all the water in the Snake River Basin, and
24 that still wouldn't bring the salmon back, I don't
25 think.

1 The scientific evidence for the Corps
2 and the different people sitting up here, the
3 National Fisheries, it's not proven that breaching
4 the dams and turning more water down there is going
5 to bring these fish back.

6 The other thing, all the sediment in the
7 bottom of those dams, like was mentioned, what is
8 that going to do? Fish swim really good when
9 they're swimming in sediment going upstream, I'll
10 tell you that. They couldn't do better, so you
11 better consider that. How long is it going to take
12 to flesh that sediment out of those dams? It isn't
13 going to be done very quick, I'll tell you that.

14 The other thing is the cost of barging
15 commodities out of Lewiston. It will cost not a
16 cent of what it will cost from 10 to 13 cents a
17 bushel more to barge wheat or the shipping rate out
18 of Lewiston than it does now if you put it on other
19 forms of transportation.

20 One gallon of fuel will move a ton of
21 commodity by the rail for 520 miles, or something
22 like that. A gallon on the trucks will move only
23 50-some miles, and the price of fuel is going to be
24 more than that. It's going to pollute our air more
25 than it ever was before.

1 The next thing is about the power.
2 There has been several things that have said about
3 the power that I've read in the last few days.
4 There will be enough power lost to light equal to
5 the whole amount of -- that it would take to light
6 the city of Seattle, which is about 2 million
7 people. That power is significant.

8 The power will be something that I pay.
9 My power bill's about \$80,000 a year, and I am real
10 serious about paying anymore. I am an endangered
11 species. We can't send anymore power than what we
12 have now, I'll tell you that.

13 So I want you to consider these things,
14 above all the other things that are said. I am in
15 the driver's seat where the money is changing
16 hands. A lot of these people don't know what it is
17 to produce a product. We produce a product every
18 day, I'll tell you that.

19 So listen to what this endangered
20 species has to say about the water. Thank you.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Harold. Duane,
22 and then Rob Blick.

23 DUANE REYNOLDS,
24 appeared and gave the following statement:

25

1 MR. REYNOLDS: My name is Duane Reynolds.
2 I'm from Twin Falls, Idaho, and I'm speaking on my
3 own behalf and that of my three children.

4 For almost 200 years we've been using up
5 the west faster than it can be renewed. We cannot
6 continue at this ever-quickenning pace. Too soon we
7 will be destitute, having traded our birthright for
8 a mere bowl of porridge.

9 If our children and grandchildren are to
10 have a west worth living in, we must learn to
11 listen to the salmon and to their kin. They speak
12 clearly but softly, so to hear them we must be
13 quiet and patient, too.

14 We must stop proclaiming, as if our
15 words made it so, what they must do to live with us
16 and listen instead, so that they can tell us what
17 we must know, know for ourselves as well as for
18 them.

19 What will they tell us? What they
20 whisper already is that we have unraveled too far
21 the web in which we and they live, and of which
22 they are only one part. ; that in spite of our best
23 efforts, we have yet to arrest that unraveling.
24 Which of us knows what may fall through those
25 holes, or when the unraveling will stop?

1 We ignored for too long and will now pay
2 the price. More will be paid, whatever we do.
3 Barging will cost, drawdowns will cost, breaching
4 will cost. But losing the salmon would cost much,
5 much more.

6 We have already paid far too much to
7 lose as much as we have already lost. \$3 billion
8 wasted to barge smolts past killing dams. I would
9 add also the loss to fishermen, and to those who
10 rely on their livelihood or their sport; more than
11 25,000 jobs lost already in the Columbia Basin. ;
12 \$500 million in earning power.

13 I would add also the loss to the tribes
14 whose life way centers on salmon, and whom we once
15 promised would have salmon forever, and they would
16 fight no more for their lands. It would cost us
17 dearly to break that promise, \$10 million or more,
18 and our honor in the bargain.

19 But if you want to know the full cost,
20 ask also the river and those creatures living in or
21 near it and who depend upon it for life. If you
22 listen to them too, you can then fully sum what has
23 already been paid and how much more would be lost.

24 For too long we have in error believed
25 that all that the river gives us is free. But the

1 song is now over and the piper must be paid. And
2 even if it was not asked to call the tune, still we
3 danced while it played.

4 Regardless what else must be done, the
5 four lower Snake River dams must be breached. It
6 is the only way to begin. It pays our debt most
7 while costing us little. While these dams stand,
8 we cannot succeed what else we may try.

9 We must restore and protect our
10 streambeds and water. We must support those who
11 help salmon by managing their own lands well, and
12 insist on better stewardship of our own public
13 lands.

14 And the greedy, the selfish, the
15 short-sighted and resentful, must be often and
16 clearly reminded that these things are our common
17 heritage and belong no more to them than to any
18 other American. They belong not to no one, but to
19 all. Thank you.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Duane. Rob Blick,
21 then Martha Hollenhorst, and Neil Bahen. Rob, are
22 you here? I have Rob Blick next, and then Martha.
23 Is Rob not here? Okay.

24 Is Martha here? Okay, Martha, you're
25 on, and then I have Neil -- I think it's B-a-h-e-n,

1 but I'm not sure. It's a little difficult to read.

2 MARTHA HOLLENHORST,
3 appeared and gave the following statement:

4
5 MS. HOLLENHORST: My name is
6 Martha Hollenhorst, and I'm from Hailey, Idaho.
7 And I work in a bakery, but I consider it a
8 tourist-related job.

9 And we all say that we want to save the
10 salmon, but the current course of action is
11 obviously not working. The salmon population has
12 dropped dramatically since the dams were built. I
13 think breaching the dams is the best solution for
14 salmon survival.

15 I would rather spend money to help
16 relieve the economic effects of dam breaching than
17 to lose the salmon from this area. Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Martha. Okay. Is
19 Neil here? Any Neils? Neil was number 63, for
20 those counting. And Phil Blick, is there a Phil?

21 Steve Munson, are you here? Great,
22 Steve. And then after Steve is Jack Rose, and then
23 Gerald Tews. Okay, Steve, you're on.

24 STEVE MUNSON,
25 appeared and gave the following statement:

1

2 MR. MUNSON: My name is Steve Munson. I'm
3 the CEO of Vulcan Power Company. I'm the head of
4 the Native Range Alliance, which is doing native
5 seed restoration work on the high desert, and we
6 have an initiative called the Renewable Salmon
7 Initiative.

8 The purpose of being here tonight is to
9 talk about context, the context of the studies that
10 have gone forward so far. I'm here tonight to
11 address the comments on the lower Snake, primarily
12 the alternative four cost benefits analysis and the
13 John Day draw down and the 4-H paper.

14 I'm in favor of breaching the dams on
15 the Snake, and I'm in favor of reopening the
16 comments, that the Corps has said that it's going
17 to quit the analysis going on on John Day Dam. I'm
18 in favor of reopening that. I believe the
19 cost-benefit analysis work that we've done shows
20 clearly that that needs to be reopened.

21 We've done three things. We've looked
22 outside the box, we've looked at the context of the
23 study, and we have also done cost-benefit analysis.
24 If we had additional time here, I would go through
25 many of the numbers. I'm going to have to give you

1 just the top end of what we've done so far.

2 We suggest four new ideas. We suggest
3 keeping the irrigated farmland at Ice Harbor,
4 37,000 acres of irrigated ground. We'd like you to
5 look into a canal to bring the water down by
6 gravity so that the costs are much reduced, both as
7 to capital costs initially and operating costs of
8 getting that water to the farms.

9 Number two, we suggest the BPA look at
10 the transmission line corridor and consider having
11 a fiberoptic line put on that corridor, perhaps by
12 private enterprise, and put in five industrial
13 parks, infrastructure in the port areas and in the
14 tribe areas, and train people for new jobs in the
15 new economy. We think that you can find a company
16 that would contract to do that.

17 Number three, we recommend that the
18 uplands, which are degraded in the areas where the
19 rivers run by restored with native plants. We have
20 a research project with four universities to do
21 that. We'd like to work with the Corps and perhaps
22 with BPA to get the restoration done. It should be
23 done as part of this effort. That's where the
24 water falls, that's where the soil runs in. That
25 adversely impacts the fish.

1 We also believe that you should look at
2 alternative power. We have 1,000 megawatts of
3 geothermal power. We have power in the states of
4 Oregon and Idaho that are unused. Natural, clean
5 steam that would cost less than 1-20th of one cent
6 to 1-30th of one cent per kilowatt hour to replace
7 those dams, the four dams on the Snake.

8 It will cost less than 2-20ths of one
9 cent to 6-20ths of one cent to replace the
10 John Day. It should be done. BPA has not been
11 doing its work. You've wasted \$15 million looking
12 at geothermal power and it's time that you do
13 something about it.

14 Ten years since I suggested your entity
15 look at geothermal, and there's not a kilowatt on
16 line in the northwest, and you're not close. You
17 need to do your job. Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Steve. Jack Rose,
19 Gerald Tews, and Joey Graff. Jack, are you with
20 us? Okay, Gerald, how about you? Is Gerald still
21 here? Joey Graff? After Joey is George Lemmon, I
22 think, or Lamar. Go ahead.

23 JOEY GRAFF,
24 appeared and gave the following statement:

25

1 MS. GRAFF: Good evening, I'm Joey Graff,
2 vice president of the Native Range Alliance in
3 Bend, Oregon. The Native Range Alliance is
4 comprised of committee members representing both
5 environmental and agricultural issues. It's
6 charged with the mission of coordinating the
7 development of ideas, research, and technology
8 between government, academic, private, and public
9 stakeholders in order to advance restoration of our
10 rangelands with the native plants.

11 Our goal is to improve salmon and
12 steelhead habitats by improving the uplands through
13 a comprehensive program enhancing healthy wildlife
14 habitat and rangeland watersheds.

15 There are many resource concerns facing
16 the high desert and Great Basin rangelands to which
17 the Snake and Columbia Rivers flow; in particular,
18 a declining habitat for wildlife, including salmon,
19 have been amongst the biggest concerns.

20 Loss of native plants increases the
21 noxious weeds and annual grasses as a direct result
22 of the declining wildlife, big game, and salmon.
23 At the same time, the hydrologic cycles are
24 severely interrupted with some vast amounts of
25 water, which flood and erode the land, fill the

1 streams and rivers with soil and/or pesticides,
2 which is detrimental to the salmon's existence.

3 Reduced livestock grazing on public
4 lands is adversely affecting many communities in
5 the western states. Our goal to improve grazing
6 lands will increase forage amounts in these areas,
7 as well as improve the salmon habitat.

8 Our Native Range Alliance, the
9 foundation being the Native Range Restoration
10 Project, a three-tiered program including research,
11 education, and demonstration, offers a solution.
12 The project is comprised of a unique ten-year
13 program of applied research with quantifiable
14 rangeland ecosystem hearing health targets and
15 annual reporting on research findings and results.

16 The native range project has the support
17 of conservation, farm, and ranch organizations, and
18 leaders from both political parties in Oregon and
19 the southwest. We are expanding this collaboration
20 to become a coordinated multiple-state effort.

21 I would like today to submit to the
22 Corps of Engineers our Native Range summary packet;
23 it's for your review. We would be providing this
24 packet not only to you, but also to federal and
25 state programs. We feel this is a very

1 comprehensive program, and can benefit not only the
2 salmon habitat, but all of the rangelands as well.
3 Thank you.

4 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Joey. Okay,
5 George Lemmon is next, and then Vince Alberdi and
6 Myron Hunig.

7 GEORGE LEMMON,
8 appeared and gave the following statement:

9
10 MR. LEMMON: I'm George Lemmon from Hagerman,
11 Idaho, and I've been in the fish culture business
12 for 35 years, raising trout, salmon, sturgeon in
13 the Hagerman Valley. There are four issues of
14 salmon recovery I would like to address at this
15 time.

16 Fish ladders. Fish ladders need to be
17 built -- am I close enough?

18 THE MODERATOR: There you go.

19 MR. LEMMON: Fish ladders need to be built
20 fish friendly. Salmon are not marathon runners.
21 They are sprinters. They cannot make long runs
22 through fast water. They need a rest stop between
23 jumps. I suggest that fish ladders need to be
24 built on a 2 percent grade, 100 feet between
25 two-foot drops with a quiet zone between the drops.

1 This will enable the salmon to climb over the dams.

2 Nitrogen. Water dropping into a pool
3 more than seven feet deep, nitrogen in the air
4 bubbles is absorbed into the water along with
5 oxygen. The Army Corps of Engineers says that the
6 concentration of nitrogen cannot exceed 10 percent
7 per million. We in the fish industry cannot raise
8 trout or salmon in water with nitrogen levels above
9 2 percent.

10 With augmented flows over the dams into
11 the pools below, the air and the bubbles -- falling
12 water is driven into the pools. The nitrogen kills
13 the salmon and provides feed for the seagulls below
14 the dams.

15 Predators. I cannot understand why
16 sportsmen, commercial fisherman, and the Indians
17 are allowed to take the endangered salmon brood
18 stock returning to their spawning grounds. Natural
19 predators must be controlled. That is, sea lions,
20 terns, and me.

21 Feed is the fourth one. And if salmon
22 or smolt are not getting feed enough in the water,
23 they cannot develop. Thank you for listening.

24 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, George. Vince,
25 and then Myron and Mike Buckley.

1 VINCE ALBERDI,
2 appeared and gave the following statement:

3
4 MR. ALBERDI: Good evening. My name is
5 Vince Alberdi. I'm the general manager of the
6 Twin Falls Canal Company here in Twin Falls. And
7 the company, to tell you a little bit about it, I
8 thought I might give you a little story about how
9 the company was formed and how many acres we have
10 here in the Twin Falls area, being that you're
11 visiting.

12 The company provides irrigation water to
13 some 202,690 acres. To kind of put that into a
14 perspective, that's an equivalent of 237 square
15 miles. We are the largest irrigation entity in the
16 state.

17 We were developed in the early 1900s and
18 we got a water right of a 1900 right that provides
19 natural flow, and we've got storage rights in the
20 reservoirs upstream in American Falls, as well as
21 Jackson Lake. And our users, of course, have paid
22 dearly for the privilege and the opportunity to buy
23 space in these reservoirs.

24 And to tell you a little bit about the
25 project, we were developed, and water came first

1 into the project in March of 1905. Since that
2 time, the project has developed into probably a
3 garden, in many people's estimations. You can
4 imagine that it was nothing but a desert at that
5 time.

6 And incidentally, it was developed by a
7 CHARIAC, which means that it was developed by
8 private funds, and not the Bureau of Reclamation or
9 the government. Incidentally, you'll be probably
10 surprised to learn that the land, once it was
11 developed and ready to be irrigated, sold for
12 50 cents an acre.

13 Any thoughts as to what the water sold
14 for per acre? The water actually sold for \$25 an
15 acre, and that was clear back then. So they had it
16 pretty well in line, in regards to what the value
17 of the land was and what the value of the water
18 was.

19 Today, we have some 4,000 families that
20 are on the project, and I certainly can't represent
21 all 4,000 of those families, but I can tell you
22 that approximately two-thirds of the employment in
23 this Twin Falls County is agriculturally related.
24 We produce over \$100 million of raw product, and if
25 you put a normal multiplier with that, you can

1 realize that the project has a substantial amount
2 of value.

3 Now, this evening we've talked a lot
4 about what we can support and what we can't
5 support. I'm confused a little bit about why the
6 All-H program does not have a component in it; it
7 does not have natural -- I mean, does not have flow
8 augmentation.

9 I hear a lot of people wanting to
10 support alternative number four, but alternative
11 number four has a flow augmentation component in
12 it.. And that is a real troubling thing for us.
13 Few people, I think, realize that it does have a
14 flow component alternative in it.

15 We cannot support the breaching of the
16 dams as long as there is a flow component, because
17 it takes that flow to grow our crops in the valley.
18 Thank you for this opportunity.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Vince. Myron and
20 then Mike Buckley, and then John Wells.

21 MYRON HUNIG,
22 appeared and gave the following statement:

23
24 MR. HUNIG: Myron HUNIG, I'm a Jerome County
25 farmer, and I love fish. In 1967 through '69 I

1 lived near and fished the Alsea River in western
2 Oregon. In the fall we caught salmon and
3 throughout the winter we caught steelhead.

4 Recently I visited with Kevin Goodson,
5 who is the fish biologist with the Oregon
6 Department of Fish and Game, who is responsible for
7 the Alsea, Siletz, and Celilo fisheries. He
8 related that fall chinook spawning returns are at
9 50-year highs, which is very good.

10 However, the coho returns to their
11 hatcheries are very low, as compared to the time
12 that I was there. 200 fish return, compared to
13 several thousand 30 years ago. The steelhead
14 numbers have also declined, from 12,000 harvested
15 fish by anglers down to 1,000 to 2,000.

16 Since these rivers do not have any dams,
17 since there are no dams, other factors are
18 responsible for the decline in the numbers for the
19 steelhead and coho while the chinook are faring
20 very well.

21 Kevin suggested several areas they are
22 looking at as solutions to their problems, such as
23 habitat, predators, and especially harbor seals,
24 which were not a problem 30 years ago, but are a
25 major problem today; ocean conditions and hatchery

1 operations. My point is that more than just the
2 Snake River dams could be the cause of the decline
3 in fish returns to Idaho rivers.

4 However, if you think the dams are the
5 problems, I think there is a solution to the Snake
6 dams that will benefit everyone. Build a new river
7 or a canal from Lewiston to Pasco to bypass the
8 four Snake dams.

9 The approximately 130-mile stream could
10 be built parallel to the existing river above the
11 current canyon, or it could go on a direct route
12 from Lewiston to Pasco. The new stream could carry
13 smolts past the four dams in a stream that would be
14 similar to the Snake River prior to dam
15 construction.

16 Existing water from the Clearwater and
17 the Salmon and Snake Rivers would be sufficient to
18 carry the smolts. A system to divert the smolts
19 into the new river would have to be developed.

20 This river could be constructed in a
21 much shorter time than what it will take to breach
22 the existing dams, and fish results would be
23 immediate, as compared to alternatives. I hope you
24 will seriously look into this alternative plan.

25 And I think due to the growth of homes

1 and people in the northwest, we no longer have a
2 surplus of power here. In a recent article in the
3 Times News it's suggested that we could even have
4 brownouts this summer. So those dams are important
5 to all of us.

6 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Myron. Mike and
7 then John.

8 MIKE BUCKLEY,
9 appeared and gave the following statement:
10

11 MR. BUCKLEY: My name's Mike Buckley. I'm a
12 local farmer, Twin Falls County. I waited a long
13 time to talk tonight; I'm kind of tired. I'm going
14 to have to read. Usually I can talk off the cuff a
15 little bit.

16 I'm a fourth generation farmer, and I'm
17 here as a supporter of salmon and fish. I do
18 believe that we need to do something. I believe
19 there are other measures that can be done besides
20 breaching the dam. I believe that's drastic and
21 radical.

22 I'm against flow augmentation. I think
23 the two are very closely connected, intertwined;
24 flow augmentation and breaching. But I'm just
25 going to read now what I have written in the notes.

1 I'd like to encourage you to use common
2 sense in making your decisions, to look at the
3 science and see if there have been any results from
4 augmentation, and if any can be expected by taking
5 any more water.

6 But more importantly, to look at the
7 other factors that are certainly affecting the
8 salmon runs; namely, the fishing interests
9 offshore. Weigh those factors against what's being
10 proposed by the proponents of augmentation or
11 breaching at the expense of not just southern
12 Idaho, but all of Idaho.

13 There was a time before all of this land
14 began to be developed and the west was still a
15 frontier that men and women of vision and
16 leadership saw the west as having great potential,
17 not just for enterprising individuals, but
18 collectively for the whole country; that if they
19 created opportunities for people with the
20 initiative, then the development of the west would
21 make this nation great.

22 I believe that in our time we have seen
23 much of that realization of the vision. I also
24 believe that there is much more that can be
25 accomplished. Our job is to continue ahead in

1 cooperation with the environment as much as
2 possible, but not to tear down what has already
3 been accomplished by taking resources away, that
4 have built whole communities.

5 With the yellow light on I'm going to
6 shift gears just a little bit. I believe that dam
7 breaching sets a very dangerous precedent. And if
8 we don't believe that more dam breaching will be
9 requested, as much as I agree with the concerns of
10 the Sho-Ban Tribe, the reason they're here tonight
11 is they want to see salmon restored in all runs in
12 the Snake River, because that's the area that
13 they're from.

14 That will not be the end of breaching.
15 I think we have to consider that. What will be
16 next? If we think power shortages are not a
17 problem, when we breach more dams it will be a
18 serious problem, and there's a huge economic impact
19 there.

20 Let's spend the billions that it will
21 cost to tear the dams down to look at other
22 solutions. One that was just mentioned, I don't
23 know how wild that is, but maybe it's workable.
24 There has to be solutions, and I believe that
25 people of ingenuity that were able to build dams

1 can find another solution. Thanks.

2 THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Mike. I know it's
3 cold in here, folks. But every single time I ask
4 for them to turn the heat up, it gets colder, so
5 I've given up. But I'll tell you a secret I just
6 discovered and that is that it's very warm in the
7 woman's room.

8 So after John, we're going to take a
9 quick break. Is John here? John Wells is our next
10 speaker. Let's take a quick break, then, and let
11 our panelists get a coat. We'll be back in ten
12 minutes.

13 (Recess.)

14 THE MODERATOR: Our first speaker up after
15 the break is Ted, D-i-e-h-l, Diehl. Ted, are you
16 here?

17 A PERSON: He gave it on the tape recorder.

18 THE MODERATOR: Okay, great. Garry Bush?
19 Okay, Garry, and after Garry is Bill Jones, and
20 then Leonard Beck.

21 GARRY BUSH,
22 appeared and gave the following statement:

23

24 MR. BUSH: I'm Garry Bush, and I'm here for
25 the fish and for the sport fisherman, who like to

1 catch them. As one of the founders and the third
2 Idaho Steelhead and Salmon Unlimited president in
3 the mid-1980s, I've been in the anadromous fish
4 business and its issues for quite sometime.

5 I am here for steelhead and salmon, for
6 fisherman; and having read, discussed, and debated
7 considerable background material for years,
8 alternative four, breaching the four lower Snake
9 River dams, is the next logical step.

10 We have not seen any improvement in
11 Idaho anadromous fishing in the 30 years that I've
12 lived here. The runs continue to decline,
13 especially wild runs. Please consider these two
14 brief comments, one economic, one social. These
15 may be issues that you have not previously weighed.

16 As a real estate broker in Idaho for the
17 same 30 years, I can say with certainty that
18 property values along and close to our fishable
19 anadromous rivers would increase dramatically if
20 the fish returned in fishable numbers.

21 Property values going up with county
22 assessors in Idaho required to assess at 1 percent
23 of market value, would provide a tremendous
24 trickle-down and residual effect for these
25 counties, towns, and the cities that service sport

1 fisherman.

2 Public benefits, such as better schools,
3 retail sales, motels, etcetera, can provide for a
4 rejuvenated economic boost in this community.
5 Revived fish returns would be exciting for
6 now-failing rural Idaho communities.

7 As an example, a real estate client
8 recently paid \$7 and a half million to buy a cattle
9 ranch so that he and his friends could have a
10 private place to trout fish. Can you imagine the
11 acquisition of fishing cabins along the rivers for
12 salmon and steelhead fishing families? It's just
13 -- it boggles your mind, what could happen if we
14 had large returns of salmon and steelhead.

15 Finally, as a sport fisherman
16 representing my family and many others with similar
17 interests, we don't need or want more politics,
18 science, and justifications to have the opportunity
19 to fish for steelhead and salmon. We want more
20 fish in our rivers to fish for. They are fun to
21 catch and good to eat.

22 Sport fishing allows people to smile
23 again. It brings laughter and happiness; the
24 joshing and the joking, the camaraderie, the
25 campfire yarns, the river talk, the favorite

1 photos, the river social networking. To me, that's
2 what it's all about. Real people and real
3 families, sport fishing for salmon and steelhead.
4 Thank you.

5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Garry.
6 Bill Jones, are you with us? Leonard Beck? And
7 after Leonard is Scott Levy, and then David, I
8 think it's D-a-u-b, possibly.

9 LEONARD BECK,
10 appeared and gave the following statement:

11
12 MR. BECK: I'm Leonard Beck, a third
13 generation farmer of the Snake River irrigators.
14 We still farm the original ground that my
15 grandfather homesteaded in the early 1900s. He
16 came to Burley to farm for one reason and one
17 reason only, and that was farm ground was being
18 developed on a reclamation project built and funded
19 by the irrigators who were participants of that.

20 Since he settled in Burley, he and my
21 grandmother raised eight children. From those
22 eight children, there are now 24 families who are
23 trying to make a living and contribute to the
24 economy in the community by paying property taxes,
25 serving with our time to make our community a place

1 where our children will want to come back and call
2 home.

3 With the invitation to participate in
4 this reclamation project, the federal government
5 became our trustee as a protector of the water
6 stored in the reservoirs which we receive our water
7 from in a distribution system, which was built by
8 those who became the irrigators of that land.

9 I see this trustee, and now, in a very
10 conscientious effort, trying to pry any amount of
11 water from the very people that you encouraged to
12 cultivate the west, to provide an economic base,
13 and also to help expand the influence of the United
14 States.

15 I am reminded of a statement my father
16 told of his father, my grandfather, a few days
17 before he passed away. "Stay united as a family.
18 There will be many issues and people wanting to
19 separate you, but being united, you are stronger."

20 This trustee, the federal government, in
21 the disguise of an endangered species, which can be
22 bought and eaten anywhere, is trying to make
23 another endangered species, the southern Idaho
24 farmer, of which I am one. Not only as a farmer,
25 but I am also a husband and a father, a taxpayer,

1 and a community servant.

2 It has been mentioned in earlier
3 hearings that people remember fishing for salmon
4 below the Shoshone Falls. As one who comes from a
5 descendant and an heritage of those who were
6 enticed to come to the land above Shoshone Falls, I
7 find great difficulty in having the federal
8 government penalize one who was enticed to be in
9 that area.

10 Government officials were well aware of
11 the consequences when treaties and contracts were
12 instituted as to when the dams were built. But
13 they encouraged the purpose of them, as they did
14 the reclamation projects, as they did with the
15 reservations, and the contents of those contracts
16 and treaties that they signed.

17 Whether it is a fish, water, or a dam,
18 those who have been given promises by a trustee can
19 and should expect that those promises will be
20 fulfilled. Be prudent and responsible in your
21 decision, even though as heavy hearted as it is to
22 make, be wise in that, so that we can all still
23 provide ourselves with the living that we were
24 promised to when we were asked to inhabit and to
25 cultivate the west. Thank you.

1 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Leonard. Scott
2 and then David and then Duane Ramseyer.

3 SCOTT LEVY,
4 appeared and gave the following statement:

5
6 MR. LEVY: My name's Scott Levy. Tonight I
7 decided to kind of free format, to tell you a
8 little bit about when I left the last meeting in
9 Pasco. Ended up running out of gas out of
10 Craigmont. Filled up there, went to the Prairie
11 Club.

12 Got to talk to a lot of the farmers up
13 there, and I was the dam breacher up there. And by
14 2:00 in the morning I had a couple of friends and a
15 lot of enemies. It was a lot of fun.

16 What I learned is that there is lot of
17 confusion; a lot of confusion about what's going
18 on. I had people telling me that if you get rid of
19 those dams, we're going to have a dust bowl out
20 here. I think a lot of that comes from the
21 petition that went around about save our dams; it
22 had 80,000 signatures.

23 It says we want to save Columbia and
24 Snake River Dams, so a lot of people think that
25 this whole thing is about all the dams of, you

1 know, a large region. They don't understand the
2 issues.

3 So we sat down with beers and went over
4 notes and pointed out what I basically talked to
5 you in earlier testimonies, shippers could be taken
6 care of, rebating, any cost over \$1.48, the
7 irrigators, we could run a pipe 35 miles or use the
8 Army Corps' recommendation to put in a pumping
9 station.

10 The ratepayers, like I talked about last
11 night, the rates don't need to go up at all. We
12 can take care of all the people's concerns. You've
13 heard a lot of people that are freaked out that if
14 these four dams go, then these things are going to
15 happen.

16 There's been lot of misinformation about
17 things. And a lot of that comes, I think, from our
18 politicians. I remember Larry Craig saying that if
19 these dams go, then southeastern irrigators are
20 going to lose water.

21 Well, Larry doesn't quite get it, I
22 guess, that those dams are quite a ways from
23 southern Idaho. A lot of confusion. I don't know
24 if he's ignorant of what was going on. I don't
25 know if he's a liar; I don't know what his

1 influences are. But it's scary when our elected
2 officials are causing confusion among the people.

3 The facts are the facts, and all the
4 people that can be -- that are afraid to be
5 effected, the shippers, irrigators and ratepayers,
6 we see that we can take care of them so that
7 nothing is going to -- that they will feel no
8 economic effects.

9 It's real exciting to be here with you
10 guys making this decision. It's a great decision,
11 and I'm really confident that -- I feel that you're
12 going to find the truth, because the truth is
13 there. All the facts are pointing to the truth.

14 One of the good arguments that happened
15 in the Prairie Club was we got to the clarification
16 that the science argument based on sediment, is the
17 sediment going to cause problems? Well, if it's
18 small sediment, it might help the fish, because
19 they can evade from the predators that see them.
20 If it's large, it will clog their gills. So
21 there's an unknown of sediment.

22 The other unknown is delayed mortality.
23 Is there delayed mortality or is there not? If you
24 take the hypothesis that the delayed mortality
25 number that the panel put it in is just put it in

1 to make it so that the dams need to come down.

2 If you take that argument, there is no
3 delayed mortality effects from barging, then you
4 have the counter-argument or hypothesis. You've
5 heard the argument; I think it's a great
6 counter-argument.

7 I'm not going to necessarily say let's
8 get rid of dams. I'm trying to speak for the fish.
9 In this case the science and all the logic points
10 to the four lower Snake River dams as the problem.

11 I'm very excited that I got to be a part
12 of this process, and thank you all for thinking
13 hard. And if there's any questions, you can write
14 me anonymously through the website Bluefish.org; if
15 the brigadier general wants to write me as
16 Fred Flintstone, that's fine. I'll do whatever I
17 can to help you answer your questions on either
18 side of the question. Thank you.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Scott. David, you
20 still with us? I think it's D-o-u-b. I can't tell
21 for sure. Duane Ramseyer, and then after Duane is
22 Bob Rodman, and then Steven Sidle. Go ahead.

23 DUANE RAMSEYER,
24 appeared and gave the following statement:

25

1 MR. RAMSEYER: I am Duane Ramseyer. I am a
2 native of Filer, and I have lived in this area for
3 almost 50 years and farmed here. I wish to offer
4 the following testimony regarding the salmon fish
5 recovery efforts.

6 The frenzy of the proponents regarding
7 the breaching of the four dams has become not
8 unlike a cheerleading section at a Bulls basketball
9 game. The cheerleaders chant, "Breach the dams,
10 breach the dams, rah rah rah, fish fish fish."

11 Unfortunately, the group of rah-rah
12 people haven't considered the whole problem of the
13 salmon recovery. It's very easy to say breach the
14 dams, but I challenge those proponents to take one
15 big step back and coldly and honestly survey the
16 whole scene. What about the many variables
17 involved? How do we address the issue that the
18 majority of the problems of the salmon have
19 occurred below the dams?

20 I would like to address a few of the
21 more obvious variables or problems of the salmon.
22 I respect and support the Indian traditions and
23 lore. However, to do their fishing thing and then
24 sell their catch for \$1 or \$2 a pound to anyone,
25 whomever, leaves me very cold. I see no

1 acknowledgment or accommodation for the sea lions
2 as a major predator.

3 We know they have increased tremendously
4 in numbers, and a large percentage of the salmon
5 who do return have evidence of attacks. What are
6 we going to do with the terns? There are probably
7 nice birds, but they have a reputation of being
8 ferocious feeders.

9 How much do we know about the affect of
10 ocean temperature on the salmon life cycle? What
11 about the actual life of the salmon in the ocean,
12 including predators? What about the ocean fishing,
13 both near and offshore on salmon numbers?

14 In farming, I have to contend with
15 variables in producing a saleable crop. But just
16 as in dam breaching context, if I decide to depend
17 upon only one solution in producing the crop, I
18 will surely fail.

19 We in southern Idaho are threatened with
20 more water needed for flow augmentation if the dams
21 aren't breached. We view this aspect with much
22 skepticism and dismay. The studies thus far
23 concluding using additional water do not bear any
24 relationship whatsoever to the successful
25 restoration of the salmon.

1 On the contrary, we were not surprised
2 to see this addition of water already being sent
3 downstream, being considered for additional
4 irrigation in other states downstream. The drying
5 up of 1,000 acres of productive farmlands is too
6 high a price to pay for a proposal that is not
7 proven and may not be proved in any other way but
8 maybe for 40 years.

9 Let me touch briefly on tourism as a
10 benefit of breaching. I always chuckle when I hear
11 this reasoning. Tourism is mainly a product of the
12 local chamber of commerce. Their figures are
13 always suspect, because of their purposeful
14 promotional efforts, and many times are tied to
15 obtaining additional money from some other force
16 for some other promotion. The fishers of salmon
17 that I know are pretty well self-sustaining, even
18 down to their beer. They bring their supplies from
19 home.

20 Dam breaching carries a very high price
21 on the economies of our state. I would suggest
22 extreme caution if dam breaching is the only
23 solution considered. We are inviting failure from
24 the word breach if we don't consider the entire
25 scenario. Thank you very much.

1 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Duane.
2 Bob Rodman, Steven S-i-d-l-e. Bob, are you with
3 us? Steven, what about you? Dave Fulmer?
4 Julie Rodman? Charles Harris? Ron Ballard?
5 Kelleen, K-e-l-l-e-e-n Chapman? Letitia Phillips?
6 The last break was pretty effective.

7 Rich Curtis? John Marshall?
8 Chuck Webb? Louie Davenport? Bill Chasteen? Is
9 that you, Bill? Great. Okay. David Erikson,
10 didn't we hear from David Erikson earlier?

11 BILL CHASTEEN,
12 appeared and gave the following statement:

13
14 MR. CHASTEEN: I'm Bill Chasteen. I'm a
15 Gooding farmer, for endangered species. They keep
16 talking about all this water and stuff like that,
17 and here's my Capital Press. It's a farm magazine.
18 It says, "Users eye lawsuits to force more water
19 for salmon." This is March 3rd.

20 You guys are suing this guy in the
21 Bureau of Reclamation to get more water out of me,
22 which is going to dry up 350,000 acres. And I
23 didn't write this. It was right here. Read it.

24 And you guys shouldn't be pushing these
25 kind of meetings to where you put us against these

1 guys when you know that there's no salmon going
2 past Chief Joseph Dam. There's no fish ladder
3 there. Colville Indian Reservation, there's a big
4 one. I don't hear the Indians crying up there.

5 You go up here, Hells Canyon Dam, why
6 aren't the Owyhees getting their salmon back? Why
7 is the salmon just going one direction, and why are
8 you so worried about breaching the dams when you're
9 going to open the locks up and let the water go?

10 See, you got to kill the generator so
11 you can fire up Hanford's three mothball nuclear
12 plants. Come on, let's get some honesty about this
13 whole thing. Think about it.

14 Why don't you -- you're an engineer. I
15 work for them. I'm an electrician, powerhouse
16 electrician for Chief Joseph Dam. You guys know
17 those locks can be opened. You don't have to tear
18 it down. But if you flush all that stuff down, you
19 can shut the locks and be back in business. But
20 there's got to be more motives behind this.

21 But they're pushing the wolves on us,
22 they're pushing the grizzly bears, we got you guys
23 sitting here trying to steal our water. We been
24 playing cowboys and Indians; cowboys always win.
25 The wolves lose. We've got cows out there, we're

1 shooting them, we're burying them, we ain't telling
2 nobody, grizzly bears, same thing.

3 You guys got our open checkbook, but
4 sooner or later you're going to sit there like,
5 what happened? We're here to stay. Why isn't
6 Craig here, the rest of these guys here? Because
7 they've got this here stuff here.

8 You see more nice little deals here, how
9 the buses are coming from Hailey down here. You
10 guys here, and you got good patience. I got to
11 hand it to you for that.

12 It's just you didn't get a good
13 representative of this meeting. , what is really
14 going on, and you got to start looking at -- you
15 all ought to take a vacation, but you really ought
16 to study offshore fishing. You've got to finish
17 your study. Go another five years. Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Bill. Don Tracy?
19 If we can ask you to hold your applause, please,
20 appreciate it. Don Tracy, Florence Sandy, and
21 Ben Walker.

22 DON TRACY,
23 appeared and gave the following statement:

24

25 MR. TRACY: Thank you. For the last 28 years

1 of my working life I was dam engineer, and for the
2 last nine years I spent six months a year fishing
3 for salmon. So we're talking about two subjects
4 near and dear to my heart.

5 I would like to think that I've learned
6 more about fishing for salmon in the last nine
7 years than I've forgotten about dams. I'd like to
8 point out a couple of things to emphasize that I
9 think was maybe lost in the crowd.

10 One thing was -- didn't bring up, was I
11 would like to read what it said in the paper today.
12 "With the clamor surrounding the recent public
13 hearings and salmon recovery, one topic has been
14 almost completely ignored: The rapid growth of the
15 northwest human population."

16 Number one problem, but a little too
17 sensitive to address. I thought the colonel
18 pointed out very vividly the second greatest point
19 right now, and I was amazed at the success ratio on
20 getting the smolts downstream. But they're not
21 coming back.

22 That has nothing to do with those dams.
23 That has everything to do with the Pacific Ocean.
24 Now, let me tell you where I go to -- I've learned,
25 if you want to fish for salmon, you go where salmon

1 are. I spent six months a year in Campbell River,
2 B.C., the salmon capital of the world.

3 And I will reemphasize what the
4 gentleman said about Oregon. 1992, a buddy and I
5 went out and caught eight coho, four apiece, our
6 limit, in less than an hour. 1996, we were not
7 even allowed to keep a coho in B.C., or in those
8 waters, excuse me.

9 1998, we could not keep one coho, the
10 whole province of British Columbia. It's not a
11 river problem, one river. It's a Pacific Ocean
12 problem, as the colonel pointed out. Why don't we
13 see what happens?

14 We breached Elwah Dam in the state of
15 Washington. What was going to happen there? Let's
16 see how fast the fish come back to that tributary.
17 If they come back in great numbers, then I would
18 say we have some success here.

19 We are talking about taking out the
20 cleanest form of renewable energy we have in this
21 country, the hydroelectric power. And we're going
22 to spend additional power that we bring in for the
23 fossil fuel from the Arab countries to replace it
24 with?

25 I am for salmon. I fish for -- next

1 month I'll be back in the salmon capital of the
2 world fishing for salmon, and I am for doing what
3 is reasonable for salmon. But let's not take and
4 do the stupid thing and remove those dams. Thank
5 you.

6 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Don. Okay,
7 Florence Sandy and then Ben Walker, and then
8 Bill Flannery.

9 FLORENCE SANDY,
10 appeared and gave the following statement:

11
12 MS. SANDY: Hi, I'm Florence Sandy, and I'm
13 from Hagerman. I have spent a large portion of my
14 life involved in a family livestock operation,
15 which stretched into central Idaho and included
16 areas near the Salmon River.

17 Some of my fondest memories as a child
18 included watching salmon struggle across the
19 shallow ripples in Nap Creek and building their
20 spawning beds and laying their eggs. I hope that
21 through joint efforts by the affected parties and
22 using sound science and logic, my grandchildren
23 have the same opportunity to see salmon in Idaho
24 that I and my children have had.

25 I'm going to skip quite a bit of this,

1 but I want to go to talk about the Caspian terns
2 and the sea birds and the pike minnows that eat
3 millions of young migrating salmon each year.

4 In the conservation of the Columbia
5 Basin fish, All-H report, there was no account as
6 to how many millions of smolts are killed each
7 year, and no figures relating to the increased tern
8 population, as referenced.

9 The marine mammals have increased by
10 more than 600 percent since the mid-1980s, and at
11 Lower Granite Dam, one out of every four adult
12 salmon and steelhead show signs of being attacked
13 by marine mammals. If the region is serious about
14 improving survival, it is time to get serious about
15 stopping this predation.

16 Many scientists believe the problem with
17 salmon returns lies with ocean conditions and
18 predators in those oceans. While these issues have
19 been marginally studied, much more work needs to be
20 done. If ocean conditions are indeed the culprit,
21 nothing that is done on the Columbia or Snake River
22 system will help recover listed salmon stock.

23 I realize this is a complex issue, and
24 as I've said previously, I grew up watching these
25 magnificent fish. I look forward to showing my

1 grandchildren what I saw. I hope and know that you
2 will use science, not emotion, in your solutions.
3 Idaho's people, economy, and future depend on your
4 wise decisions and choices. Thank you.

5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Florence.

6 Ben Walker? Ma'am, could I ask you to please hold
7 your applause? I'd appreciate it. Thank you.
8 What happens is when you cheer for one position,
9 then somebody else is going to try and cheer for
10 the other position, and before you know it, we've
11 got a contest going, instead of listening. So I'd
12 really appreciate your cooperation.

13 Okay, Ben, you're on, and then
14 Bill Flannery and Mark Daley.

15 BEN WALKER,
16 appeared and gave the following statement:

17

18 MR. WALKER: I think that's an excellent
19 point to bring out. I've already mentioned it to
20 her.

21 THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Ben. Go ahead.

22 MR. WALKER: I'm really honored to be here
23 and discuss this thing, and we are very, very
24 fortunate to live in this country, to be able to do
25 this and have this presentation of both issues very

1 validly presented.

2 Now, the first thing I'd like to do is I
3 don't know who saw that bit of Bill Bradley the
4 other night on television. He was speaking to a
5 group of people from Washington on what he had done
6 in the administration by breaking up the dams on
7 Butte Creek out of the Sacramento River Basin. And
8 I put it down here.

9 On the Butte Creek, a Sacramento River
10 tributary, dam removal allowed a run of 20,000
11 salmon in 1998, against, and would you believe it,
12 only 44 before the breaching. This gives a certain
13 amount of validity to a free-flowing stream.

14 Next I would like to state some of the
15 more major faults of the present four dams on the
16 lower part of the Snake River. In the first place,
17 they talk about the power that would be lost by
18 breaching these dams.

19 Those dams, I think it's one, maybe two
20 turbines produce only 5 percent of the electric
21 power that is needed by the area. And 90 percent,
22 because of the dams, of the west wild salmon are
23 decimated by the dams. That's a great value..

24 And Lewiston, which is really only a
25 trucking depot which could be served quite well by

1 railroad and land transport, is part of the
2 problem, when they start to use the barges for that
3 purpose.

4 And incidentally, there is no flood
5 control on any of the dams. And the impoverishment
6 of the local communities, including the Indians, of
7 course, that are dependent on the salmon. And
8 incidentally, the dams were kind of a needless pork
9 barrel instituted in 1955 to overcome the scare of
10 the cold war to produce electricity, which was not
11 needed at all. Now, the other is the --

12 THE MODERATOR: Ben, I'm going to ask you to
13 wrap up.

14 MR. WALKER: I'll do this very quickly. The
15 dams prevent by the still water backup the rapid
16 30-miles per day run of smolts to the sea for their
17 survival. I'll go on here and just finish up real
18 quickly.

19 I talked briefly about the benefits and
20 the pitfalls, and there seems to be only one
21 solution, and that is breach the dams. And that
22 would benefit all. And I am all, completely for
23 the alternative of the Army Engineers' alternative
24 A, alternative four. Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ben.

1 Bill Flannery, Mark Daley, and then Roger Rhodes.
2 Bill, are you with us? Mark? Roger Rhodes?
3 Great. And then Jim Whittaker is after Roger, and
4 I think the next one is Ralph. That's the only
5 part of the name I can read.

6 ROGER RHODES,
7 appeared and gave the following statement:

8
9 MR. RHODES: Hi, my name is Roger Rhodes. I
10 wish I won the lottery. It would have solved
11 everything, solved this problem. But I see
12 everybody up there drinking water. I'm a poor man.
13 I don't have no water.

14 And the fish are out there dying, but I
15 want the salmon running, and that way they can be
16 alive today. And I wish my friend Sam was here;
17 that way we could go fishing. Because I been down
18 in Washington, California.

19 I love salmon. I went up to Challis; I
20 love salmon. And I just hope we can solve this
21 problem and just have the salmon running. Thank
22 you.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Roger.
24 Jim Whittaker, are you here? Raise your hand if
25 you're here. So is there a Ralph? Is there a

1 Ralph at all? No? I could be reading this wrong.
2 It could be Keith. Is there a Keith? I'm sorry,
3 it's late.

4 Ron Jones? Hey, we've got one. Okay,
5 and then Jerry Callen is after Ron, and
6 Carol Murphy.

7 RON JONES,
8 appeared and gave the following statement:

9
10 MR. JONES: All things come to those who
11 wait. My name is Ron Jones. I farm south of
12 Twin Falls. My family has farmed there since about
13 1910 when the ground was broken out.

14 I want to talk a little bit about flow
15 augmentation. I took the time to read the Corps'
16 study, and there's a couple things that I disagree
17 with in the study that I think should be pointed
18 out.

19 People have thrown out the number of
20 \$430 million a year in lost farming, if they took
21 the million acre-feet of flow augmentation. But in
22 reading that study, I don't see anywhere that it
23 addresses what would happen to the property values
24 in the area.

25 It talks about cash flow and a

1 capitalized income method, but it doesn't say
2 anything about what would happen. And in our
3 experience, living 80 years in an area where water
4 isn't reliable, salmon tract versus a mile or two
5 away where water is reliable in the Twin Falls
6 tract, we know that you probably would devalue the
7 property \$500, maybe \$700 an acre.

8 Just in rounds numbers in these two
9 counties, \$400,000 acres, say, at \$500,000 an acre
10 would be about \$200 million. And the approach that
11 the study uses is to say that on an income basis,
12 if you paid people for the water you used, that
13 would replace that in the economy.

14 But that doesn't address those people
15 who take the write-down of their property value.
16 And eventually that comes back to the tax base.
17 And those people, I don't see anything that would
18 reimburse those people. If you look at that clear
19 up and down the Snake River plain, it's hundreds of
20 millions of dollars.

21 And the other thing that I wanted to
22 question, or at least look at it the way the study
23 is based. It assumes that if there were less water
24 available, people would first take out their lowest
25 valued crops, which makes sense on the face of it.

1 And you would, probably, if there were less water
2 available over the whole year.

3 But in what we're talking about, some of
4 these say that most years there would be water;
5 some years there wouldn't. In that case, you take
6 out the high-valued crops first, because it's too
7 risky to make the investment in it. ; a sugar beet
8 crop or a potato crop, knowing that perhaps one
9 year in five or in seven you wouldn't harvest that
10 crop.

11 And what happens then -- and the study
12 ignores the threshold effect -- if you don't have a
13 reliable crop for your processors, they won't stay
14 here. This is a competitive business. They'll go
15 to central Washington; they'll go to California;
16 they'll go somewhere else in order to get potatoes
17 or sugar beets.

18 So now you take the high value crops out
19 of the economy, and we become a low value, a
20 hay-grain kind of an economy. And the high value
21 crops is why there is an ag economy here. We don't
22 compete very well with our high infrastructure
23 costs of irrigation against the midwest and those
24 dryland areas, so we need to grow those things.

25 And I think to consider flow

1 augmentation we need to go back and look at those.
2 And the only reason we're considering it is because
3 I'm not sure that just taking out the dams would
4 preclude the need for flow augmentation. Thank
5 you.

6 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ron.
7 Jerry Callen? Carol Murphy?

8 A PERSON: She's not here.

9 THE MODERATOR: Okay, thank you.
10 Phil Butler? I think it's W.E. Griffith or
11 E.E. Griffith? Great, thank you. And after -- is
12 it W. or E.E.?

13 MR. GRIFFITH: W.E.

14 THE MODERATOR: W.E. Marilyn Paul after W.E.
15 Great, go ahead.

16 W.E. GRIFFITH,
17 appeared and gave the following statement:

18

19 MR. GRIFFITH: Hello, I'm Bill Griffith. I'd
20 like to say something this evening that probably
21 isn't in your realm. The gentleman before me hit
22 on it a little bit.

23 For 31 years I fished in Alaska, both
24 commercially and as a sportsman. I think you're
25 looking at the wrong part of the problem. The dams

1 aren't your problem. The commercial fisherman from
2 other countries are the problem. When the
3 Portuguese, the Japanese, the Russians, lay out ten
4 miles of netting per vessel nine fathoms deep,
5 they literally clean out everything that's there;
6 everything. Fish, animals, birds; they take it
7 all.

8 I am of the opinion, from studying
9 Alaska, that you have the same problem here.
10 You're about 25 years behind time. The problem
11 should have been addressed 25, 30 years ago, when
12 the countries started really fishing heavily.

13 I don't know if there is an answer now,
14 a solution now. It's international waters. It's
15 pretty difficult to regulate. But I don't think
16 that breaching dams, augmenting flows, mechanical
17 devices, is going to solve your problem. I think
18 it's going to have to come on a national basis.

19 The Snake River is such a little chip in
20 a poker game that it isn't even worth considering,
21 to be honest with you, in the total fisheries
22 picture. I realize it is important to the people
23 to whom it effects, but it really is not that
24 significant in the total picture.

25 I think that if you really want to do

1 something to ensure salmon get back to the state, I
2 think you're going to have to do it on a national
3 level and on an international level. I think it's
4 way, way, way beyond Idaho.

5 I think that if you were to control the
6 fishing, that you might be able to get the fish
7 back to Idaho, if there are any out there.
8 Basically, there aren't any fish out there. Those
9 of you who have flown over the ocean and you see
10 these tremendous trawlers, huge, they're processing
11 fish faster than they can be reproduced. It is a
12 nonrenewable resource that basically is exhausted.

13 I think that if you got the fish to
14 Idaho, you might then be concerned about breaching
15 dams. I think you're either 30 years too late or
16 you're about 15 years too early, because there's no
17 fish out there for you to be concerned with,
18 basically. Thank you.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Bill.
20 Marilyn Paul? Great. And then David Kipling, or
21 Kipping, and then Brian Ravenscroft.

22 MARILYN PAUL,
23 appeared and gave the following statement:

24

25 MS. PAUL: Hello, I'm Marilyn Paul, and I'm

1 an attorney. What's been said often here tonight
2 is that this process is becoming perilously close
3 to becoming a decision by default. I don't accept
4 the view that because the numbers of wild fish
5 getting past the lower Snake River dams are
6 tragically impaired that dam removal should be
7 deemed somehow not worth the trouble or too
8 extreme.

9 I support alternative four with primary
10 emphasis on partial removal of the lower four Snake
11 River dams. It does not seem to me that flow
12 augmentation is particularly productive, and it has
13 a potential to have a very negative impact upon
14 this area. And speaking of this area, I'm
15 referring to particularly south central Idaho for
16 the reasons that have already been articulated.

17 The EIS projections of both potential
18 recreation dollars and of cost avoidance seem
19 significantly underestimated to me, particularly
20 the latter, because of the potential for extremely
21 costly reparations.

22 However, this observation is in no way
23 to be construed as my permission to extend the
24 timeline of this process any further regarding
25 examination of the breaching issues for the four

1 lower Snake River dams.

2 Just generally speaking, but making no
3 mistake, the timing of corrections is very
4 important in the determination of responsibility.
5 And just speaking purely in an economic sense, the
6 timing of decisions and when to make reparations is
7 going to be very important in the long run, in
8 examining where responsibilities fall with regard
9 to these issues.

10 My request is that the dams be breached
11 as soon as possible. I do not want to see the wild
12 salmon administrated out of existence. Thank you.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Marilyn. David
14 and then Brian, and then after Brian is
15 Marshall McGhee.

16 DAVID KIPPING,
17 appeared and gave the following statement:

18

19 MR. KIPPING: My name is David Kipping. The
20 cornerstone of the Ice Harbor Dam exists with a
21 curious inscription. Quote, "Here in the early
22 years of the atomic era the people of the United
23 States exhibit faith in the future by placing the
24 first concrete of a great dam to provide the
25 benefits of peaceful living for the people of our

1 nation."

2 Now, what does this mean? Well, in the
3 latter part of the 1950s, Congress was unwilling to
4 provide money for the construction of dams on the
5 lower Snake River. Repeatedly they wouldn't do
6 that. They were not convinced of the need for
7 better navigation or hydropower or irrigation.

8 But we were in the midst of the cold
9 war, and the production of nuclear weapons was a
10 major national priority. The proponents of the Ice
11 Harbor Dam argued that the power produced by the
12 dam would help fund the construction of a nuclear
13 reactor at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, which
14 was -- and this nuclear reactor was necessary to
15 produce plutonium for nuclear weapons.

16 This national defense argument, along
17 with a large appropriation of \$1 million was enough
18 to begin construction of the Ice Harbor Dam in
19 1961. The desire for Lewiston to become a deep
20 water port was a tantalizing lure for construction
21 of additional dams.

22 And, again, the national security
23 argument came into play, and the Lower Granite Dam
24 was built, making it easier to transport nuclear
25 materials to Hanford. Over the next decade, the

1 other two dams were built, again propelled by the
2 national security argument.

3 These dams were built as part of the
4 vast nuclear weapons production infrastructure.
5 They were financed and justified primarily to
6 support the cold war efforts by reducing the cost
7 of transporting nuclear materials to and from
8 Hanford. Any other benefits, such as irrigation,
9 civilian barge transportation, and commercial
10 hydropower, were mere side effects.

11 Well, the cold war's over. Hanford is
12 out of the nuclear weapons production business, and
13 the principal reason for those four dams, that
14 those four dams were built, no longer exists.
15 We're not building bombs anymore. In fact, we're
16 dismantling them.

17 The nation is now actively dismantling
18 bombs and the structures of the cold war that were
19 built to build these bombs. It's time to remove
20 the dams. And, as the last of the dams are
21 breached, someone, maybe me, should give a
22 patriotic speech honoring the foot soldiers of the
23 cold war who gave their lives to protect our great
24 nation, the Snake River salmon. Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, David. Brian, and

1 after Brian is Marshal McGhee, and then
2 Harold Hines.

3 BRIAN RAVENSCROFT,
4 appeared and gave the following statement:

5
6 MR. RAVENSCROFT: My name is
7 Brian Ravenscroft. I'm here just representing
8 myself. You need to look at the entire big picture
9 on this decline of the salmon population. It
10 didn't start when the dams were built.

11 If you look at the entire 130 years
12 worth of records from Oregon and Washington fishing
13 records, you'll find that the population really
14 declined and started to decline around 1918. , 30
15 years before the very first dam was built.

16 You just need to look at the entire
17 thing, because only looking at the dams, although I
18 acknowledge they are a definite part of the
19 problem, they are not the underlying problem.

20 Salmon are declining everywhere, on
21 rivers with dams and rivers without dams. We have
22 bull trout declining on rivers that never see a
23 dam. We have cutthroat trout declining. There has
24 to be an underlying holistic additional problem
25 that we're not even looking at, and we probably

1 haven't even figured out what it is yet.

2 I would like to suggest that there are
3 other things which are not presently being
4 considered. One of them, the Forest Service, when
5 they write an environmental impact study for their
6 management of their forests, they openly
7 acknowledge that they're going to push that forest
8 to higher levels of old growth forest than what
9 occurred naturally under mother nature's rule.

10 The end result of this, and they
11 acknowledge this also, is that the bigger and older
12 trees will consume more water than what mother
13 nature consumed with the smaller, younger trees
14 that mother nature had.

15 If you, then, use the Forest Service's
16 own research, and they have 65 years of continuous
17 research on paired water sheds to document this, if
18 you use their numbers, you'll find that in the case
19 of the Targee National Forest, when they wrote
20 their new plan, they are going to reduce the stream
21 flow of the Snake River by approximately 58,000
22 acre-feet per year.

23 In the Wood River drainage here in the
24 Sawtooth National Forest, they're going to deplete
25 stream flows by about 4,000 acre-feet per year. If

1 you look at the entire state of Idaho with
2 2.2 million acres of forests, suddenly you come up
3 with one and a half million acre-feet ballpark
4 figure for depletion of our stream flows. That's
5 approximately what NFMS says they've got to have to
6 recover the salmon.

7 Why is not the federal government and
8 their water under consideration? Why is it only
9 the private citizen who's going to be held to blame
10 for the federal actions? Let's get the federal
11 water on the bargaining table as well.

12 I have submitted an additional report
13 that's 48 pages long. Obviously I can't read it
14 in, but please read it. Particularly, the lady
15 from EPA, I think you'll find that some of the
16 chemistry changes in our water here in Idaho are
17 tremendously different than what they were before
18 under mother nature's rule. Thank you.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Brian. Marshall,
20 and after Marshall is Harold Hines, and then
21 Harold Havner.

22 MARSHALL MCGHEE,
23 appeared and gave the following statement:

24

25 MR. MCGHEE: Hi, my name's Marshall McGhee.

1 It's been a long night. Thanks for sticking around
2 to listen to me.

3 When I was a child, my father took my
4 brothers and I up to the Stanley Basin to witness
5 the migration of salmon into Redfish Lake.
6 Standing amongst these beautiful fish as they
7 struggled upstream to spawn and die is something
8 I'll never forget.

9 That was 30 years ago. Today, we have
10 an ocean-going port in Idaho and salmon on the
11 verge of extinction. I'm not a scientist, but it
12 seems rather simple to me that if we had salmon
13 before these barge dams were built, that we could
14 have salmon again if the barge dams were removed.

15 It has happened here before in Idaho.
16 In 1910, the Sunbeam Dam was built on the Salmon
17 River, blocking sockeye salmon from Redfish Lake.
18 By 1927, no sockeye were observed in Redfish Lake.
19 After the dam was breached in 1931, the sockeye
20 returned to Redfish Lake.

21 Over 200 northwest fisheries biologists
22 have stated that the best chance of recovery for
23 Idaho's salmon is to remove the four lower Snake
24 River barge dams. So what should we do? Continue
25 subsidizing a seaport in Idaho or breach the four

1 lower Snake River dams and give the salmon an
2 opportunity to return to Idaho?

3 If we choose to continue to do nothing
4 or call for more studying of the issues, the
5 problem will take care of itself. The salmon will
6 go extinct.

7 If the salmon go extinct, I would like
8 to recommend that we rename the Snake and Salmon
9 Rivers and the four lower Snake River dams. The
10 Snake River from Lewiston to Portland, could be
11 called the Pork Barrel Politics and Special
12 Interest stretch of the Snake River.

13 The four lower Snake River dams should
14 be renamed the Kempthorne Dam, the Craig-Crapo Dam,
15 and the Simpson Dam. I would include
16 Helen Chenoweth here, but she's not worth a damn.

17 Lastly, the Committee of Nine Dam. The
18 Committee of Nine controls all the water in eastern
19 Idaho up to the Milner Dam and has never seen a dam
20 they did not like, irregardless of any
21 environmental problem the dam may present. I
22 believe it would be a fitting legacy for all of our
23 Idaho "do nothing but stick your head in the sand
24 and the problem will go away" politicians.

25 Now, what about a new name for the

1 Salmon River? I propose we rename it to Dodo
2 River. That way, every time we think about the
3 opportunity we had to save the salmon or to keep
4 our precious seaport in Idaho, we can remind
5 ourselves of the choice we made. We were dodos.

6 Tonight I draw a line in the sand. If
7 we, as Idahoans, choose to let the salmon in Idaho
8 go extinct, then I am moving from this state. I
9 want no part of a state that has the habitat, that
10 has a river called the Salmon River, that has a
11 lake called Redfish Lake, and has no salmon. Get
12 rid of those four dams. Bring back the salmon.
13 Thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Marshall.
15 Harold Hines? Harold Hines, are you still with us?
16 How about Harold Havner? How about Peter Richards?
17 Linda Shultz? Those are all the names I have for
18 tonight. Is there anyone else in the audience who
19 would like to speak? There you go, got a taker.
20 Anyone else?

21 EVAN KOHTZ,
22 appeared and gave the following statement:

23
24 MR. KOHTZ: Thank you all for being here this
25 late. This is really some kind of a meeting, and I

1 thank you all for talking. And it was a very
2 interesting to hear you, particularly yours.

3 THE MODERATOR: Sir, can you tell us who you
4 are and spell your name?

5 MR. KOHTZ: I'm Evan Kohtz, and I'm a -- all
6 my life a resident here, and have been a farmer.

7 THE MODERATOR: Can you spell that for me
8 please?

9 MR. KOHTZ: K-o-h-t-z. And I've heard a lot
10 of different statistics, and a lot of them are
11 diametrically opposed. And what does that mean?
12 That means that this is not a simple solution, or
13 it's been complicated intentionally.

14 I've been -- I'm not well traveled, but
15 I have traveled enough to see in places people have
16 made terrible decisions. But historically, people
17 have made historic, terrible decisions in other
18 countries. And I particularly mention in the
19 Russian Revolution, people even cut down the
20 orchards.

21 Now, we have a resource. We have the
22 salmon and we have the dams. And I think that
23 it -- being humans, and as managers, we should use
24 science to solve the problems of keeping the dams
25 and keeping the power and keeping the salmon. , and

1 where our job isn't done yet unless we do that.

2 But if you cut the trees down, one day
3 we're going to wake up in the morning and we're
4 going to want something to eat, and we're going to
5 want to turn the lights on, and it's not going to
6 be there. So let's solve the problem.

7 The likelihood of this problem, because
8 the things are so opposed, and it's a complicated
9 problem, that the likelihood is that it's some
10 other factor. And the likelihood of the factor
11 being, is that actually, the water is getting
12 warmer.

13 You know, I've looked in a history book,
14 and I look at the Arabian Peninsula, and there's
15 columns of -- is it Cleopatra's palace, and there's
16 just sand there. And that means 3,000 years ago
17 there was a civilization who flourished, there was
18 water, the temperature was moderate, and the crops
19 grew.

20 And I think that probably it isn't just
21 the dams, it isn't just the fishing, it's probably
22 the temperature. And it's something that we should
23 look at closer. Has the temperature of these
24 waters gone up? I think probably they have, in
25 upper streams and lower streams. And in my

1 lifetime it seems like being a farmer you can see a
2 little bit of difference. And anyway, I hope you
3 address that.

4 Thank you very much. And I was the last
5 one. It's a fantastic meeting. Good luck to all
6 of you, and hope the salmon make it and the dams
7 and the lights stay on too.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thanks. Okay, anyone else?
9 Last chance here.

10 MR. MEWER: I've got one last question.

11 THE MODERATOR: Yes, sir?

12 L.J. MEWER,
13 appeared and gave the following statement:

14
15 MR. MEWER: I'm L.J. Mewer. I came tonight
16 to learn of what the questions were and to get a
17 little information. I'll have to confess at this
18 point, the colonel's straightforward, unslanted
19 fact presentation was the most useful to me.

20 And the question I have is I don't
21 understand why a god that created salmon also
22 created beavers. That's meant to be humorous.

23 THE MODERATOR: It's late.

24 MR. MEWER: That's the reason for the levity.
25 I'm only reminded of one thing that I think would

1 be useful to share at this point. The story kind
2 of goes, there was a farmer out plowing his field
3 and a preacher went by. And as he watched, he was
4 amazed at how nice the farm looked.

5 So he stayed at the end of the field.
6 When the farmer came down with his plow to turn
7 around, the breacher motioned him over and said,
8 "The Lord has certainly blessed you with a
9 wonderful farm here."

10 And the farmer thought for a moment, and
11 he said, "Yes, He really has." He said, "But you
12 should have seen it when He had it all to Himself."

13 Good management is useful, and we have
14 the ability to solve these problems without being
15 impractical or unreasonable. Science, fact, truth,
16 are necessary to make good decisions, and I trust
17 that you'll do that.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Thanks, folks. I
19 appreciate your attention. It's been my pleasure.
20 Before you all leave, Bill, do you want to say
21 anything?

22 COLONEL BULEN: I would like to thank
23 everyone for the courtesy you showed each other and
24 the respect. And the hospitality of the Northwest
25 is truly unbelievable. I've sat through nine of

1 these, and I have to take my hat off to all of you.
2 Thank you, and thank you for taking the time to
3 listen to us.

4 (The proceedings concluded at 11:27 p.m.)

5 -oo0oo-

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25