

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”

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

MARCH 7, 2000

TRANSCRIBED BY NANCY J. SMITH

RIDER & ASSOCIATES

PO Box 245

Vancouver, WA 98686

1 MS. HEARST: I represent the Portneuf Valley Audobon Society in  
2 Pocatello, Idaho. I represent 250 members of the chapter representing all of  
3 southeastern Idaho. The society feels that the removal of the four lower Snake River  
4 dams is the only solution to the restoration of our decimated salmon and steelhead  
5 runs.

6 We feel that the overwhelming scientific data indicates that the barging  
7 does not work, flow augmentation does not work, friendly turbines are not the  
8 answer. Ninety percent of Idaho's wild salmon and steelhead runs have plummeted  
9 in spite of all of the above.

10 Bypassing the dams, we feel, will save the salmon and steelhead. We  
11 feel that bypassing the dams will not be an economic disaster as predicted by some  
12 because the dams were not built for irrigation. Very few farms are irrigated by it. The  
13 dams were not built for electricity. Only four to five percent of Northwest electricity is  
14 supplied by these dams.

15 Dams were built for barging and to make Lewiston a port. But the  
16 barge jobs could be replaced, and the barge industry has not been the boon to  
17 Lewiston as predicted. At the present time, we subsidize in Idaho the barging  
18 industry by 90 percent. We feel that there are other means of transportation, such as  
19 highway and the railroads. We feel that the restored fisheries will benefit not only  
20 Idaho, but the Northwest fishing industry in total.

21 The dams were not built for flood control. Bypassing the dams will  
22 decrease the demand for southern Idaho water that is currently used for flushing the  
23 smolts down the reservoirs, and in that way, we will benefit the farmers in  
24 southeastern Idaho. We have a binding agreement with the U.S. Indian tribes to  
25 assure survival of the salmon and steelhead, and we also have a treaty with Canada

1 which was established in 1985 to assure the continuous population of salmon and  
2 steelhead. For these reasons, Audobon believes we cannot let our fish be  
3 endangered and have them -- well, we want the fish to continue. Thank you. I'm  
4 Priscilla Hearst, H-e-a-r-s-t. The Portneuf Valley Audobon Society in Pocatello,  
5 Idaho. Do you need an address? Okay

6 MR. CARSONE: My name is Rick Carstone. I am representing no  
7 organization. I think that the issue that we have here is not necessarily are we for  
8 dams, are we against dams, are we for hydropower; I think that it comes down to the  
9 heritage of Idaho. I think the fish are as much a part of the heritage of Idaho as our  
10 farms. And I think that we need to come to some compromise.

11 We get mad at the Forest Service and federal agencies for dictating  
12 policy locally, but the problem is, we can't come to a compromise ourselves locally.  
13 So I think this is the time for Idaho to stand up and come to some sort of compromise  
14 on what to do about the fish, whatever that may be. I am an advocate of breaching  
15 the dams, but I feel that anybody adversely impacted, whether it's farmers, whether  
16 it's power people, whoever it is, that we take that into account; we compensate these  
17 people accordingly. It's only fair to do that. I worry if we do not breach the dams,  
18 flow augmentation will take place, and our eastern Idaho farmers will be without  
19 water in the future.

20 I guess that's it. Just keep in mind that it's more than just breaching  
21 dams. It is part of Idaho's heritage to have fish and have farms and have a good  
22 balance of both. Thank you.

23 MR. HOFFMAN: Hi, I'm Greg Hoffman. I'm a member of the Henry's  
24 Fork Foundation and Southeast Idaho Fly Fisheries Association. My first concern --  
25 well, I'll be honest. I'm a little bit selfish in that I'd like to keep some of the

1 southeastern Idaho water for the fish and the farmers on this side of the state. I know  
2 it's a concern if we don't breach the dams, that we'll have to give up a lot of our water  
3 and our fishing in the summers and the fall will sacrifice because of that.

4           Also, I think some of our crops on this side of the state could hurt from  
5 that. Second is I'm a very good friend of William Harsell who did a lot of the work on  
6 these dams to try to get the smolts across. He's done many projects including doing  
7 lighting systems to try to keep the smolts away from the turbine systems.

8           I've discussed this with him at length, and he continues to reinforce to  
9 me that, you know, he's happy to keep on making a whole lot of money doing these  
10 projects, but if he were to design these programs for himself -- and this is certainly a  
11 business proposition -- he would just put holes in the dams and he would not try to  
12 keep trying to do these sophisticated projects when they're doomed to failure, in his  
13 estimation.

14           He did not design these programs; they were designed by the Army  
15 Corps of Engineers, but he does not think that they have any chance of success.  
16 And he's making money from this, and he doesn't think it's a very good program.  
17 He's in Spokane, Washington.

18           Also, I think it's important for us not to alienate ourselves from irrigators  
19 and farmers. They're a very important part of our communities. My family's from  
20 farmers in Minnesota, and I think it's important, though, to be fair and -- you know,  
21 the farmers in the eastern part of the state don't get free freight provided for them,  
22 and I don't see that the farmers in that part of Washington deserve free freight from  
23 the government. And I think that's about all I have to say.

24           MR. SCHWENDIMAN: My name is Kent Schwendiman. I'm a citizen  
25 of the state of Idaho, born and raised in eastern Idaho. I've probably read almost

1 every word on the salmon recovery issue that I can get my hands on. I have met with  
2 biologists at the Stanley Basin steelhead hatchery to learn more about the situation.  
3 And first of all, I unequivocally do not want to see the salmon go extinct, even the  
4 sockeye salmon, and especially not the big ones.

5           But the thing that has really bothered me a lot about this whole issue, in  
6 everything I've read and everything I've studied, it seems like the community is really,  
7 really polarized. And the issue right now is basically on the removal of the dams. But  
8 the thing that really bothers me about this whole issue -- and I was talking to a  
9 gentleman out in front before this meeting began that others told me that he had  
10 probably had about two six-packs, and was really getting quite vehement and out of  
11 line and, of course, he was for removal of the dams. And he was telling me, for  
12 whatever it's worth, that it's basically boiled down to just about two issues: Either the  
13 salmon go extinct or the dams are removed.

14           But in my humble opinion, there are many, many different issues that  
15 need to be addressed. One of them particularly is predatorization in the ocean,  
16 commercial fishing in the ocean.

17           I haven't been able to find a single word on studies that are done in  
18 these particular areas, and I'm sure that there are other issues. We've heard a little  
19 bit about the Caspian terns in the mouth of the Columbia River.

20           I've never heard a single report on how many sea lions or seals existed  
21 in the Pacific Ocean 30, 40 years ago and how many are there now. I've never heard  
22 a single word on how many orcas are living in the Pacific Northwest, which are  
23 heavy, heavy feeders on salmon, as far as I understand.

24           But it would seem to me that someplace in this process, in the biology  
25 studies, that there are people that draw salaries as biologists and study the situation

1 that need to give us some of these numbers so that we can make an intelligent  
2 decision on where our salmon are going. Thank you.

3 MR. FORCE: All right. My name's Rex Force. I'm from Pocatello,  
4 Idaho, and I'm a private citizen, but also a member of several conservation  
5 organizations, including Trout Unlimited and Idaho Rivers United, the Henry's Fork  
6 Foundation. I would like to speak today in favor of breaching the dams, for several  
7 reasons.

8 I think the problem of salmon recovery is one that's really being literally  
9 studied to death at this point and that the time has come for action. I think that  
10 breaching the dams offers the most rapid resolution or potential for resolution of the  
11 problem of declining salmon numbers, and I feel very strongly that we should move  
12 forward through all the bureaucracy that needs to be done in order to get the dams  
13 breached.

14 One of my primary concerns involves southeastern Idaho's water, and  
15 clearly, I think that flow augmentation, especially in dry years, which we've had the  
16 luxury of not having had recently, but during dry years, is going to result in a  
17 tremendous amount of water from southeastern Idaho resulting in farmland,  
18 obviously, drying up, and also the fishing and the economy associated with fishing in  
19 southeastern Idaho on the Henry's Fork, South Fork, and other rivers and reservoirs  
20 in our areas are going to also be impacted significantly.

21 I think this is the ultimate version of trickle-down economics, if you will,  
22 to use an analogy. I'm also strongly in favor of ending the subsidies and cheap  
23 transportation by barging for the farmers of the western part of our state and also for  
24 eastern Washington, because our farmers are not currently having to -- not currently  
25 allowed or had the luxury of such subsidies. So I think that to level the playing field,

1 it's time to end the barging and to take out the dams. Thanks for the opportunity to  
2 comment.

3 FRED FINLAYSON: My name is Fred Finlayson, and I'm a 49 year-old  
4 resident of the state of Idaho. The polarization that this whole dam breaching  
5 controversy has caused is pretty good from a political standpoint, but my feelings are  
6 -- I don't understand why both sides can't find some common ground as to some of  
7 the easily remedied problems that should be solved first prior -- before they go into  
8 such a drastic measure as, you know, removing the dams and all of the economic  
9 and personal hardships that that would solve.

10 As I've followed this breaching controversy, it appears as if the  
11 environmental faction, which is highly organized and has great lobbies, tends to try to  
12 bully their way around. And instead of trying to find a common ground, they're trying  
13 to polarize both sides to where there is no reachable solutions. I think that before  
14 any dam breaching is considered, alternative actions should be undertaken, and they  
15 don't have to be scientifically studied for 20 years.

16 I think that if both sides could agree to a common ground, certain  
17 measures could be undertaken that would help both the migration patterns of the  
18 salmonoids that are concerned and the future of the population, especially in the  
19 areas concerned, which is basically northern Idaho or north-central Idaho could be  
20 reached, and certain other remedies could be taken care of before the drastic  
21 measures of the dam breaching.

22 So I'd like to go on record as to say that before any drastic measures  
23 such as final dam breaching, that all other measures such as predators and other  
24 types of fish migration studies should be taken care of prior before the dams are  
25 breached. Thank you.

1 MR. STORER: My name's Claude Storer. I'm a farmer and a rancher  
2 in the area. I'm also on the State Water Board and the Committee of Nine. But the  
3 thing that bothers me is why we're doing these things now, why we're even thinking  
4 about dams when they're so many years away. We ought to be doing the things we  
5 can do now, like with the predators and things like that that might -- that we can do  
6 before we take out these things.

7 It's going to take years to take the dams out, upset the economy and do  
8 all those things. As far as I'm concerned, we need to do the things we can do now.  
9 Thank you.

10 MR. KERR: Hello. This is Darrell Kerr From the Enterprise Canal  
11 Company. I represent a large group of farmers who use the water to irrigate with.  
12 And this concept of removing the dam is literally, we feel, an unsubstantiated claim  
13 because of the fact that the salmon are still able to come up and down the river. We  
14 need the water to be managed, especially for flood control. If the dams were taken  
15 out, there's a tremendous silt problem that will literally devastate, if not kill the fish.

16 Fishing in Alaska, our commercial fishing boats are able to go up,  
17 acquire a lot of salmon. They have an on-board program where they can literally can  
18 the fish on board of the ships and sell their supplies, and their amounts are unlimited.  
19 I really feel that we need to do a lot more study before we totally rule out the dam and  
20 the dam program.

21 There is a lot of salmon that still make it forward, but there's also a lot of  
22 things that we need to look at out in the ocean side before we alleviate and eliminate  
23 our dams along the Columbia River. So with that in mind, I think that in all fairness,  
24 that we ought to really take a hard look at some real issues, not just the concrete  
25 that's sitting in the river. That's it.



1 MR. BARRIE: This is Robert Barrie. I'm a chairman of the Farmer's  
2 Friend Canal Company. I've been there for about 20 years. And I have been over to  
3 the Lower Granite and seen all that, and I'm against tearing out those dams because  
4 I don't think it will help. There's other things that we need to do before we ever  
5 attempt to do that. We've got a lot of seals down there and predators that need to be  
6 eradicated before we ever start on those dams. And as far as flow augmentation  
7 goes, there's plenty of water going down the Columbia to take care of those fish.  
8 This is my statement.

9 MR. LAMBSON: Hello. My name is Gary Lambson with Lost River  
10 Electric. My comments relate to the draft EIS, the All-H Paper and the John Day  
11 study. I care deeply about the issues before you today. I feel strongly that the region  
12 should come together behind a plan to recover these salmon and steelhead runs.  
13 And make no mistake; the real issue here is recovering fish runs. Something we all  
14 want. Focusing mostly on dam breaching just doesn't make sense. One reason is --  
15 focus on dams doesn't make sense is that the main river part of this complex problem  
16 has seen great improvements in passage. Around 95 percent of juvenile salmon  
17 successfully pass each dam.

18 And according to your All-H Paper, in-river survival of spring migrants  
19 through these projects is higher than ever, similar to that before dams were built on  
20 the Snake River. Dams are easy targets, but they are only one part of the equation.  
21 Fish cannot spawn without good habitat, and they cannot grow to return unless they  
22 have good estuary and ocean conditions and unless they can avoid predators,  
23 including humans. To tackle this problem, we need to clarify our goals here. Clear  
24 goals and accurate measurements of progress towards these goals can be the only  
25 manner in which accountability takes place within a complex project. The draft

1 performance measures and standards outlined in the All-H documents and in the  
2 biological assessment are a first step in this much-needed direction.

3           This won't be easy, but creating measurements and integrating them  
4 among all of the HS is a task well worth the effort. We must set aside misguided  
5 proposals and focus on what we can work today. I applaud the Army Corps' study of  
6 the proposals to draw down John Day Reservoir. It showed an up-front cost of  
7 almost five billion and annual costs of up to 700 million in exchange for negligible fish  
8 recovery. It is an equation that does not make sense.

9           With all of the current gaps in the science, and there are a lot of gaps,  
10 we still have a lot to learn. Because of the complexity of this problem, we are hopeful  
11 that you will resist the temptation to act in a manner that will cause irreparable harm  
12 to rural areas, and will work towards a comprehensive recovery plan. Thank for you  
13 this opportunity to share my views with you today.

14           MR. BRIDWELL: I'm Alan Bridwell from Rexburg, Idaho. I'm the  
15 eastern Idaho representative of the Idaho Wildlife Federation. I strongly believe that  
16 we should not let the salmon and steelhead go extinct. We should use whatever  
17 means necessary to protect the salmon and steelhead. But I also believe that we  
18 should not do this at the expense of water in eastern Idaho and the endangerment of  
19 these very good population of trout and fish we have here or at the danger of the  
20 agriculture economy in eastern Idaho. Thank you for your time.

21           MR. FRED: My name is John Fred. I'm a Bannock and Shoshone  
22 tribal member. I'm here in support of alternative four, dam breaching. Millions of  
23 dollars have been spent annually to subsidize the four lower Snake River dams in the  
24 form of grain subsidies and barging. We have studied the flow augmentation and  
25 barging, all other aspects of the dams. It's time to stop the dam studies and start

1 studying the dam breaching. Allow the lower Snake to run as it had since time began  
2 in a natural state.

3           Nobody was talking about the largest run in anadromous fish that has  
4 been eliminated above the Hells Canyon, but I want to mention that. The salmon,  
5 along with the other fish species, sockeye, steelhead, sturgeon, lamprey, bull trout,  
6 would all be here in Idaho in numbers if they had anyplace to go as nature had  
7 provided. Their homes have been taken over in the name of progress just like other  
8 natives in the area.

9           What was once the world's largest salmon is now -- the world's largest  
10 run of salmon is now the world's largest hydroelectric system; the world's largest and  
11 most expensive restoration effort. We did not want the dams, and I'm sure the fish  
12 didn't want the dams, either. Give the river back to the fish so they can live for the  
13 future, theirs and ours. Thank you.

14           MR. BOTTOMS: My name is Robert Bottoms. I live in Idaho Falls. I  
15 have a small acreage about six miles north of town. And my water rights on that  
16 acreage are fairly late, not the best in the world.

17           And my greatest fear is that if the water is taken from eastern Idaho to  
18 flush the smolt to the ocean, I won't be able to irrigate. So I'll lose all the -- you know,  
19 everything on my farm.

20           So therefore, I am in favor of taking the dams out, breaching them, and  
21 mitigating the development or the people that it affects down the river.

22           I don't feel that the dams are necessary, and that they only provide five  
23 percent of the power for the Northwest system. I think we're -- the taxpayers of the  
24 nation is subsidizing those dams and giving the profit to everybody else. That's  
25 about all I've got to say.

1 MR. HUMPHRIES: My name is Eugene Humphries. I'm  
2 representing a canal company, Woodville Canal Company, Shelley, Idaho. And we  
3 do have some comments and some fears about breaching the dams. We feel that  
4 our total problem is the harvest. If I had a little garden for me and my neighbors, that  
5 would be adequate. But when we invite the whole neighborhood, it is inadequate.  
6 And this is -- I look at the Columbia Basin as being the whole thing. We've opened  
7 the door to commercial fishermen all along the coast, up and down, commercial  
8 fishermen in the Columbia. We have fishermen who now populate the riverbank  
9 much, much more than when I was young.

10 Now, if we just give the salmon a chance, I think there will be a  
11 comeback, but we must limit commercial fishing as such in the ocean, in the  
12 Columbia Basin. Now, in order to solve this, it's going to take us all. It's not a -- it's  
13 not a simple thing. Fish biologists, dam experts. I think the dams need to be  
14 redesigned with present technology in order to make them fish capable of traveling  
15 down and up the river. If we can do that, our technology, then, is working for us, not  
16 just to cut the water loose, not just to devastate the farming population with lack of  
17 water or loss of water, but to be compatible with the growth of the fish population and  
18 restore what used to be a very viable Columbia River Basin fish garden.

19 Now, you have more time? Good. Isn't that wonderful. Uh-huh. That's  
20 what the sum of our input is. We do not want to lose our old water rights. And in the  
21 news media it speaks of wanting another million acre-feet of water to speed the  
22 stream flow to get the smolt to the Columbia. Even if they breach the dams, they  
23 want another million acre-feet. And the limits of the water is only by nature. We  
24 cannot just dump a million acres without getting it from somewhere. Some years are  
25 good, some years are bad.

1           So we have to work out a plan that is going to work for us all.  
2 Reservoirs are not a killer of fish, but properly managed reservoirs could get the  
3 smolt by in a speedy performance. We could have fish ladders to bring the fish back  
4 up past the dams, but if we harvest too many in the ocean, all -- everything else is  
5 null and void. I appreciate this opportunity. And thank you very much.

6           MR. LITTLEJOHN: My name is Layton L. Littlejohn. And I'm a member  
7 of the Shoshone and Bannock tribe. But the main one I'm representing is the  
8 Bannock tribe, the Bannock nation that made treaty in October 14, 1863. And we  
9 made peace treaty with the government of the United States, and it was also during  
10 the Civil War. And it was under -- due to that, I assume it was unratified, but I don't  
11 know. But we did make a treaty with the government of the United States. So I want  
12 that to be known. (Speaking in Native Bannock language. Unable to transcribe.)

13           Now I'm going to speak to my adopted language, to English. Now, I  
14 reported this -- I mentioned both the unratified treaty, and also, I'm going to talk about  
15 the treaty that was made in July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1863, that was set aside. The Bannock  
16 reservation was set aside here in Idaho, but due to the dispersed war and uprising, I  
17 guess the government changed their mind and they wanted to place Indian tribes --  
18 other Indian tribes on our reservation. So they did in 1880, around there, and with an  
19 agreement. It's only an agreement. It's not a treaty, it's an agreement. And that's  
20 why I want the people here in Idaho to understand it, and also the legislators here in  
21 Idaho, because we already had a treaty way back there during the Civil War. And  
22 during the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln delegated and authorized General  
23 Conner to make a negotiation with the Bannock tribe.

24           And we are the only tribe that did make an agreement at that time,  
25 during the Civil War, and most of it was unratified. And what we're doing now, the

1 EPA, that was set aside in 1994. They didn't consult too much with us. They went  
2 right ahead and done the research on it, or whatever you call it, with a money grant  
3 and it was misused. It was under -- fraudulently done by the Mormon people.

4           The Mormon people was infringing on our treaty, and also the --  
5 infringing and encroaching on us. And they want to take over our reservation, and  
6 that's why our leaders, our tribal leaders just went along with them. And also, the  
7 state of Idaho violated the treaty. And the treaty was made with the United States  
8 government, Article one, Section ten. It was a violation of that treaty and other  
9 articles in our constitution. And that is why I'm making this statement. And I'm  
10 making this statement in only three minutes. And I think it's very valuable to the  
11 people in Idaho, the public people in Idaho. And when you're in a church, you're not  
12 supposed to do that. The church and politics don't mix. And I think our friends, the  
13 Mormon people, are not aware of it. But I'm bringing this up so we'll all be better  
14 educated for the new 2000 millennium. Is that it?

15           THE MODERATOR: Yes.

16           MR. DeANGELIS: My name is Jim deAngelis, and I represent myself,  
17 not an organization. As far as my comments on the All-H Paper and my comments  
18 on the environmental impact study that they're running with the Corps of Engineers,  
19 I'm in favor of immediate breaching of the dams. I feel that in terms of conservation  
20 of species, conservation of genetic stock, the salmon and the steelhead hatcheries  
21 are rearing genetically-inferior fish that are not returning. Barging is not doing  
22 anything except costing us money. It's inefficient. And studies have shown that  
23 none of these current options are working as far as the government is concerned.

24           Scientific studies support breaching. It's a political football right now.  
25 And I think ultimately if we're going to really conserve these species for our

1 grandchildren and for ourselves, we're going to have to make some hard choices.  
2 It's either going to be energy, which is minimal as far as the four dams are  
3 concerned, or actually take out the earthen part of it and bring back the salmon, at  
4 least give them a chance to come back. There's no way to really find out this is going  
5 to work except to breach the dams and let it go.

6           Ultimately, if it doesn't work over a ten, 20, 30-year period and the  
7 salmon stocks don't come back and steelhead, you can always replace those earthen  
8 part of the dams and regenerate your power. Loss of jobs is going to be minimal, as  
9 far as I'm concerned. The Port of Lewiston was a political boondoggle to start with.  
10 It had no feasibility to begin with, and there are certainly alternatives for shipping  
11 grain out of this area. And that's the end of my comment. Thank you.

12           MR. SINGLETON: I'm Brent Singleton from St. Anthony, Idaho. I  
13 represent the Twin Groves Canal Company. My comments are on the salmon and  
14 the waters flushed. Breaching the dams is much closer to being insane -- insanity  
15 than outright stupidity. The waste, the problems you have, and nothing's being done  
16 about it. For example, if we're going to have a problem saving the salmon, the  
17 bottom line is, let's put a by-way or a canal, what have you, along the side of the river  
18 and let the salmon free-flow back and forth from the ocean. The BPA is the root of  
19 the -- one of the roots of the problem. The Corps of Engineers, if they're spending 35  
20 million dollars a year and still nothing has been done, maybe we should make sure  
21 they're privatized and I think something would be done about it.

22           The issue's turned into nothing but a big money problem. They have been  
23 coming down environmentally by doing the waterway. The environmental problems  
24 wouldn't be affected as far as fisheries, wildlife and the jobs and everything pertained  
25 to it. The numbers on the salmon now, I think, are being kind of reflected from back

1 in the early years. We're working right now with less number of salmon. We need to  
2 fix the problem so you have your salmon. Flushing the rivers is not going to help  
3 your salmon any common-sense wise. After all, your data's -- you're going to see  
4 that.

5           The main thing here that we're looking at is waste. Everyone should be  
6 making a living at it, not specified to a few, more or less, especially organizations and  
7 groups. My mind just went blank.

8           THE MODERATOR: You've got 30 seconds.

9           MR. SINGLETON: The water that's left in the system's not to be  
10 counted on in a yearly average. You take into consideration low water years. It's a  
11 waste by flushing rivers if you're not going to do the job. Let's use some common  
12 sense about this and make it work for everybody and not just for a few. Thank you.

13           MR. DENNEY: My name is Dana Denney. I'm representing myself.  
14 I've gone to several hearings on the salmon and I've listened to a lot of information.  
15 And I don't have a big spiel, but I'd just like to voice my support for breaching the  
16 dams. I think it's the logical solution. I think it's the only thing that's going to work.  
17 So that's it, really. Is that good enough?

18           THE MODERATOR: Sure.

19           MR. CACCIA: My name is Bill Caccia. I'm a teacher, and I'm speaking  
20 for between 125 and 150 junior high students and myself and a number of other  
21 teachers at our school. I've submitted a signed petition from those students  
22 concerning salmon recovery in Idaho. The students and myself realize that this is a  
23 multi-faceted problem, and in studying this issue realize that full recovery of Idaho  
24 salmon as well as other Pacific Northwest fisheries will take a huge effort, including  
25 habitat restoration, ocean management, fishing controls, and most importantly,



1 practices to help salmon with in and out-migration. It was interesting to me to hear  
2 student comment at my school as we studied these issues and see kids' eyes light up  
3 as they spoke of uncles and grandparents catching huge salmon and bringing in  
4 pictures, black and white, of the big fish in Idaho in the early 30's and 40's and 50's,  
5 and to hear their enthusiasm as they thought and spoke of the possibility of having  
6 salmon restored to a fishable level in our state.

7           They were also adamant about Idaho farmers not losing their water and  
8 water rights and the Port of Lewiston not bearing the brunt of the economic losses  
9 without compensation, and their concern for the farmers of north Idaho having to pay  
10 higher prices to ship their crops to the world markets. But what they would like to  
11 see, and myself included, is the salmon saved and returned for their generation and  
12 the generations to come.

13           They and I believe that the most important part of this process for  
14 Idaho is by breaching the four dams on the lower Snake River. They also feel that  
15 this will help expedite and help in the migration of the salmon and the smolt to the  
16 ocean, and that is the most important thing for Idaho's fisheries. In addition, the  
17 monies must be used -- that are being used right now for subsidizing the Port of  
18 Lewiston to help make that port change to, perhaps, a rail market, to help the farmers  
19 in northern Idaho get their crops to the ocean, and hopefully, to help bring the salmon  
20 back to Idaho. Thank you.

21           MR. SCHRADER: Hi. My name's Willy Schrader. I'm not going to  
22 argue on either side except I say that if you take away the dams and the fish come  
23 back, the fish will be there for our children and our children's children. They may be  
24 there for them to enjoy. But if you keep the dams that can be torn down and rebuilt,  
25 the salmon may go away forever and we may not have anything left. Okay.

1 MR. PARKER: My name is Don Parker. I represent the Montevue  
2 Canal Company. I'm here to speak against dam breaching. Ladies and gentlemen,  
3 not long ago, most of us would have assumed this insane proposal of breaching the  
4 dams would just go away. We're here tonight to decide if common sense or  
5 radicalism will prevail. The real question before us today isn't whether we breach  
6 four dams on the lower Snake River, the real question is will the hype and  
7 sensationalism of dam breaching be replaced with a healthy dose of common sense.

8 Everyone is concerned about the extinction of what the Post Register  
9 deem a treasured species. Protecting and preserving the beauties of this earth are of  
10 vital interest to everyone who has an opportunity to work the land. No one wants to  
11 see the salmon disappear. I, too, am concerned about the extinction of a treasured  
12 species; one which I believe has imminent worth, the family farm.

13 My great-grandfathers helped to settle the area, build the large canals  
14 that provide the means for many to come, yes, and they helped to build dams; dams  
15 that have provided opportunity for many more to come and live in the area; dams that  
16 yield electricity to light our homes and run our pumps. Many want to return to the,  
17 quote, "good old days." I personally like having running water in the house, electric  
18 lights when I turn a switch, and more food than we can consume.

19 We've been richly blessed. Are things like when my great-grandfathers  
20 came here? No. And for that, I can only say thank you. We live in a time of plenty.  
21 There's enough and more for all to eat. Everyone has running water and lights come  
22 on with a flick of a switch, and we don't have to run to the little building out back when  
23 nature calls. The cry has gone out. The only way to save the salmon is to breach  
24 the dams. What a ludicrous statement. By their own admission, if the dams are  
25 breached, the results will not be known for 50 years. It may not work even if they are

1 breached. Do you really believe that if they breach the dams, in five years from now,  
2 when we have no more fish than before, they won't come and say we need another  
3 million acre-feet of water to save the salmon. This is insane.

4           The power generated by the four dams will light all the houses in Idaho  
5 and Montana. And they also provide power during the peak season for pumping.  
6 From the same Post Register that wants to breach the dams comes an article dated  
7 March 2nd. "BPA warns blackouts could hit the Northwest this summer." The  
8 population is growing faster than electricity can be provided now. Use common  
9 sense. Leave the dams. A projected 15 percent increase in power if the dams are  
10 breached along with skyrocketing costs for fuel and rising interest rates could be the  
11 final nail in an almost closed coffin for the family farm.

12           Former Senator Jim McClure pleads for moderation in Sunday's Post  
13 Register. He offers five sensible solutions to the problem. Let us use common sense  
14 and moderation rather than the hysteria that now seems to prevail. Leave the dams  
15 because it isn't a matter of breaching the dams or culling for our water. When the  
16 dam breaching fails to provide immediate results, which it will, the water will be taken  
17 to save the salmon. Just say no to breaching the dams. Thank you.

18           MR. MINCHER: My name is Bruce Mincher. I live in Idaho Falls, and  
19 although I belong to several sportsmen's groups, I'm here speaking for myself. My  
20 comment goes as follows: I've come full circle on the issue of dam breaching. When  
21 I first heard the idea, I thought it was nuts. However, as it began to be taken  
22 seriously, I began to pay attention. I discovered that the dams don't provide a  
23 significant amount of electricity, that it costs ridiculously large amounts of money to  
24 mitigate their effects on the fish and to maintain them. Great sums of tax money are  
25 being spent to benefit a comparatively small number of people.

1 Idaho politicians are against breaching and against using eastern Idaho  
2 water to raise flows. This is the same statesmanship which gave Idaho the wolves  
3 with no ability to be involved in wolf management. They can't have it both ways. I  
4 know for a fact that an economy can be built around healthy salmon runs. I've seen  
5 that with my own eyes in Alaska.

6 Such an economy can benefit a large number of people and not cost  
7 the taxpayers the subsidies which now prop up the dams. Dams are temporary no  
8 matter how vigorously those profiting by them defend them. They can last no more  
9 than a few human generations before natural forces prevail. Our children's children  
10 will remember us with shame if we choose to temporarily enrich a few of this  
11 generation and permanently impoverish the future. It's time to breach the dams and  
12 recover our salmon runs. Thanks.

13 MR. WEINBERG: My name is Donald Weinberg. I'm a retired  
14 mechanical engineer. Now I will start my program. I would like to suggest a  
15 compromise plan for breaching the high head dams on the Snake and other rivers for  
16 saving the fish. I was working at Allis-Chalmers in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, at the time  
17 Allis-Chalmers engineers asked the various organizations how the provision for  
18 saving the salmon was to be provided for or how the fish were to be moved over the  
19 high head dams.

20 No one in the various states or the federal government was concerned  
21 about the problem. At the time, there appeared to be plenty of fish available. There  
22 was even plenty of inland stream trout available. The Indians did not fish or were not  
23 allowed to fish for such large quantities of salmon as is presently the case. The  
24 foreign nations such as Japan did not fish too close to the U.S. shores as they now  
25 do with specialized equipment. These same countries were not using nets pulled

1 behind their ships to drag the ocean. It has now become apparent that there are not  
2 enough salmon being hatched or produced to supply the current demand.

3           The salmon supply can only be increased by hatching more small fish,  
4 more of the salmon return from the ocean to spawn and lay eggs. The eggs can also  
5 be artificially milked from the returning salmon. The eggs are then hatched into  
6 smolts in a fish hatchery. More fish milking stations and fish hatcheries will more  
7 than likely be required. I will now describe the compromise plan for increasing the  
8 supply of salmon.

9           I recommend that a 42-inch diameter steel pipe be run into the bottom  
10 of the high head hydro dam, and that the pipe be run upstream above the dam  
11 several miles to the headwaters where the water enters the lake behind the dam.  
12 The fish -- the pipe at the upstream end would be floated on a --

13           THE MODERATOR: You just have a few seconds left.

14           MR. WEINBERG: I haven't gotten even through this yet.

15           THE MODERATOR: Okay. Are you almost done?

16           MR. WEINBERG: I've got all this to do yet.

17           THE MODERATOR: And then the next page? Oh, okay. Keep going.

18           MR. WEINBERG: Let's see now where I'm at. The pipe at the  
19 upstream end would be floated on a permanently installed barge which would allow a  
20 constant supply of water to flow downstream and out the 42-inch pipe that penetrates  
21 the dam and, thus, discharges into the forebay where it will attract the adult salmon  
22 by adequate stream flowing water. I know from experience that the salmon will swim  
23 up such a pipe if laid on the bottom of the lake at the correct slope.

24           The adult salmon would thus swim out the end of the floated pipe and  
25 the lake upstream of the dam. The slope of the pipe may have to be changed at

1 intervals in order to give the fish periodic rest as they swim upstream. In the spring,  
2 summer, when the smolts hatch in the lake, the smolts can be hearded into the  
3 upstream end of the pipe by pulsating airstreams. Pulsating airstreams are used at  
4 the entrance of nuclear power plants on Lake Michigan to prevent or reduce the  
5 amount of Great Lakes fish from entering the circulating water system of the power  
6 plant.

7           The pipe would be equipped with a 42-inch ball valve to slowly close  
8 the line off to flow when the occasion arises. The ball valve would allow free passage  
9 by swimming through the valve in the wide-open position without obstructions. This  
10 ball valve could be slowly opened or closed with a pneumatic or electric motor.  
11 There will also be a need for additional fish hatcheries and fish milking facilities.

12           THE MODERATOR: Sir, you need to wrap it up.

13           MR. WEINBERG: I am a retired registered Wisconsin mechanical  
14 engineer who has had considerable experience involving mechanical problems in  
15 nuclear power plants, irrigation pumping plants, and assisting or running model  
16 hydroelectric turbine tests for such installations as the St. Lawrence Seaway, Fort  
17 Randall, Dolls Dam (phonetic), International Boundary Commission and reversible  
18 pump turbine model tests.

19           I recommend that the -- I recommend -- I recommend that the  
20 compromise plan for breaching the dams be tested on one high head dam first. I  
21 wish to thank you for reviewing the compromise plan. I'm Donald D. Weinberg.  
22 Address is 864 Clearview Lane, Idaho Falls.

23           THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

24           MR. WEBB: Okay. My name is Jim Webb. I'm from Lower Valley  
25 Energy, which is in Afton, Wyoming, serves in the areas of Afton, Jackson, Wyoming

1 and two counties in -- Bonneville and Caribou Counties in Idaho. We're served by  
2 Bonneville Power Administration. We believe that the environment should be  
3 protected. We live in one of the most environmentally sensitive areas of the country.  
4 But we also feel that good science should be used in whatever consideration that the  
5 All-H project has considered.

6           We took the opportunity recently to take several of our elected officials  
7 to tour the dams and see what is done to help the fish in passing through the dams  
8 and around the dams. We were very impressed with what has been done. I think  
9 that those types of things can be enhanced and continue to be done, and that we can  
10 have both protection for the salmon and hydroelectric power that we've enjoyed in  
11 this part of the country for many years. So we think good science should be used,  
12 and that we should save the salmon and do what we can to protect the rest of our  
13 resources and the electric power that we do have. So thank you.

14           THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

15           MS. HARP: My name is Barbara Harp, Mackay, Idaho. This is for the  
16 All-H Paper. My husband and I have been residents of central Idaho all our lives.  
17 We can tell you how great it was each summer when the salmon returned. We can  
18 tell you how his parents lost their income from their fishing cabins when the runs  
19 ceased in the early 70's.

20           We have two children, now 30 and 27 years old. Neither have they  
21 ever had the opportunity to hike to a favorite hole in the early morning of summer to  
22 do battle with huge chinook salmon. I could argue that the fate of these fish is in our  
23 hands and it's high time we did right by them, whether or not we ever get to fish for  
24 them again. But right and justice won't win. What's morally right, sadly, doesn't cut it  
25 with our political process. Economic arguments might. Those three dams were the

1 straws that broke the salmon's back. We lost our place on the river when those  
2 dams were put in place. Many other businesses slid into oblivion as well.

3           No one down river or anyone anywhere else really cared. Now we ask  
4 downriver farmers to use the railroad, for heaven's sake. They have options; we  
5 have none. These fish could be a huge economic boon for Lewiston, Riggins,  
6 Salmon, Challis and Clayton. Our jet boat operators could have an enormous  
7 increase in business. Motels, gas stations, grocery stores and sporting good stores  
8 could flourish. If you doubt this, please drive along the Salmon River between North  
9 Fork and the Middle Fork this weekend. The steelhead are running.

10           In the search to find a scapegoat for the disappearance of the salmon,  
11 we upriver have ever had more rigorous restrictions placed on grazing, logging and  
12 mining, combined with the loss of the fishery, it's a double whammy. And our  
13 legislators say they don't want economic downturn from the salmon recovery?

14           This is just shortsightedness or denial. Are they more concerned for  
15 Idahoans or for Washington farmers and the BPA? Do what is best for the fish, and  
16 that's dam removal. If you can't do it because it's right, it's moral and it's just, then do  
17 it for the people of Idaho and generations yet unborn.

18           MS. GERBER: My name is Gwen Gerber, and I'm representing myself.  
19 I'm a scientist, and I work in the environmental consulting business. And I have been  
20 in the environmental business for eight years. During that time, I've been involved in  
21 a lot of clean-ups of waste problems throughout the country. And all those problems  
22 are because of yesterday's mistakes, mistakes that years ago we didn't know the  
23 implications of what would come to those mistakes.

24           For example, putting steel tanks in the ground where the groundwater  
25 table is at five feet and later having groundwater contamination due to leaky steel



1 tanks from corrosion. Well, I believe that years ago when these dams were built,  
2 they didn't understand the implications it would cause the fish as a result of these  
3 dams. And therefore, I feel the same way. I feel that these problems need to be  
4 taken care of, and the only way that that can happen is by breaching these dams.

5           So therefore, I support alternative four in the Corps' draft EIS because it  
6 is the only plan that will restore our salmon and steelhead to self-sustaining,  
7 harvestable levels as required by laws and treaties. Breaching the four lower Snake  
8 River dams must also be included in any comprehensive recovery plan put forth by  
9 the federal caucus in the All-H Paper.

10           MR. BROG: Fred Brog from Freedom, Wyoming. I'm a dairyman and a  
11 rancher. I've been working with the utility board for about ten years, and am  
12 concerned about the proposal to breach the four lower Snake River dams. I guess  
13 my personal opinion is, is we can have dams and we can have fish.

14           And with our technology that we have today and what we have  
15 experienced on the Lower Granite Dam, the technology is here if we just have the  
16 patience to retrofit the rest the dams. I'm a little concerned about four other points  
17 which we have.

18           Number one is harvest. Nobody, in my experience and knowledge, is  
19 taking care of any kind of a harvest limit. There's predation on the Columbia, out in  
20 the ocean. We need to get after the terns. We need to get after the sea lions. They  
21 have no more right to eat those fingerlings than anybody.

22           The third is Native Americans. I think they need to work with us as far  
23 as the amount of harvest that they do. And the fourth is, we need dams. If dams are  
24 a problem, we need to be looking at the retrofit problem of the dams. We need to  
25 look at not only the four lower Snake River dams, we need to look at Hells Canyon

1 and those dams that do not have any fish ladders that have no retrofit on them before  
2 we look at breaching the four lower Snake River dams.

3           There's no way that we're going to change society. We've got the  
4 population here. We can't go back to a pristine society. We're going to have to live  
5 with it the way it is or else we're going to have to get rid of those of us that are living  
6 here, and that won't be possible. So my last plea would be, if we don't have the  
7 hydropower that's going to be lost in those four Snake River dams, we're going to  
8 have the power loss of all of Idaho and all of Montana. There is no way that we can  
9 replace that power without using hydrocarbons, and hydrocarbons pollute the air.

10           So please look at the environment. Thank you.

11           MR. MERRILL: My name's Paul Merrill, and I live in Idaho Falls, Idaho.  
12 My address is 134 Cobblestone Lane, Idaho Falls, 83404. And as a citizen, I'm in  
13 favor of the extremest measure which is breaching the dams and remodifying the four  
14 lower dams. The government has a responsibility to restore the fish, and nothing has  
15 worked. Barging hasn't worked. Hatcheries aren't working. Sheer numbers of fish  
16 aren't working. And we're running out of time. And I think that if anything, the  
17 responsibility that we have to get the fish back is tremendous, and if we waste much  
18 more time with more studies and more politics, more bureaucraties [sic.], more red  
19 tape, we could lose out.

20           I'm very disturbed that the sockeye salmon in the Stanley River Basin  
21 seemingly have gone extinct, and that was due to a lack of action. And I feel that  
22 that's going to -- or could be the excuse with the chinook. I feel that the least we can  
23 do is do our best. And without any of the other three alternatives, which are to  
24 continue with the action or to flush the spillways or modify the turbines or whatever  
25 that takes, I don't think that would work. And I don't think we need to wait another

1 ten years to find out or 15 years or whatever. If we breach -- if we can save the fish  
2 and get the stocks back, then I think that we could, you know, discover new  
3 technologies. If dams are necessary, the upper four dams don't have enough power.  
4 They weren't -- the lower four dams are where the bulk of the power is generated.  
5 And the upper four dams on the lower Snake River outside of the Columbia River are  
6 simply not necessary. And we need to at least try to do all we can and to not skimp  
7 or try to, you know, continue this course of action of just trying to get by on a minimal  
8 measure. We need to take drastic action as soon as possible. And that's my  
9 opinion. Thank you very much.

10 MS. UNDERWOOD: My name is Rebecca Underwood, and I'm  
11 representing myself. And my comment is, is I would like to see the dams breached. I  
12 have one concern, and that would be if we do consider breaching the dams, will they  
13 do it all at once or is there going to be a time lapse between each breaching to make  
14 sure that the river recovers from the silt that will be washed downstream? And that's  
15 all my comment. Thank you.

16 MR. MIGEL: I'm Dauchy Migel. I've been a resident of Idaho Falls  
17 since 1948. My wife Francis is a native of Idaho Falls. Three of our children live with  
18 their families in Idaho. Thousands of dams were built in the United States during the  
19 last century for irrigation purpose. The Bureau of Reclamation built 228 dams in 60  
20 years, mostly in the Northwest. A fair number of the dams were built for legitimate  
21 reasons.

22 Whether or not a dam made good sense, whether or not it decimated a  
23 salmon fishery or drowned a gorgeous stretch of wild river, it was a bonanza to the  
24 constituents and the congressmen in whose district it was located. Some proposals  
25 for dams were a mistake for structural or location reasons and were not built. Some

1 mistakes were built. Tetons Dam disaster is a local example. The lower Snake River  
2 dams are a disaster to Idaho salmon and steelhead because they present the timely  
3 passage of the young fish to the ocean, an accepted biological requirement. Flow  
4 augmentation has been proposed as a remedy. Present augmentation, part of the  
5 federal plan, includes 427,000 acre-feet of water on the upper Snake. But it would  
6 require 160 billion acre-feet, more than the entire flow of the Snake, to make up for  
7 the effect of the four dams.

8           If the dams were breached, additional water would not be needed.  
9 John Haney, chief of staff, Senator Mike Crapo (phonetic) believes giving the science  
10 we now have, flow augmentation will not recover fish with the current dam structure.  
11 But the bullets for breaching are not now in congress. Dam removal, which is  
12 occurring in other areas of the United States, must become acceptable to a majority  
13 in Idaho, and then by our governor and congressional delegation.

14           Interestingly, the governor of Oregon recently declared in favor of dam  
15 breaching on the lower Snake River. By restoring Idaho's \$170 million a year sport  
16 fishing economy, there should be no difficulty in, one, funding improved highways for  
17 grain transportation to the Columbia River, Twin Cities, Washington or beyond; two,  
18 providing mitigation for farmers to access water which will still flow past their lands;  
19 and three, replacing the two percent of power now generated at the four lower Snake  
20 River dams.

21           Idaho rivers and the wildlife, including salmon, dependent on the rivers  
22 are the reasons why many of us like to live in Idaho. The lower Snake River dams  
23 must be bypassed. Extinction is forever, dams are not.

24           MR. ROHNER: My name is Clint Rohner. I'm a resident of Idaho Falls,  
25 Idaho. I represent myself in this. Looking at the numbers and the biology I have

1 seen so far, I think that a major way that we could help this, is if we improve the  
2 number of smolts. If you have 4,000 eggs, you only get 200 fish that make it to the  
3 dams. A five percent increase in the number of smolts would be a large number  
4 compared to a five percent increase in fish making it back. I think you should donate  
5 substantial time, effort and money to improving that habitat before they reach the  
6 dams.

7           As far as the dams are concerned, I believe that breaching them would  
8 probably be the only way to help this. That is also the second major place where  
9 there is a large number -- a decrease in the percentage of fish that make it through.  
10 Also, there is a small increase in the number of fish that make it -- or small increase  
11 in percentage would make a large number of fish downstream. If you are going to  
12 take the livelihood of those people at that particular place, you also should look for  
13 decreasing the predators as in islands in mid-river, downriver from there that would  
14 also increase the number of fish that could make it down and back.

15           So I'm in favor of breaching the dams. I'm in favor of increasing the  
16 habitat here in Idaho, and I'd like to see the predators removed downriver from that.  
17 Thank you very much.

18           MR. ANDERSON: My name is Dave Anderson. I'm speaking as a  
19 concerned individual. I intend to speak briefly and use well less than the allocated  
20 time of three minutes. It is my very strong belief that the only reasonable hope of  
21 saving the salmon is to breach the dams. And I think that the important thing at this  
22 point is to not delay. I think that there are a number of groups who would like to  
23 delay taking any kind of decisive or definitive action here to the point that the salmon  
24 are extinct. And so I would like to make the very strongest possible case for  
25 breaching the dams and for doing so immediately. And also, I think that it's time for

1 the politicians involved here to do the brave thing, do the right thing, to breach the  
2 dams. Thank you.

3 MS. ANDERSON: My name is Dawn Anderson. I'm representing  
4 myself as a citizen of Idaho. And I would like to support alternative four and endorse  
5 breaching the dams, because I think it is the only viable alternative besides Zen.  
6 There is a preponderance of evidence indicating this is the only way to save our fish.  
7 We have never made a decision like this in the history of our country that we have  
8 regretted. There was a proposal at one time to put a dam in the Grand Canyon. I  
9 don't think anybody has regretted making that decision.

10 I'd also like to state for the record that if dams are as harmless as  
11 people pretend them to be, then why aren't we lined up to build more of them. It  
12 takes not only an act of congress, but an act of God to put up a new dam. And I think  
13 that that should say something in and of itself. And I would close this testimony by  
14 urging our legislators and those in charge of policies and decision-making on federal  
15 and state levels to seriously consider this not only for the future of Idaho, but for the  
16 future of our country and our world as well. Thank you.

17 MR. ELKINGTON: My name is Keith Elkington. I'm an eastern Idaho  
18 rancher and farmer, past president of the Bonneville County Cattleman's Association.  
19 I would like to testify about the dam breaching. I used to fish the Salmon River as a  
20 kid, and we caught a lot of salmon and it was a great experience. But I think  
21 breaching the dams for the recovery of the salmon would be a mistake.

22 However, I do feel like it's important for us to do anything in our power  
23 to reestablish the salmon population, and those dams do have an effect. My  
24 proposal is that we build a canal from above Lewiston that will dump water in below  
25 the mouth of the Snake River. This canal would be a substantial canal the size of the

1 Idaho Canal or bigger. It would carry the smolt down. It would carry the adult fish  
2 back. There wouldn't be a 60 percent survival; there would be a 100 percent survival  
3 in the smolt. There would be no more need for breaching of dams. There would be  
4 the best of both worlds. All parties involved would be satisfied.

5 A professor Eric Brennan at the University of Idaho has already drawn  
6 up plans. They would need to be modified because his plans called for a reservoir --  
7 or a canal to go clear to the Pacific Ocean. This wouldn't be necessary to start with.  
8 Let's put it down to that 140-mile stretch and see how it works. That's all I've got to  
9 say. Thank you.

10 MR. JUDY: My name is Richard Judy. I'm a farmer, rancher, eastern  
11 Idaho businessman. I'm representing myself. And I'd like to say that I'm not in favor  
12 of the dam breaching at this particular time. I think there's too many variables.  
13 There's some things that we don't understand. I think the mortality rate of the fish in  
14 the ocean, what would happen if we did breach those dams, the silt, what that would  
15 do to our ecosystem. I don't feel at this time we're in a position to -- for the kind of  
16 money we're talking and the expense of that, I think there's something that should be  
17 looked at, some alternatives.

18 Years ago in the early 70's we talked about building -- making some  
19 kind of river -- or dam around the dams, and that -- for an opportunity for the fish. I  
20 haven't heard too much of that expressed in these meetings or in these plans. I  
21 would be in favor of that as opposed to giving them a current or channel to follow.  
22 Like I say on that, I think we need to know more about the mortality of the fish when  
23 they go to the ocean. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

24 MR. JOHNSON: I'm Jerry Johnson. I live in Idaho Falls. I don't  
25 represent any group other than myself. I want to tell a little story about dam

1 breaching because a lot of the information being given is, in my experience, just plain  
2 false. This story has to do with the Clyde River, which is located in northeastern  
3 Vermont right below Lake Memphremagog. It's a main feeder stream to Lake  
4 Memphremagog, which is a 50-mile stream that flows into Quebec and into the St.  
5 Lawrence River.

6           In the 1960's, an earth-filled dam was put on there to produce power  
7 and cut off one of the most productive steelhead runs on the east coast. Two years  
8 ago, that dam was breached. It was breached naturally because of flaws in the dam  
9 construction, and in the winter, as the water flow came up, they had to breach the  
10 dam and shut it down and then apply for a new permit to reconstruct the dam that  
11 was denied.

12           Since that time, with that dam breaching, they removed the dam, then,  
13 from the river, other than the concrete sides of it. The steelhead came back almost  
14 immediately.

15           So all of the testimony that's been heard about the siltation of the  
16 streams and the fact that the steelhead or the salmon will not come back is not based  
17 on fact because no one's gone to look at the one 1960's dam that was breached to  
18 see what happened to the steelhead when in fact that dam was breached.

19           And the reality is the steelhead came back. And if anyone really wants  
20 to know the truth what happens when a dam breaches, they can go to Newport,  
21 Vermont, or call the newspaper there or any fisherman in the area and say, "What  
22 has happened to the Clyde River? Did the steelhead come back?" And the answer  
23 is, yes, they came back, and they came back in a dramatic fashion.

24           I hope that this information will be part of the mix that whoever listens to  
25 this will consider as they view alternative four, which I favor. Thank you.



1 MR. HEVEWAH: My name is Hobby Hevewah. And my comments  
2 pertain to, I guess, both issues here. My comments are going to be totally different  
3 from a lot of other comments that you hear tonight. Mine is kind of focusing on health  
4 and how, by breaching the river or breaching the Snake River dams here, the four,  
5 will help benefit Mother Earth because of the hindrance that we put in her arteries.  
6 And what I'm talking about is the river. The river is an artery of Mother Earth, and by  
7 breaching the dam, it's like relieving or like having a bypass. Human beings have  
8 bypasses in their heart and the heart pumps blood through their veins to keep them  
9 alive, Mother Earth pumps water through her veins to keep her alive.

10 So if you really look at alternatives and the best plan for Mother Earth  
11 not to have a heart attack is number four, and that's relieving the pressure. And if  
12 you look at it in that way, your comments and all the peoples' comments and  
13 concerns will be answered in that way. In the long run, your future will be benefited  
14 because the river again will be replenishing fish, wildlife, aqua life and so on.

15 And other than that, that's my comment. And hopefully you can look at  
16 it in an indigenous point of view by looking at the river as a spirit, as being alive like  
17 us. And by doing that, you'll make the right decision. Thank you.

18 MR. BURRUT: My name is Jon Burrut. I'm a life-long resident of  
19 Idaho. I consider myself to be Native American. My mother is full-blood Sioux. I  
20 have a little different attitude than most Native Americans, I guess. Idaho and its  
21 people's livelihoods come first in this argument that's going on at this time, I guess.  
22 We live close to the land in Idaho as farmers, logger, miners, ranchers.

23 We all love Idaho and its outdoor opportunities. That's why we choose  
24 to live here. But we also make our living from the land so that we can afford to hike,  
25 hunt, fish and do other outdoor activities. I support the plan or combination of plans

1 that is best situated to keep Idaho's -- I support the plan or combination of plans that  
2 the best science around says will work with the least upset to the majority of  
3 Idahoans. I believe this would be B or C.

4 Under any plan, Idaho residents must be fully compensated as per the  
5 U.S. constitution; i.e., their jobs, water, livelihoods. We all need to realize that all of  
6 us eat fish, beef, vegetables, live in wood houses, drive cars made with steel, wear  
7 gold and silver jewelry, but some of us don't seem to realize where all these products  
8 come from. They come from the producers not the takers.

9 Farmers and ranchers need water to stay in business. Loggers and  
10 miners need access to areas for logging and mining. Sportsmen and recreationists  
11 need access to national and state lands. The Endangered Species Act, in my belief,  
12 is being used as a gun to the heads of Idahoans. I hope that you choose to just  
13 wound us and not as a coup d'etat. I feel as if the south did when the war of northern  
14 aggression was waged against them.

15 There is a war on the west with the wolves, grizzly, fish, road closures,  
16 wilderness area expansions. What are we to do? Thank you

17 MR. HUEFTLE: Both sets of my grandparents migrated to midwestern  
18 America from Europe. All farmers and ranchers. They came to these United States  
19 with the dream of having the good life for themselves and their families. Then came  
20 the big drought and the depression. Word came that out west in Idaho, there was an  
21 abundance of water in the Snake River valley. The water could be counted on for  
22 farming and livestock raising. All the time, year round, unlimited mountain water  
23 forever. And to boot, the country was fascinatingly beautiful. The rivers and streams  
24 were rich with fresh-water trout, and during certain times of the year, they migrated  
25 up into Idaho from the Pacific Ocean, millions of many species, more than they could

1 name, of salmon. They were big, powerful, beautiful fish and of excellent flavor and  
2 very nutritious.

3           Why, some folks went so far as to say salmon are even better for you to  
4 eat than even beef or any other meat raised on the land. Only a relatively few folks  
5 then questioned the perception of the wisdom of damming the Columbia River.  
6 Please read into the record the books, River of Life, Channel of Death by Keith  
7 Peterson, 1995, and Cadillac Desert by Mark Risner.

8           After World War II, two of my older brothers became civil engineers, a  
9 profession that they, my parents and all our relatives were proud of. One brother,  
10 and the eldest, worked for the world-famous construction firms of the Morrison  
11 Knudsen and also Peter Kiewit. In spite of the pride our dad had for his sons in  
12 engineering, I remember that he had a great respect for the American native people  
13 and their caring philosophy of life in the way they lived lightly on the land.

14           I remember dad and other men talking how ashamed they felt about the  
15 broken treaties by our federal government with the native people who were here first.  
16 My dad and mother did not want to see the salmon go extinct. When I came to  
17 Idaho, the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation and the federal and state fishery  
18 folks and the newspaper people were only counting the in-migration of the returning  
19 adult salmon and steelhead. The out-migrating baby fish were ignored. They were  
20 ignored until the last of the four dams on the lower Snake River were in place.

21           Then came the precipitous decline in returning adult salmon. But by  
22 then, the human federal bureaucracies, the enormous hydroelectric companies, the  
23 aluminum companies and their mutually dependent airplane factories all downstream  
24 and, of course, the greed and power-driven politicians, they all were in place and  
25 becoming even more powerful.

1           The science: For tens of thousands of years, these fish have been  
2 migrating up and down the clear, free-flowing rivers. Now it's time -- past time for all  
3 of us to be honest, to be humble and to be courageous. The four dams need to be  
4 bypassed. We need to protect and restore these magnificent fishes for their sake, for  
5 our sake, and for the sake of all those who follow us, and the native people's treaties  
6 need to be honored. Eastern Idaho waters need to be protected for the farmers, the  
7 ranchers, their livelihoods, and for all of the intrinsic values of aquatic life dependent  
8 on these rivers. Thank you. I'm Keene Hueftle.

9           MR. MANNING: My name is Denny Manning. I live in Pocatello,  
10 Idaho. I have lived in the Idaho area for 62 years. I'm of Mormon heritage, and one  
11 of my parents -- grandparents pulled a handcart across the plains to Utah. And my  
12 grandparents settled in the Preston area in about the 1860's. I feel like the only  
13 sensible way to bring the salmon back with the littlest impact is to breach the dams.

14           I wonder sometimes what the Idaho people think about, if they know  
15 what they really have of the heritages here. Here when I was young I stood up on  
16 the Salmon River looking down on the river at Indian ripples, and you could see  
17 these big salmon swimming around into the water there. Two years ago, I went back  
18 and stood on the same ridge. There wasn't one salmon in that river.

19           I think it's sad that we are losing that type of a heritage. You know, I  
20 was on a quality audit team and I traveled in the eastern part of the United States.  
21 My wife went with me to Little Rock, Arkansas. And we looked at the Arkansas River  
22 there. And my wife says, "You mean people eat fish out of that and drink water out of  
23 that?" I think we're blessed in Idaho. The other thing that I found out when I was  
24 back east, the one thing I was thankful for, that they run us Mormons the heck out of  
25 there. Like I say, I can't bring much more than has been said about breaching the

1 dams. But I've fished below Ice Harbor, I've fished all along the Salmon. And I love  
2 Idaho, and I still think the only thing to do is to remove those four dams on the Snake  
3 River. And that's all I've got to say.

4 MR. RICHMOND: My name is David Richmond. I live along the  
5 Salmon River near Challis. I'm representing Friends of the West, an Idaho  
6 environmental organization. I have fished for salmon in the Pacific Ocean. I have  
7 fished for and caught salmon in the Salmon River here in Idaho. These fish are  
8 extremely important to me personally. I love to watch them swim freely in healthy  
9 streams. I also love to catch and eat salmon.

10 If the dams are not breached soon, my children, my grandchildren will  
11 never have the opportunity to watch, appreciate and catch and consume these fish  
12 since they will be extinct, gone forever. Is that the legacy we wish to leave for the  
13 next generation? Breaching the Snake River, lower Snake River dams has about a  
14 70 percent chance of recovering these wonderful fish. Breaching the dams will allow  
15 6500 ranchers and farmers in southern Idaho to stay in business.

16 If the dams are not breached, those people will be forced to give up so  
17 much of their water for flow augmentation, that they will be forced out of business. Is  
18 that what we want for the next generation to read about in the history books, that we  
19 didn't either have the courage or the care to save the salmon and to save the  
20 ranchers and farmers? Flow augmentation may help the fish a little, but it is not the  
21 critical remedy that the fish need. The dams must go and soon. Before the four  
22 dams on the lower Snake were constructed, the free-flowing river not only flushed  
23 salmon and steelhead smolt toward their ocean homes, but it also was a source of  
24 recreation. There once were about 130 named rapids where there are now flat  
25 reservoirs. I love to raft wild rivers in Idaho and look forward to experiencing those

1 rapids. A new river to run. When salmon and steelhead survived in natural large  
2 numbers before the dams were built, once they returned to their native streams and  
3 spawned, their dead bodies were a source of nutrient to the watershed. Furthermore,  
4 our previously healthy ancient old-growth forests have been shown to contain salmon  
5 DNA. Bears and other predators would eat the salmon in the river and later deposit  
6 fecal material containing salmon proteins and other nutrients in their forest habitats.

7           That source of nourishment to the river system and forests may well be  
8 what kept our old growth forests healthy. When salmon recover after the dams are  
9 breached, perhaps our forests will recover as well, bringing the possibility of new  
10 sustainable timber operations in the future.

11           Small communities like Challis where I live depend on fishing to  
12 maintain the tourism base. Recovery of salmon will stimulate our economy. Salmon  
13 recovery will bring around 170 million dollars a year in the fishing industry in the  
14 Pacific Ocean and rivers. In Challis, we also depend on river recreation as a source  
15 of income for business owners. Once those dams are breached, river runners on the  
16 newly exposed rapids will revitalize the economies of local communities. We must  
17 remove the dams on the lower Snake. That alone will recover the mighty salmon and  
18 prove to ourselves as well as to future generations that we do care, that we are  
19 willing to stand up for the right, for the salmon, for Native Americans, for the health of  
20 our rivers, forests and their own American public. Please move to breach the dams  
21 as soon as practicable. Time is short. The fish cannot wait much longer, and the  
22 heart and sole of the Pacific Northwest and the entire American continent depend  
23 upon your courage and strength. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

24           MS. RICHMOND: I represent myself. I live in Clayton, Idaho. Ten  
25 years ago, an 86 year-old friend of mine shared this experience with me. She grew

1 up in central Idaho near my hometown of Clayton just off the Salmon River. She told  
2 me when she was young, she could remember that when her father opened the  
3 irrigation diversion ditches, that their fields became red with the color of salmon.  
4 There were so many salmon that they couldn't even possibly eat them all.

5           The extras were left to rot on the pasture to use for fertilizer. I can't  
6 even imagine such a scene now. I'm sure that she would be standing here before  
7 you testifying in favor of the fish, also, if she were alive. Nearly every salmon species  
8 in the Salmon River is either listed on the endangered species list or already extinct.  
9 If we don't make the decision to remove the dams now, all species of salmon and  
10 steelhead in the Snake River are likely to become extinct within the next 20 years.

11           We cannot allow that to happen. Breaching the four lower Snake River  
12 dams will eliminate the need for additional water from southern Idaho which could dry  
13 up 650,000 acres of irrigated crop land and cost \$450 million a year in losses to  
14 Idaho's farmers as well as the loss of thousands of agricultural jobs.

15           Alternative to dam removal includes huge increases in water from  
16 southern Idaho which would eliminate Idaho's \$90 million a year steelhead fishery.  
17 And our farmers. We cannot allow our farmers, ranchers, outfitters and fishermen to  
18 go extinct along with these fish. We've been studying these declining fish for 30  
19 years. It's time to take action now, not time for more studies. Scientific and  
20 economic reports indicate that partial dam removal is the best, cheapest and  
21 probably only option for the fish and for our small rural communities.

22           Studies show that restoring Snake River salmon will create more jobs  
23 and a stronger economy than keeping the dams in place and losing the salmon.  
24 These dams are bad for fish and these dams are bad for people. They must go.  
25 Thank you a lot.

1 THE MODERATOR: You need to put your name in there.

2 MS. RICHMOND: Kathy Richmond from Clayton, Idaho.

3 MR. SALOMON: Hi. My name is Hopi Salomon. I'm a resident of  
4 Idaho Falls. I'm representing my wife Kate and my daughter Emma. One of the  
5 great joys of my life, I hope this will happen, is to be able to take my daughter to Red  
6 Fish Lake some 800 miles plus from the Pacific Ocean and be able to tell her --  
7 actually, sorry -- to show her and not have to tell her how Red Fish Lake got its  
8 name. I don't believe that will ever happen unless the four dams on the lower Snake  
9 are breached and unless they're breached quickly. I'm not a radical, but I've looked  
10 at the data, and that's the only way to get those little salmon smolts that are probably  
11 getting lost, you know, in the slack water behind those dams to the ocean quick.

12 I guess it used to take eight days or so to flush them from, you know,  
13 from the area of Red Fish Lake to the Pacific Ocean, and now it takes weeks, a  
14 number of weeks. And I think they're getting lost. And those dams need to go. And  
15 that's my vote. Have a great day. Bye-bye. Thanks.

16 MR. ROBISON: Rod Robison. I represent the Reid Canal Company.  
17 Also, I'm on the Association of Soil Conservation districts in Madison County and on  
18 the state board, and I've been on the national board, which is the National  
19 Association of Conservation districts. I've been back to Washington D.C. for the last  
20 three years testifying on different farm issues. I am a full-time farmer in the Rexburg  
21 area. It's interesting to come to a meeting like this thinking that I didn't want the  
22 dams breached, and now I'm wondering if breaching the dams, perhaps, is a  
23 solution.

24 I don't think that breaching the dams, personally, is going to work,  
25 because the problem, as I see it, is out in the ocean where the foreign countries can



1 come in and scoop up large amounts of fish and make it so that the fish don't ever  
2 make it back to the rivers. I also see a problem because of the sea lions and et  
3 cetera. Removing the dams -- I'm wondering, after they do remove the dams, how  
4 long will it take until we can still -- we can see a recovery of the salmon.

5 I think it's going to be too long and too late. The salmon need to  
6 recover quicker than that. If it takes congressional approval to remove the dams and  
7 it takes another 25 years before the dams can be removed, is that going to be too  
8 late? Do we need to do something now that can assure that the salmon survives?  
9 Thank you.

10 MR. TERRY: My name is Brent Terry. I live here in Idaho Falls. I'd like  
11 to address this. One thing that is not mentioned today very much at all, is we talked  
12 about the dams, the various ways to maybe restore salmon, but there's very little  
13 attention addressed to the other end, the ocean and the river on the other end where  
14 it comes in. When I was younger, I worked in Alaska for four summers on a salmon  
15 boat, commercial one.

16 On those boats, you go out, you stay out there the entire summer. Kind  
17 of like the Indians mentioned in their -- it's kind of hard to explain, but you develop a  
18 oneness sort of thing with nature. And one thing I could not understand for the life of  
19 me is what's not mentioned here is the full effect the predators have on salmon. A  
20 sea lion can simply catch hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of salmon.

21 That's when they come into the river system out there in the ocean.  
22 And those sea lions are allowed to stay in the base of the rivers where the fish  
23 congregate. Another thing that's not addressed is Arctic terns. When the fish go  
24 downstream, they get into shallow water, those Arctic terns get those little juvenile  
25

1 salmon by the thousands or probably even the millions. Another thing that's not  
2 addressed is the effect of foreign competition just outside our territorial waters.

3           You have Japanese, the Russians and the North Koreans. They're not  
4 in boats, but they're in ships, processing boats. These boats, these ships are  
5 equipped with electronic equipment. They can find large amounts of fish. They're  
6 not limited to how they can take them. They scoop them up by the tons, and those  
7 fish -- they process those fish right there. Their boats come and get them. It's just a  
8 circle.

9           I don't know. It's just naïve that the whole thing is not addressed. I  
10 mean, you could do what you want to up here and develop a nice food source, those  
11 fish will go down there and they just basically get annihilated. They don't have a  
12 chance, they really don't. That's not being addressed at all here.

13           I'm against breaching the dams. I think another thing, too, that needs to  
14 be brought into prospective here is these people talk about seeing all these fish in the  
15 rivers and all this sort of thing. That's not really going to happen because there are  
16 too many people these days. This was back in the 50's. The population base --  
17 more and more people come here. That's why they come here, is to fish and see  
18 those things. I think it's not reality to think you'll ever see that sort of return again.  
19 That's just what I wanted to put in. Thank you.

20           MR. HART: My name is Mike Hart. I'm here representing myself. My  
21 address is 394 Tenth Street, Idaho Falls. I want to make four points. Duty, science,  
22 economics and consequences. Duty: The loss of salmon is not acceptable. We  
23 have a moral obligation to restore salmon. I think it's possible to see that happen if  
24 the right decisions are made. A lot of times, there are -- it's not in our power to  
25 change, but in this case, it is.

1           It's the law, and the economic costs are low. I've heard politicians call  
2 for more science-based policy, and I think that overwhelmingly the science supports  
3 dam breaching, and both -- again, the majority of scientists in the relevant fields, the  
4 American Fisheries Society for one, say that breaching the dams is the most likely  
5 efficacious process. The official independent scientific advisory board recommends  
6 river light conditions, and a plan for analyzing and testing hypotheses also supports  
7 that as the most likely recovery option.

8           This is probably more the relevant comments. Economics: As a  
9 taxpayer we're paying hundreds of millions of dollars each year to do studies, and at  
10 this point, the data are in. We know what the science says. I think it's irresponsible  
11 policy-making not to act when we have the data. I think this may be a deficiency in  
12 the EIS, which is the economic analysis of the cost of continuous investment in  
13 indecision or failed policy. Lack of solutions or half solutions will continue to cause  
14 investment, which has to be taken into consideration.

15           So implementing half policies, the governmental cost of investing in  
16 those should be taken into account. Let's see. In terms of local -- or economics, I  
17 think -- again, I think the economic loss of the ports is made up by gains in the  
18 railroads and other transportation. There are no changes in products, productions of  
19 wheat or paper products. We'll still be producing the same quantity. The  
20 transportation will be different.

21           Those are extralities to the companies providing those, therefore, I  
22 really don't feel that those are really economic costs that need to be considered too  
23 significantly, because they're extralities.

24           They're not real productivity losses. But I do think that to the extent  
25 there are economic impacts, we should have compassionate conservation, which

1 means that we should look at offsetting the economic cost to those communities that  
2 are impacted.

3           Let's see. I think the real economic costs to eastern Idaho, again, the  
4 long-term of washing the water down to increase flow when in fact the dams are  
5 more likely a solution. Again, if that's a continued policy and we still have to take the  
6 dams out, the cumulative cost of not making a decision now needs to be taken into  
7 consideration. And I don't think the study takes into account alternative B. If the  
8 recovery plan fails, we still have to take the dams out, and that has an economic cost  
9 of delaying a real decision. I think those -- that should probably be it. Actually, I had  
10 more, but --

11           MR. LARSEN: My name is Winston Larsen. I'm a first-generation  
12 farmer. I farm north of Idaho Falls in the Rexburg-Plano area. I represent -- am on  
13 the board of directors of two canals, the Roxanna Canal and the Consolidated Canal.  
14 My great-grandfather homesteaded, took sagebrush off the ground, tore down trees  
15 so that he could farm 160 acres. I'm deeply concerned about taking the dams out.

16           As I've studied the salmon, there's a serious problem with the warming  
17 of the ocean. The salmon have moved to other areas such as up to Alaska. And this  
18 is a problem that if you took the dams out, you'd still have warming of the ocean. I'm  
19 concerned with the predators that are eating the eggs that seriously cut down on the  
20 number of salmon that are available.

21           These are areas that thoroughly need to be studied before any  
22 consideration at all is given to breaching the dams. We need these reservoirs for  
23 water. We need them for dry years. Because in this area, for example, at least one  
24 out of four, we're out of water in the middle of summer without the reservoirs that we  
25 have to get the water to finish raising our crops, such as potatoes. I seriously

1 recommend that the Corps of Engineers study this salmon issue more thoroughly,  
2 giving consideration to getting rid of the predators that eat the salmon eggs and study  
3 thoroughly the warming of the ocean, because these are two problems that are  
4 affecting the amount of salmon that we have. And with the dams gone, it would not  
5 matter one bit in increasing the number of salmon that we have to fish and enjoy.  
6 Thank you.

7 MR. DIXON: My name is Brent Dixon. I was born on the Wallowa  
8 River in Enterprise, Oregon. My mother was born on the Imnaha River, also in  
9 northeastern Oregon, as was her father. And in fact, my great-grandfather was one  
10 of the first settlers of the region. He moved into the Wallowa valley in the 1860's, and  
11 they lived side by side with the Indians.

12 Everybody caught salmon. In my mother's generation, everybody  
13 fished, everybody caught salmon. In my generation, again, everybody fished until  
14 about 25 years ago. And I can't think of any of my cousins that have caught any  
15 salmon in the last 25 years. I have three sons. None of them has ever seen a  
16 salmon in the wild. That's what's happened to the salmon runs in northeastern  
17 Oregon and Idaho.

18 At the same time, though, the commercial fishing in the oceans and by  
19 Indian tribes along the Columbia River -- and I don't mean the substance where they  
20 eat what they catch, but I mean when they sell what they catch -- it's continued to this  
21 day. And you have a choice. You can either stop that commercial fishing now, both  
22 by big trawlers and by the Indians in the Columbia, or you can wait a few more years  
23 and there won't be enough fish left to do commercial fishing.

24 They say that they need that for their way of life. Well, their way of life  
25 is going to have to change. They can change it now and we can have fish 50 years

1 from now, or they can change it in ten or 20 years when we have no more fish to  
2 save. Thank you.

3 MR. WARD: My name is Welton Ward. I'm from Ladd, Idaho. I don't  
4 have any salmon down there, but I am very interested in the economy of the  
5 Northwest. My understanding of the salmon recovery at this present time, there are  
6 26 west coast streams listed as threatened or endangered. Eight more are  
7 candidates for listing. And only four of those streams fall on the lower Snake River,  
8 flow into the lower Snake River dams.

9 As far as the recovery process is concerned, according to the National  
10 Marine Fisheries Service, the smolt going into the Pacific Ocean today is the same as  
11 it was in 1960. So it isn't the process. The problem apparently is not the smolt  
12 getting into the ocean, it's the number of fish coming back from the ocean. Maybe  
13 we're looking at the wrong place for our salmon problem.

14 As far as the economic problems we could face, the lower Snake River  
15 dams produce 3,000 megawatts of power. That's enough to light 1.9 million homes.  
16 This is cheap, clean, power. Cheap in that it costs \$10 a megawatt to produce  
17 hydropower compared to \$45 per megawatt for coal-fired power. And we also  
18 remember that coal-fired power is dirty power.

19 Economically, the barge transportation that was provided by the four  
20 dams is also the cheapest, cleanest and most economical way of taking Idaho and  
21 Northwest products to the Pacific Ocean. One fortified barge tow can haul as much  
22 grain as 600 railcars or 2400 semi trucks. There is no positive proof that the dams  
23 are the culprit in diminishing salmon populations.

24 Perhaps some of the salmon or the dam breaching proponents are  
25 using salmon as a way of returning a free-flowing stream. That some people want --

1 the same kind of people that want to drain Lake Powell. I believe that we need to go  
2 on pure science, not on emotion. The testimonies I've been hearing tonight, most of  
3 them are emotion, not fact. I would encourage those who are involved in making  
4 these decisions to go by science, not emotion. Thank you.

5 MS. HANSEN: My name is Helen Hansen. I live over in Arco, Idaho,  
6 and I'm representing myself. For hundreds, probably thousands of years, our salmon  
7 have made it up and down a natural river with no problem. Then along comes  
8 humanity with their better ideas that we need dams on these rivers. And the fish  
9 haven't done so well, even with our great barging equipment.

10 To my amazement, there are those who want more scientific studies  
11 before a decision is made, no doubt in the hopes that they can study them to death.  
12 Even more amazing to me is the statement that we don't know that removing the  
13 dams will help them. They got along fine before in a natural river and they'll get  
14 along fine again in a natural river. I say the dams must go. Let's save our fish.  
15 Thank you.

16 MR. YOUNG: My name is Peter Young, and I'm from Lincoln, Idaho,  
17 and I'm here representing my family, my children and hopefully my grandchildren.  
18 The reasons for removing the dams are compelling to me, really quite overwhelming.  
19 The fact that they supply only five percent of the Northwest power, the fact that they  
20 provide no flood control nor are they a significant source of irrigation water, the fact  
21 that other attempts to save the salmon have cost billions and failed miserably, the  
22 fact that salmon sport fishing, more places to kayak and increased tourism would  
23 bring in millions to the area annually, the fact that the barge traffic could easily be  
24 replaced by rail.

25

1           There are existing rail lines all along the lower Snake River. And the  
2 fact that we would violate numerous treaties if we were to let the salmon become  
3 extinct all point to removing the dams.

4           But there are other reasons to breach as well, ones that can't be  
5 spelled out in statistics or dollars. We are all stewards of all that God has given us,  
6 the plants, the animals, everything. He saw fit to put salmon here. Do we really think  
7 our dams are more important than salmon that have been living in these rivers for  
8 ages and ages? And what does our support of these dams say about our  
9 stewardship of this earth? What does it say about our choices?

10           I wonder if we really realize the total insignificance of these dams when  
11 compared with the salmon. The salmon are an amazing gift; the dams a relic of  
12 government excess. Somewhere in an old federal building in some dusty office are  
13 the blueprints for these dams, the engineers' notes, the architects' sketches, but I  
14 dare you to find the blueprints for the salmon. We don't have them. We can't  
15 duplicate these awe-inspiring fish. We can't make them, and once they're gone,  
16 they're gone forever.

17           And if they do leave, what will you say to your children or grandchildren  
18 when they ask where the salmon went and why didn't you do anything to save them?  
19 Will you say you were too afraid to act or will you say you stood up for creation and  
20 did something? We in Idaho have a precious resource that very few other places in  
21 the world have in the salmon. Why in the world would we be willing to throw that gift  
22 away? You can't find these particular salmon anywhere in the world but here in  
23 these rivers. The dams are another story.

24           There are approximately 75,000 dams in the lower 48 states. I think we  
25 can survive with 74,996. I for one think Idahoans are strong, courageous people.



1 Removing these dams will take courage, but I believe we have it. Let's just hope our  
2 elected officials have the same kind of courage and foresight. I have my doubts, but  
3 I'd love to be proved wrong. Let's show everyone we have the courage to do what's  
4 right rather than take the easy road, do nothing and hope the problem will go away.  
5 It won't. Only the salmon will, and I don't want that to happen.

6 I cringe at the thought of being part of the generation that let the salmon  
7 become extinct. You see, years from now, no one will remember these obsolete  
8 dams. But if the salmon are gone, they will remember what we didn't do. The dams  
9 need to go.

10 MS. HECHATHORN: My name is Claire Ashton Hechathorn. I live in  
11 Idaho Falls. I direct this to USACE. Gentlemen, the four dams on the lower Snake  
12 River are like diaphragms on the river which prevent the distribution of life-giving  
13 materials to inland areas. It is in the best interest of the citizens of Idaho, as well as  
14 those of the greater Northwest, to allow the free flow of the Snake River in this area  
15 again. What will be affected and are these effects easily assimilated? Production of  
16 electricity will halt, but the wattage produced amounts to only four to five percent of  
17 that consume on going conservation methods can recover this reduction.

18 There will be no loss of irrigation water to farmers as these are flow-of-  
19 the-river dams. Farmers will only need to lengthen their intake pipes. Will we ever  
20 be able to recover use of these dams if national emergency warrants production of all  
21 power feasible? Yes, because only the earthen portions of these dams will be  
22 removed and reconstruction would be quite feasible.

23 There have been many disasters created in the United States by  
24 unchecked building and unsafe materials disposal. These problems will take many  
25

1 lifetimes, if ever, to correct, but by allowing free flow of the lower Snake River, we can  
2 recover from this particular era in our lifetime.

3           Let us exercise our stewardship of this waterway, its fish, animals and  
4 surrounding land responsibly, that our children and grandchildren will not be  
5 ashamed that we wasted part of their precious inheritance. Thank you. Claire  
6 Ashton.

7           MR. COLWELL: Okay. My name is Frederick Scott Colwell, also Rick  
8 Colwell. I live in Idaho Falls, Idaho. I was born in Portland, Oregon, went to school in  
9 Walla Walla, Washington, and I'm not affiliated with anybody except myself in this  
10 statement.

11           The conservation of Columbia Basin fish is a difficult decision. It will  
12 affect the lives of many people. However, it's important to note that humans are not  
13 in danger as a species. In fact, humans are responsible for the largest extinction in  
14 65 million years on this planet, and salmon are but one of the examples of this, the  
15 salmon in the Columbia Basin.

16           In fact, this country has terrific power as a role model. An example of  
17 this was the way in which we established our national parks, the first national parks  
18 ever established in the world, done solely to preserve land. This ended up  
19 representing a model for other countries in the world. Third world or developing  
20 countries such as Costa Rica have looked at us and seen how we've done that and  
21 used it as an example.

22           How can we ask other countries to make significant sacrifices to  
23 preserve their biological diversity if we must -- if we don't do the same. So in this  
24 sense, we must consider ourselves as role models, as leaders in this area, and be  
25 prepared to make similar sacrifices of inland use and resource use. So I strongly

1 endorse alternative D, to provide maximum protection for aquatic species of the  
2 Columbia Basin, and to demonstrate our national commitment to the preservation of  
3 species. Thank you.

4 (End of taped proceedings.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25