

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

PUBLIC MEETING SESSION
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
DRAFT LOWER SNAKE RIVER JUVENILE SALMON MIGRATION
FEASIBILITY REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
WITH
FEDERAL CAUCUS CONSERVATION OF COLUMBIA BASIN FISH
“ALL H-PAPER”

CLARKSTON, WASHINGTON

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

FEBRUARY 10, 2000

TRANSCRIBED BY NANCY J. SMITH

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

COURT REPORTERS

PO BOX 245

VANCOUVER, WA 98666

1 (Transcribed from taped proceedings held 2/10/00)

2

3 MR. BAILEY: My name is Stan Bailey. I'm a life-long valley resident, 47 years
4 old. I grew up on this Snake River when it was free flowing. The Army Corps of
5 Engineers dammed it.

6 We didn't want it. Now that we've got it, they want to take it
7 away. I don't believe they have enough scientific proof to convince me and the
8 rest of the people I know that these dams are warranted to be breached. I oppose
9 breaching of the dams.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. NEAL: Thank you for the time to address this issue. I am Larry Neal,
12 and I live in Lewiston, Idaho. I wish to state that I support salmon recovery as
13 long as it's based on scientific truth. I know that dam breaching does not meet this
14 criteria.

15 I am opposed to the proposed dam breaching for the following reasons:
16 One, the NMFS studies have shown that salmon smolts have a 95 percent survival rate
17 across each dam. Caspian terns at the mouth of the Columbia are consuming 30 percent
18 alone.

19 Studies have proven that barging produces a 95 percent survival rate which is the
20 best and most conclusive, positive option on salmon recovery.

21 Two: There is not a clear consensus on any one issue that will fix the problem.
22 The most uncertain and dubious of these options is dam breaching.

23 Three: Flow augmentation has failed to produce conclusive
24 or even positive results ,proving that dam breaching will be
25 ineffective.

1 Four: Dam breaching will cause enormous environmental impacts by increasing
2 fossil fuel power generation, increased truck traffic, rail traffic, et cetera, and it will
3 negatively impact the environment

4 These issues are not being accounted for in the environmental impact.
5 I do support doing everything possible to make fish passage as friendly as
6 possible.

7 This includes modified ladders, surface smolt collection at the dams, barging
8 improvement, and Caspian tern removal. We as a country are at a crossroads.

9 And one can't forget comments made by men like Donald Ross of the Rockefeller
10 Family Fund.

11 If it means stopping a pulp mill in Sitka or what have you, that is what has to
12 happen. There are communities that are going to go over the abyss.

13 Ladies and gentlemen, they have already taken Sitka and Forks, Washington, and
14 numerous other rural communities across the country.

15 They cannot have the inland Northwest. Juxtaposed to this statement is the
16 Declaration of Independence. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are
17 created equal, that they are endowed by the creator with certain inalienable rights, that
18 amongst these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

19 President Clinton addressed the congress in the State of the Union address,
20 January 22nd, 2000, giving the context of economic sustainability, and stated giving a
21 chance for American people to live American -- to live their dreams is an American issue.
22 I do not -- I could not agree more.

23 I ask that you give these Americans a chance to live their
24 constitutionally-guaranteed right to live their dreams. Do not breach the dams. Was I
25 close?

1 THE MODERATOR: Just a tad.

2 MR. WILMONEN: I'm Ken Wilmonen. And I feel that it's not necessary to breach
3 dams. The fish have been depleting ever since they put the dams in Hells Canyon.

4 And they need to look at the amount of people that are here now compared to 30
5 years ago. And I feel that they should take the gill nets out of the river and that would be
6 a big help

7 The -- and always look into the ocean and all of our natural things that occur like
8 your El Nino and these things that help destroy a lot of fish, and the amount of people
9 that destroy fish, gill-netters.

10 Just too many people, for one thing, and breaching dams is not going to help any.
11 We're going to lose agriculture because of it. I just don't feel that it's going to help.
12 Thank you.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

14 MR. HAYES: My name is Howard Hayes. I'm the president, CEO of St.
15 Joseph Regional Medical Center in Lewiston, Idaho. We serve as the regional medical
16 center for 125,000 people in a bi-state area of southwestern Washington, north-central
17 Idaho.

18 We have 860 employees in Lewiston, and we oppose breaching
19 of the dams. And we've submitted a letter in that regards. We'd like to add some
20 additional comments to provide some further insight to the Corps.

21 We believe breaching of the dams will have a severe economic impact on the
22 community as a whole ,and it will impact all people within our service area including the
23 hospital and health care within the population.

24 It will negatively impact the employer's ability to afford all the health insurance
25 benefits for its employees and families which will, in turn, have a negative impact on the

1 hospital's ability to recoup -- retain medical specialists to meet the needs of the area,
2 even the elderly and Medicare patients and Medicaid patients who need specialized
3 services.

4 That will, in turn, also reduce their access to medical care and will need to travel
5 long distances for needed care in the urban areas, from Lewiston such as Spokane
6 (inaudible), and that should be a careful consideration by the Corps on the impact of
7 access to medical care in rural areas.

8 And we strongly endorse the Corps' decision to oppose breaching of the dams.
9 Thank you.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

11 MR. PFLIGER: I'm Tom Pfliger, assistant administrator at St. Joseph Regional
12 Medical Center in Lewiston, Idaho. Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with
13 comments from St. Joseph Regional Medical Center regarding the future way of life
14 unique to this valley and region.

15 St. Joseph Regional Medical Center strongly opposes any breaching,
16 bypass or removal proposals by the four dams on the lower Snake River.

17 St. Joseph Regional Medical Center is the largest hospital for 100 miles,
18 and provides health care services to the over 145,000 people throughout this
19 region.

20 St. Joseph recognizes the devastating consequences the removal of these
21 dams would have on the health and well-being of the people of the region.

22 We also are aware of the negative impact this would have on our way of life
23 and how our quality of life will be diminished

24 Having 860 employees, St. Joseph appreciates the economic benefits our current
25 river system provides to the people of the region.

1 Our current river system is the life blood for the region and provides a significant
2 contribution to the health of our economy.

3 A healthy economy is a benefit to the health of the community, in addition to the
4 economic benefit.

5 The river system currently employs many recreational opportunities also important
6 to the community's health, including fishing.

7 Being in health care, we rely on a solid scientific body of evidence when pursuing
8 treatments or remedies, even radical remedies.

9 The current body of scientific evidence is inconclusive on the actual benefit, if any,
10 breaching would have on salmon.

11 We do know that breaching would negatively impact other species of fish and negatively
12 impact the people of our region.

13 St. Joseph prays that the poor will take heed of the oath physicians take and
14 practice this dictum, to work for the good of the patient, to do no harm.

15 Please work for the good of our people and do no harm. St. Joseph Regional
16 Medical Center strongly opposes any and all breaching proposals because of the great
17 harm it will do to our people. Thank you.

18 THE MEDIATOR: Thank you.

19 MR. ALLBEE: My name is Rod Allbee. I've been a valley resident since 1969, a
20 Potlatch employee since 1979. And I would just like all issues explored and all viable
21 alternative methods looked at in a common sense, sensible way.

22 I don't know if dam breaching is the answer. I don't know if it's the problem or the
23 solution, but I think all avenues ought to be explored. That's all I have to say. Thank
24 you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

1 MR. NEAL: I'm Jack Neal, a farmer from Garfield, Washington. And I'm
2 very disturbed about the fact that there's a possibility that the dams could be
3 removed.

4 Removing the dams would have a very devastating effect on eastern Washington
5 and Idaho, and no proof it would increase the salmon.

6 Removing many of the gill nets and predators would be a big help. It has been
7 estimated we would need an additional 7,000 trucks to haul grain to the coast, plus the
8 loss of electricity -- loss of electricity, irrigation and much more. Again, removing the
9 dams would be a devastating effect not only to Lewiston and Clarkston, but all of eastern
10 Washington and northern Idaho

11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

12 MR. WARREN NEAL: My name is Warren Neal. I'm a third-generation farmer
13 from Garfield, and I am highly opposed to the breaching of the dams. Agriculture is
14 getting to be a very difficult way to make a living, and adding increased prices to ship
15 products now to Portland I think will be devastating to our region.

16 In my local area, we've already removed all the railroads up in that area except
17 one line which is not accessible for most of us to ship by. And I believe that the taking
18 out of the dams would be terribly detrimental to the economy, and I think it will dry up,
19 and you'll see rural Washington State pretty much fold away and many farmers totally
20 lose their way of income.

21 The truck traffic that would increase to try to move grain to Portland, I don't believe
22 our transportation system can even come close to handling that.

23 So I really feel that this has not been thought through well, and believe we need to
24 the keep the system in place as it is. Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

1 MR. PHILLIPS: My name is Mark Phillips, and I oppose breaching the dams
2 because I feel that it would be too much of an economic hardship on the farming
3 community in this area.

4 The cost of shipping grain is already too high and takes too big a bite out of the
5 price of grain. And I believe the money that would be spent breaching dams would be
6 better used on other economically feasible plans to help the communities in the area.

7 Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

9 MR. COCHRAN: My name is Craig Cochran from Garfield, Washington. I
10 oppose the dam breaching. I think it's counter-productive to use the last step -- last-ditch
11 effort first.

12 I think there's a lot of other things that could be done, and I do not think that would
13 help to save the salmon.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

15 MR. MILLER: Yeah, my name is Dan Miller, and I'd just like to state I'm against
16 the breaching of the dams. I'd like to see -- as a fisherman, I'd like to see -- give an
17 option of stopping all fishing on the river for salmon and steelhead, and also fishing by --
18 a contribution by everybody, including the tribes and people on the coast.

19 So I'd like to see -- beings how the salmon and steelhead
20 are an endangered species, then I think we ought to give it a
21 chance to stop fishing for, say, four years and try that before we
22 do any dam breaching because I don't think it makes any economic sense.

23 And I don't really believe taking out the dams will preclude the fish -- the fishery
24 anyway. That's basically all I have to say.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

1 MR. KING: Hi. My name is Steve King. I work for Potlatch Corporation, and I
2 have a small fishing guide service. I'd like to
3 thank you for letting me talk today.

4 I'm just going to talk to you about a few things I've learned and seen over the
5 years. It's not going to be no scientific study. I've lived in this valley all my life, and I
6 caught my first steelhead and salmon before Lower Granite Dam, Dworshak Dam and all
7 the fish hatcheries.

8 I can remember fishing some of the old holes with all the old timers, the old retired
9 people talking about the good years, the bad years, when the runs were up and down, so
10 this isn't something new as a lot of people are trying to make out.

11 I can remember after Lower Granite Dam went in and the fishing dropped off, and
12 everybody knew it would happen. The majority of the people around here didn't want the
13 dams to begin with.

14 Just the Corps of Engineers and business community backed it, it was pushed
15 down our throat, and it disrupted the life of everybody here. Now they're wanting to
16 disrupt our life again.

17 They catered to the minority when they put the dams in. Lets cater to the majority
18 the way it's supposed to be. After fishing dropped off after Lower Granite Dam, they
19 closed down the fishing.

20 They built the hatcheries. They reopened it back up a couple years later. Then
21 came the regulations. The first was the dorsal fin regulations.

22 I can remember coming in one day after fishing, had a couple of fish, had a Fish &
23 Game biologist there checking the fish. He told me I had one wild fish and one hatchery
24 fish.

25 I said, "No, they're both hatchery fish."

1 He says, "No, one of them has an adipose stamp."

2 I said, "Well, they don't have dorsal fins. "

3 He said, "Well, it has nothing to do with it."

4 Well, in all my years fishing, all the wild fish always had a dorsal fin. People are
5 always talking about all the scientific studies that are going on.

6 I just wonder if the same people -- the same guy that told me that didn't
7 know the difference between a wild fish and a hatchery fish, is the same person that's
8 doing all these scientific studies that we keep hearing about.

9 Also keep hearing breach the dams to save the fish. Well, I can remember the
10 draw-down about nine, ten years ago. Boy, that sure was a pretty sight.

11 They say 90 percent -- 95 percent of the smolt are reaching the ocean but only two
12 percent are returning

13 I'm not sure if those numbers are correct, but lets do something about the fish
14 getting back. Let's get the terns off Rice Island, which is a man-made island. Let's help
15 balance the drift nets. Lets re-enact the Monroe Doctrine.

16 There was a 200-mile limit off our coast. I believe one person told me one day,
17 said, well, the UN and the world court wouldn't allow us to do that.

18 The way I see it, we support the world anyhow, so they can kiss my you know
19 what.

20 Also, let's control the predators in the ocean and lets get the gill nets
21 out of the Columbia River. Like I said, we can always subsidize the tribe.

22 So just to close, let's use some common sense. Remember, for the people, by the
23 people, not for a few, by a few. Let's do what's right for the whole America and for our
24 economy. Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

1 MS. HOOVER: My name is Dolores Hoover from Clarkston, Washington, and I'm
2 a housewife. Years ago there were reasons why our fathers built our Northwest dams.
3 Those reasons still exist.

4 The dams provide, one, flood control; two, affordable hydroelectric power; three,
5 affordable barge transportation; four, greater recreational opportunities; five, irrigation to
6 arid sections of our Northwest.

7 Our dam builders years ago tried to be sensitive to the fish species and
8 incorporated fish ladders in their plans to help fish up and around the dams. They used
9 the technology of their time.

10 Surely we can make use of newer science to make fish passage better. There is
11 no need to tear down the whole house just because one inside wall isn't where we want
12 it. Thank you.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

14 MR. MIZER: Hi, my name is Steve Mizer, M-i-z-e-r. And I would just like to say
15 that I'm against breaching the dams. I don't understand how they can even consider
16 breaching the dams when there's fishing going on for these salmon.

17 When the bald eagle was an endangered species, there was no hunting on it. And
18 as far as I can tell -- I've contacted a few of the government agencies -- there has never
19 been a hunting season on endangered species.

20 I don't understand why you're considering taking out the dams while there's still a
21 fishing season on these salmon. And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

23 MR. BUDD: My name is Gary Budd and I reside in Lewiston, Idaho. For the
24 better part of the last 30 years, my livelihood has revolved around slack water in the
25 Lewiston area and the upper Snake River pool.

1 Even though I didn't live in Lewiston at that time, I lived in Great Falls, Montana,
2 and I worked for a grain elevator company that originated grain out of North Dakota,
3 South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and the tributary to the Snake River pool.

4 And the company that I worked for also operated the Clarkston Grain Terminal
5 here at the Port of Clarkston. So this situation does not only affect people in our area,
6 but it affects people in the entire Northwest system.

7 At the present time, I manage the Uniontown Cooperative Association. That's
8 about 14 miles from Lewiston. Due to the slack water, at the present time, we have no
9 rail system up there. You can go and look and there's no railroads. They've even taken
10 the rails and everything out.

11 I serve about 170 growers and producers in that area, and that grain that's in that
12 area is 100 percent tributary to the Port of Lewiston and Clarkston down here.

13 That cooperative also owns a portion of the Lewis & Clark Terminal Association
14 which I'm a board of director of. And we support the -- we support the non-removal of the
15 river system as it is now.

16 I have a resolution by the board of directors and the Uniontown Cooperative
17 Association I am submitting. We do support, though, prudent and managed -- prudent
18 and managed recovery of the salmon.

19 It has to be a proven way, it can't just be in some way that is not going to work out.
20 We are all environmentalists. We are either active environmentalists or environmental
21 activists.

22 One manages through proper use -- proper use of the resource, and the other
23 manages through absolutely no use.

24 When we have a situation like that, usually the species or whatever it is ends up
25 ruining its own self. I thank you for your time.

1 And we do not go along with the breaching of the dams in any form, and I do not --
2 there's got to be a better solution to this.

3 Every meeting that I've been to, the situation is micro-managed to the four lower
4 Snake River dams. And they're not looking at the entire situation with the over-fishing in
5 the Pacific Ocean and they're not looking at the other situations that happen on -- the
6 other situations that happened on the island out there in Astoria where the birds are
7 eating the smolts before they even get into the ocean to begin with.

8 Please keep everybody's interests and mine -- I'm not selfish and I don't think any
9 of us are selfish. We're trying to look at this difficult situation, but we do feel that the
10 industries that were created because of slack water need to be kept viable.

11 And there are a lot of people that are interested in having those there in order to
12 do their livelihood that they have in the past. And thank you for your time.

13 MR. KASPER: My name is Roy Kasper. I live in Lewiston, Idaho. Been a
14 resident of the state of Idaho for 46 years, worked for Potlatch for 32 years. Graduate
15 mechanical engineer.

16 In my view, breaching of the dams will not save the salmon, and the preferred
17 alternative would be to make modifications to the dams and to intensify the barging and
18 collection of the fish. That's the end of my comment.

19 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

20 MR. ZIPSE: Hi. I'm Brian Zipse. I live in Clarkston, Washington. I'm against dam
21 breaching because it has not been scientifically proven that it will restore the salmon
22 runs.

23 It will, however, disrupt thousands of lives due to loss of jobs, higher electrical
24 rates, shipping costs for farmers, paper, logs, et cetera. It will increase road and rail
25 traffic, thus causing more pollution.

1 We now have a cheap, non-polluting source of electrical power. Breaching will
2 turn this to an expensive source by using fossil fuel or nuclear power plants.

3 These both pollute the environment heavily. I am totally against breaching the
4 dams. Thank you.

5 MR. DRAPER: Hi. My name is Thomas Draper. I'm 44 years old. I speak for
6 myself, my daughter who could not attend because she's in school, my son who could
7 not attend who's in school, and my other daughter could not attend because of school.

8 I'm against breaching the dams for the reason we will lose 14,000 acres of
9 wetlands, marshes, ecosystems that have been in place for over 25 years.

10 The loss of these creatures, mammals, reptiles, bugs, insects, all fit into this
11 ecosystem. A true environmentalist would not let this happen. We cannot let this
12 happen. Thank you.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

14 MR. HART: Paul Hart, Culatesac, Idaho. I'm opposed to the destruction of the
15 dams of the Snake River. In my opinion, removing the dams would have a very
16 minuscule effect on increasing salmon numbers, at least for the next 40 to 50 years,
17 depending on many future factors and practices.

18 Population expansion along with related consequences such as industrial,
19 residential development, road construction, agricultural, sivicultural, recreational use,
20 commercial harvest, tribal harvest, sport fisheries and predators such as sea lions and
21 gulls all have a major effect on the salmon as well as other species of wildlife.

22 A multitude of studies by fisheries biologists from National Marine Fishery Service,
23 the Fish & Game Department and Department of Natural Resources from the
24 Northwestern states as well as studies by independent fish biologists suggests that there
25 is a lot of guesswork in salmon science.

1 This is upheld by the fact that the fish numbers in dammed and undammed rivers
2 fluctuate unexplainably.

3 Estimated returns from the ocean may not materialize. I believe the dams should
4 be left in place and one of the other three alternatives should be used to try to recover the
5 Snake River salmon. Thank you.

6 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

7 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: My name is Wiley Hollingsworth. I'm a Pullman,
8 Washington boy. I'll just read snippets from the paper. Part one: An economic value of
9 salmon.

10 Over the long run, salmon may provide more economic value than the jobs at the
11 Potlatch mill.

12 One risk factor is the nature of big business.

13 They open and close mills as suits their own interests, not the interests of
14 individual mill towns.

15 The other risk factor is the dirty nature of the sulfuric acid process. If the Fiber
16 Brite (inaudible) is legalized, Potlatch might set up mills to process that clean source of
17 fiber, and it may close a corresponding number of its dirtier mills.

18 Potlatch makes an undependable sort of base for our state's economy, but if we
19 give the salmon what they need to thrive, the salmon will provide an economic base for
20 thousands of years.

21 Our cheapest option: Because breaching the dams appears to be the keystone in
22 our salmon recovery, it might be the least-cost option since to boost the salmon
23 population (inaudible).

24 Other measures wouldn't have to be as extensive as they would without the boost.
25 Irrigation in Idaho, people who log in graves or mine, hatcheries, the fisheries.

1 So breaching the dams will benefit irrigation and all natural resource construction
2 industries. If we let the salmon go extinct, the U.S. will owe, perhaps, tens of billions of
3 dollars.

4 Sunken costs? If New England, California, et al, have to see tens of billions of
5 federal dollars be spent on treaty reparations, they might quit supporting federal money
6 for the annual subsidies for Columbia River barging and hydropower.

7 To the extent that we might lose those subsidies whether or not we breach the
8 dams, they are sunken costs and are irrelevant to the decision.

9 Let's give full weight to biologists whose jobs depend on the continued flow of
10 salmon.

11 Since what they say, that breaching the dams is the keystone and the only way of
12 salmon recovery, and that without breaching, there is probably no recovery of a
13 meaningful run.

14 Part two: The moral value of salmon. (Inaudible) self-sacrifice of the spawning
15 runs have always spoken to the depths of the (inaudible) illustrates a good sense of
16 values. Previous generations of Americans held those similar values, but we have
17 become impervious.

18 We have taken five to six trillion dollars from our young to support so much
19 consumerism. We're abandoning our young, and an increasing number of grandparents
20 hide from their young in 65 and older housing developments.

21 Again, the undependability of the jobs provided by big business. I applaud those
22 Potlatch employees who have not bought big houses, RV's, boats, second cars, et
23 cetera, but who have chosen to live below their means, to save and invest in an
24 appreciating asset with the goal of becoming self-financed and no longer dependent upon
25 big business.

1 They contribute to the economic establishment of their community, and I applaud
2 those families who value people, not according to their possessions, but how they spend
3 money and practice their social skills (inaudible). They contribute to the safety of their
4 communities (inaudible.)

5 I applaud those families because they exemplify the moral (inaudible.) I invite all
6 parties to join with me and do their part in providing the conditions that the salmon need
7 to survive and thrive. Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

9 MR. STUTZMAN: My name is James F. Stutzman, and I'm here today
10 representing myself. I'm very much opposed to the removal of the four dams on the
11 lower Snake River.

12 I am in favor of the proposal that would keep the dams in place and provide major
13 system improvements to help the fish. After all, the Corps of Engineers in recent years
14 has continued to improve fish survival and return rates.

15 As the people that live in this area know, there are only four significant ways out of
16 the valley. None of these roads is a multi-lane freeway that many states have the luxury
17 of having.

18 Highway 12 west would be the most affected by additional freight haulers that
19 replace the barging system. Even now at certain times, this road is crowded and
20 dangerous.

21 In looking at the public safety of the people who travel Highway 12, conditions will
22 only get worse with the increased truck traffic due to the loss of river navigation.

23 I feel that accidents will increase and so will resulting injuries and even deaths.
24 The -- excuse me. The removal of the dams will also expose almost 30 years of
25 sediment build-up in the reservoirs that will be washed down the rivers with every

1 rainstorm.

2 I would think that this would have a negative impact on all aquatic life on the river,
3 not just the salmon.

4 I also look at dam removal as a loss of farmland that has been reclaimed due to
5 modern irrigation methods.

6 This loss will return the farms to desert, and the loss of food produced will result in
7 an area equivalent to the dust bowl of the 30's.

8 I hope that you consider the great benefit of providing food and other crops which
9 are of use to man that would be lost as we return the area to a desert. The loss of the
10 dams will result in increased power demands that have to be met by other generating
11 facilities.

12 Since this nation has decided it does not want nuclear power, those power
13 deficiencies will have to be generated by fossil fuel plants that burn either coal, natural
14 gas or oil.

15 Its result is an increase in thermal pollution, greenhouse gasses, particulate
16 emissions and vapors or fume emissions. Fossil fuels are a non-renewable resource,
17 and since the oil embargo of the 70's, this country has had an agenda of improving
18 the efficiency of anything that uses fossil fuel in order to help prolong the availability of
19 these items.

20 There was a small article from the Associated Press in the Lewiston Morning
21 Tribune a year or so ago that the Conference on Global Warming in Kyoto, Japan,
22 identified three forms of environmentally-friendly power generation.

23 Those are solar, wind, and hydroelectric. If we are truly environmentalists, I
24 encourage you to look at the overall effect of removing the dams and decide to keep
25 them in place. Thank you for your time.

1 MR. KERNAN: Hi. My name's Jim Kernan, and I'm a resident of Lewiston, Idaho.
2 I'm opposed to breaching the four fish-friendly hydroelectric dams on the Snake River
3 system.

4 I believe there are alternatives such as limiting gill-netting and fishing seasons, just
5 to name a few. Lost jobs, irrigation water, higher taxes for road -- excuse me -- higher
6 taxes for highway improvements, commodities prices, et cetera, it just doesn't make
7 sense to me. Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

9 MR. ETTELL: My name is Marvin Ettell, 2668 Highline Drive, Clarkston,
10 Washington. Thank you for this time to give my testimony about the area above Lower
11 Granite Dam and the area now covered by Lower Granite Lake. I feel I can speak with
12 firsthand knowledge because my family was directly involved with the river.

13 Very few of you hear this, or any of you can say, that you are direct descendants
14 that were raised at Malloy, and I doubt that anyone married someone born of Malloy.

15 But my wife of 42 years was, her mother was, her grandfather was. Her
16 great-grandfather came to Malloy in 1883 from a farm in the Colton area.

17 I'm personally familiar with the area from Malloy to Lewiston, and my
18 mother-in-law, June Crestfield has written two historical books about the area.

19 And there have been many family discussions on the history, development and
20 use of the river.

21 My recollection began in the mid-40's when I went with my parents by car down
22 the bumpy road to the Batty fruit ranch for peaches. My firsthand experiences began in
23 the 50's while dating my wife, and continued through the 60's until the present with
24 hunting, fishing with my brother-in-law Rick Crestfield and others who still live in the
25 Malloy canyon.

1 My grandfather Lance Batty, father-in-law Byron Crestfield, all of us watched the
2 river system. We watched the process of building dams on the Snake and helped our
3 grandparents move from their fruit ranch on the river. And with great anticipation, we saw
4 the pool raise forming Granite Lake and finally saw the forks develop.

5 Recreation on the lakes behind the dams quickly flourished, and the best damned
6 river transportation system on the west coast began operations.

7 The river was used by our family for four generations, the oldest using it for travel
8 and irrigation of the orchard, some fishing. And in the 60's, the present work force that I
9 am involved with helped build the dams.

10 And now our environmentalists fueled by a fish-saving generation wants to tear
11 them down. The Save the Salmon circle wants to place the blame for fish extinction on
12 the four Snake River dams when no one knows for sure the results will save the fish.

13 One thing is for sure, we, fish and everything is born -- that is born on this earth
14 will eventually die, no matter what you do. It took 150 years to get the dams in place for
15 river transportation. The most efficient available in this locality.

16 The salmon circle have a life -- or the salmon have a life cycle of three to six years
17 depending on the species. Doesn't common sense tell anyone anything?

18 Quit fishing for a few years and let the life cycle of fish help restore the balance.
19 Don't take away the families in this area. One final story I'll leave you with. When the
20 four lower Snake River dams flooded the fruit orchards on the Snake River valley, fruit
21 became extinct.

22 You could no longer pick a fresh peach, apple, cherries from the orchards in the
23 area. We still have many slopes suitable for fruit orchards, and the Corps and others
24 have spent millions trying to save the fish with no consideration for helping depressed
25 farmers in this area bring back the soft fruit industry that was destroyed.

1 I make this statement: I would trade one good succulent Snake River peach tree
2 for all of the fish in the Snake River. Thank you. Save the dams.

3 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

4 MR. SCHONEFELD: My name is Alan Schonfeld. I live up-river in Kooskia. I feel
5 the other methods have been tried and proven unsuccessful. It's time to breach the
6 dams, save the salmon from extinction.

7 If we drag our feet much longer, we'll lose this magnificent species forever, and
8 the steelhead will follow soon. As a long time resident of the upper Clearwater, I say
9 breach.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

11 MS. SCHONEFELD: My name is Bonnie Schonefeld. I am from Kooskia, Idaho.
12 And I remember the last big salmon runs in the late 70's when fishermen from all over
13 lined the banks.

14 Our communities are hard pressed in an era of declining resources. Dam removal
15 could restore the salmon and give the local economy a boost. It makes sense for the fish
16 and the people.

17 As a taxpayer, we have wasted billions of dollars in salmon recovery efforts since
18 1981, and these efforts have failed. It's time to quit throwing our money away on barging
19 and trucking

20 I am more than willing to pay the estimated electrical bill increase of a dollar to \$5
21 a month to save the salmon from extinction. I'm not willing to spend more money -- more
22 money on failed programs. Extinction is not an option. Take out the dams.

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

24 MR. GOFFINET: My name is Rocky Goffinet. I'm a farmer. And I've never been
25 to one of these meetings before because I thought it was so ludicrous that it was

1 completely out of the question, but now maybe it's time to start fighting. And once the
2 fighting starts, I don't believe any of these people (inaudible.) Thank you.

3 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

4 MS. HAGEDORN: Hi. I'm Joan Hagedorn. I live in Lewiston. I think this proposal
5 to breach the dams is one of the most ridiculous things. I can't believe adult, serious
6 people are even considering doing it.

7 We have so much to lose. Having been a farmer, and the irrigation and all these
8 people that have put their life savings into farming in central Washington and Idaho, I just
9 can't imagine what this country would be like without that.

10 Our transportation and our beautiful rivers. I think we should remember what it
11 was like when they did drawdown the river. It was just a stinking mess. So I'm very
12 much opposed to the breaching of any of the dams. As long as we've got them in here,
13 for heaven's sakes, let's let them be. Thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

15 MR. STOUT: I'm Eugene Stout, a farmer in the Uniontown area. If we breach
16 dams, we would be going backwards in progress. Potlatch Mill and farmers would lose
17 millions of dollars and thus be a ghost town.

18 Mark Soloman, who seems to be the most outspoken on this issue, has been
19 nothing but an agitator as long as I've known him. He is just lucky it is 2000 instead of
20 1800.

21 If it was 1800, he would probably be hanging from a tree today. Is that all right?
22 Hanging from a tree?

23 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

24 MR. STOUT: That's the truth. If it was 1800, he'd be awful --

25 THE MODERATOR: But you'd have to catch him. Is that it, sir? Thank you.

1 MR. BUSH: I'm James Bush, a retired farmer from Clarkston, Washington, 1857
2 Fredrickson Drive. Phone number is 751-9148. This seems to be the most ridiculous
3 thing I've ever seen the federal government spend money on, and they've done plenty of
4 that.

5 But to waste all our money on this for nothing and have nothing to show for it is
6 beyond my thinking. There has been no research done on what happens to the salmon
7 once they enter the ocean.

8 And they say they don't come back, but nobody's' looked in the boats of Taiwan,
9 Japan, Russia, China and so on.

10 A lot of those fish are taken out by them, not by us. The cost of these hatcheries
11 would have to continue. If they let the water out to try to raise more fish, and the cost of
12 those hatcheries is funded with the retirement funds, the wages paid to keep those going.

13 I'm a terrific fishermen. I've caught two salmon -- or two steelhead in my lifetime,
14 so I don't think I'm over overrunning the amount of them. But I do think that the farmers
15 need the transportation for their wheat.

16 We need recreation and other things that we've developed over the years here.
17 So I think it should be kept going the way it is. We built the dams. And repair some of
18 them, the turbines and so forth, whatever's necessary to get those fish down there and
19 back. Thank you.

20 MR. REED: My name is Dwight Reed, resident of Lewiston. I am firmly against
21 the breaching of the lower Snake River dams. From the information I have received,
22 there is no benefit, no practical or common sense reason for this to happen.

23 I firmly believe that we can have both fish and the dams if we work together to get
24 the job done instead of all this bickering that's going on. Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

1 MR. BLEDSOE: Yes. My name is Cyrus Bledsoe. I do not believe breaching of
2 the dams is going to save the salmon. I think we need to look at everything, from the way
3 they harvest down in the ocean to the way they harvest in the Columbia River.

4 I think once these facts have been looked at -- truthfully looked at, I believe you'll
5 find the true answer, that it's not the dams that are keeping the salmon from coming up,
6 it's the way we harvest, and it's got to be changed. And that's all I have.

7 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

8 MR. MARVIN: My name is Leland Marvin. I reside here in Clarkston, Washington.
9 I've been here 70 years. As a result, my comments are in regards to back when they first
10 were surveying and doing the analysis of these projects of these dams, resulting now that
11 never -- turned out negative.

12 It's probably typical bureaucracy, but on the other hand, there was a great
13 commitment made, and it's been a very real, practical, real economical commitment
14 resulting now that they want to alter their plans and so forth. The results are very
15 negative.

16 It's black and white. We aren't going to do anything to save the salmon anymore
17 than we did already.

18 There's got to be more sound facts to approve such a thing, and it isn't coming by
19 taking out the dams.

20 That's my main object of this talk, is to say that they did their survey, they did their
21 original planning, and resulting now that they're going to try to turn this all around.

22 And it would be a very negative thing in many, many ways, many ways to
23 enumerate, in particular only economically. That's about all I have to say right now.

24 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Thank you.

1 MR. WEZA: My name is Tom Weza, and I have lived in this valley my entire life. I
2 hunted these hills and fished in the waters of the Snake River before the dams were built.

3 I remember when this stock -- this site right here was a livestock yard and
4 slaughterhouse. There was a pipe coming out of the building with blood water running
5 into the river.

6 I remember the alfalfa fields and orchards bordering the river, and recall the
7 promise we received about the benefits of the dams that were to be built.

8 Like many, I signed petitions and protested against the dams. I did not want to
9 see what I felt was to be the death of the river.

10 I drove the down river road highly slack water was being raised behind Lower
11 Granite Dam, and watched as many of my favorite places were being flooded.

12 As time progressed, I saw that the promise of the benefits of the dams were true.
13 Hydroelectric power, barge transportation, tour boats, recreation, irrigation and a cleaner
14 and better valley.

15 The source of the reservoirs and rivers are by far cleaner now than they were at
16 that time. Before, there were broken fences, junk cars, dead marauding livestock and the
17 like.

18 I know what a free-flowing Snake River is like.

19 I have lived it and seen it, and I believe that breaching the dams would be a
20 terrible mistake for human kind and the fish. The dams are not stopping the fish from
21 returning. Yes, they are an obstacle, but so were the Cascade Falls on the Columbia
22 River long ago.

23 The problem lies with the excessive killing of the juvenile fish by sea birds and sea
24 lions and excessive killing of returning adult fish by offshore and inland fishing.

1 You think that you could swim through all those nets on the Columbia? Slow down
2 or stop the over-harvest and watch the fish numbers increase.

3 You cannot increase a heard of cattle by slaughtering all your cows. If you want
4 calves, you have to have cows to produce them.

5 The same goes for salmon. I know that this hearing is about the four Snake River
6 dams, but what about the lower Columbia dams

7 I cannot understand why those dams are not said to stop fish and these dams are.
8 They all have fish ladders. If the decision is made to remove these dams, perhaps the
9 rest of them should go, too.

10 Also, I must ask this question, because I truly do not know the answer. Were our
11 native tribes paid or reimbursed for the loss of ancestral fishing ground that were flooded
12 by slack water?

13 If so, would they be required to pay back the money awarded to them when those
14 places are once again open to fishing?

15 I'm asking because I want to see them prosper. I do not wish to see them be the
16 losers.

17 In closing, we must use a common sense approach to salmon recovery. I am in
18 favor of alternative three, which is aggressive non-breach.

19 Breaching the dams and destroying all the benefits in the economy that they have
20 created is not using common sense. Thank you.

21 MR. EDDY: My name is Jim Eddy. I was born in Lewiston and have lived here all
22 of my life. My wife and I own a small business, and we have since 1975.

23 We just returned from a trip to Texas, a trip which we took by auto. All along the
24 whole way, we were overwhelmed by the amount of trucks on the highways. So many
25 trucks.

1 Many people will probably address this issue, but it would be extremely hard to
2 imagine how many more trucks would be on our highways without our waterway.

3 With each truck trip brings the added wear and tear on the roadway, pollution and
4 the added dangers of excess traffic. The reason I asked to speak today is to address the
5 issue of tourism. A lot has been said about barges and shipping.

6 I think that we need to consider the impact that breaching would have on the valley
7 businesses without slack water. For approximately nine months out of the year, cruise
8 boats navigate upriver from Portland to the Port of Clarkston and Port of Wilma.

9 These boats include the Sea Lion, the Sea Bird, the Spirit of Discovery, the Spirit
10 of Alaska, the Spirit of '98, and the Queen of the West.

11 These ships use the services of many businesses in the valley. We all cater to
12 them with fuel, laundry, groceries, and supplies, repairs, auto rental and taxi, jet boat trips
13 up the river, and the list goes on and on.

14 Each week, they bring approximately 1,000 people into the valley that otherwise
15 would not visit here. All of those people also spend money in our local stores and
16 restaurants, not to mention the casino.

17 Speaking of the casino, the tribe should consider the impact breaching would have
18 on their own enterprise. Also worthy of mention are the countless personal pleasure craft
19 that visit our valley each year by way of water.

20 They also visit our theaters, stores, restaurants and motels. Without this revenue
21 coming in, I'm sure some of these companies would be forced to close their doors.

22 Our little business is just a mom and pops, but it is our means of support. Without
23 the navigable waterway, I am positive that the loss of revenues from these tourists would
24 be devastating, and our business would be one of the many that would be forced to
25 close.

1 We must take a long, hard look at the impact of a wrong decision. Thank you.

2 JAY ULRICH: We're having this big discussion about salmon and the rivers. I'd
3 like to know, what about the halibut season?

4 If we're having trouble with the salmon, what's causing the halibut to be so
5 scarce? Thank you.

6 MR. BOSS: My name is Pat Boss. I represent the Washington State Potato
7 Commission, an organization that represents potato growers throughout Washington
8 state.

9 Most of the potatoes in Washington state are grown in the Columbia basin and rely
10 on irrigation water from the Columbia and Snake rivers. potatoes are the second largest
11 crop grown in the state with an annual farm production value of approximately 500 million
12 dollars.

13 Washington state accounts for nearly one-third of all potatoes exported from the
14 U.S. to nearly 500 million in potato exports from the Port of Seattle, Portland and Tacoma
15 in 1999.

16 The Columbia Basin is the number one producing area of french fries in North
17 America. In summary, Washington State Potato Growers, packers and processors
18 create thousands of jobs locally in Washington state and generate approximately 2.5
19 billion dollars annually to the state's economy.

20 Because of the devastating impact the dam breaching would have on Washington
21 state potato industry and rural communities in Washington state, the potato commission
22 wants to take the opportunity today to provide comments on salmon recovery efforts.

23 First, let me say that I believe that we are here today to talk about how to save
24 fish. This is what debate is all about or what it should be about. We are not here to find
25 the rationale for taking out dams.

1 We care about salmon, but we also care about having a healthy economy and a
2 Washington state potato industry.

3 The fact is, this is not a fish vs. economy issue. Fish are important. The economy
4 is important. Since both are important, we need to take seriously our responsibility to
5 protect both and do what it is right for both.

6 If we continue to focus on alternatives for fish recovery that are too narrow like the
7 DEIS, we don't get good science and we continue to fight over fish vs. dams. We all end
8 up losers including the fish.

9 In reality, we should be considering broader holistic solutions that take a serious
10 look at the consequences that really get results. People of the Northwest should oppose
11 option four because removing dams is not the answer.

12 Here's why: Ten years ago the best scientific information said that only ten to 30
13 percent of salmon smolts survived the trip past the dams. Twenty-six west coast runs of
14 salmon and steelhead are listed under the ESA, and another eight are either candidates
15 or proposed for listing.

16 Of these 34 runs, only four pass the dams through the lower Snake River. Taking
17 an additional one million acre feet of irrigation water for flow augmentation will dry more
18 than 600,000 acres of productive farmland at an annual cost of 430 million dollars.

19 Hydropower is clean and renewable. Replacing hydropower with other generation
20 will adversely impact air quality. Obviously taking out dams or requiring more is not the
21 answer. The All-H paper is a step in the right direction.

22 We believe it looks more honestly at improving habitat, hydropower and hatchery
23 operations while addressing harvest, plus it begins to define goals that the region is truly
24 interested in recovering our fish populations, we must have a comprehensive plan such
25 as this.

1 A lot is at stake, and these alternatives and study results should be considered
2 carefully.

3 I urge you to base your decisions on good sound science, science that strives to
4 understand survival through the river system as well as the effects on climate and
5 conditions in the estuary and the ocean.

6 Our lives here are built around these remarkable rivers. They have given us
7 clean, renewable power, irrigation for growing our crops, navigation for moving our
8 products to market, recreation opportunities as well as prevented floods.

9 In closing, we need to seriously consider the devastating impact of radical and
10 risky fixes such as dam breaching which will destroy our economy and the lives of
11 thousands of people in the Pacific Northwest.

12 MR. COULTHARD: My name's Vern Coulthard, and I'm in favor of keeping the
13 dams where they are and looking for alternative methods to increase the salmon coming
14 back, that by taking the dams out, it isn't the answer to the problem of the salmon. It's
15 going to create more problems for people and the environment down the road. Thank
16 you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

18 MS. RUSSELL: I'm Pamela Russell. I represent the Idaho Green Organization
19 or, IGO as we're known as. In 1964, there was a big flood on the Tucannon River. At
20 that time, we had three ponds of baby chinook salmon on our place. The floods took out
21 those ponds.

22 Years later, we have a fall run of chinook on the Tucannon. We have a spring run
23 of chinook on the Tucannon. Now, lo and behold, after years of only two runs of fish,
24 spring and fall, we now have a run of chinook salmon that come up the Tucannon in
25 January, the same time as that flood.

1 The dams were already in place. My question is, why do we have a new run of
2 chinook where there were none before if the dams are hampering the fish as they say. I
3 think we need to look further for other causes. Thank you.

4 MR. MOSES: Yes. My name is Ronald Alan Moses. I'm a Nez Perce Tribal
5 member, and my Indian name is Rhea Lime. That means Spirit of the Wind, God of the
6 Hunt First Kill.

7 We've been going to these meetings on these dams since they started having
8 them when I moved home from Utah in the late 60's. In the 70's, my junior high years, I
9 attended meetings. I've listened to the scientists. I've listened to Army Corps. I've
10 listened to the conservation. I've listened to all of this. But year after year, since the
11 60's, I've been watching these salmon from these different places go away for various
12 reasons, you know.

13 You can blame the dams, you can blame DDT, you can blame toxins, you can
14 blame Potlatch, but you've got to stop and realize, the salmon are part of an ecosystem
15 just like anything else.

16 If they go, what else is next? Around the Kamiah area, they're getting salamander
17 with bits of fluorescent pink and blue. I've mentioned it to people up at U of I. There's
18 obviously something in the air that's growing genotoxins that are getting into the water
19 that's getting into the streams.

20 You know, it's everybody, the farmer, too, the miners. Look what the gold miners
21 are doing with the mercury, the things they use in the water of that sort. That's all
22 something that needs to be paid attention to.

23 You know, it's time now to stop pointing fingers back and forth and saying, "You
24 did it, you did it, you did it." It's time to come together and realize you can't do nothing
25 with one hand if you keep pointing in all different directions.

1 If you grab your hand and you pull all your fingers together instead of keep
2 whining, you're going to have a powerful fist, and that's going to make something,
3 because you're going to be able to do something with that than just carry on and look at
4 each other and blame each other.

5 You know, maybe there is a way to keep all the dams and keep our salmon. If
6 there's not, let's get rid of half of them or part of it. Try it. Because you can't completely,
7 you know, just erase it and say, okay, there, maybe, there's a happy medium. Who
8 knows?

9 But the important thing is to stop and realize. And then the Forest Service in,
10 what was it, the 70's, they turned around and they had an ad in the paper I read when I
11 was about 14 years old, must have been around '74, said they're replacing the salmon at
12 Red Lake and a couple of these other lakes, saying they were just, you know, sockeye
13 and people didn't really care for them because they wanted to put, you know, the trout in
14 some of these higher lakes for the angle fishermen.

15 I said, that's something that needs to be looked into or checked on, but I just
16 haven't had the time to do it, but I keep mentioning it, hoping somebody will realize, you
17 know, hey, Forest Service had stuff to do with this, too.

18 Just like the grazing rights up in the mountains, you know, the animals have to --
19 the fish spawn and the animals all go, too, you know. Over-grazing clear up there
20 messes up the water system.

21 Everywhere you go you've got to think about it. The water's the most important
22 thing to us and anything that lives in it. It is scary if it goes, because then we're not going
23 to last much longer, either. Remember that. Thank you.

24 MR. SCHULTHEIS: My name is Tom Schulthe. I'm a fifth generation farmer from
25 the Colton, Washington area, about 15 miles north of Lewiston.

1 First of all, I'd like to say that I consider myself environmentally friendly. I do
2 everything in my power as a farmer and as a civilian to protect the environment.

3 Second of all, I'd like to say that I'd like to protect and save the salmon in any way
4 possible. And thirdly, I'd like to say that I think it's important that we keep the dams.

5 I think it's the wrong decision to breach our dams, because I don't think that that is
6 going to have any positive impact on saving the salmon.

7 There's just as much, if not more, scientific evidence that says that the dams in
8 place are not harming the flow -- the numbers of salmon, and in fact, maybe it has more
9 to do with the water temperature -- on the given years when the water temperature or the
10 environment or whatever you want to call it is colder, that increases the salmon numbers.

11 In a nutshell, I guess what I'd like -- I believe in my heart to be true is that we are
12 trying to fix a problem without having sufficient evidence that the means by the way we're
13 going to fix them, i.e., removing the dams, will ultimately solve the problem, and if that is
14 truly the case, then it is quite an expensive experiment that we're doing by removing the
15 dams.

16 Therefore, I'm highly opposed to that. When these dams were put in years ago,
17 starting with the Grand Coulee or whatever in 1933 and on down the line, we made a
18 decision what we wanted to invest our money in.

19 It would cost much more in today's dollars to try to put the dams back in. They're
20 here. We've made this decision years ago. Let's stick with what we've got.

21 Why are we wanting to put ourselves in a vulnerable national security interest
22 whereby we weaken our economic strength and have to be more reliant upon other
23 countries?

24 With this, I urge you to look at this from a common sense standpoint, from a long-
25 time Washington or local resident who is dedicated to preserve the best interest for the

1 natural resources and the human resources in this country. Let's don't be irrational.

2 Let's save our dams. Thank you.

3 MR. JAMISON: Okay. My name's Russell Jamison. I'm a Whitman County
4 farmer from Garfield, Washington. I was born in 1959, so that puts me around 41 years
5 old here in a week or so.

6 Anyway, the issue on the dams, I am against breaching the dams. I feel that the
7 economy in this area over the past 30 and 40 years that these dams have been in place
8 has grown and become accustomed to the river the way it is right now.

9 If the dams had never been put in place to begin with, then the way we live and
10 rely on whatever would have been built, the railroads or whatever, we would have
11 become accustomed to that, but that's not what happened.

12 And I feel that the dams, not only for the transportation value, but for the
13 hydroelectric power, that they should not be taken out. Another issue I am concerned
14 with is the amount of foreign trade that the United States is relying on from foreign
15 countries.

16 Currently, China is building one of the largest dams in the world to expand their
17 agriculture in that country. I feel by taking the dams out in America is transferring the
18 control from this country on our food, and in years to come, the children in the future will
19 be relying on foreign nations for their food, much more than they are today.

20 And I don't feel that this is a good thing or a good direction for our country to be
21 heading. Currently, the embargoes and restrictions that this country has on foreign
22 countries is an indication to me what foreign countries in the future could do to the United
23 States citizens if we depend on foreign nations for our food.

24 I think you should consider this when you make the decision whether or not to
25 breach the four dams. That's all.

1 THE MEDIATOR: Go ahead.

2 MR. MEYER: Oh, I just talk here?

3 THE MEDIATOR: Yeah.

4 MR. MEYER: Oh. My name is Kenneth Meyer. I live at Colton, Washington. I'm
5 a farmer. And I'm very much opposed to the breaching of the dams because that would
6 really interrupt our transportation.

7 I don't know. We're having a pretty tough time already now making ends meet,
8 and if we have -- if that would possibly cost us 30 cents a bushel more, why, it would
9 really be hard to make ends meet. And so I -- I guess that's all I have to say. Thank you.

10 MR. ELLSWORTH: My name is Ray Ellsworth, Jr. I live in Lewiston, Idaho. And
11 I've spent quite a bit of time trying to study the issues and talking to the experts around.

12 And basically, every one of the experts I talk to say breaching the dams is the not
13 going to save the salmon, so I don't even really know why we're here. Even if it came
14 down to it, if we knew for sure it would save the salmon, is it worth what we have to give
15 up?

16 As I understand, something like agriculture, that would be 48 million dollars a year
17 to save nothing. But what it's going to cost us in the increased prices of our electrical?
18 We're going to do away with all the recreation that we know today as far as the slack
19 water's presented for us. I guess that's basically what my testimony is. Thank you for
20 the time.

21 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Thank you.

22 MR. OATMAN: My name is Joseph Yacca Oatman. I'm a Nez Perce Tribal
23 member. I live in Glass Bend. And my feeling on the dam breaching issue is that I am all
24 for the breaching of the four lower Snake River dams.

1 I feel as a graduate of the University of Idaho in a fisheries management -- or
2 fisheries resource degree, that we have already been presented with the scientific
3 evidence that is so compelling that it dictates and calls for the breaching of the dams
4 under the normal river flow conditions.

5 And so under that, as well as treaty obligations between the United States and
6 Nez Perce Tribe, it is inconceivable to me that some direct action will not been taken due
7 to political -- due to political sway of our representatives from the state of Idaho,
8 Washington, Oregon.

9 And I'd like to see careful study and review of the scientific evidence available, and
10 will be presented to you as a manager or people in the position to decide on whether or
11 not the dams will be breached.

12 And so I would strongly urge and implore you to make the best decision available
13 -- make the best decision as possible, which is supported by scientific evidence, is to
14 breach the dams.

15 MR. GOMEZ: This is Mark Gomez. I am a resident of Lewiston, Idaho. And
16 there are a lot of issues involved here about saving the salmon, but one thing that I find
17 unbelievable is if salmon are really that important to save, then why are we still
18 harvesting them and fishing them and taking them out of the river so they can't
19 reproduce?

20 Seems like that would be the most logical choice, to do something to maintain their
21 populations and allow them to rejuvenate and allow them to come back to the spawning
22 grounds so we can have more fish in the future.

23 And any decision you make is going to affect jobs, is going to affect people, but it
24 seems like the most logical thing to do, is to do something to protect the salmon -- the
25 number of salmon coming back. And there are a lot of salmon being harvested all up and

1 down the river and the ocean. And there just must be a moratorium of some kind to
2 protect the salmon and their populations.

3 And even in the Pacific Ocean and perhaps in international waters. That would be
4 very tough to do, but we need to make that decision. After all, years ago when we had
5 buffalo and they were being disseminated [sic], we didn't continue to hunt buffalo and we
6 didn't decide to take out the railroads and didn't decide to take out the stagecoaches. We
7 decided to protect the buffalo and not harvest them.

8 Well, that's exactly what we need to do with the salmon. Thank you very much.

9 MR. ROBERTS: My name is Don Roberts. I've been a resident of Idaho since
10 1973, lived most of that time in northern Idaho.

11 I can accept the fact that at some point, either now or in the future, that the lower
12 Snake River dams will be removed.

13 If that becomes necessary, then the least that the federal government can do is to
14 construct an interstate highway from Missoula, Montana through Lewiston, either up to
15 Spokane or continue it on through to the Tri-Cities.

16 The federal government -- the programs of the federal government is what brought
17 the dams here. The city of Lewiston has now relied on those dams.

18 If you take those dams away, that is the least that the federal government can do.
19 In addition to that, if the dams were breached, the federal government would have to
20 come up with a mitigation plan for the restoration of the river banks in the
21 Lewiston-Clarkston area.

22 If you were able to see the last drawdown, you would understand that it would be
23 essential for the aesthetics of this community to have those river banks restored.
24 Leaving them to restore them naturally would take at least one generation. Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Have a nice afternoon.

1 MR. ZIMMERMAN: My name is Don Zimmerman. I live in Clarkston, Washington.
2 And I don't represent any organization, just myself and my family have lived in this area
3 for 47 years.

4 I'm totally opposed to any dam breaching. It's a big gamble, and what you're
5 gambling is my life and my livelihood and my family.

6 I'm presently putting two children through college and another one through high
7 school. I'm unable to do this if you breach these dams.

8 I'm not willing to gamble my life and my livelihood on somebody's hot-shot idea of
9 saving the salmon by breaching these dams. There's no proof you can show me. If
10 there was, then show me. Thank you.

11 MR. McCOY: My name is Michael S. McCoy, and I'm representing myself. I'm
12 from McCall, Idaho. I have a vested interest in the dams. My father helped build these
13 dams, and he predicted back when he was building these dams that they would probably
14 have to be breached some day.

15 I hear people talking about job loss. When the dams were built, they took jobs out
16 of southern Idaho.

17 My greatest fear about this is if we don't breach the dams, what are we -- what
18 kind of legacy are we going to leave about trying to change?

19 I worry most that it seems as if the people who have the least to lose by the
20 change are the most worried about the change, and they're also the people that are
21 going to gain the most in the long run, yet they're the ones that are fighting the change
22 the hardest.

23 They talk about the siltation. The siltation is not a real problem. It will blow out of
24 there when they breach the dams. The economy, as far as the barging -- barge traffic,
25 there was a thriving train economy through here at one time shipping the grain.

1 I grew up steelhead and salmon fishing on the South Fork and the Middle Fork of
2 the Salmon rivers, and we can't do that anymore. I remember being a kid and seeing big
3 fish, and I don't see those fish anymore.

4 I don't have a chance to show those fish to my children, and I think that's a very
5 sad statement, when we won't even take a chance to give those fish to my children.
6 Breaching the dams makes sense. Thank you.

7 MR. JOHNSON: My name is Richard Johnson. I'm an enrolled member of the
8 Nez Perce tribe. I'm in support of dam breaching. The far sense -- the current future
9 status of salmon will definitely be extinct within 15 to 17 years.

10 Looking at the status quo management, status quo management has driven the
11 anadromous fish into extinction. Looking at the short term -- short term of it, people
12 around here talk about jobs and the future, but look what their special interests are
13 gaining.

14 Right now, I'm a college student majoring in biology, so I plan on working with the
15 fish with the Nez Perce tribe. Our efforts as far as supplementing the region includes
16 1855 treaty territories which includes Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

17 But with our efforts to try to restore fish, we cannot restore fish when we have a
18 slack water system that is killing off our fish that we are putting out into the rivers. And to
19 continue on the effort of barging. Barging was -- if you want to bring back the fish, you
20 have to start barging in that sense.

21 But from our efforts and our point of view, you cannot sacrifice the salmon for short
22 term as far as transportation barging. In conclusion of that sense, if we're to bring back
23 the salmon, barging must be the first option that we take.

24 I guess from a tribal perspective, status quo management is unacceptable. For
25 future generations, dam breaching is imminent.

1 MR. MIMBS: My name's Brandon Mimbs and I live in the Moscow area. Thank
2 you for the opportunity to comment on the salmon in the four lower Snake River dams.
3 Salmon are a great resource.

4 They have a historical and cultural significance with the Pacific Northwest. They're
5 an integral component in the ecosystems of this region.

6 We need salmon for our way of life, for the environment and for the future. The
7 ecosystems of this region evolved with salmon as a major component. The health of
8 salmon relates to the health of the environment.

9 Salmon are an economic source for the region and could be a much greater
10 source if their populations were allowed the basic requirements necessary to survive and
11 grow.

12 We have a very important legal obligation to promote the health and survival of
13 wild salmon. The loss of salmon will not equal zero.

14 The fines will be substantial and last for years surpassing pro salmon experiences
15 -- expenses. For these reasons and others, the four lower Snake River dams are not
16 needed.

17 Salmon need an in-river migration route, and this requires that the dams be by
18 passed. The dams provide no flood control, provide less than five percent of electricity to
19 the region, and put far too much pressure on this great drainage and the fish.

20 Barging is a subsidized industry and there is a growing monopoly here as well. All
21 this provides for a less competitive market and shipping of goods.

22 Improving the transportation infrastructure will provide more options at a more
23 competitive market for the transportation of goods.

24 There are more vigorous options that should be pursued such as a railroad system
25 supplemented by trucking. Complete dependence on barging is not good.

1 I work in the wilderness areas of central Idaho. I've spent a fair amount of time and all
2 the drainage that has been salmon spawning ground for a long time.

3 I do not see any salmon. We cannot continue to assist them and omit some of the
4 most important constituents. The loss of an organism in an ecosystem affects the whole
5 ecosystem, even when that life is one with as much prominence as salmon.

6 This reaction flows throughout the chain of inter-relations and, yes, back to people.
7 Healthy salmon means healthy land which means healthy people. I ask for the bypassing
8 of the four lower Snake River dams. We need salmon. They need an in-water migration
9 route.

10 We do not need the four lower Snake River dams. Extinction is forever. This is a
11 great land with great rivers and wildlife. Let us be a part, not separate, thus share in its
12 greatness. We can delay no longer.

13 MR. DAVIS: My name's Rick Davis. I represent the Port of Clarkston from
14 Clarkston, Washington. We oppose the breaching of the lower Snake River dams, and
15 the reason is that because of the river traffic, port traffic.

16 We think that the economics of the area is more than vital than what's happened.
17 They also say that there is a way that we can save the dams and save the fish. At this
18 point in time, we feel it hasn't been done.

19 We also think that the biggest percentage of the fish would be lost in the ocean,
20 not on the dams themselves. We feel that the terns has taken a majority of the fish. We
21 think that the gill nets has taken the same. We think that the tribal rights should be pretty
22 much taken and worked over a little bit. And we also claim that funding and the moneys
23 that we have put into the infrastructure along the river needs to be thought about.

24 We think that the taxpayers of Lewiston and Clarkston also need to be taken care
25 of. The biological opinion that we've seen -- there needs to be a lot of different things

1 that needs to be done to that. We are hoping that the Corps of Engineers makes the
2 right decision on not breaching the dams because of the economic development of the
3 Lewiston-Clarkston valley and the surrounding areas.

4 There's too much to be at stake right now that will harm the valley and it will harm
5 the environment.

6 As far as we're concerned, if they take the water away, that the -- there's too much
7 sand and debris in the river that will take too many years to clean out and it will kill too
8 many fish.

9 National Marine Fisheries has indicated to us that 50 percent of the fish will die the
10 first year when the water of the dams are breached. And for every five years after that,
11 they will take another 50 percent.

12 That's telling us that all of the fish will die within the next five years. We feel that
13 there's ways to continue saving the fish with the dams and the people themselves.

14 And the Corps, National Marine Fisheries, the greenies and everybody else
15 needs to come together and come up with a well-planned solution. Thank you very
16 much.

17 MR. SNYDER: My name is Harry Snyder. I live at 1527 Lewiston, Idaho. I
18 represent my family. I feel that the approach that's being proposed as far as breaching
19 the dams, I'm opposed to that.

20 I am for bringing the salmon and steelhead runs back. I feel that we should
21 exhaust all other means such as removing the Caspian terns, changing the status of the
22 seals so they aren't (inaudible) too many of the steelhead and salmon coming back, and
23 also looking at the treaties with the Indian nations and the gill-netting that's occurring.

24 All these items should be looked at and approached before any dam removal
25 should occur. We don't want to sell the farm before we have it. Thank you.

1 MR. LARGENT: My name is Terry Largent. I represent Jones Truck &
2 Implement, Colfax, Washington. We're an ag farm dealership. I'm here to state that we
3 are against removal of the dams.

4 I believe that agriculture is the backbone of this country, and we need to support
5 more agriculture-related products and divisions. Therefore, I state that we're against the
6 breaching of the dams. Thank you.

7 MR. WAGNER: My name is Kevin Wagner from Farmington, Washington. I'm
8 here very much opposed to breaching of the dams. There are so many complex issues
9 involved in it as far as environmentally and economically that it's beyond my
10 comprehension that we could consider taking society backwards.

11 I've never known a society in the history of the world to progress and stay active
12 and go backwards, and this is backwards.

13 We have roads, hydrology issues, how it's going to support it, the traffic, to move
14 all these things up and down the river, the environmental issues as far as air quality, dust
15 control, all the other things, the water quality issues that are going to change so
16 dramatically from the different change in the hydrology.

17 The cost analysis that's been done by the Corps of Engineers, I think it's tried to
18 be thorough, but I don't think it comes even close to far enough.

19 I just got done visiting with one of the gentlemen about it, what they estimate for
20 just in roads, and they can't even figure out how they can be even close to what they're
21 talking about to sustain this stuff when we're talking a million dollars a mile to do a small
22 stretch of highway in my area. The cost would just be astronomical.

23 And naturally, it would affect my livelihood. I don't understand why we can affect
24 so many peoples' livelihood in such a negative way. And I certainly hope that some
25 common sense prevails in a society like ours. Thank you.

1 MR. TERZEL: My name is David Terzel. I work with Potlatch Corporation, but I
2 do not represent them in an official capacity. Dam breaching is not the answer to salmon
3 recovery. It would cost too much for what would likely be little to no gain.

4 I visited Bonneville Dam numerous times with my grandparents while I was
5 growing up. I enjoyed these visits. This is probably my first exposure to the Army Corps
6 of Engineers. I still remember marveling at the largeness of everything as a Corps
7 member toured us through the facility.

8 She explained how the hydroelectric turbines produced clean electricity, how fish
9 could migrate up through the fish ladders and how river traffic could go through the locks.
10 I was literally in awe.

11 I remember my grandparents talking about how hard Senators Magnuson and
12 Jackson and others had worked to get the dams built. Now I can only wonder what these
13 senators and others must think.

14 The building of the dams on the Snake, Columbia, and other rivers are one of the
15 best things our nation has ever done. From building, maintaining and improving the
16 dams, the Army Corps of Engineers serves us well.

17 They have made many improvements to help fish pass safe. Fish ladders, fish
18 friendly turbines, barging, deflectors, surface collectors and other things. Each
19 improvement is having a positive effect.

20 I grew up in Issaquah, Washington. Every year they have a festival there called
21 Salmon Days. This festival in the fall celebrates the return of salmon to Issaquah Creek
22 to spawn.

23 As of late, not many salmon are making it back to Issaquah. There aren't any
24 dams like the ones we're talking about between Issaquah and the ocean, but there are
25 predators, predators like seals, sea otters, sea lions, that have been allowed to flourish.

1 I submit that predators is the main cause of the problem. Man, seals, sea otters,
2 sea lions and terns. They too, know, that salmon are a great food source. Please do not
3 desecrate the dams. Too many have worked hard to see them -- too many have worked
4 hard to see and get them constructed. Too many worked hard so that they can fulfill their
5 function and too many benefit from them to justify their removal. Thank you.

6 MR. STONEWALLED: Ludwig von Stonewalled from Seattle, a writer. I am a
7 would-be -- would have been (inaudible.) BA degree graduate school. Cookbook
8 knowledge of engineering, wide experience in aircraft construction (inaudible)
9 construction, steel fabrication.

10 (Inaudible) studied and (inaudible) over completed dams in central Asia, Pakistan
11 and Turkey.

12 Regarding the Snake and Columbia River dams. The solution lies in a
13 combination of the Colorado Big Thompson project under the New Deal.

14 The Swiss experience in managing their water resources. A series of dams at
15 high elevation whereby the water can be and has been diverted in accordance with
16 international treaties to their neighbors -- international neighbors was an increase in
17 productivity and other considerations.

18 So those masonry dams on the Cascade Crest in
19 Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia, and then, also, punch towns through the
20 Cascades at lower levels, divert the almost always flooding Cascade rivers, Nooksack,
21 Skagit, Snohomish, Chehalis and Frasier, et cetera, thus, more water for fish, flood
22 control, power, irrigation, navigation and car washing.

23 During World War II, the improvements in the Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas,
24 Ohio and the TBA enabled us to build 10,000-plus ships, land craft, submarines and
25 destroyers.

1 Preserve the dams and build more, thus, increase productivity and wealth. Don't
2 tear down the dams, build. Don't destroy.

3 MS. LOOKING GLASS: I'm Delores Looking Glass, a descendant of Chief
4 Looking Glass. And I remember when we used to catch salmon along the creeks going
5 up towards Kamiah and that's all gone now.

6 But when we get ceremonial salmon, I always tell my children -- a lot of people will
7 say give me 20, 15 salmon. I tell my children, don't get grabby. We're not like that.

8 You take five depending on what you're going to use and whatnot, ceremony
9 things. But I remember way back when we used to catch salmon even in the creek.
10 And when the dams come in, we're not getting them.

11 And you don't see Indian fishermen on boats on the river along the -- they can't
12 afford boats. They say we get money every month or so. We don't.

13 I get Social Security, and that's lost land from taxes. So we don't have anything
14 (inaudible).

15 MS. MAJOR: My name is Laura Major from Kamiah, and a Nez Perce tribal
16 member. My family have been fishing for years, ever since down at Celilo Falls, before
17 they even put those dams in. I remember when I was a child and we used to go down
18 there.

19 I also remember we fished at McCall, over in Burgdorf, Wheat Creek and on up to
20 Rapid River up to the Selway Falls, up to Lochsa, there was so many fish, you know, we
21 could just see them swimming. Now there aren't any.

22 And my concern is about the state of Idaho. Today they got up in -- the lieutenant
23 governor got up and they talked about how Idaho was not for the breaching and how --
24 yet when we went to court over Rapid River about ten, 15 years ago, when the state tried
25 to close us down for conservation reasons and we all went to court, they had to rule that

1 all of a sudden no reason for conservation closure because Idaho state had brought it on
2 themselves.

3 Idaho state to me is responsible for losing a lot of our fish, because like all the fish
4 coming up from Alaska all the way up the Columbia River are coming to our headwaters
5 up in the Nez Perce Tribal reserve -- reservation and within our waters, within our 1855
6 boundaries.

7 When we went to court, we found out that the state of Idaho had -- instead of
8 putting our fish all the way back in, they had been selling the eggs off to the east coast, to
9 Japan, to fish farms.

10 Instead of putting our fish back into our rivers, they sold all them eggs, and that
11 caused some of the depletion of our runs, because even now they only give us so much -
12 - only enough to keep the run coming to kind of the minimum.

13 That's all they keep. The rest of it, they sell them eggs. What is Idaho doing with
14 them? They are hurting our whole system all the way up to Alaska. Idaho state is getting
15 away with it. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

16 MR. DRUFFEL: I am Gerald Druffel. And I wish a good afternoon to you and
17 thank you for the opportunity to participate.

18 I have lived in Whitcomb County all of my 77 years of life, except for the three
19 years of Air Force duty during World War II.

20 In this electronic age, I wish we could have an instant replay of six months of the
21 great depression so all could have a feel for the economic climate that existed in the
22 1930's.

23 The hardest thing the Columbia and Snake Rivers was a natural to provide a
24 better way of life for the Northwest citizens. Look around you. The
25 congressionally-authorized project is working.

1 Our overall economy and welfare has never been better. In the shorter term of
2 retrospect, how many of you recall the drawdown of Lower Granite pool in '92? Not very
3 pleasant by itself.

4 Then allow breaching and multiply that by four. Common sense dictates that
5 alternate -- alternative two or three be chosen. Make the decision now, then apply all
6 funding to fish-friendly modification of the existing system.

7 If you need congressional guidance, follow the policy of Senator Gorton of
8 Washington state. Choosing alternative four, breaching the dams, would be tantamount
9 to shooting yourself in the foot. You would find it difficult to walk. Thank you.

10 MR. GRABOW: My name is Gary Grabow. I'm representing myself. I've lived in
11 Lewiston for about ten years, and I've spent my whole life in the Northwest. I make my
12 living as an engineer, and I've spent a lot of time making critical decisions and decisions
13 that impact a lot of people.

14 And I will go on record saying that I'm very appreciative and thankful for the Corps'
15 effort in the research that they've done in looking at all the issues and identifying all the
16 different options, evaluating those options and looking at the pros and cons of each
17 option, and then hearing the people out.

18 And based on what I have seen, what I have read and what I have studied and
19 what has been said here today, there's not overwhelming evidence that breaching the
20 dams is the right solution.

21 And if that was the right solution and there was evidence that indicated that, I
22 would fully support that.

23 But at this point, until we have good, conclusive evidence that that is the solution
24 for the salmon recovery, the risks are just too high for us to look at that as a feasible
25 option and the impacts are too great.

1 So in conclusion, I feel that breaching the dams is not the solution right now, and I
2 would appreciate more effort and more research done in finding a viable option that does
3 make sense. Thanks for hearing me speak.

4 MR. GINGRICH: Hello. My name is Jim Gingrich. I'm affiliated with no
5 organization.

6 I own a private business in Lewiston, Idaho, and I'd like to go on record supporting
7 Senator Stagner and the lieutenant governor on their stance on issues supporting the
8 non-breaching of the dams. I'd like to thank you for the opportunity.

9 MR. AUSTIN: My name is Fletcher Austin, and I represent myself. I'm opposed to
10 dam breaching.

11 I believe that they should use all resources and science available and
12 find an alternate to breaching the dams. I think we can have both fish and dams. Thank
13 you.

14 MS. CARLSON: My name is Kathy Carlson, and I am representing myself and
15 my husband's and my business, Marcy Technologies in Clarkston.

16 Also, I'm here as a representative for my parents who are farmers in this area and
17 have homesteaded in the Clarkston area. I live at 2211 9th Avenue in Clarkston.

18 And my problems, I do not think the dams should be breached. I think there have
19 not been enough studies done on the things that are happening out before the salmon
20 get into the river.

21 I have a friend that is a riverboat captain, pilot on one of the barge systems here,
22 and the Native Americans have gill nets almost totally blocking the Columbia River.

23 They can't even hardly get the boats through. And they pull hundreds and
24 thousands of salmon out by -- in nighttime when there's nobody else watching them, and
25 they travel 24 hours a day up and down the river.

1 Also, the (inaudible) Chehalem with all the terns in it are eating a sizable amount
2 of salmon smolt before they even get into the river system. The waters have changed
3 because of El Nino and La Nina and have warmed up.

4 All of the predators have moved north and are eating the salmon before they can
5 get into the mouth of the Columbia. It's totally ludicrous to think it's the dams that are
6 causing the problems.

7 Also, I was here during the drawdown a few years ago, and the banks were lined
8 with thousands of other species that were dead because of the silt and because of the
9 drawdown.

10 What happens to those people and the people that make their living along this
11 river? What about the pictures of thousands -- hundreds of thousands of acres of land
12 that will go dry again because people cannot afford irrigation.

13 The people around here, it's a senior community, and they will not be able to
14 afford high hydroelectric power rates if the dams are removed. I fully believe it is a faulty
15 study, and people should be considered in the scenario. Thank you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm a native of the Lewiston-Clarkston
17 valley. I was born here. My grandfather was here before me and my other grandparents.
18 My grandfather was a fireman out at Potlatch Mill, and he spent his life fishing in these
19 waters.

20 They hated it back then when they wanted to build these dams, and these dams
21 were -- they fought and fought because they knew this would come to our area, the fish --
22 that the fishing would be the same. He was a -- he fought that.

23 But the changes that has been made with the parks and the recreation and with all
24 the usage and with farming, that's great. They're moving these barges and elevators
25 along the river, and grain is a big deal, getting it down there.

1 If we have trucks running down there, it would only make people more -- damage
2 to the highways and the high cost of fixing them. I believe that we could do something
3 better, and I believe there is another way of getting these fish around the dams and
4 saving our dams, because the hundreds and thousands of people that are affected by
5 this. And this is a very important thing to our community and our valley and our state and
6 Washington state.

7 I believe we should also -- when we talk about how much water the Potlatch is
8 being put into our rivers here, I don't believe it's that much. I believe that it's not enough
9 to warrant to kill these fish off.

10 THE MODERATOR: You have another minute.

11 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: And I believe that we can do something. If
12 it is enough, then let's work on it, because we need Potlatch and we also need this
13 recreation of our valley. That is very important to money coming in here.

14 These two are both strong-running recreational -- and the paper mill also is strong
15 running and it supports our communities, and this is part of our Lewiston valley heritage
16 here.

17 And these dams looked really bad in those days, but I know some of these people
18 around today, they would stand up and they would tell our people today, let's fight for it.

19 So I believe that we should fight and stay in there. And let's get these dams and
20 keep them in our valleys and all these people.

21 MS. KAY: My name's Tammy Kay. And I don't think you should breach the
22 dams. I think there should be a way you guys can do both. Thanks.

23 MR. CONE: My name is Steve Cone, and I've lived in the Elsie Valley for 33 years
24 and around this region all my life. I want to go on record as being against dam
25 breaching.

1 I find it hard to believe that salmon or any other species that is commercially
2 harvested can be considered an endangered species. I can't believe that taking the
3 positive things away that the dams provides such as irrigation for farmlands, flood control,
4 barge transportation, recreation, habitat for other types of fish and hydroelectric power,
5 things changed for possible salmon returns is a good move.

6 All the adverse effects that dam breaching will cause such as increased electrical
7 costs, increased pollution from fossil fuel power generation, increased shipping costs for
8 area products, loss of recreation, et cetera, are not an acceptable trade-off for possibly
9 increased salmon runs.

10 We need to look at the real culprits in the decline of salmon like the gill nets
11 downriver, commercial fishing at the mouth of the Columbia, sea lions, terns and so on.
12 Scientists can't agree on the best way to help the fish.

13 The overall picture needs to be looked at. Please don't take this drastic action of
14 breaching the dams for an unproven science of increasing salmon runs that are already
15 on the increase with the dams in place. Thank you for your time and thank you for letting
16 me speak.

17 MR. SAULLS: My name is Robert Saulls. I'm just representing myself here. And
18 I'm not a member of any particular organization, just a concerned resident of the valley,
19 Lewis and Clark valley here, lived here most of my life.

20 I'm very concerned about the economy of the valley and I'm very concerned about
21 the fish. I feel that dam breaching is a very extreme measure. I feel there's a lot of other
22 issues that haven't been addressed yet, for instance, the foreign commercial fisheries
23 offshore.

24 I think they ought to be able to move them back a little bit would certainly help the
25 fish populations. Something else that I feel is a definite drain on the resources is the

1 bank-to-bank gill nets we see down on the Columbia and the lower Snake, and that's
2 both the tribal and the commercial interests down there.

3 I think that predation has not been thoroughly addressed, and particularly the
4 Caspian terns down there and the sea lions down there at the Ballard Locks.

5 They have a man-made rookery down there that -- down there they've got a
6 couple million Caspian terns living on that, and they're on the increase and the fish are on
7 the decrease.

8 I think the primary reason we're not getting the fish back up here is because we're
9 not allowing the adults to return. Several years ago, around 1990, we had a large
10 increase in the steelhead run.

11 For three years, the Idaho Fish & Game Department saw fit to put a salmon fishery
12 on the Clearwater River up there. They increased the daily bag limit on the steelhead
13 from two to three, and at the same time, increased the season bag limit from ten to 20, so
14 that told me that there was a period of time that the fish were on the increase.

15 Now, apparently for some period of time, we were doing something right. Why
16 don't we find out what. And like I said, there was three different years that they held that
17 salmon fishery.

18 I heard on the radio today what was happening to the juvenile fish going
19 downstream, but I didn't hear very much at all about the adult mortality coming back.

20 I feel that these issues, the tribal and commercial interests, they don't want them
21 to be addressed, and that the dam breaching is unproven. They don't know if it will work.
22 It's just a very costly experiment, and I feel it's far less costly to take gill nets out of the
23 rivers than it is dams. Thank you.

24 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

1 MR. GOULD: My name is Justin Gould. I am a member of the Nez Perce Tribe
2 located in central Idaho. I'm glad to be here today to provide testimony on behalf of
3 myself, my children, my grandchildren and my children's children's children.

4 I, as well as every other human being that lives here on this great planet, wish for
5 many things. Primarily, in this case, as it relates to this issue, my concern is for the
6 healthy return of harvestable runs of salmon and steelhead and other anadromous
7 species that associated themselves since time immemorial to this very special
8 distinguished geographic location. Excuse me.

9 I didn't come here today to say, yes, breach the dams or don't breach the dams.
10 Again, I reiterate, my intention here is to see salmon rebuilt to harvestable levels.

11 In the science that is here with us today, should they choose to say, "Build eight
12 more dams and we'll guarantee harvestable levels of fish." Well, then, I would, then, say
13 "build those eight dams."

14 Sadly, with the studies done by the federal agencies in this regard, science clearly
15 states what must be done.

16 I urge you people to look at the science, look at the public testimony, and vote
17 your conscience.

18 And I pray that your conscience will be for the benefit of the salmon, the steelhead,
19 the sturgeon, the lamprey, the bull trout, and all the other anadromous species that do
20 exist on this very limited time frame.

21 And I'm sad to say that we couldn't have this meeting and be able to then try and
22 save the 101 species of stocks that have been declared extinct with the hydro systems
23 coming into place.

24 Lastly, I would like to wrap it up by saying, regardless of where the political winds
25 blow, my intention and belief, is that as -- the same as my forefathers. I plan on staying

1 here as we have since the beginning of time and do not plan on leaving regardless of the
2 situation that you people have a chance to leave me in.

3 I pray that you consider these words and also think about your children in the
4 same breath, that I'm not fighting for my own survival, I'm fighting for the survival of
5 humanity. I don't plan on getting a shuttle to mars and I don't think anybody else is,
6 either. We're human beings and it's time to make a difference.

7 MR. SNYDER: My name is John Snyder. I live on the Polouse. I came of age
8 near the headwaters of the Snake, and although I have lived many places all over this
9 earth, I love this region like no other.

10 Today's issue is all about fear and accountability. While in high school on a school
11 trip, I experienced a rare and endangered moment. A bus full of completely silent
12 students.

13 We had cleared a small rise and began dropping into what's called the Oregon
14 Basin. And as far as we could see stretching into the horizon in the Big Horn Mountains
15 80 miles away were antelope, way too many to count.

16 Sadness touched the silence since the buffalo must have once grazed in that
17 manner. A touch of fear also as I wondered whether my children would experience this
18 site.

19 Years later, I moved here. It occurred to me as I looked at old pictures of cowboys
20 at Dagger Falls on the Middle Fork, pike and salmon. Those salmon runs were almost an
21 everyday occurrence, and it made those antelope look like nothing.

22 And now fear predominates. We can't take out the dams, families will suffer.
23 Fishing, farming and logging will suffer both. Let's talk accountability. Had the
24 government folks in charge of the design, installation and maintenance of those dams
25 done the right thing, we'd quite likely have salmon now.

1 I remember reading in second grade in the Weekly Reader about dams and
2 bypass systems. We could have had our cake and eat it, too.

3 Yet, you took away the spatula by failing to provide those bypass systems. Once
4 the problem was identified, workable bypass systems should have been installed and
5 maintained.

6 Failure to do so was criminal. You failed. Accountability means doing it right,
7 preferably the first time. Acknowledge the mistake and get on with correcting it.

8 Accountability means doing what it takes to make it right. Let's maximize the odds
9 of fish survival now.

10 Accountability also requires maintaining our national and international standing.

11 How can we possibly urge others to save their elephants, their rain forests and
12 their cultures when we can't conserve the very things that make this region so rich in
13 natural resources, especially our salmon.

14 Statistics, studies and science can be warped to say whatever you want, not
15 breaking promises, living within our limits, and taking care of our families and our
16 environment is practical and possible. It is the right thing to do.

17 Saving the dams and the monopoly they represent won't save the family, only mire
18 our feet and our future in concrete, make us slaves to our economy rather than the
19 economy as a tool of our culture.

20 And how much does it cost to keep concrete afloat? What we need is to conquer
21 the fear, to be accountable, to do the right thing.

22 We need accountability, fortitude and the leadership to breach the dams.

23 MR. HARRIS: My name is Ed Harris. I represent myself.

24 I don't feel that there's enough studying been done to make this rash a decision to
25 remove a dam.

1 I'm in favor of keeping the dams and doing more studying and using several
2 procedures to increase the fish population instead of doing something that is going to
3 drastically affect the lives of so many people.

4 Also, I don't like the idea of removing a resource of electricity and power that is
5 economical and clean and maybe have to replace it with something that isn't.

6 I think we need to know the outcome of what we do, not just jump into things.
7 There's also a lot of positive things being done right at the moment to increase the fish
8 habitat and the fish population getting back into the rivers.

9 In our communities, there's a lot of people raising fish alongside the creeks, and
10 they should be returning this year. You're not even giving them a chance to see what the
11 positive effects are of what they've done. And I'm just against you moving too fast and
12 making too big of judgments.

13 MR. BRENNAN: Okay. My name is Kerry Brennan. I live in Riggins, Idaho. My
14 profession is steelhead fishing guide and outfitter on the Salmon River 115 miles to the
15 south of Lewiston.

16 I came to put my vote in for the fish. And I believe that the way to restore these
17 fish, that all the science says that we need to bypass the four lower Snake River dams to
18 restore these fish to harvestable sustainable levels which the tribes and the sportsmen of
19 the Pacific Northwest were promised when these dams were built.

20 So I am in favor of alternate four with aggressive breach with the other measures
21 that go along with it. I am against hatchery removal. I don't believe that -- I believe our
22 habitat in Idaho can support hatchery fish until such time that the wild fish return to a
23 sustainable level.

24 We were also promised this as mitigation for the dams, so I do not support
25 reduction in hatcheries. What we'd be looking at there with the dams in place and

1 hatchery reduction, more spill from Idaho irrigation water, there would be -- we would be
2 looking at a museum piece that would be restored, not really a fishable, harvestable run.

3 My family, the guides that work for me, families in the sport fishing industry in
4 Idaho should have as strong a voice about our jobs as the people in the
5 Lewiston-Clarkston area. And I believe that -- I believe -- that's why I came here, I think.

6 There's a lot of people that think that working for Potlatch is the only job in the
7 universe, and I'm just here to say that a lot of jobs in the Pacific Northwest, a whole lot of
8 them depend on the sport fishing industry. And this is all related up and down the coast
9 with these Columbia River runs clear to Alaska and back down to California and on into
10 Idaho.

11 It's not just a local issue that affects Lewiston. I do realize it will affect Lewiston in
12 some ways, but I believe this can be mitigated and compensated for economically. Thank
13 you.

14 MR. ANDERSON: My name is Tom Anderson, and I live in Riggins, Idaho, in the
15 Salmon River motel. And the most important thing to me is the smolt migration in the
16 river.

17 It's a fact that one-tenth of one percent of them make it. Out of ten million fish,
18 that means 10,000 make it, which is a very sad day for the fish migration. Smolt
19 migration is the most important thing. Unless we have -- extinction isn't an option.

20 There has to be a bold move made, and I think removal of the dams is the boldest
21 move that can be made. In the last 25 years when the dams were first put in the late
22 60's, they said fishing would be ten times greater than what it is today.

23 Right now, it's nothing but a serious decline in the threatened species (inaudible)
24 right now. We're one step away from extinction. It's not an option. And it's in my heart,
25 the dams need to be breached.

1 There's no doubt -- other way to get around it. Granted, everything from this point
2 is taken into consideration, from the ocean all the way down the chain to this point. But
3 unless the fish make it to the ocean, how are they going to get back? That's my greatest
4 concern.

5 Talking with the river biologists in the meetings -- the last meeting a month ago,
6 the capture of the smolts on the first dam, they suck them 90 feet down and put them into
7 a quarter mile tube, put them into a holding tank and then they ship them to John Day or
8 Bonneville Dam and they put them in the water down there.

9 If that fish has one wiggle, they're counting it a live fish. Two seconds later, it's
10 dead, so they're giving us false reports in that respect.

11 As far as I can see, there's no other option than breaching of the dams and getting
12 a free-flowing system so they can make it to the ocean.

13 Then we can take all the other concerns into consideration that have to better
14 impact (inaudible). But as far as -- it would be a complete economy boom for the state of
15 Idaho. Fisheries would bring in more money than anyone could ever realize.

16 As far as -- I've said everything that I need to say. The smolt migration and the
17 river flow is the only way to go.

18 MR. GRIMM: My name is Kent Grimm. And I support no organization other than
19 the people that like to water ski.

20 And the papermakers where I work, we've been accused of four fallacies by by all
21 the people I've been listening to.

22 And I just wanted to make sure that you, Brigadier General Strock, did not forget a
23 few of the points that were taken out of context.

24 Everybody wants us to look at Riggins and how beautiful, and it works with three
25 months of raft renting and jet boat rides.

1 I don't think Lewiston can survive on three months of raft renting and jet boat rides.
2 It does all right by itself right now with that same business. And there's the guy from
3 Boise reading his Wall Street Journal, and he said look at cheap energy costs.

4 I was over in Pennsylvania, and yes, that is such a beautiful place. I forgot to look
5 in the Wall Street Journal to look for cheap energy costs, but this guy must have been
6 looking for BP stock, because that's all that's going to happen to Lewiston, is it's going to
7 be a place where people stop and gas up from Boise on their way to whatever they do up
8 in Coeur d'Alene.

9 And then there's the 85 year-old guy who said this country survives on
10 competition. I couldn't agree with him more. And the rail systems that everybody claims
11 are going to save the barges, and we don't really need the barges and stuff like that,
12 nobody has ever talked about the noise pollution. And we forget that rail systems were
13 part of our fallacies, that they really don't need diesel to run, to have exhaust fumes,
14 either.

15 So we've got it made with the cheap electricity up here in Idaho and we don't need
16 dams to do it. That's what they seem to think. Well, I couldn't agree with them less. I'm
17 for keeping the dams, and finding sensible solutions. Thank you.

18 MR. MOATS: My name is William Moats. I'm not representing any organization
19 other than a citizen of the planet earth. I was born and raised here in the Lewis and Clark
20 valley close enough to the river that I could have stood up and thrown a rock right up
21 where I was born and hit it.

22 But my views are probably a little more radical than some people's.

23 I don't look at just breaching of the four dams on the Snake River, I believe they
24 ought to breach all the dams on the river system, both up and downriver from Lewiston,
25 Idaho.

1 An across-the-board of reduction of deprivations of other forms on fish and wildlife.
2 I'm opposed to sports fishing, really. I'm opposed to deprivations on wildlife, on hunting
3 that people do just simply for sport.

4 You know, if they need it to sustain their families, that's one thing, but killing for
5 sport is something that I don't agree with.

6 We can also look at the Bureau of Land Management and the way they allow
7 overgrazing of our lands, and therefore, the erosion of our lands into our streams,
8 reducing salmon habitat, and the cattle that trample through the headwaters of the
9 streams and the systems that feed into the Columbia River Basin.

10 Poor logging practices, poor farming practices. We talk about all the silt out here
11 that they'd have to deal with.

12 Well, a lot of that came from all these poor practices that are causing the erosion
13 of our topsoil.

14 I really believe that we need to take a look at the extractive economy that has
15 been established here and look at restructuring that entirely.

16 I miss the rivers. I miss the fish. I'm tired of being fenced in. I'm from the west. I
17 don't want any more fences.

18 As far as I'm concerned, the dams are just another form of fence. Thank you.
19 That's all I have.

20 MR. LONG: My name is Dan Long. I've lived in the valley for 47 years, my entire
21 life. When the dams were put in, I was opposed to them, and I found out I was wrong.

22 It was good for the economy, the area. It supports a lot of jobs in these areas.
23 And also, I'd like to say that when the drawdowns occurred in '92, I believe it was, the
24 devastation to the road and rail system in this area was horrible. I urge that we leave the
25 dams in.

1 There's other ways to save the salmon and that's all we need to do, is explore
2 those other avenues. Barging has worked, and I don't see a need to just try taking out
3 dams to save salmon. Thank you.

4 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

5 MS. KELLER: Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment today. I am
6 Nancy Keller. Business retention and expansion specialist representing Valley Vision
7 2001. Valley Vision is a nonprofit economic development corporation comprised of more
8 than 200 businesses, government, educational and individual investors throughout the
9 Lewis and Clark valley in both Idaho and Washington.

10 I am speaking tonight in strong opposition of breaching the four lower Snake River
11 dams, and submitting into record resolution number 98/1 unanimously passed by Valley
12 Vision 2001 board of directors November 3rd, 1998.

13 Valley Vision opposes reservoir drawdowns and removal of dams thereon and
14 recognizes the vital contribution the Snake and Columbia River system bring into the
15 region's economic well-being and quality of life.

16 Valley Vision supports the many uses of the Snake and Columbia rivers for fish
17 and wildlife, hydropower generation, flood control, transportation, irrigation, recreation
18 and recognizes the critical need for maintaining the traditional agricultural and industrial
19 uses of the Northwest water.

20 Valley Vision believes that dam removal would inflict on citizens a loss of
21 recreation, an increase in electrical rates, a loss of navigation, a risk of floods, economic
22 hardship, and impaired quality of life.

23 Valley Vision believes the salmon decline is due to many factors including loss of
24 habitat, an increase of predators, drought, unfavorable ocean conditions, poor hatchery
25 practices, increased harvest and hydro projects.

1 Valley Vision resolves as follows : That salmon and steelhead can and should be
2 preserved and enhanced in conjunction with preserving the many uses of the Snake and
3 Columbia River system.

4 We oppose additional taking of Northwest waters for flow augmentation purpose
5 and rejects and opposes reservoir drawdowns below minimum operation levels and
6 removal of any dams. Thank you.

7 MR. SLEDGE: I'm Forrest Sledge, and that's with two R's. I don't understand
8 why anyone would be thinking of removing the four lower Snake River dams. I say no to
9 dam breaching. That is no.

10 When you can go to the store and buy salmon by the case, hey , this fish doesn't
11 even get to go to the dams -- get to the dams, and it did not complete its life cycle.

12 We have sea lions, seals, nets, fishermen on the ocean, all getting them before
13 they even get to the dams, and they say it's got to be the dams stopping the fish? I say
14 hogwash. Then we have the terns getting them before -- while they're young, before they
15 can even get out to the ocean. But it's still the dams that's at fault.

16 Hogwash again. We can have fish and have the dams if we will just use our
17 heads for something more than just a hat rack. Where's the fish ladders? We must have
18 the dams for flood control, farming and electrical power. We don't need train cars and
19 trucks on our roads that will put even more pollution in the air. We just don't need to
20 remove the dams. Thank you.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Excuse me. Do I need to state my name?

22 THE MODERATOR: Yes, please.

23 MR. JOHNSON: My name is Tony Johnson, and my statement in regards to these
24 public meetings would be that the intent of them are summed up in the opening words
25 that the general spoke. These meetings are to look at how to save a salmon, how to

1 save the fish from extinction. And what it's coming out, as I see it, as a political question
2 that's a fear, that says what's it going to do to the local economy.

3 And I'd like to make a statement to the effect of how the United States historically
4 has bounced back over generations. I think about the stock market, black Monday, the
5 depression, all these things that people have showed the resilience.

6 Now it's time for us to help the fish. The fish cannot afford to -- excuse me --
7 cannot survive without the assistance of man, and it's up to man to take that step. We as
8 people can bounce back from adversity economically creating other jobs in this region.

9 For that, I'd just like to finally say, once again, that it's up to us, and we can do this
10 by not questioning how are we going to get -- excuse me -- not giving into that fear, but
11 taking that step to first do what this meeting is intended for, to put the word out there that
12 we want to save the fish.

13 Even the other side has stated that they want to see fish saved. The fear is in the
14 economic question. So with that, we need to, as I see it, breach the dams, get that out of
15 the way, bring the fish back, and then worry. At the same time, create those other jobs
16 that will help us overcome.

17 Another fear, in closing, that comes to mind, is Y2K, how big that was blown up by
18 the government, by media. And when it came, as you see by the meeting we're having
19 today, that it wasn't such a big deal.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

21 MR. NILSSON: I'm John Nilsson. I'm a farmer. I'm totally against them breaching
22 the dams. My son is a fifth generation farmer on my wife's side of the family; He's a
23 fourth generation farmer on my side of the family. And I think we have some rights.

1 The government has put the dams in for farmers to use for transportation because
2 the railroads are going out or out of use. The trucks -- there couldn't be enough trucks to
3 haul all of our grain, so I'm 100 percent for keeping the dams.

4 I also believe in saving the salmon. And from what I've -- the meetings that I have
5 attended, that there is no compromise between what we call the environmentalists and
6 the people who want the dams.

7 There's no compromise there that we can have them both. And I'm a firm believer
8 that if we got the technology, we could have both the dams and the fish. Today, there is
9 many people who spoke who consider themselves as environmentalists.

10 I consider myself as an environmentalist, but I do not want to be in the same
11 shoes as what those people are. My definition of an environmentalist is entirely different
12 than theirs.

13 I take money from out of my -- what I call my food money, and I put it back in on
14 the farm for conservation reasons. And the environmental people that get up and speak
15 on these speeches, their money is all donated by some other source.

16 MS. NILSSON: My name is Ann Nilsson. I'm a farmer in Nez Perce and
17 Clearwater counties. I remember in the -- when the dams were built. My family lost
18 ground to the Lower Granite pool and my father took the government to court to get a
19 reasonable compensation for the land that was taken for the Lower Granite pool.

20 And also when you found out -- also, the Idaho base for the Asotin dam which was
21 an opposed dam at that time. So it's not something we were in favor of at the time, and
22 we certainly didn't -- the family did not get wealthy off of this.

23 I see there's no consideration that the original landowners have any opportunity to
24 retrieve the ground which was taken by the Corps. This is going to be permanently taken
25 away from us.

1 I live now in Clearwater County, a county that was supposed to have streets of
2 gold after Dworshak Reservoir. Dworshak Dam was built and the reservoir flooded the
3 North Fork, one of the great natural wonders of the world.

4 And the recreation that came and all the opportunities that came to the Orofino
5 area was supposed to mitigate the loss of that river. Today as we sat here and listened
6 to the hearings, I heard that we need more attention to mitigation and to compensate
7 people for the losses they've had.

8 I have a very dour outlook on the government's idea of what true mitigation is.
9 Orofino once upon a time had an actual stoplight, the only stoplight in Clearwater County.

10 It's been gone for over ten years. I cannot see that the river rafters and the
11 salmon guides on the Orofino are going to bring back the streets of gold.

12 We've been promised that before and I don't see it coming back. The Indians are
13 fortunate that they have a treaty with the United States government.

14 We have a Freedom to Farm bill that was signed in 1995 which gave us a promise
15 that we would have the support for international markets and to help us stand in the
16 international community as farmers.

17 Now we hear that, oops, too bad, we're going to have another 31 cents a bushel
18 added to the cost of getting our wheat to Portland, which is going to put us, by my
19 figuring, at about two dollars a bushel for our commodity.

20 If we had a treaty, perhaps we'd have a better basis of dealing with our
21 government. But since it's just a -- the agriculture bill for 1995, we're going to be out of
22 luck. And the person who's going to fund all of this is going to be the people such as the
23 agricultural workers.

24 Mitigation isn't going to reach us.

1 MS. GERTENSON: My name is Marge Gertenson. I live in Lewiston, Idaho. , and
2 I'm against the dam breaching. I was in Washington D.C. the day after Hurricane Floyd.

3 I went to the senate offices in Washington D.C. and visited those of Washington,
4 Idaho, Utah, Oregon and Massachusetts. I went to Massachusetts because my ancestry
5 is there.

6 I visited Kerry Kennedy and Representative Barney Frank. My parents are from
7 Fall River, Massachusetts. I went to high school there and college at Boston University in
8 Boston majoring in geology.

9 My earlier education was all over the United States from Georgia to Hawaii
10 because my father was a career Army officer. I had been in every state of the union at
11 least twice, except Alaska. I consider myself an Idahoan, even though I was born in
12 Manila, PI.

13 I have lived here in Lewiston, Idaho, since 1956. I left a written message at the
14 congressman's office to let them know of the problems that we were having out here
15 about dam breaching.

16 The senators from Massachusetts were not aware of our problems. The only one I
17 heard from was Barney Frank. I intend to visit them again in May when I will again be in
18 Washington, D.C.

19 Some 30 years ago, we had a federal air quality hearing in Clarkston. Many of
20 you here were not born and won't have a clue as to what I'm about to say.

21 My husband, the late Peter Gertenson, was chairman of the first Nez Perce
22 County Health Department, and he chaired this meeting.

23 He was contacted by a reporter from the New York Times the night before
24 who told him that the figures that TFI would be presenting in the morning would be
25 false.

1 They arranged a meeting and he gave my husband the correct figures. When my
2 husband presented the figures, Mr. Cansell, the then president of TFI, called a 15-minute
3 recess and agreed to put in the stacks that would take care of the pollution.

4 So my hope is that all the figures mentioned here today are the true figures, and
5 that our guests -- are true figures that our guests and audience speakers are giving. The
6 best thing that we can all do, whether we are for or against it, is write a personal letter,
7 not e-mail, fax, to all congressmen and women on the east coast.

8 That's where the decision is going to be made. And if you don't get out and
9 exercise your right to vote, this will all be futile. I will be in D.C. again this June and will
10 visit them all and more again. We can have salmon and dams.

11 The science is here, and I think they can figure it out. I do not trust the
12 independent scientists that several of the people here spoke about. I listened to a
13 program on channel, either seven, ten or 12, that an Indian tribe in Oregon had already
14 solved the salmon problem. Thank you.

15 MS. MARTIN: My name is Kathy Martin. I've listened to all of today's testimony
16 on heritage and old ways and wild fish. Well, I've worked since I've been 16 years old,
17 and that was a long time ago.

18 I don't have the government giving me money and I don't have a casino supporting
19 me. I'm a valley resident, and contrary to some belief, I matter. I apologize if I repeat
20 anything that has been said.

21 Since this is not easy, I have to read my thoughts. I love to fish, and I would like to
22 save the fish. Where we disagree is how to accomplish that.

23 It would be nice to go back to the old days, but those days are gone. Everyone
24 wanted progress, and with progress comes a price and many times sacrifice. But the
25 price to breach the dams is too high and the sacrifice is more than I want to make.

1 The dams are an important part of our economy. They can provide five percent of
2 the Northwest electrical power and have allowed us to large wheat and other products at
3 lower costs. They've also allowed farmers to irrigate what was once desert land.

4 No one knows for certain the biological benefits of breaching the dam or guarantee
5 it will make a difference in salmon recovery. It has been reported some species will be
6 lost anyway.

7 What is known is the economical and ecological devastation it will cause. It has
8 been reported breaching will cost one billion dollars. Thousands of people up and down
9 our river will be affected with millions of dollars in extra costs and loss of jobs.

10 According to the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife, 78 percent of eggs of
11 young fish die in Washington rivers even if conditions are favorable. Then you add global
12 warming, gill-netting, over-abundance of marine mammals and predatory birds due to
13 conservation, is it any wonder why we don't have any fish?

14 Now you want to add 75 million tons of sediment to our rivers and ruin the habitat
15 for other fish like bass and crappie.

16 Destroy the habitat for our wildlife and create another pollution problem, air
17 pollution from the extra road traffic and trying to replace lost electricity, do you honestly
18 feel this is the right thing do see? It has been overstated that it will bring in all this
19 recreation.

20 Well, I like the recreation we have, and I'm too old to take up kayaking. All this
21 money is wasted, could have gone to a real cause like protecting our aging loved ones by
22 saving Medicare and Social Security.

23 And to respond to this ad in the Tribune which says working together we can offset
24 the negative impacts of dam removal, I don't believe this will happen. Does this mean
25 that they're going to pay for our relocation? It will never end. There will always be one

1 more cause, one more dam to breach. When is enough enough? I implore you to please
2 don't do this tragic thing. Thank you.

3 MS. KUTHER: Laurel Druffell Kuther. Dam breaching is not the answer to
4 salmon recovery. This is not logical. Please save our dams. Thank you.

5 THE MODERATOR: That's a new record. Thank you.

6 MR. PATTON: I'm George Patton from Craigmont, Idaho. I'm a third generation
7 farmer. I just retired this last year, one reason, because of the high production costs. If
8 dam breaching goes through, it's just one more step in adding a higher cost to raising
9 farm commodities.

10 I was in an ag summit meeting a year ago in February in Boise. Yes, there is a
11 high risk in dam removal. The Corps of Engineers personnel on the panel of eight, four
12 of those panelists were for breaching and four were for the dams, stated there's a very
13 high risk in saving our fish by breaching the dams.

14 It will take nine years of demolition to completely remove that part of the dams,
15 and this will allow the river to run in a thick, chocolate milkshake consistency of mud and
16 silt and debris.

17 It might not flow that thick for the total of nine years, but anytime you get a cloud
18 burst or Mother Nature sees fit to put us -- a little more water in the river, it will be a very
19 thick, fish-killing consistency.

20 This came from the Corps -- one of the Corps members that was on the panel that
21 day. The river as we know it today is a multi-purpose, as has been mentioned many
22 times today, fishing, transportation, electrical power, flood control, wildlife habitat and
23 recreation.

24 The people that are for breaching, I was really amazed that they were just for one
25 thing, and that was for breaching the dams and fish recovery.

1 I'm for helping the fish, but I'm not for breaching the dams. I'm for the dams. And
2 we need to do the scientific thing, because there's more fish killed by predators and El
3 Ninos and La Ninas out in the ocean than on the dams.

4 Let's work together, use common sense, and save our dams and save the industry
5 in this area and the Columbia Basin. Thank you.

6 MR. OSBORNE: I'm a native Idahoan. I've been in Idaho for 61 years. I'm here
7 this evening to speak to you about breaching the dams which I'm not in favor of.

8 My main reasons are that the conditions in the ocean are not favorable for the fish
9 in the first place, going along with the 19 and a half tons of salmon that were killed in
10 Alaska, dumped in the ocean without eggs.

11 My next example is the ships in the ocean around the mouth of the Columbia River
12 area. They're fishing 24 hours a day, taking more fish than probably the fishermen in the
13 river.

14 My next thing is the boats on the Columbia River that are so thick that the fish
15 couldn't swim by all the lines if they wanted to. My other thing -- complaint that I would
16 make would be the fish finders that all these modern-day people are using to catch the
17 fish in the river.

18 The other thing that I would like to say is that as a young child, I was a resident of
19 Orofino, Idaho, which now is where Dworshak dam is, and I used to go swimming and
20 fishing.

21 I swam quite a few times at the base of Dworshak Dam, and I do not have treaty
22 rights, I do not have fishing rights.

23 So I would like for you to take that into consideration, that most of the people in
24 Orofino did not get anything from losing theirs, but they're now enjoying the recreation
25 which they are now doing on the Snake and Columbia River.

1 And I want it to be known, that I am not in favor of breaching the dams. Thank
2 you.

3 MR. WELTER: My name is Marvin Welter. And I would like to speak about the
4 removal of the dams.

5 Removal of the federal dams on the Snake River doesn't have a scientific
6 probability of solving our salmon recovery problem.

7 The extra cost of removal and improvement additions necessary to existing
8 highways needed to accommodate the extra truck and rail traffic seems to be a bad
9 economic decision.

10 Has air pollution been addressed? The people of Lewiston are really close to a
11 (inaudible) in air quality standards. What happens when we no longer have dams for
12 clean energy and are forced to fossil fuel or some other kind of fuel that would be more
13 polluted.

14 We know many streams and rivers had viable salmon populations in the 1950's
15 and 60's that are also having the same problem with few or no dams on those rivers.

16 Take, for example, the Santiam River south of Salem, Oregon, as one of many.
17 That river was black with salmon in those days. The decline there is the same as what it
18 is in these waters.

19 With the declining tourism brought about by dam removal, cruise lines and
20 recreational opportunities will decline along with jobs. Take an additional one million acre
21 feet of irrigation water for flow augmentation, dries up more than 600,000 acres of
22 farmland at an annual cost of 430 million and thousands of agriculture jobs.

23 The Idaho Department of Water Resources has shown that flow augmentation
24 does not work. Flushing our precious water for no good purpose serves no one rural
25 communities and certainly not fish.

1 People's lives have been along and around the rivers. When their lives and
2 income are destroyed, is the federal government going to bail them out? I think not.

3 If we had used the moneys spent on studies toward a canal or a tube to get the
4 fish to the ocean, I think it would have been better spent. The smart thing done was to
5 allow Indian tribes to harvest seals. We need to concentrate on not allowing commercial
6 fishermen in the Columbia system. No gill-netting, removal of seals and terns. Another
7 idea would be to close all fishing in the Columbia tributaries for four years.

8 We may then see a return of the salmon. I would be willing to give up my privilege
9 and license for that period of time in lieu of removing the dams. I know many others
10 would have done the same. Washington had an initiative, I-696, it's been voted down
11 twice, and that was to remove gill-netting for three miles out and in the Columbia system,
12 and I think that was a good start.

13 This is about fish, after all, and why it wasn't -- the people can't get together on
14 something like that rather than take dams clear up here in Idaho and eastern
15 Washington. Thank you.

16 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, my name is Tom Holmes. And I'm against breaching of the
17 dam, and I think it's a foolish thing to do, and I think the changes would make it drastic for
18 this valley. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

19 MS. McGARVEY: My name is Trina McGarvey. I'm speaking just as a citizen,
20 not for any organization. I have concern because the scientists have disagreements
21 amongst themselves as to whether this will really help the salmon run. I'm also
22 concerned about whether enough study has been done to see the effects of dam
23 breaching, what condition it will actually leave the rivers in and what will happen to the
24 fish with all of the silt and the soil washing down the rivers from breaching the dams.
25 Thank you.

1 MR. KORNIG: My name is Dave Kornig. I work for Potlatch Corp. (inaudible) I
2 live in Lewiston. I was raised in Clarkston, and my family has fished extensively for
3 steelhead since I was a very small child.

4 I'd like to draw your attention to the idea that I worked on both Dworshak and
5 Lower Granite at the same time, literally. Both dams were built as part of a system.

6 Both may or may not have a very adverse effect on some of the fish problems that
7 have been shown to have arisen in the last 30 years.

8 I don't see how anyone could go for taking out the four lower Snake dams without
9 realizing the enormous hit the Dworshak put on the steelhead and salmon populations in
10 the whole area.

11 The fish hatchery at Ahsahka was staffed by well meaning, but rather inept people
12 who had no concept of selection of the fittest fish. They went for the biggest fish. And
13 within a couple of years, a local author by the name of Don Thomas coined a phrase
14 "river pigs."

15 That the fish my dad and I caught before Dworshak and Lower Granite were put in
16 had turned to a rather fightless but very large, but with not much fight in it.

17 You could hardly get them to jump out of the water when you were reeling them in
18 on a sitting line.

19 A combination of bad reproductive processes when the Ahsahka hatchery was put
20 in, complete destruction of the North Fork habitat and the Lower Granite Dam pool, also
21 being exacerbated by by the mismanagement of the three Hells Canyon dams, you know,
22 to-wit: a hydraulic at least once, maybe twice a day of the river levels, which messed
23 things up.

24 And if there is a spawning salmon or steelhead in the river, a slight raise in water
25 flow will automatically send them upriver right now. Why not look at Dworshak first for

1 five years before you gut out an entire river transportation system that's taken over 100
2 years to open sternwheelers to the present system? Thank you.

3 MS. RAUCH: Hi. My name is Linda Rauch. I'm a nurse in Lewiston, Idaho, and
4 have been involved in this project since it began.

5 I've been back to Washington, D.C. to show my concerns and comments
6 to NMFS and the Corps of Engineers, and at that time felt as if my concerns didn't matter.

7 I'm grateful for this opportunity and I'm hoping it does at this point. But I do have
8 several concerns about the idea of breaching the four lower Snake River dams.

9 They need to have dams ever so often to be able to keep the power sources
10 producing electricity efficiently, is one good reason to keep them in place. The need to
11 irrigate the Columbia River basin farmlands is another.

12 The need to keep our Lewiston-Clarkston valley as an inland seaport for the
13 economy of our community is another. And when the drawdown occurred several years
14 ago, there were many pools that dried up and caught up several fish, salmon and others
15 alike leaving them high and dry and dead, which was very concerning and alarming.

16 I would prefer of the four alternatives that you choose alternative number three,
17 the major system improvements, because I feel that this is the only fair, sure method of
18 increasing the populations.

19 I would like to see a few other things added to this alternative, though, such as the
20 fish hatch boxes that I've heard the Pulp and Paper Resources Council have been doing,
21 because they're using them in some of the creeks and the streams.

22 They seem to be having real good outcomes. And the way that they are set up, it
23 allows the fish to set their coding to that stream they're hatched in. I'm concerned that
24 this and possibly other methods of increasing our salmon population may have been

1 inadvertently skipped over or missed. Of the All H-Paper released by the federal caucus,
2 I think the alternative B, the harvest constraints is the best option.

3 I'm saddened to think of the possibility of decreased fishing, but I'm aware that
4 something needs to happen to help them return. I really truly believe there are other
5 methods available than breaching the dams that will be more effective, thus, dam
6 breaching is not our best choice, in my opinion.

7 Please take these comments into consideration when making your final decision
8 and thank you for this opportunity to share my concerns.

9 MR. BAILEY: Hello. My name's Mike Bailey. I've lived in the valley for -- all my
10 life, 44 years. I've worked at Potlatch for 25 years. And I feel that they should not breach
11 the four dams that we have now.

12 If they do decide to breach them, I feel that they should breach all of them clear to
13 the ocean, because if these four dams cause trouble, I feel that the other ones probably
14 are doing no good, also.

15 I was here when they had their drawdown, and I feel that there's no -- once we
16 have that drawdown, if they do breach it, that there's no habitat for the salmon to survive,
17 because it will just have rocks and mud lying along the river banks. And we have to look
18 at this for ten years.

19 I lived up here when I was a little kid. I loved the river when it was flowing free.
20 They decided to put the dams in, and I accepted that.

21 And it is nice now that we have them, and I feel that we should still have them as it
22 is now. That's all I have to say.

23 MS. HAMMOND: My name is Coni Hammond. I've lived in the valley for 30
24 years. And I just have a real concern about going back in time instead of forward. I'm
25 hoping that some way we can find a compromise to be able to save the dam and our fish,

1 and maybe we should look into slowing down the commercial fishing, as well as the nets
2 that are in the river. Thank you.

3 MR. NITCY: My name is Joel Nitcy. I'm an engineer by education and a
4 sportsmen by nature. I've lived in Idaho all my life. Truly, the dam breaching issue is an
5 economic issue. Everyone has a stake, whether you're a taxpayer or someone who lives
6 in this area.

7 But I don't understand that. I guess the question I have is that -- what real control
8 we have over salmon and steelhead. Certainly, there were many runs of salmon and
9 steelhead before the dams were in place, but what about before man?

10 During the last ice age the whole Northwest was covered with ice. Certainly there
11 was no flowing water. Where were the salmon? Certainly Mother Nature must have
12 provided them after the ice receded.

13 Man, when they came, threw up roadblocks for the fish and steelhead, whether
14 they be dams or not dams, man-made islands. We've done a lot of things to impede the
15 salmon and steelhead.

16 But I guess the key is Mother Nature's found a way. Why are the lower four Snake
17 River dams any more of a burden or a barrier than the dams on those rivers -- on the
18 Clearwater and the Snake that have no ladders? If the fish had been able to climb
19 ladders, there's no evidence to show that they can't climb the ladders. The numbers
20 show that they make it to the ocean.

21 The numbers show that if I have 200 friends and I make it to the ocean, I'm the
22 only one that makes it back. The mortality seems to be in the ocean. I guess I liken the
23 decline in salmon and steelhead, to wrap this up, to what we've done -- to what we tried
24 to do to with the buffalo and the whales. When we quit killing them, they came back in
25 numbers.

1 My solution would be to put a moratorium on harvest. That's the answer. Not
2 taking out the four lower Snake River dams. Thank you.

3 MS. LILLIGREN: My name is Sandra Lilligren. I support the removal of the lower
4 four Snake River dams because I believe that without such action, Snake River salmon
5 species will become extinct.

6 I am not a radical environmentalist from back east. I grew up in a tiny rural
7 Oregon timber town along a free-flowing river which has yet to be dammed.

8 People like me believe that just because we have the power to eradicate a species
9 does not mean we have the right to do so. We believe such power and capability places
10 a huge responsibility upon humanity.

11 That responsibility can be difficult to appreciate. You see, we have a choice, but
12 the salmon don't. The many fisheries biologists of our region have no difficulty
13 understanding the validity of the scientific information we currently have.

14 It's the clearest picture we have of the biological status of our salmon runs. There
15 is truly no doubt that these species are endangered by human activities and are headed
16 towards extinction.

17 The biologists also understand from their professional knowledge that we do not
18 have much time left to try to save these species. This is not the science of how to
19 alleviate the situation for people. It is the science of the status of the species of the fish.

20 I am concerned about how removal of the dams would affect the people in our
21 region. Dams will, in existence or removed, definitely have an impact on the way of life of
22 people in our region. Those societal effects deserve attention for fair resolution.

23 Keep in mind many Native Americans argue that we need to remove the dams to
24 ensure fish supply so that their way of life is not further threatened, and their way of life
25 pre-dates the rest of us in our area and is, in fact, protected by law and treaty rights.

1 Rest assured, removed dams will not wipe out Homo sapiens as a species. We
2 U.S. taxpayers, and that includes those people back east, paid for the dams to begin
3 with, and we now heavily subsidize the maintenance and upkeep of the navigation locks.

4 As a taxpayer, I would rather my money subsidize railroad lines and road
5 improvements to ensure that the folks shipping goods to market still get a decent break
6 while the salmon are getting the best chances for survival.

7 As an actively concerned citizen of this country and of this region, I promote
8 removal of the four lower Snake River dams for the good of the entire ecological and
9 societal systems for the long-term. Remember, we have a choice, but the salmon don't.
10 Thank you.

11 MR. FARRINGTON: My name is Doug Farrington and I live in Lewiston, Idaho.
12 I'm against dam removal. I think they ought to work more on the fish ladders and stuff,
13 trying to get the fish up. I think all the net fishing and stuff like that ought to quit on the
14 river.

15 We took a trip down the river by train, and the nets are every so hundred feet
16 down the river. It's a wonder anything gets up here. That's about all I've got to say.

17 MS. ALTMILLER: My name is Jennifer Altmiller. And I think that the reasons for
18 saving the fish are not -- there's not enough proof, and I don't think it's worth the
19 devastation that it will bring to the valley and all the people living here. Thank you.

20 MS. KLAWITTER: I'm Christa Klawitter. I work with Potlatch, and I feel that
21 breaching the dams is not a good idea, and that they should show more evidence to what
22 else is going to go on with it. Thank you. Good-bye.

23 MR. WALDHER: Ready? Okay. My name is Dan Waldher. I live here in
24 Clarkston, been here since 1961. I think what is important here is as a group we learn
25 how to keep the fish, but we also keep the dams and learn how to manage the river the

1 way it should be, and manage the fish below the dam. And with the new technology for
2 the turbines and ways of moving fish around the dams, we should be able to survive and
3 have everybody happy.

4 With the dams gone, with the increased transportation in the area and the pollution
5 and problems that would (inaudible) and the surrounding area, and people getting killed
6 and damage to the roads because of loss of river transportation, I just don't think it would
7 be worth it. So I think we should keep our dams. Thank you.

8 MR. WILKERSON: Hi. I'm Dave Wilkerson. I live in Lewiston, Idaho. And I'm
9 opposed to dam breaching as an alternative to save salmon runs. I've -- giving this as an
10 example, an article by the Associated Press that I read just today in the local paper about
11 the Warrenton, Oregon, area.

12 The report stated that the salmon returns have been depleted on the Skipanon
13 River to the point that the government has granted funding for the building of fences to
14 keep cattle from further damaging spawning beds, and the planting of thousands of trees
15 and native grasses along the waterways to stabilize the banks.

16 This is just one of several articles I've read about Oregon areas, fish run, salmon
17 runs being depleted. The article went on to say that similar projects are under way all
18 across Oregon funded by the government to restore salmon runs, and dams had nothing
19 to do with it.

20 Again, I'm opposed to dam breaching on the lower Snake River. Thank you. How
21 did that sound?

22 MR. MATHEWSON: My name is Ralph Mathewson. I live in Lewiston, Idaho. I
23 am very much against breaching the dams. The dams are only a very small part of the
24 problem with the fish. The ecosystem of the fish has problems clear from the smaller
25 streams that feed the larger creeks, from the timber industry.

1 It has problems on down in the -- also from the timber, from the Cattleman's
2 Association, with the cattle in the woods crushing in the creek banks. It has problems
3 with the effluent from the farms with the siltation of the streams and the chemicals from
4 fertilizer, pesticides and herbicides.

5 It has problems with the dams, yes, but they're all very much a very small part of it.
6 There are many streams that run into the Pacific Ocean that have no dams. Their fishery
7 is already gone or near extinction. Dams aren't that much of a problem. They are part of
8 it, but very little of it.

9 You go on down, and then you have the nylon Indian nets that shouldn't be
10 allowed. They should have to fish with their cedar bark nets as they did in aboriginal
11 days. You go on out to the ocean near the shoreline, you have the commercial fishermen
12 that take some of the fish there.

13 You go on out into the open ocean, and you have the long drift nets that go from
14 here to Spokane long and catch everything indiscriminately. I believe that it's terribly
15 wrong to put the people of this -- of this area under the stress of losing their jobs and
16 whatnot because of breaching these dams and lowering our attempt at making a
17 livelihood here. I think it's an extremely bad thing to do.

18 MR. HAMMOND: My name is Randy Hammon. The first comment I'd like to
19 make is, I do not understand why this -- we should have had more than one day of
20 testimony. And two, the facilities are not large enough to have participation.

21 The rest of it, it goes like, when they first put the dams in, is a -- they talked about
22 prosperity and growth and what it was going to do for the valley and bring economic
23 goodness to the valley and everything like that.

24 And now, they want to take away our economic growth and progress and
25 everything else. To me, I think that there's other alternatives that they need to look at.

1 Offshore fishing. This is not just a Snake River drainage problem, this is a national,
2 international problem.

3 We need to look at all of the offshore fishing and maybe get national and
4 international involvement in stopping the fishing. Take away the gill nets out of the
5 Clearwater, and maybe that would help solve some of the problems before we start
6 taking away the dams.

7 I cannot believe with the technology that's available today that we can't look at
8 other resources and ways of saving the steelhead and the salmon. The thing that really
9 bothers me is the loss of jobs that will come about because of this.

10 I've heard a lot of people making comments and guesstimations about what
11 impact it will have on us. But all of us has been touched by guesstimations at one time or
12 another, and they're inaccurate.

13 We do not know what the impact of it will be, let alone the impact that it will have
14 on the steelhead and salmon when they breach the dams. There will be large quantities
15 of sediment over the next several years that will be flowing down the river. And what kind
16 of impact will that have on an already endangered species?

17 I think that we need to look at other alternatives other than breaching. Thank you.

18 MS. STAUFFER: My name is Chris Stauffer. Clarkston, Washington. I just
19 wanted to say that I'm in favor of not breaching the dams.

20 I believe there's a lot of scientific information that needs to be gathered regarding
21 other variables that may be affecting the salmon and steelhead migration such as
22 dredging at the mouth of the Columbia, different birds that have inhabited the Columbia
23 and various fishing practices.

24 I think these need to be looked at more before we can affect the economy of any
25 certain area of this region. Thanks.

1 MR. STELLJES: Wayne Stelljes. The people who really care about the
2 Northwest, they want to preserve the things that we value most about living here. A vital
3 rural culture, a strong regional economy capable of supporting families.

4 We want common sense solutions that really work. That are many reasons for the
5 decline in fish population world-wide, climate changes and ocean conditions, and laws
6 that protect salmon predators such as birds, marine mammals and ocean fisheries.

7 The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' annual fish passage data indicates that more
8 than 4,000 spring summer jack salmon were counted past Lower Granite Dam in 1999.
9 This is ten times more than what was counted in '98 and 40 times more than '94.

10 More than 95 percent of the barge salmon smolts arrived alive at the mouth of the
11 Columbia River. Barging works. Continued hydro passage improvements and
12 improvements in conditions of habitat, harvest and hatcheries hold the best hope for
13 saving the fish. Dam breaching is not a silver bullet.

14 This option is radical and has no support from reasonable people. Thank you.

15 MR. KRICK: My name is Alan Krick. Thank you for the opportunity to testify
16 before you this evening. My name is Alan Krick. I am an active environmentalist.
17 Please, do not consider me an environmental activist, because there is a major difference
18 between the two.

19 I have been a dry land farmer from the Genesee area for the last 14 years. Our
20 farm has been cared for, yes, cared for by my family since 1907. I am a supporter of the
21 environment including fish, but I am also strongly opposed to the removal of any dams.

22 My late father told me many times, God gave you a brain, use it. This is what we
23 all need to do. If we do not make any rash, hurried decisions, we can have salmon and
24 dams, too. There's technology that needs to be utilized, natural predators that need to be
25 controlled, including mankind with the harvest of these fish.

1 Common sense, which seems to be lost in a lot of these testimonials, needs to be
2 followed. I do not know the number of barges that transport product from the four lower
3 Snake River dam regions, but I do know that it takes 134 semi-trucks to haul the
4 equivalent amount of grain that one barge hauls.

5 The emissions from those trucks would be immense. The infrastructure would
6 have to be dramatically rebuilt whether trucks and/or trains were used, not to mention the
7 lives that would be lost with the increased traffic and accounts.

8 While we are caring for fish, we need to use our common sense and realize that
9 the fish ladders will not be working while the rivers are drawn down for removal. This
10 process will take four years and will take place in the fall, therefore, for four years, there
11 will be no fall chinook or steelhead returning because the dams will be fully blocking their
12 way while each dam is being removed. A very poor way to save salmon.

13 Let's work together to keep our heritage, whether it be in farming, fishing, logging
14 or recreation. We can have dams and fish if we all work together. Our nation has built
15 these resources that have brought prosperity to this region. Let's work to keep this
16 prosperity and build on the dams to improve it in the future.

17 Thanks again for your consideration on saving the dams and the fish.

18 MR. SPEDDEN: My name's Steven Spedden. I've lived here Lewiston all my life.
19 I think we really need to look at this closer. We need to look at our ocean harvests,
20 miles-long drift nets we have out there, the Caspian terns. There are too many other
21 things than just dams.

22 Please consider, at this time, to not tear the dams out and leave them intact.

23 Thank you.

24 MS. PHILLIPS: My name's Rebecca Phillips. I'm a resident of Lewiston, and I'm
25 totally against breaching the dams. My personal view is, is that why give up a renewable

1 resource for producing electricity and use a nonrenewable resource such as natural gas
2 or a dangerous resource such as plutonium or whatever we would have to use for
3 nuclear production of electricity.

4 Or we would even have to use coal or a wood-burning way to produce electricity
5 when we have a renewable resource that we're using right now to cost us additional
6 money to go ahead and have to take out the dams.

7 And then also the impact that it has on people and jobs. A lot of our farmers can't
8 afford to -- the additional shipping cost to get their grain to market. You know, the paper
9 mill here in Lewiston would have to pay additional shipping costs, their customers would
10 for our products.

11 And the chipping mills here in the area would also be put out of business, because
12 chips are not a highly -- there's not a real high profit margin. You know, there's just too
13 many jobs that are going to be lost if you take away the dams.

14 It helped our community to have them put in. It also made it much prettier. It
15 made the dike bypass system a beautiful place to exercise, which I use regularly, and it
16 gave us some recreation for water-skiing and jet boats.

17 And please consider this. Please don't take away our dams, jobs and recreation.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. RUSSELL: Name?

20 THE MODERATOR: Yeah.

21 MR. RUSSELL: Name is Keith Russell. I'm from Moscow, Idaho. I'm a resource
22 economist.

23 And I have considerable problems with the economics that have been done on the
24 study, and particularly the way the costs of breaching have been determined. Benefits
25 have been brought back through time and costs have not.

1 I'd like to see the economics done in a way that is more amenable to how amenity
2 resources are being valued in today's society, not just the raw cost of breaching the dam.

3 And I'd also like to say something about the process.

4 This is a ridiculous media circus, and the Corps needs to figure out a way to have
5 public involvement be real public involvement because it's obviously an issue that people
6 are concerned about.

7 All in all, eventually, we're going to have to take the dams out if we're going to
8 save fish, so that's something we have to come to grips with whether we do it now or
9 later.

10 That's all I want to say.

11 MR. JONES: My name is Ron Jones. I'm here to say that I'm against breaching
12 the dams. If the salmon and the steelhead are an endangered species, then we need to
13 stop fishing for them.

14 And they shouldn't be in the supermarkets. I believe there's other alternatives to
15 saving the fish vs. tearing out the dams and we need to look at those. Thank you for your
16 time.

17 MR. MEADOWS: Clegg Meadows From Lewiston, Idaho. I'm here to make
18 comments on the EIS, the four proposals for the breaching of the lower Snake River
19 dams.

20 From all of the reading I have done on the various opinions and whatnot, it seems
21 like we're looking at a 100-mile solution to a problem that exists not only here and
22 upstream from us, but downstream and including the bearing -- the ocean and whatnot.

23 We've heard comments of ocean conditions. When they start catching marlin off
24 the coast of Oregon, that means that there's fairly warm water.

25 As we all know, that salmon do not do well in warm warm water.

1 And then we have the pressures upon the fish, not only from human consumption
2 but predatory pressures of the natural world.

3 And so I just feel that looking at removing the earthen portions of these dams and
4 restoring these rivers to their natural state doesn't offer any guarantees that this will
5 indeed bring the fish back to levels they call historical levels.

6 I guess if you looked at data even from the Columbia River, from the early 1900's
7 where it showed that the catch limits of king salmon dropped off drastically, and then the
8 coho and chinook in turn as they were depleted by over-fishing, and it continues to be a
9 problem.

10 I feel that we have not yet looked at one alternative which would probably make
11 the most sense, considering we're looking at endangered status for these fish runs.

12 And that is a fact, that we should not be harassing or taking any of these
13 endangered fish, such as followed with the American alligator and the American bald
14 eagle and numerous other species that we've not been allowed to harm or chase or
15 threaten.

16 It just seems that we should try this option before we go to a drastic extreme of
17 removing all these dams or the earthen portions thereof.

18 I'd like to thank you for allowing me this time for this comment, and I hope that we
19 can come to an equitable solution. Thank you.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

21 MR. HILL: My name's Don Hill.

22 I've been a resident of Lewiston for 50 years. I remember the slack
23 water after the dams went in. I also remember the fresh water before the
24 dams.

1 We have more fish now than we had then. I cannot believe if the salmon are that
2 endangered, that they're selling them along the Columbia River road system at two
3 dollars a pound.

4 If the dams are the problems, we need to look at dams that don't have fish
5 ladders. There are several dams in this area that are hindering fish runs that could be
6 fixed for friendlier use for the fish.

7 I'm against breaching. Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

9 MS. LaVOIE: My name is Wendy LaVoie. I've been a pretty much life-long
10 resident of the valley here, and I am opposed to the dam breaching. I honestly do not feel
11 how people can believe it is the most effective way to save the fish.

12 Although I do believe that the fish need to be saved, not at the cost of people's
13 lives and people's jobs. The National Marine Fisheries Service has found that 95 percent
14 of the fish do survive through the dams.

15 In my opinion, when a species is endangered, it's put onto the endangered list. I
16 don't understand why this is not being done with the salmon. If we stop fishing for them,
17 their numbers will grow.

18 If the tribes feel that we would take away their livelihood, then there is a way that
19 they could be subsidized. I feel that this would be, by far, the least expensive approach.

20 I also am concerned about the fact that the hydroelectric power will be lessened
21 due to the loss of the dams. If we do that, 1.9 million people, families, will lose electricity
22 for one year. That's the amount that will be lost if the dams are breached. Thank you.

23 MR. THOMAS: I'm Bill Thomas. I live in Clarkston, Washington. I represent only
24 myself and my family, and I want to go on record as violently opposed to dam breaching
25 as a not proven cause or any improvement in fish recovery.

1 I question as to where the human being is in this whole scenario. We've had the
2 darter snail and the spotted owl, and now this, and probably the tse-tse fly will be coming
3 up.

4 But where is the priority given to the humans? And I resent outsiders who'll not
5 live as a result of this decision in this valley coming in and making recommendations as
6 to what needed to be done for fish recovery.

7 I appreciate the opportunity to give a talk, and hope that you all spend the time in
8 analyzing what this valley presents. I believe if you took a vote of the registered voters in
9 this valley, it would be monumentally in the majority against any consideration toward
10 dam breaching.

11 The economy, the recreational loss we would have here. People have invested in
12 their homes because of the environment. They've invested into -- the companies have
13 invested, too, because of the environment.

14 And to lose access to the recreational and economics that we have in barging and
15 in the port facilities and in boating and
16 water-skiing, et cetera, for the purpose of trying to return the salmon, I think is a ludicrous
17 suggestion.

18 And I hope that you do consider it and the other options as a great priority over
19 such considerations. Thank you for the time.

20 MR. WARREN: My name is Bud Warren. I'm a new resident to the Clarkston
21 area, recently moved here approximately three months ago by my choice with the job
22 offered to me, with the same company.

23 I did not have to come here. I love the area. I liked what it had to offer me.
24 I'm quite concerned what it's going to do to the property value of the house I just
25 purchased.

1 And I have not heard anybody mention anything about who's going to be also
2 picking up the tab on clean-up or are we going to put this back to natural ground all the
3 way through?

4 Therefore, I'm quite concerned. My house does overlook the river, and I don't
5 particularly want it overlooking a garbage dump. Therefore, I am against breaching these
6 dams. And I think we can have both.

7 I think there's other solutions, and I think we need to look at those and quit wasting
8 our time. Thank you.

9 MR. FRANK: Hi. The focus of everyone -- my name is Terry Frank, for the record.
10 Hi. The focus of everyone's input seems to be from their point of view when the focus
11 should be from all points of view.

12 The truth and the only way to save the fish is to follow a multi-view course. One,
13 removal of Rice Island, that would be a 30 percent increase for the salmon recovery.
14 Limit commercial, tribal, sportsmen harvest until return numbers recover.

15 Three, increase barging of smolts and returning salmon, steelhead. Four, improve
16 ladders or create fish bypass canals. Five, improve habitat, implement bank vegetation
17 recovery (inaudible) and livestock on the water's edge is a cause.

18 As a child growing up in the valley, I remember the natural rivers here and going
19 fishing with my dad. His sister Cleo Wilson caught a 1964 world's record steelhead
20 across from the Potlatch Mill.

21 It would be nice to have the rivers we have had, but we don't. And breaching the
22 dams won't bring them back. It's been said, you can never return home. Thank you.

23 P.S. Follow the truth and not another pipe dream. We need a multi-view course of
24 action. Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

1 MS. EWERT: My name is Sara Dant Ewert. And I would like to testify in favor of
2 breaching the dams. For too long, too many have given too much to too few. When we
3 built the Snake River dams, we truly believed science and technology could solve the fish
4 problem.

5 We were wrong. Today we are faced with the deceptively simple choice to dam or
6 not to dam. That is the question. Arguments forwarded by dam advocates cite the
7 economic impact breaching the dams will surely have on the Pacific Northwest.

8 Our response must be, we are willing to pay. For the question before us is not
9 simply about fish and dams, but about humans and the earth. We, too, are part of the
10 same ecosystem that will sustain or betray the salmon. We have a chance to make the
11 right decision. We cannot have salmon and dams, and we must have salmon. Thank
12 you.

13 MR. WISCHMEIER: Hello. My name is Jerry Wischmeier. And I came here
14 tonight in opposition of breaching of the dams. I have heard a lot of good arguments for
15 and good arguments against.

16 In my opinion, it's hard to understand who's right and who's wrong. We should not
17 come to a conclusion, though. The people that are in these positions should weigh out all
18 of the arguments on scientific, factual, unbiased, and pertinent information before any
19 decision is ever made.

20 Who are the people that decide on these? I hope it's fair people. I hope it's
21 people that will do this in an unbiased. Okay. Here's a theoretical question.

22 Okay. If I was to tell you there was only one T-rex left in existence and
23 he can only survive in New York City, and I wanted you to move every one out of
24 New York City because I say it is the only place that he can survive, what would
25 you do?

1 A man 90 years old was quoted as saying, there is nothing that we cannot do
2 as a collective body if you set your mind to it. However, you must have the honesty, the
3 integrity, as well as the wisdom and the common sense to come to a factual and logical
4 solution. That man was my grandfather.

5 All I can do here tonight is to ask that the people of this panel and any other
6 person that has a deciding factor on this issue do the same as my grandfather would.
7 Thank you very much. I really appreciate you allowing me to say my comments, and
8 please do not breach the dams.

9 MR. DASENBROCK: Okay. My name is Bill Dansenbrock. I'm a resident of
10 Clarkston, Washington. I've lived here all my life. My only concern is, by listening to the
11 survival rate of the salmon after they leave the Columbia, I believe there should be more
12 investigation done on where the migration is of the salmon and where they go.

13 I believe a lot of the problem is the harvest of salmon outside the 200-mile radius
14 which is caused by foreign countries. I think that we're spending a lot of money
15 needlessly by looking at breaching the dams.

16 I think more investigation should be done outside. It's easy to breach a dam
17 because it's done in the United States. It would be harder to solve the problem by doing
18 it world-wide. That's all I have to say. I think it's more outside the United States than
19 internal.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

21 MR. SOUTHWICK: My name is Eric Southwick. I live here in Clarkston,
22 Washington. Been a member of this -- a resident of this valley for roughly 30 years, 35
23 years.

24 I've seen a time when we didn't have the dams on the river here close in the
25 vicinity.

1 And all I can see is changes with breaching the dams that are wrong. The whole
2 river process (inaudible) everything else has changed since we put the dams in. The
3 riprap. I also saw the river after we had the recent drawdowns for testing, full of silt
4 where they used to be free running.

5 There's -- it's a change in the channel. There's a lot of silt. They're trying to save
6 the salmon. There's a lot of economic meetings in place at current to save those salmon.
7 Barging, all those other effects are proven to be effective. From my understanding, it's a
8 95 to 98 percent living rate when they reach the mouth of the Columbia.

9 It's the concerns from the time they come back from the Columbia. I have no
10 scientific evidence, but if you had a million smolts that made it to the mouth of the
11 Columbia and you're only getting 100,000 back to the first dam on the river three years
12 later, that means we need to research everything that's going on now currently more so.
13 The ocean effects, fishing, the gillnetting, all those need to be addressed rather than just
14 trying to remove the four lower Snake dams.

15 Anything that would be beneficial to this community and everybody else is in favor
16 of. We do definitely need to research further, in my own opinion, and make sure we
17 make well judged guidances and bring the human factor into it.

18 You're looking at a lot of jobs that will be lost. And when I say jobs, I don't just
19 mean working jobs, I mean jobs that pay a livable -- living wage so a person can go out
20 and support his family instead of having two or three jobs, jobs that support a family on
21 one income.

22 That's what I'm asking. Just please research. Don't make a hesitant move
23 without a lot more research. We need that. On that note, I'd say thank you for giving me
24 your time.

1 MS. THOMAS: My name is Jessie Thomas. And I'm speaking on the behalf of
2 people who share my same views on the issues of dam breaching. I'm very pro dam
3 breaching

4 I feel that it's the only option that we have in order to save salmon species. It's the
5 only option that we have that will provide us with any chance to recover salmon numbers.

6 I'd just like to say that it's a part of our culture, part of Native American culture. It's
7 very valuable to our ecology. And dam breaching is the only thing that we can do in
8 order to save them.

9 MS. STROBL: Hello. My name is Crystal Strobl. I'm speaking on behalf of
10 myself, and I'd like to say that I am in favor of breaching of the lower four dams of the
11 Snake based on the reasons -- because it's a very ecologically important factor that we
12 need to keep in mind, that the salmon need to continue to run, and the steelhead need a
13 viable environment in order to sustain their populations.

14 I think the individuals who are basing all of their decisions on economic factors are
15 at a little bit of a loss, because they're not completely taking into consideration the
16 spiritual factors in which every natural element on this earth has a circle motion.

17 Which if we extinct another species, it is only pertaining to our own extinction. And
18 then one day, it will backfire and all of us will suffer severely.

19 It is important that we try to come to a single decision, whether it be the
20 breaching of the dams, which is what I'm in favor of, or some kind of gentle opening
21 up of the turbines, it still seems to me that it has detrimental effects on the animals
22 themselves.

23 Fish are a very important factor, knowing water quality, and it's showing that if we
24 do not have a certain water quality, our animals are dying. It's showing that we are not

1 able to even drink our own water. And it's very important that we can be able to drink
2 from the Mother herself because she is the life of every individual around.

3 I think breaching of the dams will be a very positive decision to make based on the
4 fact that populations of natural animals will sustain and one day humans will realize that
5 they are not above every other living creature. We are just merely equal.

6 MR. HOWARD: My name is Gregory Howard. I would like to make comments
7 regarding the breaching of the dams.

8 I definitely do not support breaching the dams. I have spent thousands of dollars
9 going to Alaska fishing for salmon, and I consider myself a true outdoorsmen and
10 environmentalist.

11 I notice up there that the people are complaining that they are losing their salmon
12 runs, also, and they have no dams or pulp and paper mills within thousands of miles.

13 The oceanic conditions up there are giving them all kinds of trouble, the warm
14 ocean. Also, the predators such as the sea lions and the seals and the offshore fishing.

15 These rivers up there are from three to seven miles long, so the salmon aren't
16 having a tough time going 400 miles from the ocean to their spawning beds. So that
17 proved to me that the dams are not the main problem.

18 The barging seems to have worked, and certain things -- and I'd like to give that a
19 little more time, even though I do not want to see anything go extinct. It is something that
20 is terrible, and I want my children to have the opportunity to enjoy the salmon just like I
21 have.

22 But I definitely do not support the breaching of the dams, and I think there's
23 several alternatives that we can do before it comes to that. Thank you.

24 MR. SIMPSON: My name is Paul Simpson of Lewiston, Idaho. Suppose
25 someone takes a hammer in one hand and pounds the thumb of the other. The thumb

1 complaining about the pain is /advised not to stop the pounding, but instead, to cut off the
2 hand that holds the hammer.

3 The rational person wouldn't accept such a recommendation. Breaching is like
4 that. It's a power madness having nothing to do with fish. Fish runs are diminished for
5 two reasons. First, not enough fish return upstream to spawn.

6 Second, not enough smolts hit the ocean to become adults. Of course, the
7 second reason causes the first reason. So if our fish ladders need improvement, improve
8 them.

9 And if we are harvesting spawning fish, we can't say any other factor prevented
10 those fish from spawning. If we need those fish to propagate, stop harvesting them. But
11 that goes to reason one.

12 Reason two, the real problem has nothing to do with the dams. It is caused by
13 ecological tinkering by environmental terrorists who caused the overpopulation of seals
14 by eliminating their harvest.

15 Now these bull seals perch on the mouth of the Columbia and other rivers
16 consuming as many as 2200 smolts per hour each. Moreover, ecological tinkering that
17 lies silent in other places caused the boom in tern populations, each of which consumes
18 an average of 114 smolts per day.

19 The answers are simple. More seals, less fish. More terns, less fish. More
20 harvest, less fish. If you breach dams and allow the predation to continue, the runs will
21 continue to decline and the benefit from the dams will be gone.

22 Thus, we propose this action should be required to sign on for part of the monetary
23 damage thus resulting, then the playing field would be level. After all, we're talking about
24 eliminating the economic viability of hundreds and thousands of people in Idaho.

1 It is the indictment of our system that an action as perverse as dam breaching, or
2 cutting off our economic right hand, be given serious consideration by our government.

3 Don't think so? Well, then, how about we breach Hoover Dam? I'll propose that
4 now. Is that perverse? Is it stupid? Is it imbecilic? Is it lunacy? Of course it is, and so
5 is this.

6 MR. CRANE: Hi. My name's Jeff Crane. I'm working on a Ph.D. in
7 environmental history, and salmon is my area of focus. And I've done a lot of work
8 studying the history of the region and salmon, and it's clear that dams are one of the
9 major problems for the salmon.

10 There's a lot of other issues, of course. Habitat destruction, deforestation, over-
11 harvest of salmon. Those are all issues.

12 The destruction of smolts due to going through turbines into slack water reservoirs
13 are all issues that need to be dealt with.

14 So far, the science, the bargaining, has not worked. So I favor breaching of the
15 dams.

16 MR. McGARVEY: Randy McGarvey from Lewiston, Idaho. I'm opposed to
17 breaching the dams. I feel that most people that are against the dams are using salmon
18 as a crutch.

19 Most of the salmon are getting to the ocean, 90 percent, that it's not the dam's
20 problem. It's commercial fishing, it's all the predators, the warm water cycle of the ocean,
21 and the fishing that's coming up is more of a detriment than the dams.

22 And I feel that it should be left more to the people that live in the area rather
23 than people that are being bused in from areas outside.

24 And people that are working here should be considered more than the people here
25 that are being hired to make the decision.

1 MS. CHANG: Okay. My name is Sally Chang. And I would like to say that I'm
2 very proud to live in this democracy where in this case, the good sense of the majority
3 might actually overrule the petty self-interests of a few.

4 Christ told us that what is done unto the least of God's creation if not unto God.
5 We share this earth with many species and all of God's creations.

6 How dare we threaten the existence of them. Give the river back to the fish.
7 Breach the dams. The science and study that has been done indicate that breaching of
8 the dams is the most effective way to restore our fish runs, and I think that's what should
9 be done. Thank you.

10 MR. RAUCH: My name is George Rauch. I represent Northwest Timber Workers
11 Resource Council. While it is true that many jobs have been lost in the fishing industry
12 and in the recreation industry that rely on fish, I feel that breaching of the four lower
13 Snake River dams is by far the extremest measure (inaudible).

14 None of us want to see the extinction of salmon, but other already tried and found
15 to be successful methods can be used that has a strong possibility of bringing the
16 populations back.

17 This has been proven by the increase in the numbers of returning fish this year
18 alone. Local fishermen have been reporting that their catches this year are equaling
19 those that they caught ten to 15 years ago.

20 Therefore, I feel that alternative three, major system improvements, is our best
21 option. Transporting fish has proven successful, and I feel that the installation of surface
22 collectors and voluntary spills, numbers of returning fish can be further increased.

23 Rivers in the Northwest that aren't dammed at the present are also experiencing
24 losses in the number of fish returning. So I feel that in regards to the All-H's paper, that
25 alternative B, or harvest constraints, is our best choice. We must reduce ocean fisheries

1 and put limits on in-river fishing, including the tribes, and increase our use of hatcheries
2 to rebuild wild runs to further increase the number of fish in our rivers.

3 The single alternative of dam breaching is not our best choice.

4 Please take these comments into consideration when making your final decision,
5 and thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns.

6 MR. HOOD: My name's Rick Hood. And I'm against breaching the dams. I don't
7 believe that from all the studies I've heard, it will not save any fish.

8 It's only going to kill more. It's going to interfere with the Lewiston shipping grain,
9 goods and everything else.

10 If they're taken out, we won't have any type of transportation to move our grain out
11 to Portland. And the roadway -- we'd have no railways. Nothing's going to be able to
12 take up the slack.

13 I believe that there are other reasons for the salmon problem and it has nothing to
14 do with the dams. They aren't even getting back to the dams.

15 Gill nets, fishing in the ocean and the sea lions are -- have a great deal to do with
16 it. Those are my feelings.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

18 MR. SEHARNHORST: My name is David Sehornhorst. And I'm against
19 breaching the dams for the reason we're a (inaudible) in Washington, and that's the only
20 way we have to get our wheat down to the port.

21 I don't think the salmon is -- the dams are not a problem with the salmon.

22 There's a lot of other reasons that they're not here. A lot of other things that have
23 caused problems, it's not just the dams.

24 I don't think it's going to solve anything, and what kind of a guarantee do we have
25 if we take the dams out that we will get the fish back?

1 We don't get the fish back, we lose our dams, I lose my livelihood and we don't
2 have anymore fish than what we started with. What good is that? I am very opposed to
3 it.

4 MR. PETERSON: Earl Peterson, and I live in Clarkston, Washington. In the state
5 of Washington, we've already, of course, had four nuclear reactors canceled.

6 And this state has gone through a five billion dollar bankruptcy, more or less, from
7 the Washington Public Power System over the construction bonds for those reactors.

8 We don't have a replacement for the electricity generated by the dams. We don't
9 have the solar power or the wind power or anything else available at this time.

10 I believe that we should keep the dams and work on technology to aid in the
11 survival of the fish which must migrate up the river. At the present, they seem to think
12 that a good many of them are dying in the ocean. I'm not sure what you can do about
13 that.

14 But I feel that we should keep the dams and that we, in the future, will need that
15 electricity. It's a matter of having enough electricity without being forced to buy it from the
16 power grid, especially from Canada.

17 The Northwest power grid, I understand, is based in Alberta, and it serves western
18 Canada and the states of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, some of Montana, some of
19 northern California.

20 Now, it's nice to be able to buy power from outside this region, but I feel that the
21 state's economy would be much stronger if we could generate more of our own electricity
22 here in the state. Thank you.

23 MR. EBERHARDT: My name is Boyd Eberhardt. I'm a 60-year-old (inaudible)
24 from Lewiston, Idaho. I've seen rivers as free-flowing rivers and I've seen dams. I can
25 attone to the fact that we've been better off with these dams.

1 There's a lot of people that say that they don't provide flood control. I believe that
2 they do. Two or three years ago, Portland would have been flooded much more severely
3 than it was if they didn't have the little bit of (inaudible) that these dams held back.

4 The electricity that these dams produce supply a growing need. And if they were
5 to be taken out, that would have to be replaced by fossil fuel type generation of electricity
6 which would do nothing more than pollute the atmosphere more than we do today.

7 As far as the fishing, I've fished this river for 40 years. There are more fish here,
8 essentially, now than in my fishing history. I feel that there are more and better methods
9 to save our fish. An island, Rice Island down at the mouth of the Columbia is one of the
10 major problems in their migration.

11 The seals that are protected when the fish return to spawn (inaudible). I believe
12 that the dams should be left in place. That's all I have to say.

13 THE MODERATOR: Ready?

14 MS. FARRINGTON: Mm-hmm. My name is Linda Farrington. I work for Potlatch
15 Corporation. I can't believe that people want to take the dams out. Our community will
16 be devastated. I can't believe that people would really think that the 35 salmon that come
17 up in our area by trying to get through the gill nets are going to make a difference.

18 If we're going to bring the salmon back, we need to all work together. We need to
19 get rid of the nets, because it's a horrible thing to see when you drive down or take the
20 train down to see, and the management of the fish that we observe how they take care of
21 it is unreal.

22 We need to work together and try to make things better for everybody. And taking
23 out the dams isn't the answer. We need to look at it a little bit more. We've already had
24 a drawdown. We know what it's going to do to this valley. We need to do something else
25 besides take the dams out. The silt, the -- everything that's going to be coming down

1 through the water, the removal of the dams, it's going to destroy everything else that
2 we've ever had to even have a chance to bring these salmon back.

3 We need to -- we just need to work together and think of something different
4 besides tearing -- we're going backwards, we're not going ahead. We need to work
5 towards the future where people and environment can live together as one.

6 And by destroying what we've built isn't it. And if my grandchildren get sick
7 because of what happens to the drawdown, it's going to be a horrible thing that we have
8 to explain to our kids why this place looks like it does.

9 Like I said, I've been a fisherman my whole life, and I have never heard of one
10 couple that's caught a salmon in the last five years that's fishing these rivers. There's not
11 very many that's getting up here. We need to do something to get them up here before
12 we can send them back.

13 From what I understand, there isn't even enough food out in the ocean if we did
14 bring them back. So something's wrong somewhere else besides here. That's about all I
15 have to say.

16 MR. GALLUCE: I'm Joe Galluce from Lewiston, Idaho. And I'm particularly
17 against removal of the dams. Why do these dams need to be breached when there are
18 free-flowing rivers that the salmon are declining in?

19 There was more fish across the Lower Granite Dam in 1999 than in 88. The count
20 at Bonneville Dam are the highest since 1970.

21 Consider climate changes, how birds and predators take their toll on the fish,
22 along with gill nets on the Columbia.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Gary Johnson. I'm here to oppose the breaching of the four
24 lower Snake River dams. I've seen no positive evidence that shows that this is the cause
25 of the loss of salmon.

1 It seems to me that there are less drastic measures to take to recover the salmon.
2 Why don't we try eliminating predators and removing nets. Barging proved that 95
3 percent reached the mouth of the Columbia River, but only .5 percent returned to Idaho.

4 Where have these fish gone? Are they lost? Were they netted or did predators
5 have lunch? I've yet to see a dam in the Pacific Ocean. I've lived in this valley for my
6 entire life, and I am also a fisherman and sportsmen. And I don't want to see the salmon
7 gone, but I don't think there -- but I do think there are other measures that could be taken
8 to restore the salmon.

9 Remember, salmon are not the only things that don't want to become extinct.
10 People should also be considered in you're decision.

11 And I'd also like to know that if they do take out the dams, what's going to happen
12 to all the sediment and stuff?

13 Is this going to get rid of them? Five, ten years down the road are we going to
14 say, well, that hasn't worked, then what are we going to do? What are we going to do for
15 people in the meantime? Thank you very much.

16 MR. LEONARD: James Leonard. I'm against the dam breaching. We don't need
17 to take the dams down in order to save the fish. We can leave the dams in place and use
18 other methods to go about saving the fish. Lots of other methods we can use besides
19 taking the dams down.

20 There's no -- there's lots of other rivers and streams that run without dams on
21 them we need to also look at. So we can't say it's just the dams that deplete the fish
22 runs.

23 We need to come together and find a solution besides getting rid of clean power.
24 The last thing we want to do is get rid of power sources so we have to bring in nuclear
25 power plants to get excess power to our cities and towns.

1 We need to -- water power is clean power. We don't see very many trucks coming
2 from the dam hauling away toxic waste and finding a place to bury it. Water power is
3 cheap power and clean power, and taking down the dams is not the decision to save the
4 fish. Thank you.

5 MR. WESTERHOLM: My name's Rick Westerholm. I work for Potlatch
6 Corporation. I have a big stake in these dams not being torn out of here. I believe that
7 they were designed and built by people who were trying to build the economy of this
8 area, and I believe that they still support the economy of this area.

9 And I'm totally against people from out of our area destroying our way of life. And
10 that's the way I look at it. I'm totally against breaching these dams. Thank you.

11 MR. MYERS: My name is Bill Myers. I'm from Colfax, Washington. I'm a
12 Whitman County farmer. I'm assuming I'm addressing an officer in the Corps of
13 Engineers. The reason I make this statement is that you gentlemen are sworn and --
14 sworn to protect the our constitution.

15 I don't totally understand warfare, but I understand that we are in a culture of
16 warfare, and there's a non-productive element in our society that wants to remove us
17 from our natural resources.

18 And what you have provided for us by building these dams in the first place is a
19 tremendous tool for us in agriculture. Being involved in production agriculture, we rely
20 heavily on these dams.

21 In fact, we were solicited to -- many were solicited to come in and take advantage
22 of the inexpensive electricity and the abundant water provided by these things.

23 Myself in a dry land situation, I use the freight aspect of this. With the loss of
24 each one of these dams, I'm sure you gentlemen are aware that we'll put 100 trucks on
25 the road, and the interstates will not withstand this.

1 Rail is not sufficient at this time because we pulled it all out. How are we
2 supposed to move our products to market? One of the major differences, other than the
3 free enterprise, obviously, between us and the Soviet Union, they raise good crops there,
4 too, on occasion. And when they do, they lose them because they cannot move them to
5 market. They don't have the infrastructure that we do. We have this marvelous thing
6 that, again, you provided by your hard work and effort.

7 The Army, under normal circumstances, against a foreign enemy, would defend
8 these structures to the death. And I'm very surprised that we're even discussing these
9 things.

10 Here are some suggestions if you do intend to follow through with this foolishness.
11 Anymore drawdowns? Draw down lake Washington first. Breach anything? Let's
12 breach Ballard Locks first. Okay. If you insist on doing this, let's return the property back
13 to the original owners, give them first right of refusal. If not, I'll sell that to the -- anyone
14 -- put the property back in private hands.

15 This just can't be allowed to happen. I think anyone with a sense of duty and
16 conscience at the (inaudible) that you gentlemen have sworn. I realize you're
17 instruments of policy and you must obey the elected officials. But even the -- even the
18 Russians in the recent revolt where Breshnev (phonetic) anyway, I'm done.

19 MR. BUNCE: Hello. My name is Ken Bunce. I'm employed at Potlatch
20 Corporation in Lewiston, Idaho. I believe that the prospect of breaching the lower four
21 Snake River dams and stuff is currently an ill-conceived idea. We have other
22 opportunities to pursue before we take that relatively drastic and basically irreversible
23 step.

24 I believe there are harvest issues that need to be addressed. There are -- in
25 addition to harvest issues, I believe we also have issues from both climatic standpoints

1 that possibly there are (inaudible) climate. It comes and goes in cycles. It may affect the
2 livelihood of the salmon and other species and stuff.

3 We may be getting a cooler climatic period that may be more conducive to the
4 runs of the salmon. I believe that as a species the human being oftentimes can come up
5 with novel and good solutions that encompass both elements of the topic.

6 I believe that we can come up with a solution that both saves the dams and allows
7 for the recovery of the salmon.

8 MR. HANSEN: My name is Craig Hansen. I believe that breaching the dams is a
9 drastic measure without first trying some other things such as the offshore fishing, the gill
10 nets, and even the predators, the seals and the terns. I think those are the first steps that
11 need to be taken.

12 I feel that the removal of the dams is a drastic step. It should be the last step in
13 the process. Thank you.

14 MR. LANG: My name is Kent Lang. I believe before we breach any dams, that we
15 should explore all other options and take into effect the equation the dams provide jobs,
16 irrigation for food and recreation.

17 And the fish are important, but we need to explore all other options before we
18 remove the dams. I'm against removing dams.

19 MR. GILBERT: My name is Dean Gilbert. And I'd like to express my opinion that
20 breaching of the four lower Snake dams would not do enough to help the salmon. I think
21 there has to be alternatives that are a lot less drastic than that.

22 And I hope that the Army Corps of Engineers and all the people that are involved
23 in the studies can find a method that addresses all the other concerns with explosion in
24 sea mammal populations and the terns at the mouth of the Columbia River, along with
25 the commercial fishing in the ocean as well as a ong through the Columbia Basin.

1 And sport fishing and all those things can be brought into balance and honestly
2 help the salmon without devastating the local economy in the Lewiston-Clarkston valley.
3 Thank you.

4 MS. GILBERT: This is Nancy Gilbert. I oppose breaching the dams as a solution
5 to salmon recovery. There is no scientific evidence that suggests removal of the dams
6 will result in any appreciable increase in fish populations.

7 On the contrary, the effect of removing the dam would be devastating to the
8 Lewiston economy. Potlatch Corporation would not be able to be competitive in the
9 marketplace due to increased loss of transportation by truck and rail.

10 The end result would be mill closure. Many would be out of work, and not just
11 Potlatch employees whose earnings support all of the businesses. I urge you to please
12 select a proven alternative that will have a definite impact on fish recovery but won't hurt
13 the families in this valley.

14 MR. BROEMELING: My name is Greg Broemeling. And I adamantly oppose the
15 breaching of the dams for the benefit of salmon or steelhead or anything else.

16 I just don't feel there's enough scientific evidence to back this. And we need to
17 think of a time when the public has to say when as far as taxes, because that's what will
18 pay for the removal of this. Too many other things that enter in, many other factors such
19 as commercial fishing, predation, fishing from clear out in the ocean into the gill nets into
20 the rivers.

21 I just really am adamantly opposed to this. Thank you.

22 MR. CRAWFORD: My name is Dan Crawford. I'm from Lewiston, Idaho. And I'm
23 concerned about breaching the dams. I don't believe at this time that it's a good idea. I
24 believe that it hasn't been proven that it will bring back the fish, if indeed they are headed
25 for extinction, which I don't believe is proven yet, either.

1 I think the money, the jobs, the recreation, all the different things involved, I think
2 some more time is needed to decide, and I believe that right now, this isn't the right time.
3 I'm not convinced, and I would appreciate your consideration in that area. Thank you.

4 MR. RYAN: My name is Clete Ryan. I'm a resident of Asotin County and local
5 CPA. And I'd like to express my opinion that I'm against breaching of the dams. I heard
6 the study that there would be a 246 million dollar a year cost to breaching the dams as
7 opposed to the maximize transport and restricting the catch of the salmon, the salmon
8 and fish, there would be a 14 million dollar benefit. I think the choice is obvious.

9 I can't believe that we'd even consider breaching the dams with that high of cost
10 when the economic benefit in the (inaudible) of the fish seems to be as good under the
11 other options. Thank you.

12 MR. PARIS: I'm Greg Paris. I work for Potlatch Corporation. I've lived here all my
13 life. I just thought I'd sit in here and make my point that I am against breaching of the
14 dams. Six months ago when we had another breaching of a dam meeting, had a guest
15 speaker there, an old-time farmer, back in 19 -- who made the comment back in 1920,
16 1930, there was also no salmon in the river and there was no dams then.

17 So what is the problem? I think it's just a cycle. Just give it some time. If we
18 breach the dam, it's like going back in time and doing something -- trying to do our past
19 over. And I believe that we need to just go forward. Thank you.

20 MS. RYAN: My name is Brenda Ryan. And I'm against breaching the dams
21 because I think the economic cost to the area is just too great especially when you're
22 looking at a minimum of 700 jobs lost. I think it just (inaudible).

23 MR. AICHLMAYER: I'm Fritz Aichlmayer. I'm from Clarkston, Washington. And
24 when they put the dams in, I was against them, but to take them out now would be a big
25 mistake, because it would take years and years to get the river back to where it was.

1 And I think if they took the gill nets out down the river and in some way made a
2 spillway around the dams, which is possible, somebody with a little ingenuity, I think that
3 would take care of the problem. So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

4 MS. CROMER: Hi. My name is Elizabeth Cromer. I live in Lewiston, Idaho. I
5 think to consider the full economic impact of dam removal, you must consider the
6 Midwest farmers and the Montana lumber mills, both of whom use the Port of Lewiston in
7 order to keep their export shipping costs low enough to compete in the world market.

8 Not to mention the estimated 20,000 jobs locally that will be affected directly or
9 indirectly by dam removal. So I request, please leave the dams where they are and use
10 an economically less devastating method of saving the salmon. Thank you.

11 MR. SMITH: My name is Glenn Smith. I'm a retired Army engineer major, and I'm
12 here to speak in opposition to dam removal. I'm all in favor of salmon recovery and
13 steelhead recovery and saving those runs, but I do believe that the effort that's been put
14 in to studying these and other fish, 90 percent of our study time and ten percent of our life
15 zone (inaudible) fresh water.

16 I really believe that more effort should be put into studying what happens with the
17 fish in the ocean rather than taking what would be the most spectacular stance of
18 removing dams. Thank you for your time. Have a good evening.

19 MR. LANDRUS: Ron Landrus from Clarkston, Washington. I oppose the
20 breaching of the lower Snake River dams.

21 I think that there's enough scientific proof that we can have fish and still have the
22 dams.

23 I think a greater problem that may exist is the Indian gill nets. I kind of call them a
24 netting dam. I think if they're really concerned about our salmon, what we need to do is
25 eliminate all the others.

1 I also think that part of our problem is the ocean currents and the temperature.
2 And I think you're starting to see where we're going into a wet cycle, and I think because
3 of the wet cycle, you're going to start seeing more and more salmon returning back into
4 the rivers. Thank you.

5 MR. TINDER: My name is Cameron Tinder. I live here in Clarkston. There's a lot
6 of talk about saving the fish. I want to save the fish just like anyone else, but I don't think
7 getting rid of the dams is the way to go.

8 We need to first look at the alternatives before going extreme. And I think that
9 right now what we're doing is we're at the dams. We're collecting the fish at the dams
10 and we're transporting them. It seems to me we're doing a pretty good job of
11 transporting.

12 I've heard them say a high 90 percent of the fish are surviving the transportation.
13 They're dumping them off. And we're wondering why a lot of the fish are not returning.
14 There are several issues that need to be looked at before we even remotely consider
15 removing these dams.

16 It has to do with the sea lions that are -- we're feeding the sea lions. We're
17 feeding the terns. We built an island, Rice Island, where thousands upon thousands of
18 terns have reproduced and -- now that's a problem.

19 (Inaudible) drift nets. We're catching thousands of these fish out in the ocean in
20 these drift nets. This is wrong. Another problem that I haven't heard a lot of people talk
21 about has to do with the cattle. I'm certainly for the cattle ranchers, and I appreciate the
22 difficulties they're having.

23 But part of the problem -- I've been all over the area here. I've seen this happen.
24 Cattle drink in one end and they poop out the other right there in the streams. And the
25 fish go and try to spawn in these areas and they can't.

1 A lot of these -- anyway, that's part of it. Another issue is the hydroelectric. That's
2 not to be taken lightly. The alternatives to the hydroelectricity is nuclear and we know
3 that that's not very popular.

4 Coal, oil or gas alternatives. None of these alternatives are really feasible.
5 Anyway, I am strongly opposed to breaching the dam, strongly opposed to breaching it
6 without first considering the other alternatives.

7 This is a bonehead thing to do. You consider the alternatives, and as a last resort,
8 if you still can't bring the fish back, then you can talk about it.

9 We shouldn't even be talking about this. Thank you.

10 MR. HIRT: My name is Paul Hirt, and I'm a professor of history at Washington
11 State University in Pullman, and I'd like to offer a little bit of a historical perspective here.

12 Last October, I had the privilege of giving a series of presentations and lectures on
13 American history in the country of Ukraine.

14 And one of the universities that I spoke at, a little town called Perioslav (phonetic),
15 still looks like a village to me.

16 I was surprised when they told me that their town was 1400 years old. And they
17 asked me -- when I showed my surprise and shock they asked me how old my area was.

18 I had to think. Well, of course, the Native Americans have been there for 10,000
19 years, but if you're talking about Europeans, they've been there about 150 years.

20 And they all just shook their heads and smiled at what a short history we
21 have.

22 In the last 150 years there has been tremendous change in this region. And when
23 you think about how short a period of time over the long haul we've had these dams in
24 here on the lower Snake River, not put in until the 1960's, it's been virtually one
25 generation, 30 years or so that we've had these dams on the lower Snake River.

1 They're not permanent. The economy was strong and vibrant before that with the
2 ups and down that we always have. People made a good livelihood before the dams
3 were in, they'll make a good livelihood after the dams are out if they go out.

4 It's a tiny little blip on the large historical screen. I think all the concerns about
5 what the effects are going to be on society and the economy, we can't even imagine what
6 it's going to be like 30 years from now. These dams have only been in 30 years.

7 After 30 years, if they're out, it will be a different world. It will be as good a world
8 or a better world as it is now, depending on our commitment to make it a better world.

9 There's nothing written in the Ten Commandments that says once we put a dam in,
10 we've got to take it out. There are dams coming out all over the country. There's a dam
11 coming out in Oregon. There's been a dam on the Olympic Peninsula that's been
12 authorized for dismantling. There's a dam in, I believe, Minnesota, Maine that's been
13 authorized for coming out.

14 The Army Corps of Engineers is taking out the old flood control structures on the
15 Kissemmee River in Florida and returning the river to a natural river.

16 We're in a watershed, I think, in our history of river management. For 50 years
17 now, we've been on an engineering binge in which we're trying to turn our rivers into
18 hydraulic tools for production and consumption. Now we value rivers, and we realize that
19 we've lost sometimes as much or more as we've gained in our efforts to control efforts.

20 And it's time to bravely take that turn to a new future where we decide certain
21 rivers maybe are better off wild. Thank you.

22 MR. EWERT: Eric Ewert. I appreciate the opportunity to speak, unfortunately, my
23 comments are directed more to the public than the committee, but still I'm in favor of
24 breaching the dam.

25 THE MODERATOR: Pardon me?

1 MR. EWERT: Oh. Eric Ewert, Pullman, Washington. Look at the size of the
2 crowd and the intense media coverage of this event. The nation is watching. We reside
3 in an important time, especially in an important place here in the Pacific Northwest.

4 We are the bellwethers of the future. Our actions are harbingers of our legacy.
5 What shall we do? Shall we dig in our heels and fight to maintain the status quo? Shall
6 we continue to prioritize cheap electricity, subsidized barge transportation and short-term
7 profit or shall we prioritize fish, habitat, quality of life and our region's natural future.

8 These are difficult questions, to be sure, but if you had the chance, what would
9 you tell your grandchildren's grandchildren about this moment in our region's history?
10 What will you say we do?

11 The nation is watching us. We tried the technological fixes with dubious results.
12 The fish ladders and hatcheries, barge programs and a host of other remedies haven't
13 worked. Those were easy solutions. They didn't affect our lifestyle much.

14 Now come the hard solutions, and they will require change. What will we do?
15 The millions of residents of Portland, Seattle, the salmon fishing fleets in the Pacific, the
16 farmers of the Columbia Basin, the power company customers, the Native American
17 tribes, and anyone else with an interest in salmon and the larger issue of the Northwest
18 habitat, they watch us through this lens of this dams vs. salmon debate.

19 We with the most to lose or really the most to contribute lack the courage to make
20 changes, then surely the others won't sacrifice, either. It's our choice for the future, the
21 distant future, not next year's bottom line.

22 Let's take the chance to do what's right and remove the dams. Let's continue the
23 repair of the natural Northwest. After all, everyone is watching. Thank you.

24 MR. BETZ: Okay. My name is Albert Betz. I live in Lewiston, Idaho, have been a
25 resident all my life. My issue on the dam breaching is I don't think they should. I think as

1 far as the salmon runs go, I think that they should at least try to halt some of the outside
2 foreign trollers from fishing for salmon.

3 I think they should have a moratorium on salmon completely. You don't fish for an
4 endangered species. And that's pretty much my comments as far as the way things are
5 going. And I don't believe in dam breaching. Thank you.

6 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

7 MR. ZENNER: Hi. My name is Doug Zenner. I'd like to thank you for the
8 opportunity to speak on dam breaching. To me, I have three thoughts that I'd like to
9 leave with you tonight. No means no on dam breaching.

10 Second, constructive alternatives to better migration as in option one, two, three,
11 in the 4-H paper, and better science not nonsense. Thank you.

12 MR. REYNOLDS: My name is Nathaniel Reynolds. I've lived in Lewiston for
13 eleven years, and I'm in support of dam breaching. I believe that's the option, alternative
14 four. And thank you.

15 MR. MACY: My name is John Macy. I live in Asotin, Washington, which is part of
16 the valley, the Lewiston-Clarkston valley. The concern of mine is not just today, but for
17 my children and grandchildren and their futures.

18 This area has become stabilized because of the dams. As far as the economy, as
19 far as the fish, as far as the water temperatures, we've been able to control the flow of
20 the water so we don't have the flooding we had years and years ago.

21 There was hot water coming out of the Clearwater in the summertime. That's
22 controlled now with cooler water coming from Dworshak under the controlled conditions.
23 We have an ideal situation here.

24 (Inaudible) that we're not missing the salmon or the salmon is not coming back or
25 might become endangered, there's a lot of falsehoods in that. The fishing has

1 transported salmon to their facility river, the Fish & Game Commission and the fishery
2 department.

3 So I know a lot of this is fallacies. In a lot of cases, it's overstated. I feel that we
4 need to look at more than just the dams as a problem. The mouth of the Columbia River,
5 the smolt being eaten up there before they even get into the ocean so they haven't a
6 chance of even trying to come back.

7 We need to also look at what happened in California. They were able to take care
8 of the Fish & Game situation there, a better volume of fish. The east coast was able to
9 do the same without taking out the dams.

10 So I think there needs to be some common sense utilized with this situation
11 more than just -- I think the dams need to go for a better -- (inaudible) extreme. It will
12 never be the way it was 35, 40, 50 years ago with the dams still, with the changing of the
13 water.

14 With the changing of the flow of the water, now you have the silt build-up in the
15 area where there used to be flowing streams. Take out the dams, which they've lowered
16 the water before and it made a real stinking mess. It was a health problem. It's a
17 combination of everything.

18 Twenty-five years ago they put all the dams in place, and they need to stay and
19 remain in place and do the control job that they are doing. They need to figure another
20 way of taking care of the salmon shortage.

21 What's happening in the ocean, what's happening in the Columbia River with the
22 netting, what's happening with the smolts, with the birds eating them and the combination
23 of all these things, the biologists need to look at all aspects.

24 Thank you very much for your time and consideration of this situation.

25 THE MODERATOR: Very good. Three minutes and one second.

1 MR. EIER: My name is Thomas Eier. I'm from Lewiston, Idaho. And I believe
2 that we should defer at least ten years until we make a decision on the breaching of the
3 dams for the lower Snake River.

4 During the bicentennial we need all the opportunity we can to promote our area. If
5 we don't, then we're not going to allow all the people that want to come in honor of the
6 Lewis & Clark bicentennial the opportunity to see what we have.

7 If we decide that we're going to breach the dams, therefore, losing all the
8 opportunity for the economic and commercialism and recreation, we're going to lose our
9 ability to promote our area.

10 Therefore, do not, I repeat, do not breach the bottom four dams just because of
11 some unfounded economic activity due to the salmon.

12 Please do not breach the four dams and please give us ten years before we
13 decide what we're going to do. Therefore, we'll have all of the activity with the lower
14 dams to be done.

15 If you have any questions, you can give me a call or write me. I am on the
16 Bicentennial Commission. We are not wanting to breach the dams in the next ten years.
17 We'll talk about it in ten areas. Thank you very much.

18 MR. LOVELAND: My name is Corey Loveland. I'm a student at the University of
19 Idaho, environmental science major, and I am for my -- for the breaching of the dams on
20 the lower -- the four lower dams on the lower salmon -- or the lower Snake.

21 MS. GEORGE: My name is Raynelle George, and I live in the Lenore, Idaho,
22 area. I'm just going to read a list of my thoughts and ideas on breaching vs. not
23 breaching the dams.

24 We know that there are costs (inaudible) on both sides. We know that there's pros
25 and cons.

1 I think the cost of the (inaudible) breaching, the cost of rebuilding if this does not
2 work if we breach the dams. There will be many jobs temporarily provided. (Inaudible) it
3 will be a free and wild, unmanaged river.

4 Inaudible a secure environment in fact (inaudible). And how are all these tax
5 dollars going to be appropriated if we have to rebuild the dams. What are the inaudible of
6 leaving them breached? Who supports the inaudible of the people that live on the river
7 who aren't benefiting inaudible the method of having electricity inaudible irrigation.

8 Who picks up the pieces (inaudible) what it means? Are we looking at one or two
9 nuclear power energy plants on the lower Snake River? Now for breaching. Breaching,
10 not -- excuse me, restoration and (inaudible) jobs ongoing, continuous uninterrupted
11 hydropower, a (inaudible) of respectability. What would happen in that situation?

12 (Inaudible) the ladders over sides or allow a free unencumbered run along the
13 sides of the dam for the salmon. Why (inaudible). Save the salmon. Halt the fishing for
14 several years and do a recount. Just think of all the billions of salmon we could have had
15 in captivity restored with the money spent and the pros and cons of the salmon viability
16 in the wild.

17 Is this a vortex of ideas of the costs? Have you already decided your courses of
18 action? Will this be put to the vote of the people that it directly affects? My offer is in the
19 Department of Fish & Game in the state of California, please (inaudible) and extinction of
20 California. Please ask to do that. These comments were (inaudible) by the direct factor
21 in the extremes of the salmon along the Pacific Northwest coast, also, a major impact
22 was the international waters within ten years of offshore the Pacific Coast for fishing.
23 And it needs to be extended, he said, no less, preferably 50 miles out. We are looking at
24 our salmon internationally.

25 THE MODERATOR: Before you start, state your name, please.

1 MR. BARNES: Hi. My name is Jim Barnes. I live here in Clarkston. And I
2 appreciate the chance to talk with you guys. I come here to get enlightened on the
3 subject we're talking about, the fish and the dams.

4 And here tonight, I hear a lot of biased attitudes both ways, and I don't envy your
5 decision, which way you might go. I would like to say I do see a lot of people that are
6 shipped in from other places, and if -- I agree with the gentleman who was saying that
7 maybe not be a good thing to do.

8 I also was listening to the biologists, and they've got a few good points. I would
9 like to say that one biologist was talking about dam breaching, and that he said it works
10 because there was a dam that was breached some time back in the -- a year or so, and
11 he says that the bass are coming back.

12 Last time I checked, I didn't think bass was a migratory fish. For a biologist to say
13 that brings me a little concern. I also heard a geologist point out that we have a good
14 model of a dam being breached in Idaho, the Teton Dam.

15 I think that would be a good model to look at and find out the true facts of what
16 happened. In conclusion, I think -- I do appreciate talking with you, and Mr. Strock, I
17 would hope you base your decision on your conscience rather than reason. Reason
18 leaves room for mistakes and conscience doesn't.

19 So in the end, base it on your conscience. You'll sleep at night and so will we.
20 Thank you.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Residing in Lewiston, Idaho. I've worked for
22 the Corps of Engineers, hydroelectric design branch in their turbine section. I've been a
23 commercial salmon troller on the Pacific.

24 I've worked for Boeing Commercial Airplanes as a mechanical engineer, and
25 currently work for Potlatch Pulp & Paper as a mechanical engineer.

1 As a commercial salmon fisherman, I saw three to 400-foot long factory ships 12
2 miles offshore of the United States. I'm aware of ten of thousands of miles of drift nets
3 that have non-selective kill of any fish that are run into those nets.

4 Let's move first our 12-mile fishing limit to a 200-mile fishing limit which was
5 proposed in the mid-70's. I've been to Lower Granite Dam, I've taken a tour of the efforts
6 of the Corps of Engineers to have fish collection systems implemented at the dam.

7 These systems are fairly new and really have only been started -- researched fairly
8 recently. Currently, I believe approximately only 20 percent of the river cross-section is
9 collected and does collect salmon smolts. Let's move to collect instead of 50 percent of
10 salmon smolts, 100 percent of salmon smolts.

11 The technology is not difficult. Small mesh nets stretch across the rivers, perhaps
12 upstream, close to the upper reach of the pool, up near Lewiston-Clarkston. The rivers
13 are less than 1,000 feet wide in this area. The Clearwater and Snake could both be
14 collection zones for smolts.

15 The rivers are approximately 30 to 40 feet deep at the most. This is not a large
16 netting scheme that would be required to collect 100 percent of all smolt. Let's take a
17 look at what happens if we take out the dams on the lower Snake River.

18 Each dam produces enough electricity that if removed would take a coal-fired
19 plant to use enough coal to fill the Kingdome or approximately a 300-foot-cube of coal
20 every year for each dam on the lower Snake River.

21 We do not need any additional greenhouse gasses in our environment. We need
22 to look beyond just a surface ecosystem and look at our whole environment, our whole
23 atmospheric environment, also.

24 I'd like to congratulate the Corps of Engineers for their work thus far. I'd like to
25 recommend going forward with alternative three, major system improvements, to collect

1 100 percent of smolt in the river systems. This can be done. We've put a man on the
2 moon. We created a space shuttle. Netting fish across 1,000 foot and 500 foot rivers in
3 Lewiston is not high technology. Let's get to work on a solution. Thank you for your time.

4 MR. WATSON: My name is Bruce Watson, and I'm a farmer on the Camas Prairie
5 just south of Peck, Idaho. I've lived in this area all my life, and I'd just like to say that I'm
6 opposed to breaching of the dams. I feel that the fish have the ability to adapt to slack
7 water if they're given half the chance with a good environment.

8 I think there's several things that could be done for reduced harvest, redesigning
9 of the dams, predator reduction, various things like that that should be taken a look at
10 first. One of my primary concerns is -- regards mitigation. I haven't heard too much talk
11 about that to this point.

12 But in the year 2002, all farm subsidies will be phased out, and therefore, the
13 dollars to compensate agriculture for the losses of taking out the dams will never happen
14 because it will be illegal.

15 I'm opposed to dam breaching, as I say. I think that we can restore the salmon
16 runs and maintain an acceptable lifestyle for people and salmon without taking the drastic
17 step of taking out the four dams on the lower Snake River. I also think that's just a first
18 step by some of the environmental groups, that it won't stop there. And we could totally
19 devastate the economy of this local area. That's all I have to say at this point.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

21 MR. HARTWIG: My name is Gerald Hartwig. I've lived here all my life. I
22 remember years ago when we didn't have no dams. We had flooding on D Street in
23 Lewiston, Idaho. It flooded these areas and everything else. Since we've had the dams,
24 we've had no flooding.

1 That's such a thing. I've fished all my life and I can't see where they're having any
2 problem with the fish. I've been fishing the last several years up the Snake River and last
3 year we caught more fish than we caught in a long time. And I think a lot of this is just
4 another movement for activists and the Sierra Club to shut down another mill like they're
5 doing on the west coast, trying to move across the country and take over the whole dam
6 country and get rid of us people that are willing to make a living and not being supported
7 by other people.

8 If they would all lose their jobs, I hope they can come back and afford to feed our
9 families. That's about all I have to say. I just hope that they do not breach the dams. I'm
10 not for breaching the dams. I think it's a big mistake if they do. The Sierra Club
11 (inaudible). I think they're a bunch of hoodlums if they do believe in breaching the dams
12 and putting people out of work.

13 We will not have the jobs around here that we had before, and I don't see how
14 they could ever get the jobs they got around here before if they breach the dams, without
15 our shipping and industry. That's all I have to say.

16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

17 MR. HUTCHINS: I'm Elwin Hutchins. I represent the city of Weippe, Idaho. And
18 as the colonel said today, there's two and a half percent of the fish that get to the mouth
19 that actually come back up the river.

20 We have a problem here, because just the terns alone take out 20 million
21 juveniles, so that would give us back -- if we didn't lose them, we'd have 500,000 fish
22 coming, mature fish coming back up the river.

23 That's not counting all the seal lions and seals that have also killed our fish. We
24 have the Endangered Species Act to thank for this increase in predatory birds, seals, sea
25 lions and other predator fish. The tern that are located near the mouth of the Columbia

1 River on Rice Island were placed on the endangered species list ten years ago. They're
2 there now, 9,000 protected birds which eat up 20 million juvenile salmon annually.

3 A friend of mine was visiting one of the dams passage-through. He was told that
4 45 to 50 percent of the salmon to pass the window had scars from escaping from seals or
5 sea lions and most all had scars from gill nets.

6 Now, back in 1977, Livingston Stone advised the U.S. congress in his 1877 report
7 of the commissioner of the fish and fisheries. There were over a thousand different nets
8 in the Columbia, each 1200 feet long running all summer. There were drift nets and two
9 traps in the Clackamas, and in September they trapped nearly across the mouth of the
10 same river.

11 How could they expect to get any parent salmon to take eggs at the terminus of a
12 gauntlet like that. The fact was, nearly all salmon that entered into the mouth of the
13 Columbia was trapped, netted, eaten, speared or otherwise destroyed before it reached
14 our fishery.

15 Stone was trying to establish a salmon hatchery on the Clackamas River at Clear
16 Creek to augment declining runs. It sounds just like that same thing today. As you travel
17 along the Columbia and see the nets, you know that the nets that aren't helping the runs.

18 Last year a friend told me he was walking up the Clackamas and saw more than a
19 dozen large chinook salmon laying on the beaches.

20 These are endangered species. He went to the Fish & Game Department, asked
21 them why these fish were dying. They said it was from stress from being caught in gill
22 nets.

23 I'm getting tired of all the talk about removing dams before something is done
24 about these other conditions. If the dams are removed, we will not see a significant
25 increase in the salmon return. We will, however, lose our present fisheries, wetlands at

1 the mouth of each creek running into the dam pools, boating, barging, generating
2 electricity, water sports, only to name a few.

3 Let's keep what we have, but improve on fish passage. Keep birds away from the
4 fish that come from the turbines until they are able to swim back to the river. There are
5 many new systems being developed to get fish through and around the dams.

6 Before we remove any dams, we must first try all these other options. Thank you.

7 MS. WALKER: Hello. My name is Renee Walker. And I'm addressing the
8 alternative four to the Corps of Engineers program. To whom it may concern, in regards
9 to the controversial issue of dam breaching, I would like to say that I fully support the
10 breaching of dams to help save the salmon, the Indian nations and the rivers.

11 I fully support the breaching of dams because the salmon is on the verge of
12 becoming extinct. For my Nez Perce people and the other Native American Indian
13 nations, salmon fishing is an integral part of our culture.

14 Without the salmon, a part of our culture also dies. Take, for instance, the Nez
15 Perce and the neighboring Indian nations, the salmon is what the buffalo is to the Plains
16 Indian culture.

17 Without these creatures, we lose a little bit more of our ancestral rights as Indian
18 people. And we don't want to lose our salmon. We take salmon over the dams any day.
19 Not only is the salmon important in this controversy, so is the river. So without the river,
20 we also fail to exist as we have for generations with natural beauty surrounding us.

21 I will never have the privilege or the honor of seeing all the rivers flow as free as
22 they once did, and neither will my children nor their children as long as the dams exist.

23 This is another reason why I support dam breaching. For the neighboring Indian
24 nations who also support dam breaching, I say the dams must go. From this day
25 forward, let the Indian people's voices be heard. We are rooted in the earth and the river

1 holds our stories, the stories of ancestors, our children, ourselves and our future. This is
2 all I have to say today.

3 MS. BONILLA: My name is Natalia Bonilla. And I'm a resident of Moscow, Idaho,
4 and affiliated with Friends of the Clearwater. I stand here today in front of men and
5 women who have found themselves at yet another cross road.

6 I've seen time and time before, reiterating the same familiar disputes between man
7 and creature. Thus far, mankind has been able to conquer and destroy a daunting
8 collection of precious animals in the name of certain ambiguous freedoms, such as
9 freedom to emit poisonous gasses into our fragile atmosphere, freedom to introduce toxic
10 chemicals to our once pure, clean river waters, freedom to cut down miles of pristine
11 forest habitat.

12 We must preserve our atmosphere, our waters and our forests for they are homes
13 for you and for many animals that share this space with us. Such animals I speak of, in
14 particular, are those with whom we have constructed legends about.

15 The wild grizzly bear, the once heavily threatened majestic bald eagle, and our
16 very own loyal Pacific salmon.

17 They have been desperately crying out for our attention hoping to be heard among
18 the confusion of our own busy lives.

19 I and so many others here today hear their cry. Today, I speak for the salmon,
20 and the four lower Snake River dams don't make sense. Most argue that the decreasing
21 number of salmon is a disastrous consequence of man's struggle in securing a foothold
22 over the environment.

23 Tonight, most will try to counter this point by providing self-satisfying retorts such
24 as "but we need dams." Or breaching is too costly. The truth is, we don't need these
25 dams. We could pay more for energy. Why? Simply, they are killing our last remaining

1 wild salmon in the Pacific Northwest, plain and simple. And artificial habitats will not
2 suffice.

3 Big hydropower established here in the early 1900's destroyed the natural river
4 conditions for salmon migration along the lower Snake and Columbia Rivers. As a
5 pathetic alternative we have chosen to haul salmon downstream during migration past
6 large federal dams in hopes to mollify their decreasing numbers while keeping power and
7 business booming.

8 These dams don't make sense. The salmon are dying. How can we choose to
9 alter a creature's habitat and expect it to thrive as before? We have disgraced the
10 salmon just as we have disgraced the Native Americans of this country by not honoring
11 the treaties we were entrusted to uphold.

12 These hearings are so crucial for all of us to come together and receive valuable
13 information imperative in improving the well-being of our wildlife. I ask you, take some
14 time from your busy schedules and take a trip to the river.

15 Stand and look at the primal waters, the easy motion of the currents, and let your
16 mind fall silent. Now imagine every salmon extinguished there. We are all creatures of
17 the earth. We have our homes, please, let the salmon have theirs.

18 I support alternative four in All-H Paper. Thank you.

19 MR. ALFREY: Hello. My name is Thomas Alfrey, Sr. I was born in Idaho and
20 have been a resident, except for a few occasions when I went outside of the
21 Lewiston-Clarkston valley.

22 I'm also a Nez Perce tribal member, and my comments have to do with -- in
23 respect to honoring the treaty rights that have been given to us. Also, I recently have
24 been knowledgeable about studies about barging, and the true cost that barging does
25 cost, and if those costs were passed on to the farmers that had to use that system would

1 be. So I think this is a part of what we need to look at when we talk about the economic
2 situation. Also, I'm aware of another study that's being done in Oregon concerning the
3 salmon and their contribution to the ecosystem. It's something that I sort of knew about
4 myself for a long time, but now there's a study to back up just what I knew.

5 That the salmon benefits -- its ecosystem, wherever it's at or whatever its tributary
6 river or stream that it's in, not only just to the stream itself but also to the plant life
7 surrounding the stream and so forth.

8 And considering this, I am supporting the breaching of the dams on the four, and I
9 know this will be a considerable fear among this community, a loss of jobs and economic
10 changes. I believe that there were jobs before the dams were put in and there will be
11 jobs after the dams are not in.

12 So I believe that the human person has a better chance of adaptation than the wild
13 salmon has at this time. I think we all need to take steps -- have a moral obligation to
14 take steps to help bring back the salmon. Thank you.

15 MR. ALLISON: Okay. My name is Robert Allison. I live here in Lewiston, even
16 though we're in Clarkston at the moment. I've been around this area for approximately
17 35 years. I saw Lower Granite Dam come in, and yes, we were skeptical about the dams
18 coming in.

19 We all wondered where the money was coming from, and they said from our tax
20 moneys, which everybody knows where a lot of this stuff comes from. Who sponsors --
21 who funds the Corps of Engineers? It's our tax dollars. I've heard people say that tax
22 base -- or not tax base, but the shipping people are not saving very much money, and
23 that every bit of money that is being saved is going back in just to the shipping and
24 nothing's going to the Corps of Engineers. Well, they're wrong, because every bit of our
25 tax dollar goes to help government entities such as the Corps of Engineers.

1 I heard a lot of comments tonight which I was proud to see so many people, so
2 many diversities come in to talk and say their sides. I've heard so many comments that
3 nothing can be done but dam breaching. Nothing can be done but no dam breaching.
4 Why can't people get together and work these problems out instead of fighting a battle?

5 One thing that I do have to say for myself, and that I've done a little bit of research
6 on, how many eggs does a salmon lay? How many thousands, hundreds of eggs does
7 one salmon lay to bear their young? Okay. How many eggs does an eagle lay in their
8 nest? One or two?

9 It wasn't all that many years ago that our eagles were on the endangered species
10 list because there were very few left in the United States. It was just a few years ago that
11 the eagle was taken off the endangered species list. How'd they do that? They stopped
12 hunting of the eagle and protected them altogether.

13 The same could be done with the fish. Thank you.

14 MR. McCAULLE: Yeah. My name is Stanley McCaulle. I live here in Lewiston.
15 I'm originally from Bellingham, Washington. I lived on the Nooksack River which is
16 having the same problem as the river here and there's no dam on it.

17 Breaching the dam I don't think is going to help any, because here I'm from an
18 area that the river's having the same problem, no dams. There's something in the ocean
19 going on. They need to try to go out and find out what it is. That's mostly what my
20 comment is.

21 MR. ERICKSON: My name is Mike Erickson. I've lived in the valley for over 30
22 years. I work at Potlatch Corporation, Boy Scout -- scout master in the valley. I'm
23 against breaching the dams, and one thing that I would like to say is, I'm an avid
24 fisherman, and I catch a lot of steelhead each year. A friend of mine this year and his
25 friend, and this is the first time I've ever heard of this -- I have a favorite hole right here on

1 the Snake, right in the confluence between Lewiston-Clarkston that I fish all the time.
2 This is the first year in ten years that they have -- they each caught a salmon this year
3 and released it. And I've never heard of that before, so basically, I think something is
4 happening. I think they're coming back.

5 Another thing, too, I want to talk about. Thirty years ago when they put these
6 dams in, they changed the habitat. And we never used to have crappie down here like
7 we do now.

8 And crappie is an excellent fish and I enjoy fishing for them. And they're really
9 coming in good in this area. And you know, I wondered if anybody thought about that,
10 how they've changed the habitat over and what they're going to do if they took the dams
11 out to all those crappie. They're going to be history, flushed down the river.

12 That's all I have to say.

13 MR. LANGSTAFF: My name is Richard Langstaff. I appreciate this opportunity to
14 comment on the dams and the salmon situation. I think we have to bear in mind that the
15 situation that we're in is the result of causes and conditions and activities that were
16 sanctioned by the culture at that time, 40 years ago.

17 Now we're reaping the effects of these causes and conditions that were put into
18 motion, and we're having to fix the problems that arose due to those activities. So the
19 question is, how do we approach changing not only the causes and conditions to
20 physically rehabilitate the salmon runs, but in addition to this, how do we change our
21 cultural perception of the resource and how the resource can be used or accessed to
22 make it more equitable for all concerned?

23 Stake holders, not only just people, but the land and the animals and plants on the
24 land as well. So if we think the goal is to restore the salmon runs while sustaining
25 economic environmental equality in the region, iff the information that we have that the

1 rate of return is less than expected, then we can see that we're probably losing many fish
2 out in the ocean.

3 So actually, in this case, if this information is correct, dam breaching will likely not
4 result in completely restored or reasonably restored salmon runs. And in fact, the
5 drainage of these ecosystems which have developed over the last 40 years and reached
6 their new steady state, may have catastrophic effects on those ecosystems -- actually,
7 probably will have a terribly catastrophic effect on the animals living in those shallow
8 areas. That's not even debatable.

9 If we have the Asian fisheries that -- their fisheries are collapsing and the Asians
10 and Russians are coming over and are catching our fish, then we may want to make sure
11 that they have aqua culture available to make more inexpensive and sustainable fish
12 available since they're mainly depending on fish. The fish that we catch for market in
13 America is mainly a luxury-type market.

14 This is a problem. We owe the fish the opportunity for them to continue since they
15 were here before us, and they'll hopefully be here after us. We owe it to the earth since
16 that's where we gain our livelihood from, is this beautiful, beautiful land.

17 And we owe it to the children of the future to make responsible decisions, whether
18 we breach the dams or not.

19 You know, I still have to see convincing science on both sides that it will restore
20 the runs, but I'm afraid I only have three minutes, so we're coming up to the end of
21 that.

22 But changing the regard for the resource, I think, will be the single greatest issue
23 in finding some resolution to this issue that all Americans will be able to feel that they're
24 getting parity in the solution. Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: I gave you an extra --

1 MS. KUNCH: Hi. My name is Theresa Kunch, and I'm here tonight representing
2 myself and the salmon of the Pacific Northwest. I was on the list of people to speak in
3 front of people, and I couldn't get up and do it. There was so many articulate speeches
4 that I just -- I didn't feel like I could give this issue justice or my feelings towards this
5 issue.

6 But I cannot leave here without saying that those of us that favor the breaching of
7 the dams do not in any way want to harm other human beings.

8 One of the major reasons why we want the breaching of the dams is for people.
9 It's for our children, for our grandchildren, for the Native Americans and the Canadians
10 with which we've made treaties, promising them fish.

11 And besides the people, it's the fish. I care about the fish, and I think a lot of
12 people that are here opposing keeping the dams in place care about the fish. They have
13 an intrinsic value that goes beyond our economics, goes beyond our way of life. The fish
14 are important for the fish's sake.

15 And besides the genetic diversity that they add to the river, we cannot survive on
16 hatchery fish. Hatchery fish cannot survive with just hatchery fish. We need genetic
17 diversity if we want to have any fish in those rivers at all.

18 I guess that's all I wanted to say. But again, it's not -- we're not against the people
19 of this area or their way of life. I think humans are very adaptable to change. We've
20 certainly done a lot of changing in the last couple hundred years, and I think that we
21 could probably figure out a way to get by if we were to take out these dams, to breach
22 these dams.

23 I think the subsidies that are now going towards the barges, Tidewater in
24 particular, I would like to see my tax dollars -- my part of the subsidy go towards getting
25 the railroads back up and the roads, making the roads an efficient means of getting the

1 grain down to the Columbia. So I think there are -- there are, in fact, ways that this can
2 be remediated and that won't cause great economic loss to this region.

3 This region was doing fine 30 years ago. It might be doing a little bit better
4 economically now than 30 years ago, as most places are, but I think it will survive as it
5 did before the dams were in place. Thank you for hearing me speak, and that's all.

6 (Conclusion of taped proceedings.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25