

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"

HOLIDAY INN AT THE AIRPORT
8439 NE COLUMBIA BOULEVARD
PORTLAND, OREGON
COLUMBIA CONFERENCE CENTER- JOHN Q. HAMMONS HALL

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION
FEBRUARY 3, 2000
2:30 P.M.

COURT REPORTER: SARAH THOMAS, RPR, RMR, CSR

RIDER & ASSOCIATES
COURT REPORTERS
P.O. Box 245
Vancouver, Washington 98666

THE MODERATOR: We are going to move into the oral testimony portion of this meeting now. If I could get my light helper out here. Let me tell you again what we are going to be doing for oral testimony. As you know, there were a number of different signup sheets up front. I am going to be taking number one from each sheet. What I will do is I will read the first three people so you can line up at your microphone.

And let me, for the folks that weren't here earlier, remind you that we will be using the light system. We have three minutes for each person to speak. Green means go, yellow means you have one minute left, and red means time to stop talking. We would really like to ask that you do indeed stop talking out of respect for the other folks that want to express their opinions, as well.

With regards to that, we are hoping to accommodate between probably -- at this point probably between 50 and 55 people today. I think we will actually get to everybody who signed up to speak. Again, as you know this meeting is being transcribed.

Please indicate whether you are commenting on the Corps EIS or the Federal Caucus All-H paper, or both. If you are not sure, we will do our best to figure that out and get it to the appropriate agency so they can review your comments. Also, please state your name and the name of the organization or agency that you are with, if any.

And at this point what I would like to do, if we are all set and ready to go here, is we will begin by allowing Senator Starr and Representative Bill, our elected officials, to have a brief word. Then I will move on to all the names. If I can let you know, we will start with Jeff Curtis, followed by Peter Huhtala, followed by Pat Reiten.

So Senator Starr, thank you.

SENATOR STARR: Thank you very much, gentlemen and ladies. It's been very interesting and, of course, it's a long and ongoing debate. I am State Senator Charles Starr from Western Washington County presently, serving on the State Interim Joint Committee on Species Recovery and Stream Restoration.

I really appreciate the effort and amount of science that's going into this. I am afraid that my biggest concern is the escapement of common sense. We many years ago made a commitment to the economic betterment of this region by installing on the Snake River four dams primarily for power generation; also, for the purposes of providing water for agriculture, recreation, and for fisheries.

I think that that was a good decision then and it's a good decision today, to keep those in place. Our future will demand more and more good, clean water. We need more storage; not less. We need to look at how we can manage this recovery program in ways that benefit the human population.

The people involved have to be the most significant part of the equation. Species are important, but the human species is God's dream in the management of those natural resources. Unless we look at how we can appreciate these things so that we maximize opportunities for the human population in this region, for our country, then we fail in what we accomplish.

And so that, to me, is the one part of the equation that somehow we're not aptly addressing. So I propose that we really look at what we want in this region as far as liveability. And the biggest part of that is opportunity for people to have jobs, high paying jobs.

And the agriculture of this region has done a tremendous job of feeding not only the United States, but a big part of the world. We must increase that production. To do that, we must have water.

I thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Jeff Curtis. I'm so sorry.

Mr. Bill. Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE BILL: Thank you. Don't start my time yet, because I was wondering about this panel, the federal part issue. And I would like to see us all come up and give orals instead of verbal written questions.

I do not agree with the barges and transportation. I agree with the fact that it is unsuccessful and that the science cannot be wrong. They have all agreed that transportation and barges doesn't work at all.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I know that for a fact, because they never return up river, where they come from. It's a large colony below Bonneville where there are lots.

We are all in this together. We share. It's not only for the tribe. It's for everything and everybody. And replenish their tables and their medicine to salmon.

Because they are medicine to us and they are very traditional to us. They are our culture and parents and drum songs, the salmon. All species of life is all sacred to us.

Thank you very much. I would like to start in with my talking points. The Umatilla Tribe have made a treaty with the United States government to have hunting and fishing rights, which is guaranteed to us.

We are a sovereign nation within a nation. We believe we are among the leading friends here. We are not your enemies.

A number of Columbia tribes have treaties with the United States and have been promised the rights to fish. And treaties have the promise that we can catch half the fish from fully productive rivers. The tribal fishing of Snake River dams is truly one percent of the amount of salmon that Indian tribes caught in 1855, below the Snake River Dam. The tribes have been catching ten percent of the number of fish being caught when the treaties were signed.

Salmon and other fish and wildlife are important to the tribal culture, and restoring the tribal economy, the physical and spiritual way of tribal people. We have been waiting for more than 140 years. We are tired of waiting.

The United States government, the Bonneville Power, should have a clear understanding of the obligation of the tribes in the Columbia basin.

A number of tribes have plans. Many of these plans call for the removal of several federal dams to restore the natural river. They also can -- they also call for restoration of habitat, the supplementation of salmon population by the Bonneville Power to make sure we restore salmon and steelhead.

And this is -- and we are working on -- we have a written thing about that TRP, salmon. This is our direction and our guidance instrument that we go by. And it's all in the name of recovery and salmon to come up to the headquarters. No blockade of dams and artificial barriers that man has created for the salmon.

We need the forest on the west side. You have the spotted owl on the west side of the state; on the other side, the salmon. We need the forest so they lay their eggs and they spawn there.

We would strongly like to be able to recover our salmon to sustainable harvest, not only for the tribe, but for everybody. We got support from our senators and congressmen from Oregon. We do not stand alone. We see we have many friends among you. We are not working uphill. We are working together.

That's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Jeff Curtis, followed by Peter, followed by Pat Reiten.

JEFF CURTIS: Thank you. My name is Jeff Curtis. I am the Western Conservation director for Trout Unlimited in American Rivers, which has over 110,000 members, including more than 8,000 in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska.

The region and the nation is confronted with a very important and difficult decision. Do we allow species that have existed over a million years to be eliminated by less than 200 years of unbridled human exploitation of salmon and habitats? Making the huge decision, the region needs to be guided by the best science and economic information available. Fortunately, that information is available.

Trout Unlimited in American Rivers have contracted with one of the region's most qualified experts on decision modeling. Dr. Ooserout (ph) is working with scientists. They have examined the work that provides much of the scientific basis for the DIH and LH documents.

What she has found is a series of major errors that compromise the science in those documents and, more importantly, the policy discussions related to the alternatives that have been presented to the region. She has exposed these errors in a document entitled "Seven Questions About the Columbia River Initiative," which we are entering into the record if I can do that now.

I will give it to you later. Got to keep rolling.

I do not have time to go into all the questions, obviously. Let me highlight one my colleague has presented up here.

The CRI chose a quasi distinction of threshold of one fish or fewer to analyze the risk of distinction. That threshold is virtually unheard of in conservation biology. It gives an overly optimistic view.

Dr. Ooserout has taken the same model that CRI has used, the Dennis model, and calculated the expected time to extinction using more commonly used quasi extinction thresholds. As you can see, the time changed dramatically when different values are used. You can see Marsh Creek goes from 40, 49 years with one fish or fewer, 15 fish at 6.6 years, and 50 fish at 2.2 years.

Actually, the prospect for extinction is even gloomier than that table, as the CRI has done other things to the data that leads to optimistic projections, as well. On that chart Marsh Creek fish are already extinct on the CRI definition, having had less than one fish returned in 1999, having zero fish.

In contrast to the CRI science, we are also entering into the record a study by one of the region's scientists, Phil Mundy. The spring-summer chinook will be functionally extinct: Dr. Mundy's projections seem to be far more accurate. The point is not that the CRI is wrong. The point is the agency is making decisions with the best scientific and economic evidence available.

We call on the National Marine Fishery Service to respond to the seven questions. We also call on the Federal Caucus to choose the alternative that is based on this science.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much, Jeff. Next.

/

MR. HUHTALA: My name is Peter Huhtala. I am the executive director of the Columbia Deepening Opposition Group from Astoria, Oregon. I would like to offer testimony today on the All-H paper that is the Federal Caucus.

You are going to hear a lot about dams this afternoon. I personally have no doubt that breaching those four lower Snake River dams is going to improve the survival rates of the species of the Snake River salmon using them.

However, right now I would like to direct your attention to the other end of the Columbia River basin, the lower miles of the river, which we call the Columbia River estuary. Mr. Stehl has pointed out estuary survival is one of the aspects of habitat that is being considered under the four H paper. Right now I want to call your attention, again, to the urgency of the devastation that is planned for that very lab at that time.

Every species of salmon that uses the Snake River, every species of salmon that uses any river in the entire quarter million cubic yard watershed of the Columbia River drainage passes through the Columbia River estuary twice in their lifetime, if they manage. So the importance of the estuary is becoming more evident and folks down river certainly find it very evident.

The Corps of Engineers has a project that's poised, ready to go, almost, that would devastate this lower river. It's the most aggressive assault on the lower river that has ever been planned for the Columbia. Over a period of two to two and a half years over two million cubic -- two million dump truck loads of sediment will be rearranged from that river, put back in the river, piled back up on the islands that attract the Caspian Tern, and continually process -- I am talking day and night, night and day, every season -- assaulting every single run of salmon on this river.

And if we don't halt this project, we are going to have so many fewer salmon to barge. Please consider the best way to save the salmon of the Snake River.

Thanks.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Next up is Pat Reiten, followed by Donald Sampson, followed by Bruce Lovelin.

Rider & Associates

Pat Reiten?

MR. REITEN: Right here. Thanks.

Hi. My name is Pat Reiten. I am here to represent PNGC Power. It's an economic power services corporation that represents small to medium size utilities spread across the northwest. PNGC and its system serve a number of areas, actually, you're going to be in, that you will visit over the course of all the comment period.

We would like to thank you for the extensive public comment period. I guess, also, I should offer my condolences, too.

I am here today because PNGC is so closely tied to these rural areas. We care deeply about the issues before you today. Oddly enough, we remain optimistic the region can come together behind a plan to recover the salmon and steelhead run.

How can we optimistic? We have already seen great improvements with regard to the hydro part of the complex problem. Our customers are paying almost half a billion dollars through the BPA rates to achieve those improvements. How many people realize 95 percent of juvenile salmon successfully pass these dams similar before dams were built on the Snake River? The draft biological assessment outlines some of the methods used to achieve these results. Surface bypasses, intake screens, a focus on predation.

We also need to eliminate measures that do not help run. In addition to reducing the chance of damaging fish due to gas bubbles, lessening those spills that have the effect of freeing up scarce dollars for more effective projects, that makes sense.

I hope you will take into account cost effectiveness, because we know if you don't, Congress will. Another reason for encouragement is we were starting to hear more and more people talk about clarifying our goals here. What type of recovery are we trying to achieve? Which fish are we trying to save? What do we do about conflicting goals found in other laws that protect other species?

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Clear goals and accurate measurement of progress towards these goals is the only way we can reassure. Towards that end, we note that draft performance measures and standards outside in the appendices to the All-H paper and in the biological assessment are a first step in that much needed direction. It won't be easy to find standards that really work. Creating measurement and integrating them is well worth the effort.

We need goals and accountability. Without them we won't make any real progress. Regional interests will continue to point fingers at each other and try to grasp that one magical solution without really knowing what to do.

Thanks very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Pat. We can move on to Donald Sampson, followed by Bruce Lovelin, followed by Mike McHam. I apologize now if I mispronounce anybody's names.

MR. SAMPSON: It's Sampson. You did good. Thank you.

I just wanted to make a few brief comments. Particularly, we are here -- I am a representative of the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, which represents the four treaty tribes on the Columbia; the Yakima, Warm Springs, Umatilla and Nez Perce.

First of all, we have to take comprehensive approaches to salmon restoration. It's very clear and simple. We have subjects in the Columbia basin areas, like Umatilla, where we need to learn from.

Very clearly, our position has been with the dams, and particularly the four lower Snake dams, and hydro is that the biological choice is clear. Breaching is required.

At the same time, the tribes support mitigation, economic and social mitigation, in the communities because we know what the impacts are. The tribal people have been affected for years and years and years by the loss of salmon to our people. We know that all these people are here to represent that salmon means jobs. Salmon means a lot of things to a lot of people in the Pacific Northwest.

The second thing is, the administration needs to make a clear decision here with regard to breaching. They need to be prepared to move into the engineering for that.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

The second H we want to talk about is hatcheries. We need to use hatcheries appropriately to help rebuild salmon runs. We also need to protect wild fish populations.

The third H, of course, is habitat. Federal lands have to be on the table. There has to be accountable, measurable standards for protection of habitat on federal lands. The Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan is not going to do it. It has to be stronger.

We also have to restore habitat in degraded areas.

And fifth, we have to be able to have abundant space for harvest management.

So those are the four H's we are talking about. Many people talk about the fifth H, which is the human H. That's what a lot of these people are here to represent.

We have to make the right decisions now, because our future generations are going to wait and see if we leave the legacy that we need to. That's salmon in these streams.

So I ask the administration to make the right decision. We applaud the decision that Fish and Wildlife Service has made in looking at the science. Let's keep the science up on the table. Let people review it. Let's keep the economics up on the table. The Corps environmental impact statement, make sure you look at what the impact has been and will be to tribal people.

The last thing is, the tribe will use our legal basis to do whatever we need to do to restore salmon to the Columbia.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Bruce Lovelin, followed by Mike McHam.

MR. LOVELIN: My name is Bruce Lovelin. I am the executive director of the Columbia River Alliance. I am going to speak as quickly as I can here because of the three minutes allotted to speak.

Our group, the Columbia River Alliance, represents river user groups dependent on the Columbia River system. Clearly, it's been our goal from day one to recover the salmon and recover them in a way which maintains the economic viability of the Columbia River system. I think that can happen.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

One of the central issues in this whole issue -- I am going to talk about the All-H paper plus the Lower Snake River Feasibility Study. But the central theme missing in this whole effort has been science. It has.

I know that we were unable to come up with a scientific recommendation, a scientific recommendation on does dam breaching help salmon or not. And what I have in my handout here is playing back the science that you folks have put in this Lower Snake River Feasibility Study.

If you read the science, I think it's very clear. You ask yourself, all these folks are out here saying dam breaching is the answer. It's an emotional plea. It's very devoid of scientific merit.

Now, on your own document you talk about transportation. Does transportation work? You say very clearly over 25 years' worth of study, transportation does work. In most cases it has between a two to three time ratio over fish left in river.

You have other comments that have been made. One of them is survival, increased water survival, water travel time. Time out. When is increased water particle travel time from dam breaching going to help salmon?

Well, your answers are, well, no. The Pintag (ph) studies of the last couple of years have shown that there is no relationship between flow and travel time and survival for spring chinook.

You also talk about in your study and you give ten very good reasons why dam breaching could be the final solution for salmon recovery. And that means that in the two-year to five-year period of which we are going to be implementing dam breaching we are going to cause massive sediment to move down stream. We are going to be disrupting the habitat for steelhead and fall chinook, the whole variety of species.

The bottom line, I think, comes from your CRI and your PATH analysis. Let me read your PATH analysis. This indicates that if adverse transport efforts in the future are closer to or better than most recent information, then there is little overall statistical advantage to this dam breaching relative to NMFS recovery criteria. That's even PATH. PATH was out there as the deep scientific support for dam breaching.

Rider & Associates

They are not there, folks. I really admire Mr. Stehl -- don't let the record show this. I admire Mr. Stehl in terms of the All-H paper. It's the right thing to do. We knew it in 1995, 1999, and now.

Let's move forward with an All-H program. Let's show leadership to get dam breaching off the table.

We have two options in front of us. One option is to study dam breaching for five more years. Or the other option is discard it. Let's discard it and move on to more meaningful cooperative measures to help salmon. I think we will get the job done.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mike McHam, followed by Scott Yates, followed by Tom Backman.

Mike McHam? No Mike McHam.

Let's move on then to Scott Yates, followed by Tom Backman, followed by Jay Formick.

MR. YATES: My name is Scott Yates. I am a member of Trout Unlimited. I work for the Western Conservation Office in Portland. I am going to talk briefly today in general terms regarding our comments to the economic components of the Corps' EIS.

At this time Eco Northwest is working on more in-depth comments, and we will get you those as soon as we can. We have three comments regarding the economic appendices.

First, the Corps has underestimated economic impact by excluding impacts associated with quality of life and liveability here in the Pacific Northwest. For your review, and in part of my written comments today, I am going to submit a couple studies for the record.

Basically, we see removing the lower Snake dams as a way of restoring unique national resource. And jobs and income will be attracted to the resource to see this resource and live near this resource. The Corps excluded these impacts from their analysis and, therefore, underestimated the potential positive impact associated with dam removal.

The second, the Corps' EIS overestimates the negative economic of removal. The agency does this by assumptions on the input and output analysis. This provides a mere snapshot of an economy at one point in time, in this case 1994.

Rider & Associates

The fundamental flaw in this case is that the economies, whether local, regional, or national scale, are not static and continue to evolve. The Corps' economic analysis does not allow for consideration for important international and natural resources. Mr. Stehl's conservation plan, in turn, impacts the economic consequences of this addition.

Further, the Corps' analysis does not minimize losses or capitalize on new opportunities.

Finally, the Corps' Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement considers economic losses and costs that are easily quantified. However, culture and tribal impacts and cost benefits are more difficult to quantify or deemphasize. The Corps' analysis of impacts is based on principles and guidelines that were recently reviewed by the National Research Counsel and found to have significant flaws. The Corps must respond to these criticisms and amend their approach to insure more complete analysis.

Tribal Unlimited appreciates the chance to comment. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Tom Backman, followed by Jay Formick, followed by Bob Rees.

MR. BACKMAN: Hello. Thank you very much. And I welcome this opportunity. I am Dr. Tom Backman. I am a conservation scientist who has been dealing with these kind of restoration issues now since the early seventies. And I also do research in the main stem Columbia River. I am speaking in my own words here today.

I am pleased to see the government reducing the number of heads to, I guess, two. I would like to point out that the -- well, the sign out there said the Government Caucus and the Corps of Engineers, so that's two.

The science is pretty clear on this issue. I would like to point out that I am going to use the word restoration rather than protection, because we want to restore the salmon habitat. Protection is a part of that. We need to protect what is left, but to restore to get back to where we were.

The All-H is kind of a temporary, somewhat justifiable breakup of the salmon life history. We must always focus on that life history.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

For example, when we talk about the hydro system and the breaching of the four dams, it's not just to bring Snake River -- upper Snake River salmon down to the estuary and out. It also recovers the habitat those fish have to use and also brings back spawning habitat. That helps to restore things like fall chinook.

There is a restoration comment that seems to be overlooked here. So the science is clear on this. And although I spent all these years developing myself as a scientist, I found out I would have known science better if I majored in law. That's what I've learned.

On economics, I think that's kind of a myth. I mean, look at our society. Look at what we spend. Millions -- we have a trillion dollar economy. There are a few thousand people that talk about maybe being displaced. But our society does not promise us anything in terms of jobs or growth or debt.

But we did make a promise to the tribes. We said in our treaties that their cultures were an important and valuable commodity. Their cultures are dependent on salmon and good habitat, and the elk and the deer and the bears, and all those things. We said we wanted their culture to be here and we said we want to share this with them.

And the federal government, it sounds to me, following the lead of the Department of Energy, is finally admitting that it has done harm. And it is time to undo some of that harm. Part of that can be done in breaching of dams.

There are more than four alternatives. Those are the only four you guys are considering. The breaching could be done in various scenarios and different ways. I think you need to be open minded to some other various ways if those are the only four you can see.

We ought not to be worried about the economics. We will find a way to help these people that are displaced.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Dave Formick, followed by Bob Rees, followed by Bob Bernert.

MR. FORMICK: Good afternoon. I am Jay Formick. These are comments directed for the benefit of the EIS, as well as the All-H process.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I am the executive director an independent nonprofit organization that helps low income Oregonians in paying their bills during heating season, I am chair of the League of Utilities and Social Services, I am secretary of the Advisory on Energy for the Oregon Department of Housing Services, and I have served on a national board that looks at energy issues for low income people all across the nation.

I participated in the public purposes working group during the regional review process and assisted with the development of economic deregulation in the State of Oregon. I am a citizen of Canby, Oregon, which is served by a municipal utility. I know something about electricity.

As you can tell, I might claim to represent any number of constituents within the State and subject of these hearings. I am here to speak for a larger constituent than the large constituents that attach themselves to my many activities.

This is my 18-year-old daughter, Jacqueline. That's the constituent I wanted to address. That's the one I want to represent to you today. I am here to protect her interests in this issue. She has not shared with me her opinions on the disposition of salmon species, the price of electricity, or economic development in this region. Nevertheless, I consider it my responsibility to safeguard the national treasures that are as much her birthright as they were mine when I was her age.

You will hear from highly credible people a great deal about the science and economics supporting returning the Snake to a free flowing river. After considering all that I ever read on the subject, including the publications of all your agencies and publications of those who would like to keep the dams in their place, I am convinced the benefits of removing the dams are worth the risk and expense this region must endure.

If we don't take that action, I feel there is extinction in the future, period. And the economic and political fallout of that will be far worse than anything considered from taking the dams down.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Three generations of my family living in Oregon and Washington are consumers of the low cost hydro power generated in Clark by the lower Snake River dams. We do not take this benefit for granted. However, we are more dedicated to pre- serving Jacqueline's birthright than saving a few bucks on our electric bills.

We urge you to serve the people of this region by adopting a salmon recovery plan with the surest chances of success. Those dams don't make sense.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Bob Rees, followed by Bob Bernert, followed by Dr. Sarah Stebbins.

MR. REES: Hello. I am going to comment on the All-H paper.

THE MODERATOR: Can you state your name?

MR. REES: My name is Bob Rees. I am a full-time fishing guide in Oregon. I derive close to half of my yearly income from the lower Columbia River. I am here today to try and show the light to the National Marine Fishery Service and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Sport anglers, fishing guides, charter boat operators, commercial trollers, commercial dead headers, Native Americans, boat dealers, tackle distributors and manufacturers, motel operators, gas station owners, coastal communities, and our own Department of Fish and Wildlife are gathered in mass here today. We are here for one reason and one reason only. Our federal government must stop the scapegoating.

User groups will no longer point the blame to each other for the decline of our valuable salmon resources. We don't need to. The problem is too plain and simple to blame each other anymore.

Dams kill fish. We also know that dams provide economy. But those economies have been thriving off the Columbia River for close to a century, while our fish runs and the families that they support go down the toilet.

Yes, we are worried for our jobs. We are even worried for the jobs of the farmers and barge owners. But we are more worried for the fish. Science has proven time and time again what the problem is.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Why is the federal government still scapegoating the issue? Is it because of political fear of the Columbia River industries? Look around. Would you call this sport industry? How about a three billion dollar a year industry?

We have taken our hits. The federal government has had fish closures for decades on the Columbia River spring and summer chinook. Are the numbers on the increase? No. They are at near extinction levels. We have the dams to thank for that.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers barging, no, that didn't work. Cut back on active production and harvest levels, and destroy a multi billion dollar industry. The government says maybe. We say no.

Breach the dams and restore scores of miles of spawning habitat. Return the river to a free flowing status, creating a faster, safer migration to the ocean and no turbines to negotiate. Fish don't negotiate turbines. They get turned into bird food by turbines. Breaching the dams makes sense.

We say yes. The government says cut harvests and cut hatchery production. Please listen to your scientists. Listen to your people. Breach the dams. Save the salmon. Stop the scapegoating.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Bob Bernert, followed by Sarah Stebbins, followed by Harold Blackwolf.

MR. BERNERT: I am Bob Bernert with Bob Bernert Barge Lines. And I am supposed to respond to a 4,000 page environmental impact statement in three minutes, which is pretty difficult.

But one of the major concerns I had in reading the Environmental Impact Statement was the sediment problem. One hundred fifty million tons of sediment are now deposited behind the dams and are accumulating four million tons a year. By the time the dams will be removed, we will have over 200 million tons of sediment.

On page 5.34 of the report it states that 50 percent of the sediment will wash out in the first three years perhaps. This is all estimates. But that would mean the river would be carrying ten times or a thousand percent more sediment than it normally carries.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

That's my big concern. I question whether any fish could survive, even the carp. I wonder if any fish could survive in this three-year mud flow. They are certainly going to very likely annihilate the salmon runs in this first three-year mud flow period.

Another one of my concerns in the report regards recreation. The Corps of Engineers has constructed many dams throughout the United States.

Is there any incidence where recreational use of the water ways did not increase after the dam was installed? Why does the Corps believe recreation will increase with dam removal?

There was no recreation vessels on this stretch of the Snake River before dam construction, except by me. I made a few trips and never passed a soul on a 140-mile trip. I was the only one.

Another thing that really concerns me is chapter five of the Corps of Engineers' draft. It had so many conjectures such as, "it may still be," "results are dependent on assumptions," "it may be caused," "may be lower," "could be," "for assumptions used," "four sets of assumptions considered," "more likely be," "mortality hypotheses," "it may," "it is unknown," "analysis indicates," "dependent on assumptions."

I mean, it just goes on and on. And it just scares the bejeebes out of me to read so many guesses involved in what may happen if we remove the dams and what will happen.

We have -- at the present time we just have too many unknowns, we are taking too many guesses to consider moving ahead on dam removal at this time. I consider the consequences of dam removal could be disaster for all of us.

Is that a red light there?

THE MODERATOR: There is a red light, I am sorry to tell you. Goes quickly, doesn't it? Thank you very much.

Sarah Stebbins, followed by Harold Blackwolf, followed by Terry Courtney, Jr.

MS. STEBBINS: Good afternoon. I am Dr. Sarah Stebbins, president of the Earth and Spirit Council. I want to explain who we are and why we are concerned about the Columbia River and Snake River salmon recovery issue.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Earth and Spirit Council is a non-profit educational, non-sectarian organization of religious, spiritual leaders and environmentally concerned citizens educating and engaging ourselves and others. We have been following the salmon recovery debate and are encouraged by what we perceive is a greater level of acceptance for including a spiritual perspective in the discussions of the Columbia River-Snake River basin.

The issues of important biological and political dimensions have been well addressed. The spiritual dimension, however is, missing. This perspective cannot be captured in cost benefit analysis, probability modeling exercises, or engineering studies.

Appendix N of the draft EIS correctly states that, "Native Americans in particular believe that there is a close physical and spiritual interrelationship between humans and nature." We know that this perspective is acknowledged by other faith traditions, as well.

We believe that the Columbia and Snake River watersheds should be viewed as a sacred shared ecosystem. We, therefore, make the following comments and four more recommendations.

Number one, we support the Federal Caucus five goals for a regional fish recovery plan listed in the All-H paper. We are particularly pleased that the paper clarifies the ultimate goal; species recovery and long-term survival, rather than avoiding extinction of threatened or native species. We categorically reject the misleading statement that preserving a small number of salmon or steelhead for each evolutionary unit, ESU, is sufficient.

Two, we believe that the region should look for a comprehensive solution. There are no silver bullets and no single action will be sufficient. In the same way the ecosystem is composed of interconnected parts, so too must the solution address all of the interconnected parts of the problem. Attention must focus on habitat, hatcheries, harvest, hydro power lifestyle and land use practices all along the Columbia River-Snake River watershed.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

We believe removing the four lower Snake River dams is part of the solution. We know there is less political support for dam removal. That does not mean dam removal will have a more severe impact on human population.

Finally, we believe that the region's ability to preserve its low cost hydro power from the Columbia River basin is linked closely to our success in saving the fish and wildlife. Other regions of the country believe that they should share the benefits of this low cost resource or that everyone should pay higher market. So far we have quieted our critics and our region has supported funding for additional purposes.

On this point we agree with Governor John Kitzhaber if the Northwest does not propose a regional solution for fish and power, these issues will be decided for us. We strongly urge you and your regional leaders to consider the broader and larger leadership on this issue.

We thank you for your time and appreciate the opportunity to present.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Harold Blackwolf, followed by Terry Courtney, Jr., followed by Zephyr Moore.

MR. BLACKWOLF: Good afternoon, friends and relatives. My name is Harold Blackwolf, senior chairman of the Fish and Wildlife Committee Warm Springs, one of the commissioners of Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission. I am speaking as a tribal member of Warm Springs.

I have been a fisherman for close to 38 years. As a kid, I caught my first salmon at the age of 12. I fish in streams on the reservation, streams throughout the State of Washington and Oregon, which I would like my kids and grandkids to do, too.

Our creator placed salmon here to be a benefit to the people. The Indians fishing on the Columbia River voluntarily ceased fishing on the summer chinook in '64 and spring chinook in '77 and sockeye in 1988. Those runs of fish have not increased.

The tribes have already done without, already sacrificed. All mortalities of fish needed to be listed under harvest, predatory, dams or otherwise. Recovery burdens need to be shared equally. Hydro mortality is 80 percent. Harvest is four percent. Habitat for fish needs to be restored for our salmon. When habitat is fit for fish, for fish recovery, it will be fit for everything else, too.

The habitat needs to be preserved and protected. Before any dams were built on the Columbia or the Snake Rivers the fish numbered in the million. Common sense tells us, take out some dams; habitat improves. Fish will have a better chance of recovery.

Federal government needs to live up to its treaty obligations, implement a plan that will include a goal, four million fish within 25 years. If the federal government doesn't have a plan, then the tribes do; a plan that will work not only on the reservation, but all streams throughout our region for everyone; not just the Indian.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Terry Courtney, followed by Zephyr Moore, followed by Glen Stonebrink.

MR. COURTNEY: Good afternoon. My name is Terry Courtney, Jr. I am from the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, member of the CRITFC Commission.

I will speak to you as just a traditional person that fishes off a platform, a way of life I didn't really know until I was 36 years old. One that I would never give up.

Treaties and dams. The bands of the native people that lived in their respective areas of the Oregon territory could see that their lands were to be lost to the invading horde of immigrants. Word came to the native people that the people wanted all of their lands. Some of the leaders said: Fight to the death until we are all gone. Our way of life is to be no more.

The native people needed to make a good decision that would protect the young ones and unborn for years to come. The decision made by the Indians and the U.S. Government, not the individual states, was that the native people would retain their exclusive rights to hunt, to fish and harvest their various roots in their usual and accustomed places. The trade was 40 million acres of land. No blood shed.

At one time there was between nine to 16 million fish in the Columbia River. Now maybe a few thousand struggle for their existence. The federal government is breaking its treaty promises made in good faith with the tribes. Now that the agreement is being broken with our treaties, will the Indians now take back their land, Portland, Pendleton, The Dalles, Tri-Cities?

The easier fix is to simply restore the salmon as promised. Hatchery supplemental, monitored flows, breaching the four dams on the Snake River. Quit studying the fish and join the tribes in their hampered efforts to help society recover the streams and fish.

The tribes have been left completely out of any decision making in fish recovery. We had lived in harmony for a few thousand years and the salmon were still there. We are tired of empty nests, empty promises and empty streams.

The tribal employment for the four tribes that I represent is 20 percent. During the winter months it's 56 percent plus.

Speaking for myself, I thank you very much for the opportunity to testify. And please don't let money be the main issue in your decision.

THE MODERATOR: Thank You.

Zephyr Moore, followed by Glen Stoneblink, followed by Jim Martin.

MR. MOORE: My name is Zephyr Moore of Portland, Oregon. I speak for the salmon because they don't have vocal cords. Of course, if they had vocal cords, we would all be deaf from their screams, the raping of their habitat.

The uplands, which feed water to our streams, are very well degraded. The Bureau of Land Management a few years ago noted that grazing -- or primarily due to livestock grazing, riparian areas were in their worst condition in history.

Rider & Associates

Lewis and Clark, in their journeys they state in their journal about a river in Boseman, Montana, say, "I attempted to proceed on through the river bottoms, which were several miles wide. I crossed several channels of the river running through the bottom in different channels, all of which were dammed with beaver, rendering passage impractical.

After being swamped in these bottoms of beaver, made my way to an island.

I proceeded up this island four miles across the main channel of the river. The river is much divided and all the small streams in irremovable quantities of beaver dams, although the river is yet navigable for canoes."

That's a fantasy I've never seen. I was in John Day just shortly last summer. There are cows walking along the John Day River just chewing up the land. And we need to restore the watersheds. Grazing, it's incredibly horrible what's happening to the watershed because of that.

So we need to restore the watershed. I am speaking, I guess, in regard to the H side of this thing.

And I also have written a report. I am about on page 80. It's all on the word processor. Please make note, audience, my phone number is (503) 287-1224. 287-1224. Please ask me for this report. I've got about 80 different ways that pollutants can be reversed into the Willamette and Columbia Rivers in Portland, from Portland everywhere.

So please restore the habitat. That's where the salmon get it all done.

By the way, I wrote the report in the 1996 voters pamphlet. Salmon have sex once in their life. So we got to have habitat. They only get one shot at this whole thing. They got to have a habitat just right. Just right.

Thanks.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Glen Stoneblink, and then Jim Martin, and then after Jim is Fred Weber.

MR. STONEBLINK: Thank you. My name is Glen Stoneblink. I am the executive director of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association. I just want to address dam breaching or dam removal organization.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

In the 1999 session of the Oregon Legislature we introduced Senate Bill 987, which basically says dams or reservoirs can only be removed from the waters of this state with the approval of the legislature. The legislature approved that. The governor vetoed it. We wanted the representatives of the people to be able to help make that decision before any of these dams or reservoirs were removed.

My rationale I used in arguing with the legislature was simple. Went to the archives of the Corps of Engineers and I found the Declaration of Policy Act of 1944. And I quote from that.

"In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the rivers of the nation through the construction of works of improvement for navigation or flood control, it is hereby the policy of Congress to recognize the interest and rights of the state in determining the development of the watersheds within the State's borders and, likewise, their inherited interest and rights in water utilization and control. Plans for management and construction shall be submitted to the State. Construction shall not conflict with beneficial uses as determined by the State for such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining and industrial purposes."

My point is this. If it's the policy of Congress to obtain agreement with the state prior to construction of dams on the waters of the state, there should, likewise, be an inherent right of the state to approve or disapprove of dam removal.

I call on you to adhere to the intent of Congress by obtaining the approval of the people of the state through their legislative process before any dams might be removed.

Now I want to veer slightly from my prepared statement in the time that I have left to address cattle grazing along streams. We just have some good science for a change from Oregon State University, where they have control areas where there's intense cattle grazing and where there is absolutely no cattle grazing on streams.

They found there is no significant difference. The cattle that are supposedly harming all of the rivers, the salmon nests and so on, they found after a two-year study that they were able to find one hoof print in one of the beds, but that, actually, salmon and cattle get along quite nicely.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Jim Martin, followed by Fred Weber, followed by Laura Berg.

MR. MARTIN: Hi. I'm Jim Martin, a pure fisherman. I am a recently retired fisheries biologist with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for 30 years. I participated in the NMFS settlements in 1995, when the federal government promised the Corps and all the plaintiffs that interim measures would be followed in 1999 by a long-term strategic recovery strategy.

I remember clearly Judge Marsh's words admonishing the federal government for minor politically acceptable adjustments to the hydro system when the system literally cried out for major overhaul. One of the results of that 1995 deliberation was a commitment to collaborative science, and that led to the PATH analysis.

To this day, the PATH analysis is the more collaborative opinion. The PATH analysis suggests that only through breaching the four lower Snake dams can all the species listed on the Columbia and Snake be recovered. I agree with that, and the vast majority of knowledgeable, independent scientists agree, as well.

Now, most knowledgeable scientists understand that breaching the four lower Snake dams will not be a silver bullet. It will need to be supplemented by substantial water quality improvements, improvements in habitat which were degraded, migration habitat improvements, continued habitat adjustments. But the breaching is an indispensable center point.

NMFS would have us believe by improving fresh water habitat, restricting fisheries and hatcheries, salmon numbers would increase.

With regard to Snake River spring-summer chinook, the remaining habitat is in at least as good a shape as in the '60s and most prestige habitat almost devoid. Harvest was a problem the last 30 to 40 years. The most estuary independent fish, like the fall chinook, the river fall chinook, many of the other stocks that relied far more on the estuaries wouldn't show such shrinkage.

It's the Snake River dams that caused the move in a rapid arc toward extinction. Fifteen years ago Aldo Leopold said that the first law of intelligent tinkering is save all the pieces. Boiled down, that means avoid irretrievable decisions. Avoid irretrievable consequences. Be risk adverse.

If there is doubt about this analysis, make the risk adverse decision. The future of the Columbia is more development, more intensive water use, global climate change. These fish don't have -- these fish don't have a bright future.

We cannot afford not to make good decisions now. If we lose these fish, how we going to explain this to our kids?

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Fred Weber, followed by Laura Berg, followed by Joyce Cohen.

MR. WEBER: Fred Weber. I represent no particular group. Fish ladders on dams need some resting pools but -- for about every 30 feet in rise in elevation. Removal of the sand islands on the lower Columbia River that were not there in 1933.

There is two good places to put all this sand. One of them is the government island in close proximity to PDX for their third runway. The other part after the year 2004 might be a little sand for the Ross Island. Reduce the number of Caspian Terns, also, on the lower Columbia River to the number that were there in 1933.

Insofar as barging and fish is concern, barges ought to be covered with some netting so that some birds don't snack on too much. At the point in which the fish are collected in the barges the water temperature is probably a little bit cooler than it is at the point of discharge. The water needs to be warmed up a little bit.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

There is about 3,000 megowatts of power in these four dams. They may come in handy when another two million people move into the three state area of Oregon, Washington and Idaho by the year 2020.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Laura Berg, Joyce Cohen, followed by Captain Mike Simonsen.

MS. BERG: Hi. I am Laura Berg. I had the privilege of working with the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission for almost 18 years.

I am now a private consultant. And most recently I have had the privilege of working for the Department of Defense on cultural resource issues.

My statement is simple. We must help save Columbia River salmon. Why? Because it is morally and legally the right thing to do. It is our responsibility.

The tribes signed treaties with the United States -- that means us, us citizens -- to secure not only their home lands, but the right to fish at all usual and accustomed places. We must honor that commitment.

Also, salmon have the right to exist. They are a species, just like we are, and they have a right and a place in this basin.

Additionally, this is a legacy we want to leave for our children, for our species in the future, that this would be a place that supports salmon. And I think that we can accomplish this.

Most of the scientists in the region say that we will have to breach the dams in order to do this. I think we can do this. We are the most prosperous country in the world. We can afford to make this change.

But we are going to need to do more than that. We are going to have to look at habitat issues. Maybe that's our long-term real challenge. But there is a great deal of promise in that approach. We are also going to have to use hatcheries. We made quite a mess of things. I think we are going to have to use them as a tool in the short term. We are going to have to make more changes at the dams. We are going to have to provide more flow.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Fourth, I think you've already gotten what you can out of harvest except for maybe some places in the ocean. And as the Warm Springs gentleman reported, the tribes have already quit fishing commercially on three species. And we haven't achieved any recovery based on that.

You are not going to get it out of harvest. I think that is, in fact, an immoral and illegal approach to take, at least when you are talking about the tribes.

And I just want to say that politically this may be a very difficult decision. But I urge you to ask yourself, does your decision, does this path you are going to take, does it have a heart, before you really sign off on an approach. And I pray that you will have the courage to make the right decision.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Joyce Cohen, when followed by Captain Mike Simonsen, followed by Jeff Fryer.

MS. COHEN: Hi there. I am Joyce Cohen, the Governor's water quality coordinator for the Columbia River. I am here today to present more general comments on the 4-H paper -- the All-H paper -- excuse me -- and some specific comments to those appendices that were included under that as to how they address water quality. We will submit comments on the EIS draft in a much more detailed way later on.

The document -- and when I speak of "the document," I mean the All-H paper -- states that we are here to develop a conceptual recovery plan. The region has operated for the last five years on a conceptual recovery plan. We are going to urge you, what we need to do is get to a firm plan that will recover the fish in actuality.

We are here to say the time is running out. The region must have a comprehensive strategy that includes actual recovery of fish population. The document, as it's prepared today, does not provide the region with enough information to have that debate. So we are urging you to come forward with some detailed information that will support analysis of all of the considerations as posed by the Federal Caucus.

We also believe that the goals that you have laid out, broad goals, are acceptable and they appear to be broad enough. The paper also lacks any quantifiable figures to inform the region when we would get to recovery. We are asking you to come with some specifics in that area.

The general concerns over the inclusion of the Clean Water Act in your documents stem from our concern over the lack of urgency on behalf of the federal government in meeting its own Clean Water Act for the Columbia River. You have heard that from us.

The Clean Water Act requires not just an accumulation of measurement, but a process to determine the total daily load of listed pollutants that exceed clean water standards. It also encompasses development of a management plan with milestones with responsible parties of the river. Measures are required to meet the standards, those being the states and the tribes.

The federal government, through its management of the main stem recovery Columbia River habitat, has an obligation to assume its responsibilities under the Clean Water Act. We don't find those intentions anywhere in the All-H paper. We would urge that you amend your paper and include that as an obligation.

The states, the tribes and private and public entities are at considerable -- and at considerable expense are on track with time lines for accomplishing Clean Water Act responsibilities on the tributaries in the basin. The federal government must step up with funding and similar commitment to achieve the Clean Water Act standards in the main stem.

We ask you to go ahead and support. We do support the appendix that includes the Corps commitment to modifying the McKenzie River's Cougar Dam to address temperature problems and would encourage you to make those modifications as quickly as you can.

With that, I will submit the additional comments in writing.
Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Dr. Mike Simonsen, followed by Jeff Fryer, followed by Sally Nunn.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

DR. SIMONSEN: Good afternoon, ladies, Colonel, sir, light keeper, neighbors and friends, brothers and sisters. Let's take a moment here and call the Columbia River system the trunk. Let's call these people sitting over here branches, these folks over here the leaves. We have all the way up to Lewiston, Idaho.

If we go down that trail of breaching the dams, what we have to remember here is why we all live here, why the population has quadrupled in the last five decades, if we go down the frame of breaching dams. I am with the Coalition of Responsible River Users, the masters, mates and pilots. It doesn't matter who you are. It's what you do.

I'm fourth generation commercial fisherman here on the Columbia River system. My greatgrandfather is one of the keepers of the Potomac lighthouse. I know the Columbia River.

But my other aspect of this problem is the quality of life. I am pro salmon. No doubt about it. But on the other aspect, let's look at the big picture. The big picture is this. We have the most viable transportation system in the continental United States. Forty-eight percent of all the grain gets shot right out on the Columbia River like a turkey baster.

You remove that, some of the quantities don't generate enough revenue. Don't forget our farmers. That's why we are all here. We are not talking about just Idaho, Oregon, Washington. We were talking Montana, North Dakota and South Dakota, Nebraska. They are all part of this integrated system.

There is solutions. Dam breaching, I personally am against it. Some of my members are personally against it; some of them are for it. But the issue here is, we got to replace that transportation connection, rail, semi trucks. One little grain barge coming down the river is equivalent to 104 semi trucks. One barge. There's four barges total. That's 546 semi trucks one direction. All you sports fishermen towing these \$40,000 Duckworks behind semi trucks.

All I'm saying, we go down that avenue of breaching dams, ladies and gentlemen, and brothers and sisters, we need to replace at the same time that transportational link to keep on bringing what everybody takes for granted to the Pacific Northwest, the most inexpensive mode of transportation for grain. If we don't do that and it quadruples the cost of grain.

What do we tack it onto? That's one question. Let's tack it onto the expense of what it cost to build those four dams. Anybody know what it cost? There's still \$800 million owing on the Snake River and Columbia River dams.

We are CRRU, Coalition for Responsible River Use. Thank you very much for your time.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Jeff Fryer, followed by Sally Nunn, followed by David Liberty.

DR. FRYER: Thank you. I am Dr. Jeff Fryer. I have been a scientist for the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, working for Columbia basin chinook and sockeye salmon, for over ten years. I am speaking for, really, myself this afternoon.

One of the things we did was send a letter to President Clinton last year saying the lower Snake River dams needed spawning tanks, river temperatures and flow, biological productivity. It's difficult to foresee other options having a chance of recovering the salmon. Those seem to be more politically palatable to dam breaching, to turn the lower Snake into something that resembles a river.

Agriculture in Idaho and eastern Oregon would have to be sharply curtailed, leaving more water in the river. I suspect that would generate more options. The Columbia estuary could be restored.

The deepening of the channel for 110 miles, so much for improving the estuary. Land use regulation that protects habitat separately strengthened on city, forest land, grazing land and farm land.

Four, harvest could be cut back still further, but that would further devastate Alaska, Washington and Oregon.

As for technological, we have been barging every fish we can get our hands on for over 20 years and that hasn't arrested the decrease.

Use of screens to divert fish and bypass fish from dams for some chinook and steelhead stock would likely hurt others. Screens will devastate what does get barged.

Killing predators such as Caspian Terns will only have a minor impact on salmon runs and may also prove to not increase populations. The extension of salmon runs, we must return to the Columbia River to what scientists have been calling a more normative system; a more natural flows regime, as well as the breaching of the lower Snake River dams.

Looking at the four alternatives, I believe that a mix of the dam removal and maximum protection options are needed. Salmon need the habitat restoration, but I don't believe the hatchery practices and harvest should be changed as much as proposed in that alternative.

Harvest has suffered quite enough. You really can't get much more out of it. However, without proposing drastic measures to restore salmon, to increase flows, is it impossible for me think the Snake River salmon could be recovered without breaching the lower Snake River dams.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Sally Nunn, David Liberty, and Peter Lickwar.

MS. NUNN: Good afternoon. My name is Sally Nunn. I am a concerned citizen, a volunteer with numerous environmental groups across the state.

Benjamin Disraeli once said there are three classes of lies: Lies, dam lies and statistics. I believe the verdict is in. No more studies need be done. No more panels spending taxpayer money to tell us what we already know, but don't want to face are necessary. The wild runs of Snake River salmon are about to follow the passenger pigeon, the great auk (ph), and countless other species that have flourished for centuries, into the oblivion of extinction.

We are responsible for this crisis. We have tortured the landscape of the West to conform to needs both economic and political, but all distinctly human oriented. We have chosen to ignore any physical preconditions other species might depend on to survive. Certainly we have ignored indigenous people's needs.

I have a couple of questions. Where was the wisdom in trading 10,000 jobs in the fishing industry for 100 jobs on the dams? Why would we risk the retribution of lawsuits that would certainly ensue if treaties are broken or the laws embodying the Clean Water Act defiled. When our reasonable utility rates slip away from us, what do we say to people on fixed and low incomes? That those in the fishing industry were more important than they were?

Who says we need dams for recreation? I much prefer the type of recreation that depends on free flowing water. What do we say to future generations, that we tinkered with what was perfect to begin with and lost all of the fish, but we sure watered a lot of onions?

Others here will have excellent logic and excellent figures to back up. But for myself, the bottom line in the statements in the All-H paper and the core DEIS is that the dams do little good and much harm to the citizens of the natural world. To quote a famous American, Wallace Stegner, something will have gone out of us as a people if we allow it to happen.

So I say, please, breach the dams. Will somebody please tell Helen and Honuick (ph) to give up the party life and give us real freedom. Days of manifest destiny are in the past and we need salmon in our future.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: David Liberty, followed by Peter Lickwar, followed by Rob Walton.

MR. LIBERTY: Good afternoon. My name is David Michael Liberty. Thank you for providing me this opportunity to testify on behalf of my relatives, the salmon.

Despite my so-called caucasoid features, I am a member of the confederated tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation and I live in Hood River. I exercise my treaty rights to fish as often as possible. Unfortunately, most of my time on the river is a fruitless and frustrating experience that garners little success.

I have a family to feed and a tradition to uphold. Conditions on the river make it very hard for me to do either, requiring a supplemental income. In no way are my comments here today intended to represent the views of anyone but myself.

In the early eighties I acted in exercising my fishing rights, which led to an interest in the management of the Columbia River fishery and its many components. That interest led me to return to school to study cultural resource management for eight years.

Since that is my area of expertise, I have a special interest in Appendix N of the EIS. But first I must express strong support for dam breaching.

Dams have wiped out huge runs of fish since Bonneville was built in the 1930s. To deny that is to deny your history. Since European settlers first arrived in the Northwest, the region was initially trapped out, leaving only a small remnant of the once thriving, small, fur bearing animals.

Next the area was mined out at a great cost to the environment, which we are still trying to clean up today. In the meantime, native people were run out of most of our traditional areas and virtually imprisoned within a fraction of our original land.

Next, the area's greed for fish over exploited that resource until it was no longer profitable. Today there is an intensive push to log all the timber, spoil the water not already unfit for human consumption, poison the soil that isn't already poisoned from years of chemical dependency.

On the Snake River coho have been extinct since the 1980's. Yet instead of taking the drastic measures needed to assure the propagation of sockeye, of the remaining fish in the Snake, the status quo has prevailed, resulting in sockeye, chinook and steelhead listed as either threatened or endangered.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

If extinction is not enough impetus for federal agents to act, what is? My impression is federal land managers are going to wait until all the salmon are extinct on the Snake River before they decide what action to take.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is at the forefront of environmental degradation. Your projects resulting in so-called cheap electricity have come at very high cost to the region's natural and cultural resources.

Get rid of the lower Snake River dams before it's too late. They use ancient technology and are seriously dilapidated. I firmly believe if power technology had kept pace with computer technology, the Grand Cooley Dam could provide a flood of free electricity to the entire world.

THE MODERATOR: David, I need to cut you off. You have hit your stop mark here. Thank you very much.

Peter Lickwar, Rob Walton and Butch Erickson. Peter Lickwar, Rob Walton, followed by Butch Erickson, followed by Mike McHam.

MR. WALTON: Thank you. My name is Rob Walton. I am on the staff of the Public Power Council here in Portland.

I would like to comment on the All-H paper today, and start by reaffirming the commitment of public power in the public utilities in the four states to the obligation to protect, mitigate and enhance fish and wildlife from the impacts from the building of and operation of federal dams.

Survival in the main stem appears to be much better than previously thought. But we do not believe that the work is done. And we are committed to continuing to improve the efforts to improve survival in the main stem.

With that preface, I would like to offer a few comments on the All-H paper and commend the Federal Caucus on the progress demonstrated in this latest round of documents. We understand you were not finished, but we think you are headed in the right direction.

We will submit numerous positive comments on the All-H paper, including the recognition for the need of a comprehensive integrated plan, the statement of the five goals, which is much clearer than in the past. This is crucial. The discussion for the need for priorities in habitat, which is important.

It's not reasonable to try to do everything everywhere all at once. The brief history of salmon fishing in which they discussed at the peak of the commercial harvests were in the 1880s, the 1890s and the 1920s.

We also have a series of concerns about the All-H paper. The goals, while being better, still aren't adequate. In fact, there are major disagreements within the fisheries management community that clouds these goals. I recommend that you give these disagreements more credence and put them squarely on top of the table.

For example, it's not clear what level of population it is that we are supposed to save from extinction. That's very controversial and it has enormous implications for meeting our goals, especially the ESA and tribal harvest. The goals are contradictory; in some cases mutually exclusive.

We desperately need a guiding vision of how we can all work together towards these disparate goals. The options are not sufficiently creative or broad in scope.

Finally, the integrated alternatives are not realistic because they don't address the NMFS agreement and don't demonstrate a path that can guide us to success in reaching these goals. There are many different interests in this room and the region that are speaking today, and will continue, about salmon.

But the differences include the current discussion in Oregon where the tribes, the state legislature and ODF and W are in disagreement on elements of co-management of the rivers and the salmon. The issue of hatchery fish, there are disagreements among the salmon managers about where the priorities should be for the use of the reservoirs. For instance, in the Snake system should it be to spring flows or fall flows. There are disagreements.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

And with regard to the spring-summer chinook run this year, the projection for 140,000 fish, of which 80 percent are hatchery, will put you squarely on the spot. Will you say no to the harvesters and not let them catch increased numbers of fish or will you insist on the same rates, which will be hard on the reaching the harvest goals to protect the ESA goals? Will we be managers for one kind of fish or two kinds.

THE MODERATOR: Time's up.

MR. WALTON: As you know, the treaty tribes are in disagreement with --

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Butch Erickson, followed by Mike McHam, followed by Charles Hudson.

Butch Erickson? Going once. Going twice.

Mike McHam, followed by Charles Hudson, and then followed by John Saven.

MR. MCHAM: Good afternoon. My name is Mike McHam. I am the resource director for the Association of Northwest Steelheaders. We are a fairly sizable organization that's been around several years up here.

We've followed this issue for several years now and we haven't taken it lightly. Last year, after we had gotten quite a bit of information, we drafted a resolution or policy statement from the association. I would like to peruse that very briefly. I'll just read a few things.

Our resolution applies only to those four dams constructed on the lower Snake River; none of the main stem Columbia dams. We found these four dams basically eliminated or destroyed 137 miles of main stem fall and summer chinook habitats. That's a major share of the total decline of the fish population in the Columbia basin.

Mitigation has not maintained the runs at or near levels of salmon or steelhead before construction. Technological dam improvements and juvenile fish transportation have not resulted in improvement to sustainability, much less recovery, above these dams.

As of last year, Coho salmon population were extirpated. Sockeye salmon were nearly extinct. Fall chinook have been listed as endangered with ESA.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

The plans for analyzing testing hypothesis of PATH scientists concluded fall chinook would have nearly 100 percent chance, a strong chance of recovery, if the dams were breached; only a 30 percent, plus or minus, chance if they are not. The SRT has concluded the major impact on regional chinook returns from the construction of the four lower Snake River dams. High mortality of juveniles.

Fish and Game biologists of Idaho, Oregon and Washington support breaching of the four lower Snake River dams to prevent salmon and steelhead populations from possible extinction. Therefore, it is the policy that the four lower Snake River dams, including Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose and Lower Granite, should immediately be breached to such an extent as to provide Snake River passage to migrating salmon and steelhead.

A few comments, just personal comments. Some of us have dealt with these four H's, which are in vogue these days. Work has started on habitat. Hatcheries have started to clean up their act. Hopefully, that will continue. Harvest has changed quite a while.

I myself do not fish listed runs anymore. That's how serious I am about this. It's time for hydro to step up to the plate. Let's get rid of these four lower dams. It's not that big a deal, really.

To me, it comes down to asking myself one thing. It's a question of price versus value. We know the price and some of us feel there's a lot more value here.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Next up here is Charles Hudson, followed by John Saven, followed by, I believe, it is Tiernan Sittenfeld. If that's wrong, I'm sorry.

MR. HUDSON: My name is Charles Hudson. Contrary to the belief of many, the treaty making era of 1780 to 1871 did not give Indians anything. Treaties took from Indian people primarily in the form of land and freedom. The treaties of 1855 reserve the rights held forever by the people of the mid Columbia, the right so eloquently stated by my brothers, the right to take fish at usually and accustomed places.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

By entering those treaties, the federal government and each of you, as public servants, are trustees to the tribes. As trustees, we are accountable to them for those trust resources.

For you bankers, if your account holders saw their accounts dwindle under your oversight, you would have failed in your role as trustee. If you were a doctor and your actions or negligence took years off the life of your patients, you would have failed as their trustee. Sixteen million salmon were once in these rivers. Now there are one million. You have failed as trustee.

Nowhere in the constitution or the treaties does it refer to tribes as stakeholders or special interests. They are your partners in this trust. When they say they want four million fish above Bonneville dam, I sure hope you are listening. More than listening, and planning, and planning on doing.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: John Saven and Tiernan Sittenfeld and James Herston.

MR. SAVEN: Thank you. I am John Saven. I am the executive director of Northwest Irrigation Utilities, which is located in Portland. I represent smaller utilities that are customers of Bonneville, with a lot of agricultural interests. Also, on a personal basis, for 30 years I've been a recreational fisher. That's kind of my one real passion in life.

As we talk about a regional consensus, at least I can tell you that I have a consensus internally on some of these issues. And I'm not here to articulate an end state position. But I would like to offer a couple of comments about process.

One thing that I would encourage you to do is to make sure that all of the options are, in fact, analyzed. And in that regard, Mr. Stehl, I would particularly like to commend you for the staff work that has gone into looking perhaps a little bit more broadly than we have in the past and for the entire federal family to say, let's consider all the H's. So that's good.

However, there are some things which I don't think you have considered. The best example, from my perspective, is the Northwest Power Planning Council has gone through a multi-species framework process and has come up with a series of alternatives, including an alternative sixth that was submitted by customer groups.

The long and the short of that was, well, let's really question whether flow and spill is doing that much for us. And from an economic perspective, if that could free up 40 or \$50 million of Bonneville revenues, let's put that into habitat. Let's put that into perhaps some other improvements.

And I wish some of you could have been there earlier in the week when the Power Planning Council would get the results of that. We saw 62 percent increase in native fish under alternative six. We saw a 207 percent overall increase in fish.

You can compare that to the fairly aggressive option that had about an 80 percent increase of native fish and about a 205 percent increase overall. Even the dam breaching option. I think the alternative six in the framework process was very competitive.

So I think what I would want to say, in closing, those facts have not escaped us. I am not here to say that that science is perfect or that analysis was all that good. But in these forums and other places, we will question, why are you coming to a certain conclusion? We will ask you questions about flow and spill. And we will want to know what some of those answers are.

So thank you for the opportunity to testify. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Tiernan Sittenfeld, followed by James Herston, followed by Kate Tate.

MS. SITTENFELD: Hello. My name is Tiernan Sittenfeld. I am the field director for the Oregon State Public Interest Research Group. Thank you for the opportunity to comment today.

I am here today on behalf of OSPIRG's 25,000 citizen members across the state. I urge you to save salmon by partial removal of the four dams on the lower Snake River.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

As an organization which works to protect both consumers and the environment, this issue is particularly important to us. We need salmon for many reasons. Our economy depends on clean water, healthy rivers, and abundant salmon.

Salmon are part of our northwest heritage, which we must pass on to future generations. We know this to be true because we have talked to Oregonians across the state who believe salmon are part of what makes the Northwest so special.

Unfortunately, as we all know, salmon are in serious trouble. And the four dams are the biggest reason that Snake River salmon are going extinct. These dams simply do not make sense.

We have already spent three billion dollars on supposed salmon recovery efforts that do not work. Unless we restore salmon, we will lose both our low cost power and an important part of our way of life.

I urge you to partially remove these four dams, because it is the only way to bring about recovery for all Snake River salmon. Alternatives under consideration by the All-H plan and other agency initiatives lack clear evidence of effectiveness and would be far more expensive and far more disruptive to too many people.

Both the science and the economic case for dam removal have been made. It is clear that partial removal of the four dams on the lower Snake River are the most effective and economical way to save salmon. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

James Herston, followed by Kate Tate, followed by Jean Wilkinson.

MR. HERSTON: Hi. I'm James Herston. I worked for the United States Steel years ago, the largest steel company in the world. Just the boats are 240 feet long, 40 feet wide. Most sophisticated boats in the world. Tell me how many miles. Cut out 13 of them. That's a lot of fish going down the drain. Just sweep it up.

We got to do something out there. Not the rivers. I congratulate the Corps. No doubt about it. They worked hard at that. The only way you will ever do it is stop it out there.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I know what's going to happen. If you don't get them to come up, below, if you knock the dams out, 20 years from now there will be starvation. There won't be anything. Because the population growth is coming up so fast and all that, it will never happen. If you can knock them dams out, we won't have electricity and we won't have dams and we won't have nothing.

That's the way I feel about it. Because I've been around here. I'm probably the oldest guy in here. I don't know. I hope some of you -- I think my time is running out. I've been around for a lot. I have been through a lot of history and all that.

The way I see it, you better keep them dams in. If you don't, it's out there. I've traveled that ocean many, many miles. If you don't take some of them out, you are going to have to get Alaska, Canada and every dog-gone one of them, and this nation.

These fish that go up and down this river, you should not fish for four years. If you don't, they are not going to come up. That's the only thing I have to say about it.

And I think the Army engineers are doing the best they can. It's the way I look at it. It's terrible. I've seen a lot in my lifetime. And I know.

THE MODERATOR: Kate Tate, followed by Jean Wilkinson, followed by Larry Martin.

MS. TATE: Good afternoon. I am Kate Tate, representing the Weyerhaeuser Company. We need to preserve and enhance salmon runs without harm to the economies of local communities.

A lot is at stake by removing dams. For example, if barging were curtailed, truck traffic along the Columbia Gorge would increase significantly to transport goods to market. Consider that 750,000 more truck trips per year would occur into Portland. That's about 2,000 more truck trips per day, adding traffic and air pollution to this region that we don't need.

We have concerns, also, about how removing dams would affect energy costs. We believe energy would become significantly more expensive to the manufacturing community. This, in turn, affects families, who must pay higher prices to buy needed products.

Rider & Associates

We hope serious consideration will be taken to the economic consequences of removing dams. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Jean Wilkinson, Larry Martin and Don Dodds.

MS. WILKINSON: Good afternoon. My name is Jean Underhill Wilkinson, and I am a lobbyist and an attorney with the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation. The Oregon Farm Bureau Federation represents about 20,000 members here in Oregon. It consists of farmers, ranchers, and timber operators from across the State.

I grew up on a family farm east of the Cascade Mountains. It's a wheat ranch. And my family homesteaded there in the 1870s. We still operate those pieces of property that my ancestors did so long ago.

My family's wheat that we produce there is transported down the Columbia River system. And I've seen through the years growing up vast amounts of food product being transported up and down the Columbia system and the Snake River system.

I've seen this because I -- growing up, during the summer harvest I drove a wheat truck. And I would drive the wheat truck from the fields to the Columbia River. And most of the time the wheat that I dropped off would be put directly onto barges and taken down immediately to the Port of Portland for international trade.

And, well, because dam breaching will require incredible financial resources and reduce commerce, decrease vast acreages of agricultural lands and decrease the value of those agricultural lands, with no certainty, from the studies that have been done, with recovery of the fish species, we strongly oppose the breaching of the dams at this time.

I did want to say, too, that with the farming, when we talk about habitat and improving habitat around the state, much has been done. We look forward, as farmers and the agricultural community, to improve on our agricultural practices for the benefit of everybody, including the farmers and ranchers.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

My ancestors probably wouldn't even -- probably would wonder what the heck we are doing out there in our agricultural practices. We have put in place 50 diversion dams and terraces just on our farming property alone for the benefit of the species and reduction, primarily, of erosion. We are now planting some vegetation along the streams. That's all done voluntarily, with the help of incentive based, cost sharing approaches.

And I think that, too, the federal government should look to prioritizing its resources. In other parts of the state we are suffering, especially the activities that go on on federal lands, because the government has had a hard time convincing anybody, especially judges, that they are properly managing both species and the activities.

The federal government has had a difficult time completing its paperwork, doing the species analysis that it needs to be doing under law, and properly managing the area. And that has posed significant difficulties on the folks that use those federal lands.

So perhaps we should reprioritize our limited financial resources and take care of the species and activities throughout the state.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Larry Martin, and Don Dodds, and Ivan Maluski.

Larry Martin?

Don Dodds.

MR. DODDS: My name is Don Dodds. I am the president of North Pacific Research. I've been in the research business for over 30 years. And we have recently undertaken an unfunded research project to look at the science surrounding the salmon issue.

Unfunded projects do not make you a lot of money, but they do give you the freedom that you don't have to deal with your client's biases. We can speak the facts as they fall.

And this is a complex issue. And if you are talking about survival of a specie, you are talking about essentially three factors. One of those is food, the other one is predators, and the third is habitat. To date, almost all of the research has been focused on habitat. And again, most of that is on river habitat.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Now, to base your science on this complex issue on such a small bit of the science is a little foolish. It's like intensely studying my ear lobe trying to predict what I'm going to do next Thursday. It simply won't work.

There are -- the science, again, is based primarily around human activities. And that, I guess, is because humans have increased over the last 100 years and salmon have decreased over the last 100 years.

There are some interesting things people here have said about we need to remove the dams because they are causing the problem. Ninety percent of the salmon had already left this river before any of these four dams were constructed.

Now, how is that going to resolve the problem? Seventy percent of the salmon had left the river by the time Bonneville was built. So we've got a disconnect here somewhere.

There are other factors. The predators were almost extinct, sea lions, sea otters, bears, were all driven to extinction around 1883. Presently there are 650,000 of those predators off our coast. The sea lions can account for over 100 million salmon.

You have to look at the predator issue. If the Indians want to catch salmon -- and we all want the salmon back in this river -- we are going to have to look at predators and food supply. And the predators, if we increase the fish in that river by any manner, the predators will increase off our coast and eat those fish, and the Indians and the commercial fishermen and the sports fishermen will not get a single fish unless we have predator suppression.

If you want the levels of fish that we had in this river in the 1930s, you have to suppress the predators to the 1930 level.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Let's hear from Ivan Maluski, followed by Dan James, followed by Bob Tackett.

Ivan, are you here?

Dan James, are you here? Dan James, and Bob Tackett, and then Jan Wilson.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

MR. JAMES: Good afternoon. I am Dan James. I am federal affairs representative for the Pacific Northwest Waterways Association. We were founded in 1934 and our members include the region's ports, transportation providers, agricultural and forest products producers, public and restaurant utilities, municipalities and others.

I am here to comment on a variety of these processes and documents. First, we believe that the region needs a recovery plan with a clear vision, goals and priorities. We need a plan that rebuilds healthy fish runs while maintaining a healthy economy.

We oppose dam breaching. This is not a fish versus economy issue. Fish are important. The economy is important. If both are important, then breaching is not the answer.

Twenty-six West Coast runs of salmon and steelhead are listed under the ESA. Another eight are either candidates or proposed for listing. Of these 34 runs, only four pass the Snake River dams.

The dam removal is not the answer to saving salmon in the Northwest. We should focus on the broader common issues.

Ten years ago the best scientific information said that only ten to 30 percent of salmon will survive the trip past dams. Today NMFS says the survival is as high as before the dams were built. If survival through the reservoir is as high now, returning to pre dam conditions is not the answer.

Dam removal is not a silver bullet. It is extreme and it is risky. It may not help the fish, but it will certainly hurt the economy. Our jobs and northwest way of life are at stake.

Dam breaching will also create significant negative environmental impacts, with loss of habitat for fish and wildlife and increased air pollution from trucks and fossil fuel burning power plants. As it relates to the Corps' Snake River EIS, we will oppose the alternative four for the reasons stated above.

The EIS asks the wrong question. The question should be, what is the best way to rebuild fish runs throughout the region? Not, can we breach dams? The EIS shows there are uncertain biological benefits from breaching dams. Although the negative economic impacts are seriously understated, the EIS shows there is severe harm.

Rider & Associates

We really do believe that it's a good start. For the first time it begins to address all H's. It's the first time we have seen attention paid to all of them that equals the hydro system.

We are also pleased that the agencies have begun to discuss goals and performance standards. The region needs a recovery plan with a clear vision, goals and priorities.

We do have several concerns about their paper, however. The goals, some of the goals appear to be in conflict. They are not clear. And a full range of options were not presented.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to testify.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

How is everybody doing there? How about Bob Tackett? Are you still here? Bob, followed by Jan Wilson.

MR. TACKETT: My name is Bob Tackett. I am a steelworker. I work at Reynolds Aluminum.

I am against breaching the dams, first and foremost. That's my personal opinion. I am here to represent 350 other steel workers in my plant alone that would be affected by the breaching of the dams.

Obviously, we depend greatly on cheap hydroelectric power. I am only here to ask that you consider the extinction of 350 in my plant alone, 350 wage -- high paying wage, family wage earning jobs. I would appreciate you take that into consideration, as well as the fish. Obviously I don't want to see any salmon go extinct, but I don't want to see my job extinct, either.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Jan Wilson, followed by Caroline Martin, followed by Julie Papavero.

MS. WILSON: My name is Jan Wilson. I am an advocate from down in Eugene and this is not the first hearing that I've been to. I've been to numerous hearings this month, one of which was the 4-D hearings, and I have been to a couple of those.

I want to say that if you think that you are going to get away with advocating habitat protections over dams, I am here to tell you removing the dam is the easier choice. I've been to those NMFS hearings.

People are not willing to modify their habitat behaviors.

Rider & Associates

I hear the Farm Bureau lady getting up here, saying, "Don't remove dams because I need the water." They are all down in Eugene telling us, "You can't make us keep our cows out of the stream. You got to let us put the pesticide things in the stream."

Nobody here wants to make the hard choices they have to make. The 4-H paper is recognizing we need to make the choice now. The easy choice, though, is to remove the dams. Let's just do it. It doesn't cost us as much as to do all the habitat modifications. It won't take us long.

With the Snake River salmon we actually have the opportunity to do that. With some of the other salmon we don't because their critical habitat is all above the dams or whatever. We are stuck.

So you have an opportunity here. Whatever it's going to cost, it's not going to be as much as repaying the Indians for loss of their treaty rights. Let's do it.

THE MODERATOR: Caroline Martin, followed by Julie Papavero, followed by Jan -- I think it's Hinkston.

Is Caroline Martin here?

What about Julie Papavero?

MS. PAPAVERO: My name is Julie Papavero. I'm representing myself. I'm commenting on the All-H paper and the Corps DEIS.

I am in favor of partially removing the four lower dams on the Snake River. I grew up in southern California, and I feel bad about what our civilization is responsible for doing to many of the fragile ecosystems that made up what we called paradise there.

For 18 years now, though, I've lived in the Northwest. I call the Northwest my home. I've seen the salmon come home here to spawn, their bodies so battered and beat up I was surprised they could even move.

These fish are the toughest of the tough, these wild salmon. They will follow the cycle of their life if there is a chance to do so.

Wild salmon must be allowed to persevere in their native Northwest streams and rivers. Salmon have sustained people in the Northwest for thousands of years. They have formed an important part of the ecosystem here for eons.

The salmon are facing extinction now because of our civilization. In order to give salmon their chance to survive I am convinced it's biologically clear we need to breach the lower four dams on the Snake River. All of our other ideas, including barging the young fish around the dams, have not worked and have cost more than three billion dollars.

If we look at the thriving salmon runs found in the Hanford Reach in the Columbia River, we find a good stretch of the Columbia River undammed, undeveloped and allowed to flow freely. To keep salmon coming home, this type of natural river system is what we need to approximate by partially removing or breaching the four lower Snake River dams.

We still have the chance to do the right thing for the salmon, for ourselves, for the native people, for future generations, and for the Northwest to keep this piece of paradise together.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Jan Hinkston, followed by Kathryn Dapcic, followed by Tom Wallace.

MS. HINKSTON: Hi. I am Jan Hinkston. I, too, am from southern California. I say that almost whispering, because I know it's not welcome in a lot of places.

However, I was a conservationist there. I joined the Sierra Club in '69. Moved here approximately five years ago to help my daughter get through law school.

Of course, I'm still interested in the environment. The first thing I did was go to the Oxbow Park and see if I could see a salmon spawning. Boy, is that exciting. And it still is. I've not seen it very often except once up in Alaska.

So what -- I didn't know which paper to put my comments on, the Army Corps or the 4-H.

What my first impression was here, they are very insufficient alternatives. You know, somebody mentioned something about the sediment.

What will happen to the sediment if the dams are breached? Has that been studied sufficiently by the scientists?

So each thing that comes up has an opposite question that comes up. I'm very concerned about the sediment, worried about the sediment that would come from digging a deeper channel in the lower Columbia.

Rider & Associates

Well, same is true up there in the Snake. How are they going to do it? How would they keep the sediment from ruining the river for about three years or so?

So I have come to the conclusion that, yes, habitat needs to be continually worked on. But we need to take a holistic approach.

It's a strange term. But it seems to me that is what is sadly lacking in this whole study that you have made and which other scientists have made. I don't see it as a complete study. I see there should be at least a moratorium on all the elements that are contributing to the salmon's demise.

For instance, the whole lifetime of the salmon is like four years, I understand. If that is true, then we should have at least a four-year moratorium of any fishing and especially those trolling guys who do the most damage. But also the predators. Gosh, I didn't even know about that problem.

So I've been listening here, and I get this solution and what about this problem. And I don't know. So all aspects of the problem that have an impact should be scientifically studied. But on the other hand, I don't want to see so much time go by before a solution is found or several solutions.

A holistic solution, please. Okay. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Kathryn Dapcic, followed by Tom Wallace, followed by Gary Beck.

MS. DAPCIC: My name is Kathryn Sue Dapcic and I am a concerned citizen. I am a citizen who is very tired of hearing and talking about saving salmon. And we are talking about saving salmon from going extinct.

And the only thing, we need to start on this journey of saving the salmon if we are really going to save them. And if the dams remain, I'm convinced that the salmon will surely go extinct. And so it's not a pleasant thought to have to do this, but I do believe that the dams must be removed.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Tom Wallace. Actually, I think it might be Gary Beck.

Tom Wallace, are you there? Tom Wallace isn't there.

Rider & Associates

Is it Gary Beck? Come on up, Gary.

Followed by Bob Jenson, followed by Ramona Rex.

MR. BECK: I am Gary Beck, United Steelworker Local 330, at the Reynolds Aluminum plant in Troutdale, Oregon.

I am a living product of a loss of a job. In 1981 they shut our plant down in Arkansas. I transferred to Oregon in 1983. We have sustainable jobs around this Columbia basin.

And economics of breaching those dams, to me, would be a disaster. I think we need to do what the elderly gentleman said and work out on the West Coast, clear up the predator problem. Clear up some of the excessive netting and look to our futures as sustainable in the Northwest the way it is.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Bob Jenson.

MR. JENSON: Thank you. I thank you for the opportunity to be here to testify this afternoon. I am Bob Jenson, State Representative from District 57. Yes, Oregon has a bicameral legislature. District 57 is Pendleton to roughly the Boardman area along Interstate 84.

I am debating some of the thoughts that I might have about this testimony. It started out a few months ago, I think it was, over at Lewis and Clark College, when Will Stehl was a key note speaker at the law school symposium on generally the same topic.

I think the speaker -- director made a comment that I have never seen an elected official from east of the Cascades that favored breaching the dams. Before he has any coronary problems, let me assure him that that particular official that is not here today. I am not a proponent of breaching the dams.

We hear a lot of testimony here today and as we look through the literature, some of it is ostensibly based on science. And we hear some "scientists" saying that this is the answer, "Breach the dams." We hear some other scientists with equal qualifications and reputations saying, "No, this is not the way to save the salmon."

I would like to remind us that sometimes we get a little confused, I think, about this area of what we call science. What answers you get from science depend upon the questions that you ask.

If you start out wanting to breach the dams and ask those questions of your science, that's the answers you are going to get. If, conversely, you start out with the opposite, those are the answers you are going to get.

I think we need to bear that in mind as we look at the conflicting or what seems to be conflicting science. I'd suggest it isn't conflicting. It is the questions that are a conflict.

Again, if I can pick on the director, you know, once more -- I think he's shaking his head like that might be all right -- he said something about -- the question came up about the Caspian Terns, and he said that he had, you know, had a real difficult time with that because every time somebody from the eastern Oregon area, you know, he talked to them, they brought up this Caspian Tern as this was a silver bullet to save the salmon. He quickly said there is no silver bullet.

And I think we need to recognize that. And I think that is what the 4-H paper is trying to do and, as such, I think we need to look at and follow that development.

I do appreciate and applaud the efforts that have been made there and the fact that the government has not taken hasty actions that they have might have found unsavory.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Ramona Rex, followed by Kyle Martin, followed by Don Merrick.

MS. REX: Hi. My name is Ramona Rex. I am a concerned citizen. I appreciate being given the opportunity to speak here today.

I am nervous as heck. But I am speaking on behalf of the salmon as part of the cultural heritage of the Northwest. And I am deeply disturbed and concerned that in my living memory this species has come to the brink of extinction. I'm a 40-something.

What I would like to posit is looking at a paradigm shift. People are concerned about jobs. I'd like to take a page from history and talk about my own personal experience.

Rider & Associates

I think many people might remember Ma Bell. Ma Bell was busted up and broken up in 1984. I worked for Ma Bell. And you know, it wasn't the most pleasant of experiences to have gone through that change.

But science and technology have come to a point where a monopoly was no longer viable. There were many nay sayers. The Department of Defense thought this is of strategic importance. You can't break up Ma Bell. Well, Ma Bell was broken up.

Sixteen years later, we look at the telecommunication sector as one of the driving engines in one of the longest economic recoveries of the United States. Hey, did anybody come to me and say: Gee, Ramona, how do you feel about your job and would you like to lose your job because it's in the greater good?

Well, hey, I did lose my job. You know something? This is the United States of America. There's opportunity galore. There are many people that had to make personal sacrifices and we did for the greater, common good. That's what we are asking for today.

I personally am in favor of breaching. You are all scientists. There is a heck of a lot smarter people than me out there.

If it does come to the scientific conclusion that the dams should be breached, then I am here to say that we live in the United States of America. We sent a man to the moon. We can go through this and have a win-win; win for salmon and win for the people, all cultural groups here in the Pacific northwest.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Kyle Martin, Don Merrick, and Claud Leinbach.

MR. MARTIN: Hello. My name is Kyle Martin. And although I am a professional hydrologist, I am representing just myself here today.

I am here to speak out in favor of alternative number four, the dam breaching option. I am appalled with the first three alternatives for being very wasteful use of the taxpayers' resources.

It is critical the Corps of Engineers restore the Columbia and Snake Rivers towards a natural and normative river. Breaching of the four lower Snake dams will create more natural habitat, salmon habitat, in the main stem Snake.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I have about five points here to make. The NMFS CRI model is flawed, as it poorly accounts for effects of river flows in the main stem Columbia and Snake on the salmon's life cycles. NMFS needs to use a life cycle model such as flush or cohort model that has more sensitivity to main stem river flow.

Point number two, the Corps needs to stop the mishandling of the running of the river. For example system wide flood control can and should be reduced for the Grand Cooley, Drorshack and Bramley Dams. This can be achieved while not significantly increasing the risk of flooding downstream at Vancouver or Portland.

The public needs to know the Corps has been way too conservative in main system flood control management on Snake and Columbia to the detriment of the salmon. More regional programs are advocating change in flood control management, yet the Corps always opposes such actions.

The Corps needs to move away from expensive techno fixes, like large barging and trucking, and toward environmental restoration. The Corps is in a resourceful position to do just that.

Point number three, the Corps needs to change its current flood control management to better benefit the salmon. In fact, I would actually offer modified flood control as a fifth alternative, interim recovery plan, before the breaching the four lower Snake dams.

Point number four, the Corps also needs to meet its treaty trust responsibilities of the Columbia basin to Native Americans who hold treaty fishing rights, to be only constantly blocked by the Corps and other federal agencies in their efforts.

Finally, my fifth point, the federal operating agencies need to work with the native tribes here in the basin to embrace the tribal recovery plan in the spirit of the salmon, which is actually the most effective plan on the table to recover salmon. In that regard, I stand by my Native American friends in their salmon recovery efforts.

That's all I have to say.

THE MODERATOR: Don Merrick, and Claud Leinbach, and Art Lewellan.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

MR. MERRICK: Good afternoon. I am Don Merrick. I am a professional engineer, engineering consultant, and chair of USA Vancouver-Portland. I reside in Tigard.

But I am here because I am concerned about the restoration of the Columbia River watershed for future generations of all species considered. I believe that there is a preponderance of quality scientific evidence that breaching the four dams on the lower Snake River will benefit both the young salmon on their way to the sea and the adults that return to spawn.

Other options or other scenarios are definitely and conclusively less favorable. A vast majority of the scientific community believes there is enough evidence to make a decision now.

We can't afford to wait until results are in from the fish monitoring program to make a decision. I would not discourage a reasonable completion of the fish monitoring program and all the other studies. If completion of the new studies in the next year or two indicate that a decision should be reversed, it should not be too imposing to cease implementation and reverse course.

When the stakes are large -- and they are here -- with the perilous decline and imminent extinction of the Snake River salmon, the amount of information or evidence needed for decision making must be reduced.

I am proposing a two-track concurrent approach. One, proceed with the first stage, breaching, with judicious planning that allows reversal of actions; and number two, conduct other decision rendering studies as expeditiously as possible.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you for coming and commenting.

Claud Leinbach, Art Lewellan, and Peter Illyn.

MR. LEINBACH: My name is Claud Leinbach. I am a federal employee. I work for the Corps of Engineers. By the way, I'm here on my own vacation time.

I also am the union secretary for United Power Trades Organization. We represent the people that operate to maintain the hydroelectric dams we are talking about.

Rider & Associates

We have heard plenty of testimony today about how horrible the dams are. I would like to give you some scenarios about how much benefits the dams have.

For starters, I would like to talk about hydro power. The four Snake dams have approximately 3,483 megawatts of capacity. The Corps' own papers say they average 1250 megawatts per year.

To give some perspective, the City of Seattle uses a thousand megawatts of energy. The whole states of Idaho and Montana use about a thousand megawatts of energy.

I've heard American Rivers spokespeople say in November the plants only average 950 megawatts. Then a couple weeks ago the general manager of Emerald PUD claimed they only average 850 megawatts. My own research shows they average 1600 megawatts.

Last June I testified in front of the Oregon legislature that the night before I checked with the four Snake plants they were generating 2500 megawatts that evening. Granted, that was during spring rain runoff. But the 2500 megawatts was being generated. And that the energy was being used and sold. And that one day's wholesale energy was worth approximately \$1.2 million.

Eighty percent, approximately, of the energy generated in the Northwest is hydro power. That is one of the reasons that the Northwest has the clean air that we all value is because the energy is hydro power. It's clean. It's the cleanest mass produced energy in the entire world.

The other aspect I would like to address is flood control. It's been said there is no flood control whatsoever of the Snake River dams.

That is not entirely the case. They were not authorized as flood control, but there is a flood control plan for Lower Granite and the Snake plants. I have log sheets from the dams there that show in February '96 flood those plants were called upon to do their part in helping stopping the flood that came within five inches of flooding downtown Portland.

It gets said many times that there is no flood control. That's not entirely the case.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Art Lewellan, followed by Peter Illyn, followed by Patricia Sims.
Rider & Associates

MR. LEWELLAN: I am Art Lewellan. My field of study is in transportation and my testimony in support of dam removal will address that side of this issue.

I do not believe that the global economy is sustainable because of transportation costs, particularly regarding its enormous fuel requirement. Therefore, I do not believe that large scale grain agriculture is sustainable, for both the shipping and the mechanized harvesting require massive amounts of fuel.

It is not wise to eliminate small farmers around the world and monopolize the cultivation of grain for world markets. Farming should not be put in the hands of a few agribusiness giants to derive profits from undervalued oil. Leaving the dams up to protect global agribusiness and related industries will be futile.

Another use of the dams is for navigation. While it is true that barges can handle large quantities of grain downstream and fuel upstream, they cannot transport these goods as energy efficiently as great railways.

Railways is the most efficient way to transport any good. It has been avoided in the context of the testimony tonight, always referring to trucking as the main alternative way to move grain. This is not true.

Trucking is not the most efficient way. Rail is the most efficient way to move goods. It takes less fuel to haul freight by rail than any other mode. Leaving the dams up to protect the barge industry is energy inefficient.

The third major purpose of the dams is electricity generation. While hydro power is a clean method of energy production, most of the energy goes to industries or is wasted. We would do more to curb our growing demand for energy by conservation than by creating new sources of energy.

Industry, particularly transportation related industry, demands too great an amount of electricity to be sustainable. It is said that 40 percent of the power from the Columbia River hydro power goes into aluminum smelting. How much of that aluminum goes into custom wheels, engine and drive parts, so that some clown can go joy riding through my neighborhood and terrorizing?

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

We tie too much to transportation. The industry is not sustainable, nor is it a laughing matter for fools like us.

Leaving the dams up to maintain electricity supplies, which go to unsustainable, environmentally degrading, transportation related industries is wasteful and destructive.

Thank you for taking my comments.

THE MODERATOR: Peter Illyn, Patricia Sims, followed by Bud Stone and Dan Kent.

MR. ILLYN: I want to thank you gentlemen for taking your time to come here today and present your positions to us. It's been very informative to me and I appreciate the efforts that you've made.

I'm here speaking for myself, as a citizen. That's all. But I am a little concerned about the baseline attitude of federal agencies when it comes to making decisions like you are required to make.

I remember during the '30s and '40s the attitude about building dams at that particular time was, every drop of water in the United States should be dammed and "made use of."

Well, this is a very antiquated system of thinking. I'm a little concerned that much of that attitude still prevails in our federal agencies today and is apt to be used in making your final decision, which you tell me that you have not made yet.

I think that this attitude is degrading to our other citizenry, the tribes, and there was no thought given to the economics that they needed in order to survive. I think that the attitude was pervasive in this, in disregard of our fish and wildlife and the fact that they are an indicator species about what's happening to human kind.

And I really hope that that attitude can be reversed and that you can seriously think about the effects of -- the benefits of breaching the four dams and what will come from breaching those -- the benefits that will come from breaching those dams.

I remember when I was a kid my father was one of the first people to practice conservation farming. And he was ridiculed by neighbors, by members of the whole community, because he took out some of his acreage and put it into growing grass lands and preventing erosion. But the thing that happened is that there was no economic loss to him at all because his crop yield was a lot better than the neighbor's, whose land was still running downhill.

So when it comes to making your decision, please consider that there is a tremendous economic benefit, also, to breaching what man has made. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Bud Stone, followed by Dan Kent, followed by Maxine Wilkins.

DR. STONE: My name is Dr. Gordon F. Stone, Jr. I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

I would like to say that it's a very difficult situation for you, that there is no way people can convey the information that should be required and input by you in three minutes. I am relatively insulted by it. I will talk as fast as I can. Thank you very much for the comments thus far.

First I would like to say, I humbly come before you for myself. I am 58 years old. My mom is 84. My dad is 89. I am a fifth generation Northwesterner.

I humbly beg you to make the tough decision and the right decision. There is no question what it is. Everybody at that table knows it.

And I would like to say, for the people that don't understand science, I've been so embarrassed here today for many people. Here is a book. It's The Logic of Scientific Discovery, by Carl Popper. I think that a lot of the people here in the audience should get this book, or one like it, and read it. It's been a pathetic display of: Don't cut my money line off.

Onward, first, I would like to say that, to paraphrase something I heard about 26 months ago -- it went along something like this: We are here to get the world's greatest scientists, not theologians, ichthyologists, but biologists, of all times for a broad spectrum and follow their recommendations immediately in two years, when it's done.

Yeah. You guys didn't come up with the results and you sold the people. But the results were good and it was scientific. I applaud you for your efforts.

I am going to talk real fast. I feel like someone who is in a position where he can't win no matter which way he goes.

Being a fifth generation Northwesterner, I've been good friends of many, many tough fielders, Lou Russell, his ancestors were my ancestors. My mother was named after his grandmother Marjorie. I know all 14 of the boys.

I'm sorry. He left. He was not one of the boys. He was a second generation. Tackle manufacturer, sporting goods, boating people, business of fish.

I've been going to these meetings since I was five years old with my grandfather, my greatgrandfather, and my mom and dad. These meetings have been driving me nuts and it's a short drive.

We need to stop talking money. We need to stop talking welfare. I'm not talking social welfare. I'm talking economic and corporate welfare. Irrigation, the farmers have not made any of the payments that they were supposed to make 50 years ago on the Grand Cooley. None of them. They buy their power for 28 times less than you and I do. I can't go into that.

Barging. They pay 28 percent less than you and I pay. That's corporate welfare and I am a fiscal conservative.

I have been here -- in my 58 years of life it appears to me that the only thing that anybody really stands for is stonewalling. They want to sit down and wait until the fish become extinct.

I am ashamed of ODF, DFW, NMFS, bargers, retailers and, indeed, many organizations that talk the right talk, but not do not walk the walk. No one wants to be the guy, as Captain Mike says over there, we have to have these tugboats. I work on tugboats.

He says the population has gone up 87 percent in the northwest. I don't care if it goes up 1,000 percent. I haven't seen real good things happen as the population increases. Progress is not money.

Thank you. Have I gone over my three minutes? Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: You have gone over three minutes. I hate to cut you off.

Dan Kent, followed by Maxine Wilkins, followed by Meghan Moore.

MR. KENT: Good afternoon. My name is Dan Kent. I am also speaking in favor of the breaching option, representing Pacific Rivers Council, Eugene based river and native fish conservation group.

I grew up on a small farm in Eastern Washington located about 20 miles from the Snake River. I spent many, many summer days down on the Snake, a very slow moving river during the '70s.

But as a native of the Palouse, I know how important the Snake River dams are to the farmers of Eastern Washington. But I also know that wheat farmers have viable alternatives, as was mentioned very eloquently just a few moments ago, is shipping by rail. The salmon have no alternative.

The Snake River has been turned into a freeway for grains since the 1970's. An earlier speaker threw out the number 40 percent of America's wheat moving down the Snake and Columbia River system. Turning the Snake back into a river will require a major reinvestment in rail.

The discussion of the fate of the dams always does seem to come back to dollars. But unfortunately, what saves transportation dollars is killing the fish.

The lower Snake River, because of our federal dams, has been slowed to a lake, like one mile per hour. According to one federal study last year, the market values of the navigation power and irrigation provided by the dams is roughly 300 million per year. At about the same time the Idaho statesman estimated that a restored -- excuse me -- Snake River salmon fishery will contribute at least that much to the regional economy each and every year.

Restored salmon means a revitalized regional economy. Commercial sport and tribal fisheries depend on the Columbia and Snake River salmon and steelhead runs. Indeed, the greatest economic value the Snake can provide is clean, cool water, a healthy river and abundant wild salmon.

It is time that we recognize that the Snake River is not a free resource. A free flowing Snake and the habitat it provides has great economic value and the dams have lessened that value dramatically. It is time to retool the river in favor of native fish.

Thank you.

PANEL MEMBER: I just want to make a quick response to a comment that was made here about the three-minute time limits. If there is anybody who has more to say, I want to remind you of what Donna said early on. There is a recording device back in the back room, so you have an opportunity to make those comments.

I hope everybody appreciates we are trying to get as many people here to speak as possible. You can comment in writing or you can take advantage of the recording device in the back room.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Maxine Wilkins, followed by Meghan Moore, followed by Sidney Clouston, followed by Peter Lickwar.

MS. WILKINS: Good afternoon. Thank you for allowing me to speak before you.

I do not have anything prepared in advance. I am not a scientist and I don't have any statistics to give. My only concern is the depletion of species in the world.

Every day there is a species that is annihilated and eliminated. I am afraid that the salmon is going to be the next one. After that, I think that the human race will be the last one to go. Everyone will become a dinosaur sooner or later.

Rider & Associates

I would like to say that I think that if you listen to the Native Americans that you probably can solve the problem. And it won't be done yesterday, like we Americans have a propensity for. But the Native Americans do know how to handle this. They've done it for thousands of years before we got here. And I would urge you to really listen to their proposals.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Meghan Moore, then Sidney Clouston.

MS. MOORE: Hi. My name is Meghan Moore. I am commenting on the All-H paper the DEIS paper.

I am a citizen of Oregon. I've been here almost two years. I moved here for a number of reasons. One's named Ryan. He is five. The other is Timmy. He is three. There's another one in the womb not named. We are going to name him, but I am not going to tell you yet.

I also moved here for salmon. I heard of salmon and wondered about the species that can go up through the river and down to the ocean and transform. I was fascinated.

I came out here. I went to the salmon festival. I looked, and I bought the glasses, and I couldn't see any salmon. I kind of feel the best way to express it is read this poem written by Sherman Alexie (ph). He is a native from Spokane, Washington.

"I'm told by many of you that I must forgive. And so I shall. After the Indian woman puts her shoulder to the Grand Cooley Dam and topples it.

"I'm told by many of you that I must forgive. And so I shall. After the flood waters burst each successive dam down the river from the Grand Cooley.

"I'm told by many of you that I must forgive. And so I shall. After the flood waters find their way to the mouth of the Columbia River as it enters the Pacific and causes all of it to rise.

"I'm told by many of you that I must forgive. And so I shall. After the first drop of flood water is swallowed by that salmon waiting in the Pacific.

"I'm told by many of that you I must forgive. And so I shall. After that salmon swims upstream, through the mouth of the Columbia, and then past the flooded cities, broken dams and abandoned reactors on the Hanford.

"I'm told by many of you that I must forgive. And so I shall. After that salmon swims through the mouth of the Spokane River as it meets the Columbia, then upstream until it arrives in the shallows of the secret bay on the reservation where I wait. I wait alone.

"I'm told by many of you that I must forgive. And so I shall. After that salmon leaps into the night air above the water, throws a lightning bolt at the bush near my feet and starts the fire which will lead all lost Indians home.

"I'm told by many of you that I must forgive. And so I shall. After we Indians have gathered around the fire with that salmon who has three stories it must tell before sunrise. One story will teach us how to pray. Another story will make us laugh for hours. The third story will make us dance.

"I'm told by many of you that I must forgive. And so I shall. When I am dancing at the pow-wow with my tribe at the end of my world."

I am not a Native American, but from Oregon and Washington. Breaching the four Snake River dams is a viable option. I am committed to the Pacific Northwest that is a healthy home for humans and salmon.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Sidney Clouston. Is Sidney still here?

Peter Lickwar. Is Peter here?

MR. LICKWAR: Sorry I missed my first speaking slot. My name is Peter Lickwar. I am a professional biologist here on my own time, speaking solely as a citizen.

I simply would like to support breaching the four dams of the Snake River. I recognize that there is uncertainty regarding the complete benefits of that as an action. However, scientific uncertainty is simply reality that we must address. It's inescapable.

The other options dealing with hatcheries, habitat and harvest have largely been addressed. I think this is largely an example of Occam's Razor, where the simplest answer is the best. It is the simplest answer. However, it is probably the most difficult one.

I recognize it is a very difficult choice for you folks to make. I just want you to know I do appreciate the situation you're in.

I would simply hope that you would seek to establish sustainable ecological and economic environment for all of us who love the Northwest and want to live here and want to have children who can live here. I know it's going to be a difficult decision for you people.

I just hope you will make the right decision and support removing those dams and help us all have a place where we can raise our kids and grandkids and have salmon to fish for and a sustainable economy.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. That, actually, unbelievably, is the end of our list at exactly 5:00 o'clock when we planned to end. I want to thank you all very much for your attention, for speaking as clearly and well as you did to these folks. I would like to see if there is any closing remarks that you might want to make.

PANEL MEMBER: First, Donna, let me thank you for your moderation and very professional handling of the proceedings here tonight. I want to thank you all for coming.

I appreciate those of you that stayed from the beginning here. I appreciate that. I appreciate the time you've taken to listen to each other, as well as listen to the presentations that were made by Mr. Stehl and myself.

We will be reconvening again at 6:30, pretty much going through the whole process again, give the opportunity for those folks that are working and didn't have a chance to get here this afternoon, give them that opportunity this evening to enter their comments on the record.

So with that, then we will adjourn these proceedings. And again, we will start up again at 6:30. Thank you all for coming very much.

(Proceedings concluded at 5:00 p.m.)

EVENING PROCEEDINGS

7:30 P.M.

THE MODERATOR: We are going to get started here. Let me just give you a little reminder about the process here again. I think several people have entered since we went over this earlier.

I am going to call your name, and you come up to one of the many microphones in the room. I am going to use the signup sheets. I have six signup sheets. And we are going to go across on each one, so take the first one on each sheet and second one on each sheet. I will call the name up, the next, and then the one on deck, so that we can keep people close to the microphones and move as quickly as possible so we can hear from as many people as possible.

Be ready to speak when it's your turn. Let us know if you need us to bring the microphone to you. Watch the lights right here that we have in front of you. The green light means speak, the yellow light means you have one minute left, and the red light means stop. Please respect the time limit so we can hear from as many people as possible.

Because the meeting is being transcribed, if can you please indicate whether you are commenting on the Corps' EIS, the Environmental Impact Statement, or the Federal Caucus All-H paper, or both. If you are not sure, we will do our best to make sure your comments get to the appropriate federal official.

Be sure and state your name, too, and the organization you are with, if any.

One more quick review of the ground rules. We ask you to please treat one another with respect. There is going to be a lot of opinions here today. Everyone has the right to have their own opinion and express it. We ask that you please show courtesy and respect to all people here.

If you can keep your side conversation to a minimum, please, so that the reporter can hear. I think that's about it.

We are going to stop at 10:30, but we are also going to take a quick break about 9:00 for five minutes so the reporter can change the paper and our panelists can have a quick break. So I will try and fit that in between testimony.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Let's get started. The first three people, then, are Karl Aruta, Jeff Shields, and Dr. Jeane Tryon. Those three, if you can get lined up.

Karl.

MR. ARUTA: Good evening, members of the panel. My name is Karl Aruta. I am here on behalf of the Northwest Environmental Defense Center.

I am here primarily to talk about one of the issues that I don't think comes up very often in this kind of discussion. There is a lot of policy, legal, and scientific issues that you are going to hear about. But I think the one that is perhaps the most important for you to hear about is the one that addresses why the option that involves removing the dams is critical to the survival of BPA.

Without those dams, BPA cannot live up to the deal that has been struck by the United States Congress and with the people of this country.

The deal was simple. BPA and the federal power marketing agencies provide subsidized, incredibly low cost power for this part of the country. In exchange, as part of the Northwest Power Planning Act Equitable Treatment Doctrine, the Endangered Species Act, and a variety of other policies, BPA is supposed to help insure there are salmon left for people in the rest of the country whose taxpayer dollars are subsidizing our cheap power.

If we continue what we are doing and the fish continue dying, BPA will not have held up its end of the bargain and we in the Northwest will have failed to do what the people in the rest of the country expect us to do.

For those of you paying attention to the political realm, that's always involved. There are members of the delegation in other parts of the country that are kind of wondering why the federal taxpayers at large are subsidizing the BPA cheap providing of power. I would be asking the question if I lived somewhere else. I kind of like the cheap power.

Now, we have to do this soon. We have already lost 90 percent. If we don't take the system down, we will lose both the Snake River salmon and our low cost energy.

We can't afford to lose that deal. We need the salmon for our future and the future of the rest of this country. And it is really imperative that everybody focus on the fact that it's not just us.

Rider & Associates

It's not just those of us in the room that are old enough to speak out and articulate our thoughts. It's the rest of our world. It's the rest of our country. It's our kids, if that's important to you. We need the salmon for all of those kids. Without them, we are sending our children to a life where they can talk about what used to be there, the fish that their parents used to know, and what their grandparents used to know.

That's not what I want for my children. That's not what any of these kids are entitled to. There is the best reason in the world why you should take those dams out, right there.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Okay.

Jeff Shields, Jean Tryon, and then on deck is Jack Glass.

MR. SHIELDS: Thank you. My name is Jeff Shields. I am general manager of Emerald People's Utility District. We service about 40,000 people's electric needs in the Eugene and Springfield area. We are a customer of the Bonneville Power Administration. We are in the top 25th quartile of those customers, so we are a fairly large customer in terms of the purchase from BPA.

On May 9th, 1999, Emerald's Board of Directors voted to support bypassing the four lower Snake River dams. Many people asked, well, if I were a power company, I wouldn't vote to support the bypassing of the four lower Snake River dams.

We do that because it's our belief, after several months of study, that's the least economic impact on the power system in the long term. At the foundation of Emerald's belief are two fundamental reasons. Extinction is not an option.

Two, there is a serious void of political leadership in this country. The hydro based system, by assuming seven billion dollars for two dead nuclear plants and one that's on its knees, fully one half of BPA's total debt, \$14 billion, seven of that is spent on nuclear. From 1979 to 1984, BPA increased its rates 484 percent in five years and didn't have a second thought. No multi year studies; nothing. Four hundred eighty percent increase.

Can you honestly tell the people and those kids that were just here that saddling these kids with \$7 billion in nuclear debt is reasonable, but spending one billion dollars to restore salmon is not? We don't think so. The fish are fighting extinction. Three species already have gone extinct.

I promise you this region will not lose the five to seven percent from the output of these dams. We will lose Bonneville Power Administration. We will lose the rights to power at a cost this region has enjoyed for the last several decades. That tradeoff isn't worth it to Emerald PUD.

I understand there is \$8 million still owing on the four lower Snake River dams. Again, seven million nuclear still owing. That seems pretty poultry.

I would ask if you honestly believe this region or this country has the political backbone to implement the strict logging and agricultural prohibitions that will be necessary to achieve the same probability of species recovery that the bypass option offers. I submit that it does not. I submit that all of you know that it does not.

You four people and your agencies are honored and you are blessed with the serious public trust responsibility. We ask that you honor that public trust and get on with breaching these dams.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Jeane. Then Jack Glass is next, and then Diane Valentine is on deck.

MS. TRYON: Good evening. My name is Jean Tryon. I am a psychotherapist with my own counseling practice in Beaverton.

I am here tonight to express my opinion as a concerned citizen and business owner about the Corps' draft Environmental Impact Statement and the National Marine Fishery Service All-H paper.

I am afraid the federal agencies responsible for making the decision to protect Snake River salmon will forego saving the salmon in favor of making a more politically safe decision, a decision that will, in the long run, be detrimental to both the fish they are charged with saving and to the people in this region.

Rider & Associates

The decision before the federal agency is fairly simple. Either remove four federal dams on the lower Snake River and protect Pacific Northwest salmon or let the dams stay and watch the salmon runs go extinct.

If the dams stay, scientists have estimated that all Snake River salmon will be extinct within our lifetimes. That's incredible. And it has major economic impact on this region.

The problem with both the Corps' EIS and the NMFS' All-H paper is this. Neither truly addresses the cost of letting the dams stay and destroying Snake River salmon runs. And I would like to point out a few of the most obvious reasons.

First, in 1855, this country signed treaties with native peoples that promised they would always have salmon to catch. If the salmon go extinct, American tax payrolls are looking at tens of billions of dollars in reparation costs to the tribes.

What's more, we will be burdened with the knowledge that we were instrumental in destroying an integral part of native people's culture and religion. We shouldn't and don't need to be responsible for these results if wise decisions are made now.

Second, allowing the salmon runs to go extinct will put our Northwest low cost power rates at risk. Part of the agreement in allowing the Northwest to have access to low cost power created by the federal dams was that the BPA would insure long-term survival and protection of Columbia and Snake River salmon. If we let the salmon go extinct, we have reneged on our part of the agreement and there would be no reason for the rest of the country to allow us to continue to have this sweetheart deal.

In fact, other regions of the country are asking why they pay for salmon recovery efforts that simply hasn't and won't work while the Northwest continues to have one of the lowest electric rates in the country. Losing BPA and the special power deal will double the Northwest power costs.

I realize I am out of time. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Jack Glass, and Diane Valantine is next, and Liz Hamilton is on deck.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

MR. GLASS: Good evening. My name is Jack Glass. I am a full-time fishing guide on the Columbia River.

I've been fishing it actively since 1982 as a guide. I've fished it as a youngster growing up with my father, grandfather, and all through my life. Went into full-time guiding in 1982, and enjoyed the fishery there and had an opportunity to actually make a living out there doing this.

This is a passion that I've had since I was a youngster, living on the river and being a fishing guide. God has been gracious to give me the opportunity to do so. I would like to continue this occupation for sometime and also work my children into the same occupation if possible.

I am just a layman who has worked the water. I have worked most of my fishing 20 minutes east of here. I just would like to express the things that I actually see out there.

We do have a season. I try and line up trips with customers that come from out of town. Then we get into the season and you want to close the season at the last minute. It's difficult to try and manipulate customers on this. If we had a healthier run, we wouldn't have to worry about closures.

Transporting fish in the barges to get them past the dams. Then we also see trucking the fish past the dams. I see a 70 to 71 degree water temperature. Then a truck gets loaded on a barge and drives onto the Columbia River, and then they turn around and release the juvenile fish in the river. The fish are disoriented in the 71 degree water. The sea gulls are having a feast. We are seeing a mirage of birds attacking these fish.

Can't you at least do it at night? Why in the middle of the day, with all these fishermen watching? After talking about -- to a lot of people about the bird predation problem, one out of three juvenile smelts are eaten by the birds.

Now, can we do some more management with Rice Island, some other fashions, to try and save our juveniles at least, you know, and to get as many to grow up and mature and don't lose so many of those fish? One out of three fish is a terrible loss for the millions of fish that come through the system.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

At least do something at night with those trucks and barges. Release them at night, for gosh sakes.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Diane Valantine. Liz Hamilton is after Diane, and then Dan Rohlf on deck.

MS. VALANTINE: Hello. My name is Diane Valantine. I am with the Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition.

After waiting eagerly since last spring, we are very glad to be here finally having a chance to comment on the urgent and crucial decision whether to remove four dams that don't make sense or to be the last generation of humans to share the Columbia basin with majestic wild Snake River salmon.

Save Our Wild Salmon is a coalition of more than 50 separate organizations, including sport fishing groups, commercial fishing organizations, business associations, and environmental groups. Our various member groups come to this issue from many different angles and with many different perspectives, but we all want to save the salmon.

As broad and diverse as the Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition is, it still begins to incorporate all the many organizations, businesses and individuals across the region and the nation who support removing four dams that don't make sense. I couldn't begin to list all these entities in my three minutes, but I would like to read you a short and partial list: American Rivers; Association of Northwest Steelheaders; Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission; Earth Justice Legal Defense Fund; Friends of the Earth; Idaho Rivers United; Idaho Salmon and Steelhead, Unlimited; Natural Resources Defense Council; National Wildlife Federation; Northwest Ecosystem Alliance; Northwest Energy Coalition; Northwest Sport Fishing Industry Association; Oregon Natural Desert Association; Oregon Natural Resources Council; Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations; Pacific Rivers Council; Salmon for All; Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition; Taxpayers for Common Sense; Trout, Unlimited; U.S. Public Interest Research Group; and Washington Environmental Council.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Just these groups that I've read alone represent more than six million members and supporters. But that's not all. Individuals from all over have been making phone calls, writing letters, signing petitions and postcards, and sending e-mail messages. The blue banners that you see filled with thousands of individual flames represent less than one-16th of the 96,441 people who have already spoken out to say we need salmon and those dams don't make sense.

This is just the beginning. More and more people are making their voices heard every day. The science is in. The economics are in. We know the right thing to do. Now we just need to generate the political wealth to do it.

Like it always has been and always will be, the people must lead for the leaders to follow.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Liz, and then Dan Rohlf, and then on deck is Jean Frost.

MS. HAMILTON: Good evening, and thank you all for being here and listening to us. We have a lot to say.

I am going to apologize in advance. I represent some extremely frustrated people and I am here to represent those frustrations. Don't take it personally. Our organizations represent hundreds of business and thousand of family wage jobs that are dependent on healthy salmon.

I am here today to recommend strong support on the adoption for an alternative that requires removal of the four lower Snake dams. I am also here to expose what looks like a farce to us. My written testimony will cover three points in more than three minutes.

The economics of the Corps' study are really of concern to us. We think the actions that they pertain to hydro and habitat are not serious. We are concerned the Federal Caucus is displaying a transparent lack of courage, when the only aggressive action we see is the removal of the weakest link in the chain.

I am here to tell you we are not the weakest link. This does not constitute recovery. We are looking at a federal family that seems to want to have its cake and eat it, too.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

On the one hand, we have the Corps' report saying our jobs don't count. We need value to add the value of the down river. We lost 150,000 angler days in the '70s. We lost about 20 percent of our opportunity to fish last fall. On the other hand, we have the natural research suggesting that the fisheries must be cut 50 to 75 percent further to save salmon.

We want to know which it is. We either count or we don't. If we want to achieve that, that is reflected in the benefits of breaching. It won't work and it's not fair. We want to see political willingness to go after the true salmon harvesters, the federal dam.

We have seen years of techno facts; increased barging, trucking of juvenile salmon, and a multitude of failed strategies. This region has spent three billion dollars trying to protect the hydro system; not trying to protect salmon.

Unfortunately, as we watched years of scientific analysis and debate, a group of tribal, federal and state and independent scientists told the agency what every sixth grader already knows; dams are bad for salmon. The most certain recovery choice for salmon is to breach the lower Snake River dams.

The PATH recommendation, what happened to this peer review collaborative science? We are also concerned about the habitats. Sometimes inactions are speaking louder than words. We don't see any consultation on the Bureau of Reclamation with illegal water spreading. We don't see them suggesting 50 to 75 percent of water withdrawal eliminated. Temperature pollution breaches standards every year.

Why do we trade the best science and best hope for unclear, not actually feasible actions? Furthermore, the results came by stacking. Breaching these dams could prevent tens of thousands of more salmon that could be saved for further part of the trust.

The Emperor has no clothes. This is not a recovery plan and it best goes out for two of the H's. The fishing community has paid enough. And it's time to turn our attention to the real salmon harvesters, the dams, if we are going to save the Snake and Columbia River basins.

THE MODERATOR: Liz, I have to cut you off now. Sorry. Thanks a lot for your comments. Appreciate it.

Rider & Associates

PANEL MEMBER: Liz, you brought up a point that was asked this afternoon. With regard to the economic studies, that if the sports fishing industry, or any other industry or business interests, do not feel that the economic aspect of the study covered their concerns appropriately, we invite, as part of the testimony, that get submitted in.

THE MODERATOR: Dan, is that you? And then next is Jean Frost, and on deck would be Don Swartz.

MR. ROHLF: Hi. My name is Dan Rohlf. I am with the Pacific Environment Advocate Center.

I have been doing this for over ten years now, working to save salmon, which makes me at least somewhat of a veteran in this process. And with my historical perspective, I think that lends some value to what we are discussing tonight.

In 1993, the National Marine Fishery Service attempted to rationalize the hydro system status quo by manipulating its science to reach predetermined conclusions. A federal court rejected this decision, held that National Marine Fishery Service was arbitrary and capricious. It also noted the Natural Marine Fishery Service was not listening to the states or the tribes.

The judge called for a major overhaul of the system in order to save salmon.

When NMFS prepared its biological opinion in 1995, to respond to this court decision, it switched its standards at the last minute to make its conclusion fit the data and keep the status quo on the hydro system, with the exception of a few bells and whistles. Those bells and whistles, such as John Day draw down, additional water in the Snake River, have never come to pass.

But at that time the Natural Marine Fishery Service left us with some promises and some conclusions -- I hold those in my hand -- from a 1995 biological opinion. The National Marine Fishery Service said that, "NMFS has concluded that without major modifications to the Snake and Columbia River dams it is unlikely survivals can be sufficiently improved to insure the operation of the hydro system does not impede the survival and recovery of listed salmon."

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

The National Marine Fishery Service also said that it would have a prompt -- let me quote this -- "A prompt but reliable schedule to make future decisions about what we are going to do to save salmon," which, incidentally, was supposed to culminate in 1999.

History is not repeating itself. The National marine Fishery Service has abandoned its promises in favor of pointing to a universe of problems. Instead of a river of science, I would submit we have a river of deceit. NMFS, once again, is tailoring its science to reach politically expedient answers to the questions.

What can we make of this? I think we have had a systematic effort to delay rather than to act. We don't have many more salmon, but we have a lot of process.

Years ago Ed Cheney, who I think you all know, told me that, "Some day we'd realize we can make money and save salmon at the same time." I think the data we developed over the last couple of years proved that to be true.

I would add that we can save salmon and comply with the law, as well. I suggest you do that, learn from the past so that salmon have a future.

Thanks.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dan.

Jean Frost. Did we lose Jean?

Don Swartz is next, M. Lewis, and then on deck would be Karen Russell.

MR. SWARTZ: Good evening. My name is Don Swartz. I am a retired fisheries biologist. I worked for over 30 years for the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Currently I serve as the science and policy advisor for Northwest Sport Fishing Industries Association.

For 62 years I've been an Oregonian. For almost all of those years I've been a fisherman. I caught my first fish on a beach right here in the Columbia River in Vancouver when I was five. It was a seven pound carp and I thought it was Moby Dick.

I put myself through college after I got out of high school fishing on commercial fishing vessels and charter boats at the central Oregon coast. I've been in quite a bit of the fishery aspects of this thing, besides being a fisherman all my life.

And beside me here we have some of the documents that represent the studies that have been going on on the Columbia River by federal agencies during my career. There's no duplicates here and I'm sure that your library is bigger than this.

But what we seem to have here is a never ending process of study. We need to study. We started -- before the dams were completed we started studying the probability and the feasibility of transporting fish around the dams.

I remember Bruce Snyder and Wes Ebel and Howard Raymond designing those studies and making it go. Those guys are long gone. The conclusions have never been concrete one way or another.

We are still studying the old studies and designing new studies. And it appears to me that we will still be studying this problem 20 years from now. But I'm not sure there's going to be any fish left 20 years from now, the rate that they are going, particularly those in the Snake River.

I want to address the four H's as they relate to the Snake. Taking out the dams are not going to do any good for Willamette River fish or John Day River fish. But in the Snake River we have a real acute problem. The rate of decline for those fish is much greater than the problems we were seeing with the other stocks.

In the 4-H studies, we look at harvest on the Columbia River. We stopped harvesting summer chinook in 1964. We haven't had any fall season sport or commercial or tribal harvest since '64. We haven't harvested spring chinook since 1968. We still fish a little bit on some of the lower river stocks.

We haven't harvested wild steelhead since 1975. Nobody has harvested any Snake River coho since 1987, because they became extinct.

The current harvest rate on most of those stocks, because of the lack of fishing and the lack of interception in ocean fisheries, when you look at the marine fisheries and fresh water fisheries combined, we are harvesting, even with the tribal allowances and so forth, less than ten percent of the fish.

How can we get any more water out of this well? I think that well is dry.

THE MODERATOR: Don, I have to cut you off now. Thanks a lot. Appreciate your comments.

M. Lewis next. Then we have Carol Russell and on deck is Nicole Cordan.

M. LEWIS: Good evening.

THE MODERATOR: You look great, I have to say.

M. LEWIS: Thank you. I am Captain Meriwether Lewis of the Corps of Discovery. I come before this body as a scientist, soldier, citizen, private secretary to President Thomas Jefferson, and with my dear colleague, Captain William Clark, leader of the expedition dispatched to discover the Northwest Passage.

I return here after 195 years with a weary heart and discouraged soul. Tragedy affects these waters and lands. The promise we made to the first people who lived here, who many times saved the Corps of Discovery, are broken. My heart felt apology to the native people who trusted the message of peace, brotherhood, and respect we brought from President Jefferson. This apology, I add, is long overdue.

The generations who followed us did not honor you, your rivers, or the salmon. When our men put canoes in the Columbia River it ran with such might and swiftness the native people regarded our immediate death as certain. They waited below the swallowing and boiling rapids to rescue us from our own foolishness.

The water was so clear the salmon could be seen as far as 20 feet below the surface. On the banks the red flesh hung on drying racks mile after mile. Salmon provided the people of the Northwest a great part of trade, as my colleague once wrote. This was the greatest salmon fishery in the world.

Salmon saved our expedition not far from here in late November 1805. We were weary, having come more than 4,100 miles. Earlier that fall, again, the fat salmon from the Denepoo (ph), the Nez Perce, unquestionably saved our starving people as we struggled.

At our return, I find that you have eradicated nearly all this bounty and the sheer, beautiful canyons and the waters that had such speed as to catapult us 34 miles in a single day. Like me, the salmon, the rivers and the wondrous canyons are ghosts. These ghosts haunt me and these ghosts haunt all of us. We risked all to open the way for you to share in these riches. Careless action, goaded by air guns, have turned swift waters into something unspeakably bad.

If you continue to pursue this damned course, you will cheat the forest, the eagle, the bear, and the people of the wealth the salmon bring from the ocean. Fortunately, though, you are gentlemen and ladies of education, capable of taking the correct course.

As Captain of the Corps of Discovery, I call upon you all to become the Corps of Recovery. You will breach just four of the hundreds of dams on these rivers, so for the decades hence you do not have the shame of exterminating the mighty species, the salmon. You honor the true anniversary of our expedition.

THE MODERATOR: I have to --

M. LEWIS: There is only one honorable decision for you. I hope that you choose to make it.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Meriwether. Now I understand why you signed in M. Lewis. If you had put Meriwether Lewis, I probably would have been quite shaken.

Karen Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: My name is Karen Russell. I'm here tonight representing Waterwatch of Oregon. Waterwatch is a non-profit organization located in Portland, Oregon, and we advocate for protection of the streams and flows in Columbia and throughout the West.

It's been said by some that removing these dams will result in a loss of water rights of farmers that take the water from the reservoirs from behind these dams. This isn't the case. The water rights that farmers hold will not be affected by dam removal. Farmers need to move or extend their pipes, but nothing about dam removal would change the legal nature of the farmers' rights to take water from the lower Snake River.

Right now the Bureau of Reclamation delivers hundreds of millions of acres to Idaho water users. If the dams are not removed, flow augmentation needs for salmon recovery may require that we eliminate these water deliveries and many Idaho water users will be without water. In fact, by the Corps' own estimates, keeping the four federal dams in place will affect six times as many acres as would be affected by removing the dams.

We need to understand that a decision to delay removing these dams or a decision not to remove these dams means more pain for the region than stepping up to the plate now and making the decision to remove the dams. Water users in our region can't afford for you not to remove the four federal dams. Snake River salmon cannot afford for you not to remove the four federal dams. Our children and our children's children cannot afford for us not to remove the four federal dams.

This is not a water rights issue. It is an issue of cost and an issue of extinction. At the bottom line, it's too costly both economically and societally to keep these dams.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Nicole Cordan, and then Daniel Lichtenwald, and then on deck and is Cole Dahle.

MS. CORDAN: Good evening. My name is Nicole Cordan, and I am here representing the National Wildlife Federation and its four million plus members and supporters. I wanted to thank you for giving us this opportunity to comment here tonight. My comments here are addressed to both the Corps' EIS and the Federal Caucus's All-H paper, but we will be submitting more formal comments later in the comment period.

Just for the record, National Wildlife Federation supports the removal of the four lower Snake River dams to protect salmon in the Pacific Northwest. Let's be clear that the question that we are discussing tonight, about removing the four lower Snake River dams, is no longer a question of science.

Your agencies have told us what the science is. And the science shows that breaching the dams is the best way to insure the restoration of wild salmon and steelhead.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for being the only federal agency that had both the integrity and the courage to acknowledge the science and to say it out loud to the rest of us. Thank you, Mr. Cheney. Thank you.

It's also not a question of law. It's clear that the best option for complying with all the federal laws is removing these four lower Snake River dams. Both ESA, Clean Water Act, which seems to be a legal statute that has been forgotten in this decision.

It's not a question of keeping our promises and meeting our treaty obligations. Again, it's clear that the way to meet your obligation is, our treaty obligations and our promises of the past is to take out these four dams.

Finally, it's not a question of economics. I'm sure you will find new studies of economics in the record and actually there are -- I think if you look at some studies that have already been done, the economics are clear that removing these dams is good economically for the region.

The only question here is a political one about whether or not we should take out these dams. Let me help you with the politics. Diane Valentine a little earlier said that the people must lead for the leaders to follow.

Well, the people of this region, the people of this nation want the dams removed and they want the salmon back. I'd like to take this opportunity to ask those in the room who know that and feel that we want salmon, that we need salmon and that these four lower Snake River dams don't make sense to stand up and just show you that the people are leading and it's time for you to follow them.

Rider & Associates

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Let the record show that the room is standing.

Before it gets any later, I also want to thank the parents who brought their children tonight. It's nice to see kids taught to be involved in their democracy. Thank you.

Daniel. And then we have Cole Dahle, and on deck we have Dwayne. Can I skip your last name? It's long and complicated. You know who you are.

MR. LICHTENWALD: My name is Daniel Lichtenwald. I live in Goldendale, Washington.

It is predicted in some studies that in ten years the last wild Snake River salmon will follow its ancestors. To replenish the circle of life for that individual and all of its kind, the circles ends forever, as it has already for the Snake River coho. It's less than 25 years that the Snake River dams have been standing.

It's only a brief moment in the eons of the wild fishes that have survived through times of cataclysmic floods -- those are natural events that left room for adaptation, readaptation for survival studies -- for the short-term greed of a minority of self-serving promoters and speculators. Greed and pandering of myopic local interests to the Goddesses of growth in creating exponentially several lifetimes of careers and busy work for themselves by practicing perpetual indecision.

The impacts of these unnatural courses have come too rapidly and in less than good faith to give the wild salmon wiggle room for survival. For the wild Snake River salmon historically comprise about half of the population of the Columbia River and whose numbers have been reduced about 90 percent since the pork barrel dams went in.

It's time for change. What will it cost? My congressman declares I should be the first to have my electric bills increased. From \$1 to \$5 a month for a wild river full of wild salmon is a bargain.

We welcome opportunities to promote energy conservation strategies and forward technologies. Some of the con men squander their taxpayer subsidies on 3,000 acres of crops that will wither if the 13 pumps they use can't reach the river. I say, pay them to get longer pipes. It certainly won't take more than the 25 million in the 1950s dollars that the Corps gave to the tribes in destroying Celila Falls.

One of my senators decrees that the economic losses that would follow dam removal far exceed the cost of wild salmon extinction in the Snake River. But that senator also swore an oath that salmon is extinct. For what would be the grossest violation yet of the 1855 treaty.

In any case, a penny or two per bushel can't put that much of a dent in the contribution of free speech the senator is dependent upon. The era of taking the wild Snake River for granted should give way to restoring a natural wild river for conditions that will sustain a vibrant, thriving, wild population of salmon. This is the overwhelming consensus coming from the scientific community, is it not?

No more radios down the throat. No more man-made gates, grates, deflectors or screens. No more wild rides. No more in vitro fertilization.

Give the Snake River back to the salmon while they are still here. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Cole Dahle, Dwayne Pfenninger, and on deck is Teresa Howell.

MR. DAHLE: My name is Cole Dahle, and I am in the third grade at Becker Grade Primary School in Wilsonville. This fall I studied salmon and their life cycle, and found out what dams do to them. Almost everything revolves around salmon. If salmon are dead, bears will die, because that's their main source of food.

Salmon are big. If there are no salmon to eat little fish, the little fish will invade the ocean. If there are no salmon, the humans will have to eat more junk food and get a heart attack. If you were a fisherman, there would be no salmon to catch and you couldn't make money for your family.

No dams on the Snake. I want the kids in the year 2000 through 9000 to see salmon. I will fight with anything to keep salmon and take out dams if you don't do it now.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Cole. Dwayne, then Teresa. On deck is Susan Crisfield.

MR. PFENNINGER: Well, I have to follow that kid? And I was all ready to yield to the gentleman from Washington and give him my three minutes.

My name is Dwayne Pfenninger. I am president of All- Sports Supply, a 45-year-old business here in Clackamas. We do about \$45 million, of which \$20 million of it per year is in fishing and fishing related products. I obviously have a concern. We employ approximately 105 people through the Northwest region and service approximately 700 customers.

I am also the president of the Northwest Sport Fishing Industry Association. And we have concluded through much study that breaching of the dams is the obvious way to go if we are ever to expect to have salmon recovery.

As a sideline, I am also on the Willamette Restoration Initiative, the task force that was Governor Kitzhaber's project.

Our company just finished a trade show. We brought in over 300 dealers down at the convention center. And economics is what I am going to deal with here and try to talk about.

I feel a certain sense of comfort, because if we use logic, the dams are going to go. Because I can promise you the arguments are very feeble against them. If you use logic and economics, that's the only decision you can come to if you want salmon.

The sports fishing industry is tied to the health of this symbol. It's not only a heritage and a culture. I was amazed -- you guys may kind of recognize my accent; I'm not kind of a native -- to come out here and realize how much the salmon means.

We have great fisheries out here. Everyone tries to steer them towards other fisheries, but the salmon is the heart and soul of the Northwest. Economically everybody thinks that if the fish go away, then I am going to be out of a job. I am going to have to get a real job. We are going to have to find something else to do.

Let me just tell you, if you want to see the true economics of what happens when the fish go away, take a little side trip to Astoria. Take a little side trip down to Newport.

I can tell you the dock feels down there, when I went down to dock my boat, they gave me a price list from 1993. I says, "You mean to tell me you have not raised your rates since 1993?" She says, "No, sir. Not since the fish left."

It's a very true fact. It's \$126 a month to dock a 40-foot boat down there. It's half empty at that rate.

The last economic figure I want to give you, and I will tell you that there have been numerous studies both in salt and fresh water and the value of a sport fish caught swimming and released, or whatever, is, in the neighborhood of 25 to \$30 a pound. We can substantiate that. That is be it a red fish, be it a salmon, and particularly a salmon.

So I just want to leave that figure. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Theresa Howell, and Susan Crisfield, and then on deck now is Walt Socha.

MS. HOWELL: Hi. My name is Patricia Howell. I actually am a native Washingtonian, and actually grew up in eastern Washington, right near where the dams are located. My grandfather actually helped build the Lower Monumental, as well as the Little Goose Dam.

As a small child I remember going to the Snake River and swimming in it near the Little Goose Dam, being able to see lots of salmon traveling up and down the river. I also graduated from Seattle University with a Bachelor's in ecological studies and a minor in biology, as well as chemistry.

When I think of the Great Northwest, I think of three things: Salmon, old growth forests and Orca whales. Unfortunately, all three of those are in dire risk of becoming endangered and really extinct unless we act.

The Endangered Species Act requires us to take the necessary steps in order to save these salmon. If we fail, there are dire consequences, including paying Canada as well as the tribes for broken treaties; not once, but forever.

Our children won't be able to know the icon of the great Pacific Northwest. That would be a sad state of affairs. What a shame that would be.

These dams don't make any sense. As an ecologist, I would just like to talk about the life cycle a little bit about these amazing creatures. After spawning, baby salmon hanging out and on their way to the actually the ocean, they have to go through eight dams in order to get out to sea. So they are hanging out, little baby salmon, getting ready to make that trek. And what happens is tens of -- or 15 percent of them die at every dam because they either get chopped up through the turbines, they don't make it over the spillways, they don't make the little sneaky tracks that bypass the dams altogether.

They are having a hard time. So, you know, a huge percentage actually don't even make it out to sea. Then once they get out to sea they have an enormous trek up to Alaska, where they are commercially fished, as well as sports fishermen up in Alaska.

Then they come back to the great State of Washington, where we have the most cancer-causing chemicals in our waterways than any other state in the nation. Then they go up the last remaining eight ladders, which are pretty good at after they have managed to survive all of that.

So I just really want to make sure that you understand that we can save these fish. By removing the dams we can bring an estimated 123 million in just recreational value to this area by making 140 mile stretch of beautiful, pristine waters.

What better way to support recovery efforts to these endangered stocks than to return this river to its natural state. So we need to move as a community, region, and really a nation, and shift our focus to a more ecological and sound one. We can start by saving our salmon, and remove the four dams, and protect them.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Theresa.

Susan Crisfield, then Walt Socha, and on deck is William Levin.

MS. CRISFIELD: Good evening. My name is Susan Crisfield, and I am here representing Northwest Environmental Advocates. It's an organization with members throughout the west who are dedicated to the restoration and protection of our northwest ecosystems.

Our comments tonight address both the U.S. Corps of Engineers' draft on the EIS, on the feasibility of removing the four lower Snake River Dams, and the Natural Marine Fishery Services' All-H paper. There are many factors contributing to the decline of salmon in the region.

We applaud the agencies in recognizing we need to address all four H's: Habitat, hatcheries, harvest, and hydro power. However, in the case of the Snake River Dam, NEA believes the agencies are using the call for reform of all four as a means of deemphasizing the primary cause of decline, the hydro system.

NMFS has spent much of the last year working to protect the Columbia River estuary for salmon and other wildlife. We appreciate that.

However, our concern is that while the All-H paper promotes the estuary as perhaps the most important habitat for these endangered fish, NMFS has given the go ahead to a project that will impact the health and function of this habitat, the deepening of the lower Columbia River.

In one proceeding NMFS suggests that dam removal is not necessary because salmon could be recovered by protecting and restoring key habitat that includes the Columbia River Estuary. In another proceeding NMFS suggests the channel deepening project can proceed without causing jeopardy to these same fish.

It doesn't make sense. It's the salmon that are losing. The question of whether or not to address the Columbia River estuary and whether to remove the four lower Snake River dams are integrally linked. The effects that dredging the estuary might have on the ability of a habitat has not been addressed. Without this analysis, the agencies are playing a shell game that will end in salmon extinction, the loss of a Pacific Northwest icon.

Northwest Environmental Advocates members will not stand by and watch this happen. Neither will the rest of the Northwest.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Walt Socha. After Walt we have William Levin, then Shelley Cooke.

MR. SOCHA: I am Walt Socha. I am here today as a genetic offspring of this planet's biosphere.

I would like to thank you for being here and listening to me. Start out by saying, I fully support the removal of the dams in question.

However, instead of referring to particular plus or minus cost or particular plus or minus numbers of fish or particular plus or minus numbers of jobs, I would like to support that approval for the dam removal from kind of a broader perspective.

Allow me to stand here. Wealth is created by three sources: Capital, labor and resources. The U.S. is in the midst of an unprecedented period of wealth creation. However, the three sources of this wealth -- capital, labor and resources -- are not benefiting equally.

I claim that the holders of capital are keeping a disproportionate share, to the detriment of labor, jobs, which we were talking about here, and resources, fish. Labor certainly isn't doing well. High paying manufacturing is going off, slowly being replaced by low paying service jobs.

Most of the \$12 trillion in wealth generated in the past few decades is being held by a few percent of the population. Net worth since 1983, by the bottom fourth of population has dropped by 80 percent, and so forth.

These numbers are out there. They vary widely from source to source, but all show this trend. Resources, fish, water, air quality, forest, they are all being degraded.

Now, returning wealth to resources could be measured by increasing sustainability. Other measures could include the health of the biosphere, reduced pollution, liveability. You got to remember, we live in this environment.

What does this have to do with fish and dams? I would say that this country has the wealth to remove the dams to protect the fish. This country has the wealth to create alternative good jobs. This country has the wealth to convert our industries. This country has the wealth to maintain and increase sustainability. This country has the wealth to meet treaty obligations. This country has the wealth to act on our ideas of better life.

The problem is, we are not allocating a fair share of this wealth to the two to three sources of that wealth. This entire controversy of fish jobs industry, power generation and so forth is misleading. The root issue here that we are not addressing is the allocation of wealth.

I would like to end by saying, we should stop fighting among ourselves because we do have these common issues to resolve. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Walt.

William Levin, and then Shelley Cooke, and then on deck is Tim Hester.

MR. LEVIN: Hi, everybody. Thank you for being here and listening to us. I am a human being in training. I am very nervous to speak in front of all of you.

Something that bothers me and hurts my heart a great deal, all we have talked about are complex and politics and commodifying this and that, and the other thing. Salmon are very old. They've been here far longer than any of us have. I think without any other conversation, they should be able to survive simply because they are magnificent creatures.

If you have ever stopped and watched them spawn, it's a magical experience. It's an honor to watch them. It's something that has to be here.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

They are more important than we are. I think that humans could become extinct and we would do -- this planet would do fine. I think salmon need to be here.

I don't think any of this has to be really complicated. I just don't understand the discussion about the politics of it, the economics of it. It's not right. We have made many mistakes and we need to start learning how to live in a more sustainable fashion on all levels.

I think restoring a river a little more closely to its natural state, its wild state can only be good ultimately. It may require some adjustment as far as livelihoods are concerned. I don't wish any harm to humans and their livelihoods.

I think we have to make changes, though. We have to make them quickly. We study and we talk and we study and we talk, and we have piles of those studies. Meanwhile, time just ticks along.

I suggest that there is a sense of urgency that I don't feel is addressed here. I can hear it. But this has to happen soon, I think.

I don't know. I didn't prepare any written statements. People here know what they are talking about. You all have done your homework. But I'd say that this is a spiritual issue. It's about life. Really, that's more important than anything else.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Shelley Cooke, and then Tim Hester. On deck is Matthew Garrington.

MS. COOKE: When I think about salmon there is a lot of different words that come to mind. Some of them are strength, power, perseverance, and beauty. I think to myself, those are wonderful things. Those are things that God has given to salmon.

I think there are other words. Some of those are threatened and doomed, extinction and sorrow. I think to myself, those are things that man has given salmon. That makes me really, really sad, to think that.

I moved here about a year and a half ago from central Idaho, where I worked with salmon and steelhead for about five years in a place called Red Fish Lake. If any of you are familiar with salmon, you probably have heard of sockeye salmon. For the five years I worked there I saw two fish return over five years. On the salmon river we had 37 fish return to our facility.

It's pretty darn sad when you start to think about Red Fish Lake, which was a lake that was named for sockeye salmon spawning on the shores, the lakes would be red with color because of the sockeye salmon. The day that we have a Red Fish Lake without any red fish and the salmon river without any salmon would be a very sad day indeed.

There are many, many things I learned while working there. One of the things is the politics involved with salmon recovery. I can see that the salmon are suffering. They are literally drowning in a river of red tape.

It is one of the things that are holding salmon back from recovery, is the fact that politics is holding them back. There are so many different agencies trying to manage salmon recovery that they literally are bickering about how to save the salmon while they are going extinct.

Another thing that I learned is that technology is not saving salmon. We have hatcheries and barges. We have fish turbines, screens in front of the turbines. None of those things are saving salmon. Those are all Band-Aids for something that needs open heart surgery.

We have these fish on life support. We are stringing them along. We are keeping them together, but not bringing them back.

We will never bring them back until we breach those dams. That is the only thing that will save the salmon, is by breaching the dams. Until we do that, we will never, ever bring the salmon back.

They have everything that they need. They have the strength, the power, the perseverance. What they don't have is the river. If we are going to give the salmon any gift man can give, it is a river. That is what they need and that is what we need to give them.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Shelley.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Tim Hester, and then after Tim is Matthew Garrington, and then after Matthew is Nancy Tracy.

MR. HESTER: I just want to thank you. My name is Tim Hester. I work for Save Our Wild Salmon. Once again, we are a broad coalition of environmental groups, but as well as sport fishing and commercial fishing organizations, some of which you saw earlier today.

I just want to, first of all, turn around and thank all of you that came here tonight. I know that with the location change after our beautiful mailer was sent out, a lot of people may not have been able to make it here.

I just wanted to just say I feel like I have had the privilege of being able to travel Oregon and to go to central Oregon, Pendleton, Astoria, and give slide shows on this issue. And the people that we talk to are just a cross range of folks, you know.

And it's just -- it makes me feel good to tell you that the people that want to save Snake River salmon are not a certain set of persons. They are people that care about the fish for very many different reasons. And I just feel that that's a very important thing to think about.

As far as some of the economics, I had mentioned earlier that I wanted to ask you to look at, one of the gaping holes that I would ask that you look at is down river benefits to dam removal. There is zero dollars in your analysis for down river benefits.

We really feel that that's an important benefit that needs to be put in there. That's a huge dollar figure. I am not the expert, but that should be a dollar figure that would be included.

I think, also, some of the other economics that were not looked at or were misleading, I believe, is that you low balled a lot of the benefits, as well. It's very complicated to go into and I won't go into that.

Please take some of the advice that folks said, to look at the median range of some of the economic numbers because that will definitely bring the cost down quite a bit. You will see that dam breaching is not that expensive for the region.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I mean, the science is clear, so I don't even want to go into the science. We know where the science is.

Once again, I just want to thank everyone that came here, because most folks here believe that those dams don't make sense.

Say it with me. Those dams don't make sense. Those dams don't make sense. Those dams don't make sense.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Matthew, and then after Matthew is Nancy Tracy, and on deck is Scott Bagstad.

MR. GARRINGTON: Hi. I just heard a little question earlier about the politics and the reason why the dams aren't being removed have to do with politics. I believe the politics and politicians aren't paying attention to the fact that there seems to be an overwhelming amount of support to have the dams removed.

Since I am not going to be as articulate as my brothers and sisters, I will try to make up for it in brevity. I just want to say I wholeheartedly support the removal of the dams.

Definitely, I think, as far as -- I am not an expert, by any stretch of the imagination, on this, but I do think from the plans you listed on the net job loss isn't including that, since the first three plans are options that you have will lead to extinction of the salmon, really there is not going to be a net job loss. There is -- there is going to be a net sustainability of jobs whether it be Alaska, the tribes, State of Washington, Oregon.

The only choice is to remove those dams. Obviously, if the salmon go extinct, we are looking at observing ocean whale populations. Obviously they like to eat those. And also, again, to reiterate, if the salmon do go extinct, it's going to be \$10 billion we are going to have to be paying Canada and Native American tribes for that loss.

Also, when I heard that fish were actually barged down river, I just found that idea to be completely obscene, really. And I think we just need to remove those dams, let the salmon go in there and do their thing.

Really, technology isn't always the best solution when dealing with nature. Sometimes nature needs to be able to do what nature does and just get on with the thing.

Let's remove those dams. Not to be so esoteric, the man who didn't have a prepared speech really hit the nail on the head in saying that we have a spiritual need to make sure that these salmon stay here.

So again, let's get those dams removed.

THE MODERATOR: Nancy Tracy, and then Scott Bagstad, and after Scott, on deck -- I can't read the first name, but I think the last name is Denison.

MS. TRACY: I am Nancy Tracy. I am a member of the Oregon Natural Resources Council and also the Audubon Society. I am here as a citizen speaking as a Northwesterner with concern with salmon.

The sound science and the professional people with all the fish and wildlife agencies are on the side of dam removal. That's where, certainly, I am, also. If we are going to keep the salmon from going extinct, that is the step we need to make. We are always figuring what is the loss up at the top in terms of money, but we are never looking at the gain down below after we've done the right thing.

I think one big thing that is out of reference with all of this is that this planet has gone through five major mass extinctions. At the present time we're in the midst of the sixth mass extinction. And it should scare us to death.

What's happening is one species -- this was something I heard several years ago -- one species goes extinct every ten minutes. We hear about and we were aware of those creatures in our own environment, right in our own communities. But all around the world species are being lost that haven't even yet been identified, classified.

So I think what we need to do is to stop playing this dangerous game, to realize we're the cause. Nothing else -- the five previous extinctions were caused by extraordinary circumstances. We alone are the cause of the sixth mass extinction that's going on on this planet, and we are not really even talking about it except on the fish basis, with one species.

Somehow we've got to get it into our consciousness we're responsible and we are intelligent enough to do something about it and not delay. Because the more we delay, the worse is the legacy we pass on to future generations. There is either going -- scientists say in the next two decades they'll either have a legacy of living a good life or they are going to have a legacy that we leave them of having to meet chaotic problems that absolutely defy solution.

So thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Scott, Scott Bagstad. Then next is Denison, Mr. Denison, and then after that Bill Ruggles.

MR. BAGSTAD: Hi. My name is Scott Bagstad. I belong to a few different organizations, but I'm here not representing them. I am here to represent the children I plan on raising.

I saw a lot of kids come on earlier on. That hit home.

Personally, I am scared to death to be up here, and it's a hard move to come up here. But I feel I had to come up here. It's the right thing to do.

We have to get rid of the dams. If it means for me to be uncomfortable and kind of expose myself and do something very scary for myself to do, that's what it takes.

I hope you guys listen to that and kind of take a lesson from that. When I was a kid, I watched Dr. Seuss on television, watched these big machines Dr. Seuss had that came and cut down all the trees, polluted all the rivers, killed all the fish, killed everything. As a small kid, six, seven, eight years old, I saw that. It was wrong.

Now 20, 30 years later people see that in real life. They can't just conclude it's wrong. It's the exact same thing.

The answer is clear. We got to get rid of the dams. Look at the Corps of Engineers. Thirty years ago the Corps could have looked forward and seen some of the absurd extremities we've got to go to: Hatcheries, ladders, vacuuming fish out of a river, putting them in a tanker truck, drive them down the river, squirt them back in the river so we can barge grain on the river when the grain could easily go on the trucks or trains and leave the fish in the river.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I mean, a little much. I believe that if the Corps would have foreseen that, they would not have built the dams.

Two quotes from business school. The value of an asset is not the amount of money you put into that asset, whether you want to keep it or not. The value of that asset is what the future monies put into that asset is going to accomplish.

Putting more money into the dams is going to accomplish extinction of the salmon. Putting money into removing them is going to save the salmon.

I heard once before the definition of insanity is doing the exact same motion over and over and over again, expecting a different result. Don't do it.

THE MODERATOR: I'm sorry that I can't read your first name.

MS. DENISON: I am Marci Denison. I live in the spawning grounds. I have every kind of salmon and fish in the coast range. After breaching the dams -- non native folks have a history of trial and error from day one at Plymouth Rock. The four dams on the lower Snake are monuments to this learning process.

It's time to reassess what we have done to the world around us and others besides ourselves. There are better ways to do things. Dams were put where natural barriers already existed. Barges have a shallow draft. Why can't there be grain pipe lines at these points instead of dams? Barges, instead, could still be used between -- between them at least for possible shipping.

Please stop the corporate welfare subsidies and owners of over 60,000 acres would pay full price for the barging. Irrigation uses too much water and some places are better off deserts. If there is too much flooding and dams are so important to store irrigation, then protect the forest watersheds from clear cut logging.

Please -- where am I? You should try reading this.

Let the salmon up the Snake River. Let it be as it should be, with wild salmon to fish, to live and to spawn and to die up the Snake, where they belong.

Thank you.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Marci. Okay. We have Bill is it Ruggles. Then after Bill we have Brett Swift, and on deck is Christopher Frank.

MR. RUGGLES: Thank you. My name is Bill Ruggles. I am a quality engineer for a local manufacturing company, so I come to you basically as a concerned engineer.

As a quality engineer, there is a couple things I heard tonight I want to share with you. I can never have enough data. But that leads to something I have heard referred to called paralysis by analysis.

The science is astounding and very complex. And I don't pretend to be so smart as to be able to understand half of the data that's out there.

I think the logic is very simple. As a quality engineer, I am called upon to find solutions every day. One of the first things I want to find out, what changed. In the system that we've had here, we've had the natural system working for thousands of years. We had an abundance of fish and wildlife.

What's changed? We have added dams, we've removed trees, we have channelized the river, we've dredged the river for transportation, we've added irrigation and ranching.

What are the effects of these changes? Slack water, increased water reduction, more difficult passage of fish, loss of spawning sites, alterations of water quality, addition of various chemicals and by-products from agricultural and ranching operations.

What's been the result? What is the current situation? Salmon population has plummeted.

I've heard some figures today by the Corps of Engineers which I have thought were very interesting. Spring and summer chinook, over a 100-year period 30 percent chance of extinction. That, in my profession, would be something of serious concern. Snake River steelhead, 90 percent chance of extinction over 100 years. That, in my profession, would be a definite serious business decision. It is a known fact for a business decision. We have to act on this.

Now, how I do believe we should act? We have to act to restore salmon. Economically, biologically, ethically, spiritually. The best way to do this is to restore things back to the way they were before the changes occurred, which in this case means not only restoring the free flowing rivers by removing the dams, but taking any and all possible steps to restore the entire river system to as pristine a state as we can.

Real briefly, I want to share with you that I had a kind of parallel experience in my childhood. I grew up in southern California in the orange empire of the world, as I was told when I was growing up. Orange groves were a primary source of economic operations. Smog killed the orange groves. You don't buy California oranges up here. You buy Florida oranges.

Now, of course, there've been changes. Air quality has improved. The economy changed. It survived.

The economy up here will change one way or the other. The best thing in the long term, I mean the thousands of millennia terms, is to restore and protect the native species that were here.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: After, let's see, Brett, and then Christopher Frank.

MR. SWIFT: Good evening. My name is Brett Swift, and I am here tonight on behalf of American Rivers, a national organization dedicated to the protection and restoration of rivers and river ecosystems throughout the country. My comments opportunity are directed toward both the draft EIS and the All-H paper.

American Rivers strongly supports the removal of the four lower Snake River dams. In March of last year we named the Snake River the most endangered river in this country because we believed that the Snake River is a unique and important ecosystem that is in danger of losing what makes it so outstanding; wild salmon and steelhead runs. Yet it is an ecosystem we still have an opportunity to protect and restore.

I urge the agencies today to take this opportunity and protect this ecosystem that includes -- as an alternative, that includes removing these dams.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Removing these dams makes sense economically. In fact, a comprehensive look at all costs and benefits including those omitted by the Corps draft EIS, such as Clean Water Act compliance, suggests that dam bypass save at least \$50 million annually.

Keeping the dams doesn't make sense for salmon. PATH found that the best chance for recovering Snake River salmon would be to remove the lower Snake River dams. Even NMFS' CRI analysis shows you can't recover all Snake River salmon and steelhead species without removing the dams.

Further, conclusions are more optimistic than can be supported by the data.

Finally, as we have heard numerous times tonight, 150 years ago our government signed treaties guaranteeing tribes the right to fish at all usually and accustomed rights sites. It is time we uphold these promises. To do otherwise is inconceivable.

It's time for the federal government to fulfill its legal mandates, to do what's right for salmon, our communities, and for the tribes. The only one alternative can do that is breaching the four lower Snake River dams.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Brett.

Christopher is up next. Then Steve Wise is after that. But after Christopher I'd like to break for five minutes. We will please -- our panel is needing a break and so is our court reporter. So we will stick to that five minutes, because we want to try and get back and hear from as many of you as we can.

Taking a look at our list here, we are not quite halfway through the names that have signed up. So I just want to suggest that if you have a lot of people here from an organization, and some of them have driven from out of town and won't be able to get to another meeting, you might want to think about that and arrange your speakers that way, so that they can get a chance to speak tonight.

I'm not sure we are going to get to everybody. We are going to take Christopher's comments, take a five-minute break. As soon as we get back after our break, Steve Wise will be our first speaker.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

MR. FRANK: My name is Christopher Frank. I am a Washington resident and a Native American.

By now you've heard the litany of facts that support the removal of the dams. I am going to try and speak from my heart and how it affects me.

I find it really disturbing we are discussing the very survival of a species that have been so important to my people. My grandfather used to tell me stories about how you could practically walk across the backs of the salmon in the rivers and the streams. It should never have come to this.

I mean, now we are talking about in 26 years the absolute extinction of this species. I just find it really sad that it's gotten to this point.

There's ample evidence that this is the only option that works. I mean, fish don't have wheels. If the great spirit intended fish to have been trucked downstream, they would have been given wheels. That's the way I see it.

I want to remind the panel that the decision you guys make -- I know it's not necessarily this evening, but the decision you make tonight affects the survival of an entire species and the way of life of millions and millions of people.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Christopher.

Okay. Five minutes. We are going to be back here exactly ten minutes after. Be ready. We will have Steve Wise ready.

(A five-minute recess was taken.)

THE MODERATOR: Steve Wise, and then Steve Grutbo. Then we have on deck Dan Kent.

MR. WISE: My name is Steve Wise. I work with the Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition.

I was a participant in some of the economic research that the Corps of Engineers did, so I know far more than anybody deserves to know about what's in the reports and what's not. I would like to talk about both of those things tonight.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I would also like to congratulate the Fish and Wildlife Service for their courage and honesty in declaring the dam removal a no brainer. Based on that, I think we can safely say with great certainty that dam removal is the only recovery strategy that is both affordable and effective.

Keeping dams in place does not make sense. It requires far greater spending, which would impact many more land users, and has no scientific evidence of reaching recovery. At present the biggest part of the so-called All-H program are hope, the false hope that it brings, that we can ignore and destroy natural functions of an ecosystem and still have salmon that depend on the ecosystem.

The development EIS consistently curtains or ignores positive economic and ecological values of a restored river, while exaggerating costs of dam removal and excluding higher costs of keeping dams in place.

If you include all the costs of the All-H program, dam removal saves money while building a sustainable regional economy.

I believe that three minutes is hard to get your feelings in. I would like to do that and share my time with everyone here. I think it's important on these issues when we go to speak with one voice.

I would like to ask a few questions and hope you can help me answer them. I would like to choose delay, denial, and extinction or bring back the salmon.

At a time when the region and nation's economy is the strongest it has ever been, should we breed poverty or do what needs to be done and bring back the salmon?

When bypassing dams would create thousands of jobs, should we believe false claims of economic disaster or invest in a healthy economy and bring back the salmon?

Shall we continue to falsely blame predators, the ocean, fishermen, complexity and uncertainty, or take responsibility, remove lethal dams, and bring back the salmon?

Shall we continue to violate the treaty rights of Northwest Indian tribes, risking billions of dollars in reparations for breaking the treaties or meet our commitments and bring back the salmon?

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I think the answer is very simple. Take down the dams and bring back the salmon.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Steve, Steve Grutbo, are you with us?

Dan Kent and then on deck is Bruce Frazier.

MR. GRUTBO: In my little speech here I had, "Good afternoon." I guess we are not there anymore.

Good evening. My name is Steve Grutbo. I am a key accounts manager for a company called Pure Fishing, or otherwise known as Outdoor Technology Group. I am also a board member with NSIA, the Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association.

With the help of my co-workers, I represent over \$12 million in fishing tackle sales in the Northwest. A substantial proportion of that business, approximately 30 percent, is associated with Columbia River cold water fisheries.

Like many of those who have spoken before me today, I am most concerned about the human factor involved with this issue. I am concerned about the jobs and business that will be lost in my company and in my industry if the Federal Caucus does not take decisive action to remove the four lower Snake River dams.

I am not opposed to the dams for the sake of opposition. If the best available science concluded the most viable option for the Snake River salmon recovery included maintaining the dams, then I would support their science.

But it does not. The best available science concludes the strongest chance for recovery is supporting breaching the four lower Snake River dams.

My company estimates that if a million dollars in business done prior to 1964's summer run closure and the 1976 spring chinook closure on the Columbia could be recreated today it would be worth over \$25 million when adjusted for growth and the economy and inflation.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

In other words, if we had spring and summer chinook in the fishery in the Columbia River comparable to the ones we had in the early sixties, that millions of dollars would be worth over \$25 million -- excuse me -- that million dollars would be worth over \$25 million today. A fishery accounting for ten million in sport fishing sales prior to the closures would be worth over 250 million today.

Unfortunately, those runs have only gotten weaker since the original closures and are still not available to us today. Thousands of jobs have been lost in the sport fishing industry since 1964 closures; thousands more after 1976. Yet the stock has continued to decline and the jobs have not been replaced.

The jobs of people in my company and industry are no less important than those in industries associated with maintaining the status quo. In previously Columbia River -- if the previous river closures had proven successful or the best available science concluded that dam breaching would recover this fishery or other stakeholders were apt to share equally in the cost of recovery of Snake River chinook, then I might be able to support closure as an alternative.

But maintaining the status quo does not do that. The future does not appear promising by maintaining the status quo. Delay in decision and further studies are political luxuries that neither fish nor the industries can afford.

THE MODERATOR: I am going to have to cut you off. Thanks.

I would like to remind everybody that there is an opportunity to give your comment on tape in the next room. All comments are getting treated equally. Your comments will all be treated equally. If you feel like you are not going to get heard tonight, I am going to be sure to invite you to give your comments in the next room.

Bruce. And then -- Bruce Frazier.

Tom Marlin, then Robert Stevens, and after Robert, Eric Thompson.

MR. MARLIN: I am Tom Marlin. I am chairman of CASH, Coalition for Adequate Steelhead Habitat. I wish I got my gray hair out of the way. I will just make a few comments.

When the dams were built, along with other industrial activities, no one considered what would happen when the salmon runs were gone as a result of this. Thirteen billion dollars is lost annually to the Pacific Northwest because of the loss of the salmon.

The salmon are running out of time and they will become extinct if we don't do something now and correct the problem. What I read recently really ticks me off. I wish I could do something about it.

But the scientists have known for 100 years about the problem with the salmon and were afraid to speak up because they didn't want to anger anybody. That was just published not too long ago in our local newspaper.

And I don't like to kick a guy when he is not here to defend himself, but Will was here from NMFS. He made a statement in July of 1979, that was published that it will take at least a decade to rebuild the salmon runs, to get them back.

That's a long time ago and the decades have come and gone. I kind of wonder what happened.

The dams have to go. There is no question, really.

And in closing, that was my Bible, Columbia Basin and Steelhead Analysis, September 1st, 1976. It said that the salmon, steelhead, and the people who depend on them traditionally have little to no local or political priority in the exploitation of the basin's valuable land and water resources. I think that's all changed now.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Robert Stevens. Robert Stevens.

Eric Thompson, and on deck is Pat Rumer.

MR. STEVENS: My name is Robert Stevens. I am a student at Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College.

Salmon don't need dollars. Salmon don't need government funded studies. What they need is a river without dams. Who slaughtered all the dodo birds to extinction in the 17th century? Are we any different 400 years later as we sit by and watch a salmon die a slow death?

We are ignorant if we think we can have it both ways; plenty of dams and plenty of fish. Then we sit down and wonder, gee, why isn't this working? Let's grow more fish and buy more trucks.

So we have created artificial salmon who won't be able to find their way up stream. Pretty soon we will have to issue a salmon a driver's license. Bonneville Power, in association with Monsanto, has created artificially dam friendly salmon. Great tails and no rivers needed.

Do we really want a future like this? Growth hormone milk there. This isn't progress. This is a nightmare.

A man with no soul. What we get is Frankenstein's monster. We create a fish without diversity, without a river. Indeed, without a purpose. They will be too extinct to swim up and down the river. The salmonstein will sit in the water, waiting to be trucked around by humans.

Do we need all this nonsense just to generate cheap electricity or save a few dollars, to save a ton of grain by barging it, so Idaho can have a deep water port? The only monitor run amuck will be our numbers and our artificial worlds.

Who addressed the importance of wildness? We all strive for safety, prosperity, comfort, long life and dullness.

But it all comes to the same thing; peace in our time. A measure of success and this is all, perhaps, that is a requisite to objective thinking. Too much safety seems to yield only danger in the long run. Wildness is the salvation of the world.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Eric Thompson and then Pat Rumer.

MR. THOMPSON: My name is Eric Thompson. I've been in Oregon all my life except for four years, when I lived at Lapwai on the Nez Perce Indian reservation.

I currently live here in Portland. I own a business actually in Tigard. I have eight employees, and I have some customers that have been with me for almost 18 years. I have four employees that have been with me for 12 years.

I found that one thing that my customers really, really like and they are rewarded to do if they have been a good customer, we take them salmon fishing. It's got nothing to do with our business. But once they've gone on a trip and actually gotten to catch a salmon, they seem to be our customer even if we give them lousy service.

A second point I would like to make is, I feel really proud of the tribes that have come out in support of breaching the dams. I lived for four years on the reservation, as I said, at Lapwai. I have two daughters that are Nez Perce Indians. And I'm going to report to them that I'm here speaking on their behalf. I think they're going to be proud of me for a change.

Lastly, one thing that I learned when I was on the reservation was that the tribes, when the salmon or any run of steelhead or salmon was in trouble, they always looked to themselves and asked themselves: What are we doing wrong? Our tribe must be sick. There must be sickness in our tribe because the salmon are not healthy right now.

So I suggest that maybe we are doing something wrong, and maybe we should give some medicine and give the dams an enema.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Eric, I think.

Pat Rumer and Lester Carlson, and after Lester, Annie Wexler.

MR. RUMER: Good evening. My name is Pat Rumer. I am here this evening representing the Ainsworth United Church of Christ.

Ainsworth is a small congregation located in northeast Portland at the corner of 30th and Ainsworth. It has approximately 175 members. We are part of a national church that has been a leader in issues of environmental justice, leading the way with one of the very first studies in toxic dumping in communities of color.

I am on the justice commission. And in the summer of 1998, we responded to a request from the confederated tribes, with Umatilla Indian Reservation inviting us to join the Home for the Salmon campaign.

Those of you who either have been part or are part of religious communities, it's never just that you leap from the invitation to the decision. So we invited the representatives of the Umatilla Indian tribes to come and preach, to share their spirituality with us some morning and for an opportunity to dialogue.

Rider & Associates

And after that the justice commission brought a recommendation that the congregation endorse the campaign. And it was tabled. And the suggestion was made that we needed to hear other points of view, just like tonight.

So we invited a number of people and did an educational forum in the spring of 1999, and we had a variety of perspectives presented, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, sent a representative. We viewed the video that they had done.

We went back to the congregation in the summer of 1999, asking once again for them to endorse the Home for the Salmon, and they did. So I am here tonight saying that, on behalf of one religious community, that we do support the breaching of the dams and that we join with Antoine Mentorn (ph), who said, "As Native American people we see the gradual demise of salmon as a profound religious and cultural crisis. It is a terrible disgrace that our salmon, who were entrusted by the creator to all of us for our care, could be lost forever. We believe in all people, who are stewards of God's creation."

So we ask you to remove the dams and let the people join together to save the salmon from extinction. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Lester Carlton. After Lester, I don't know if it's Arnie or Annie Wexler. Then after Annie it's Jordan Norris.

MR. CARLTON: I am here tonight to tell you folks I would like to have you breach those dams on the Snake River. I started fishing for salmon back in 1960. I caught one out there on Sauvie Island, the spring chinook.

About that time the old fellows out there were saying -- they were talking about those dams on the Snake River. They said, "One of us out here might catch the last one." I said, "Gee, that's kind of funny." They were catching quite a few.

Now I am retired and I am out there fishing. They are putting us out of the river now. So I thought maybe I will come down tonight, follow around the Save Our Salmon people, and listen to some of the things they have been talking about.

I would just like to tell you I'd like to get those dams out. Thank you.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lester.

Annie, and then Jordan Norris, and after Jordan is Peter Bales.

MS. WEXLER: Hi. It's Amie Wexler. I am here tonight for the National Wildlife Federation.

I was a bit taken aback when a few weeks ago the location was changed for the hearing. As probably everyone knows, it was supposed to be Governor Hotel. We sent out a 25,000 piece mailing to the Portland area.

BPA was kind enough to send out 9,000 postcards, but that didn't get the word to everyone. We had put a quite a bit of expense and time into it. We rented a bus to get people here. This is with the Save the Wild Salmon Coalition. I just want to say you are getting in the way of people making a public comment.

As you can see, it's getting very late. People are really dedicated to saving these fish. So thank you to everyone here again. I know Tim Lester said that earlier.

In addition, and the room would have been overflowing -- I just think you should know that -- at the Governor Hotel. We had a good crowd here tonight, but it would have been double downtown. No public transportation here and, again, the lack of notice on the change.

A few other things I want to say is that Native Americans have been fishing these fish for generations. And we must honor our treaty rights. We told them that they would be able to fish in their usual and accustomed places. We are breaking that by not allowing them to fish for these fish and by potentially talking about further cutbacks in harvest.

The fishing community is taking the hit. It's not fair they should take further hits, tribal and non tribal fisheries. The hits need to come from somewhere else.

In addition, there's burial grounds and villages that are under water right now behind these dams. And if we were to remove these dams, the water level goes down, they can have access again to those burial grounds and villages their people once lived in.

If you want to rely on habitat to save these fish, the best habitat for fall chinook is right now under water. Taking out those dams would open up that habitat for their spawning grounds.

Rider & Associates

To talk about habitat and not talk about taking out the dams doesn't make sense. Those dams don't make sense. We can't rely on habitat and still talk about channel deepening in the Columbia. Channel deepening in the Columbia is going to ruin estuary habitat. And again, losing habitat is going to provide a much greater hardship economically to people in Idaho and throughout the region.

And the science is clear. I know I'm running out of time, so I just want to say the PATH report is supposed to be independent science. We should look at the PATH report and use the results from the PATH report to make our decision.

We must comply with the Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act is being violated now.

I see I'm out of time. I just wanted to close by saying we must honor our mother earth and brother and sister salmon by taking out these dams that don't make sense. Any option must include dam breaching.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Jordan Norris. Jordan? Is Jordan here?

So then we move on to Peter Bales and, after Peter, John Ost, and on deck Mary Daly.

MR. BALES: What was I going to say? I have been waiting quite a while.

My name is Peter Bales. I am a third generation Oregonian. I learned to fish from my grandparents about 20 years ago, who were fishing the Columbia River tributaries for over 50 years.

I have a lot of love for the rivers that flow into the Columbia. I am also a fish biologist. I have over 15 years experience working in Oregon, Washington and Idaho for state and federal agencies, as well as tribes, and currently working for a consulting firm in the Portland area.

I don't have a lot of extra to add here except that I wholeheartedly support dam removal as a necessary part of the equation to restore Snake River salmon. I think nine out of ten fish biologists would agree with me except for one that's working for the Army Corps. But I really think it's necessary.

However, dam removal alone will not restore these fish unless the over harvest issues are addressed, the habitat issues are addressed, and the fish hatchery issues and mixed stock fisheries are addressed, as well.

Regarding the name NMFS report, I think the fifth H they forgot is somebody has brought some humor to think that additional hatcheries and calling them conservation hatcheries is going to actually do anything positive for the region. I think that needs a real close look in terms of conservation hatcheries and every alternative they presented.

Also, enough salmon stream is needed to replenish the food webs and nutrient bases in the tributaries. Simply opening the dam and let a few fish get out will not work.

Regarding the Corps study, the Corps seemed to compare the economic cost of different alternatives, assuming that all those alternatives would somehow restore salmon. That didn't really look at the economic cost if some of those alternatives cause those salmon to go extinct.

What is that going to mean in terms of imposing other measures, much more stringent on the entire region to protect salmon stocks? If dam removal isn't part of the equation, what's it really going to cost the region to restore salmon? What sort of Draconian habitat rules are going to be required across the region to protect salmon stocks?

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: John Ost, and then Mary Daly, and then Karon Carlson.

MR. OST: My name is John Ost. I am a resident of Portland, Oregon.

I came here to speak in my belief that the Snake River dams need to be breached before that they have been discussing. I come here from -- and I have a bit of a relationship with fish in my history. I grew up fishing for steelhead on the Klamath River, and, similar to a gentleman who was here earlier this evening, I had a dream as a young boy of being a river guide on the Klamath River.

I saw in a very short period of time, from about age six through about age 14, fish drop so much that I have to admit I was part of the problem at the time, not the solution. We would often go out with four people in the boat and the limit was five fish per person. We would come in with our limit maybe a third of the time.

By the time I was 14, 15, those -- I forget exactly what years things dropped. But by the time I was 20, it was down to two fish per person and people were lucky if everyone in the boat caught one fish. Now I'm told that the limit on the Klamath is one fish per person. Hatchery fish are the only ones that can be kept. That's a very short period of time to see such a very healthy population of fish decline that rapidly.

I wanted to say a couple other things. I studied biology some. In the last several years, last few decades population biology has come a long ways. We are now in the information age, where we use computers to model systems with a greater degree of accuracy than we used to. We can take into account probabilities for more variables.

As science is coming in, it's becoming really clear that the only viable option for saving Snake River salmon is dam removal.

I would also like to add another thing that, I think, generations down the road are going to be dealing with. That's the fact that at some point we are going to go through a shift where we recognize another human right that isn't entirely recognized at this time. That is the right of every person to experience a natural world that is as rich as the natural world was for his or her predecessors in the previous generations.

That is not true when we continue to follow courses of action that cause the decline of our natural world, including salmon, which are an important part of our economy and culture here in the Northwest.

It's a shame that the dams went in in the Snake River at all. And I think that we have a wonderful opportunity here.

The last thing I am going to say, I hope that the only study that's really seriously considered after this is a live population study of what actually happens after the dams are removed.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, John. Mary Daly, then Karon Carlson, and Ralph Wieser.

MS. DALY: Good evening. My name is Mary Daly. I am here as a concerned citizen to comment on the All-H paper and the EIS.

I feel that these studies have detoured around the root of the problem, that root being salmon extinction, the heart and soul of the issue at hand. The alternatives under consideration by the All-H plan and other agency initiatives to restore Snake River salmon do not include dam removal as a feasible option.

Their proposals to keep the dams dwell on economic myths versus reality. This position will have a larger negative and environmental and economic impact on the region than partial dam removal.

As we have already heard this evening, scientists predict extinction. In accordance with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife service, as well as with a team of federal, tribal, state, and independent scientists dam removal must be the centerpiece of any option chosen.

Without partial removal of the dams, the vast majority of biologists agree salmon are on the brink of extinction. Partial removal of the four lower Snake River dams is the most effective, economical way to restore essential habitat for salmon.

If we do not carry out partial dam removal this is what we can expect to happen. Salmon will soon be extinct. We will continue to renege on tribal fishing treaties. We will be in further violation of the Clean Water Act.

We will be glossing over scientific data and economic alternatives that support dam removal. We will maintain the status quo that will have irreparable damages. The history of bountiful salmon population is it will become even more mythological to future generations.

The government has already spent several billion dollars on elaborate salmon recovery projects, including dam bypass mechanisms that have included trucking and barging young fish around the dams. These projects have proven to be costly and unsuccessful.

Let's forget the technological fixes and allow nature to run its course. The engineering challenge should be directed to us, human action, to modify our habitats and our livelihoods to blend with the natural occurrence of a free flowing river.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

In closing, I support breaching the four lower Snake River dams, which will restore salmon to sustainable harvestable levels. This, in turn, will support a robust regional and national economy.

Extinction is forever. Dams are not.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mary.

Karon Carlson, then Ralph Wieser, and on deck is Nick Forrest.

MS. CARLSON: Hi. My name is Karon Carlson. I am with the Save Our Salmon and also just a concerned citizen.

I and my husband Lester like to fish for the salmon. I have been only been doing it since 1990, but it's something that is very fulfilling, to go out and see the salmon in the water. I really hate to see it go to extinction.

Out of all the reports that I've read through for all of the studies that have been made, one statement sticks out more than any others. It's from a partial segment from United States versus Winals (ph) in 1905.

"The right to resort to fishing places was a part of larger rights possessed by the Indians, upon the exercise of which there was not a shadow of impediment and which were not much less necessary to the existence of Indians than to the atmosphere they breathe."

If it's that important to them for their religion, let's not let it go extinct.

I would also like to go on record with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Regional Director Ann Bagley and Oregon Governor John Kitzhaber with their statement, "Taking out these dams, it's a no brainer."

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead, Ralph.

MR. WIESER: I am Ralph Wieser and I've been a citizen of Oregon for a long time.

While I was still a child we had a farm on the Columbia River sand out of Astoria where they housed the horses that did the nets that dragged the fish out of the river. When I read of the Caspian Terns at the mouth of the river, I figured that probably our mistake was that we didn't leave a Tern unstoned.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I don't think that the Columbia River or the Snake River dams are the last items on the agenda of the folks here. If you go up to Orofino on the Clearwater you can look right up there and see the Dworshak Dam, which has no fish passage.

I highly invite people, everybody here, to remember what the Colonel said about John Day Dam and what they had, perhaps, in mind for it. But I also invite you to remember that we're in the year 2000 and that we're talking about old technologies and old techniques.

And I noted in the Corps of Engineers report reference to a transponder. Well, the vibrational technologies are available to herd fish where we want them to go. And if we can do that, apparently the fish have no trouble getting up the creek, but the little ones have the trouble getting down the creek.

We can build fish streams around those dams without much expense or trouble, comparatively speaking, and we can get the small fish, the smolts or the fry, or whatever you want to call them, into the fish streams and get them around the dams.

We can do that for McNary and John Day and Bonneville and The Dalles, as well. We can also put them up over Grand Cooley or any other man-made or natural barrier that we have in mind.

We are into a new decade, a new century, new technology. We would do very well to use them. I can't imagine that we can't get the fish around those dams on the lower Snake.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Nick Forrest, and then after Nick is Frank Wann, and after Frank is Jim Boon.

MR. FORREST: Thank you. I am Nick Forrest from Southwest Washington Sierra Club group. We are strong supporters of dam breaching.

Normally at hearings like this I get annoyed by speakers complementing other speakers. I have been coming to dozens of hearings like this over years. Rarely have I seen one of such a high quality of good speakers in favor of one issue.

Environmentalists get stereotyped as tree huggers or emotional, haven't done their homework. We have heard people tonight, a long list of them, who obviously knew the issues, had considered the alternatives to dam breaching, and still came to the conclusion that this was the best way to go.

It's a difficult choice. I recognize that. As we've heard tonight, not breaching dam has extreme cost, as well. Some of the other alternatives of breaching dams, salmon transportation and hatcheries, are also expensive alternatives.

I was also impressed by the variety of people who spoke tonight from all walks of life. We had fishermen who make their living off the river, people who work for public utilities.

In the past I have had to present environmental cases with all the culture and spiritual significance versus economics. That's not the case here. We have economics on our side, if you really do a fair and honest accounting.

So just one last thing about the impact of breaching the dams. I've heard over the years from some of the folks who are involved in barging on the Columbia and some of the farmers. I understand why they're concerned. Absolutely. No question about that.

Let me just point out a few things, though, about the history of that region. Lewiston, Idaho was not founded to be a sea port. It became a sea port because the federal government completed a huge public works project. That eventually made Lewiston into a sea port, that made irrigation of the deserts and arid grasslands possible.

That project was paid for by the taxpayers and citizens all across the country. It's not paid for even by today. It's a subsidy.

So we should reconsider it, while the people's lives revolved around that. And we know a lot more about the ecosystem than we did 30 years ago.

If the voters feel we should take away the subsidy that was given to that region, then that's what we should do.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Frank Wann is next. Jim Boon is next after Frank, and then A. Kerr.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I just want to let you know we've got about 26 people left signed up and about time for maybe 11 left. Again, I encourage you to make your comments over in the room next door on tape or in writing.

So after Frank is Jim and then A. Kerr, Bruce Hansen, I think Darey Schultz, Holly Forrest, Doug Riggs, Greg Beeker. That takes us to probably Gillian Lyons and that's it. That's about all we can get.

MR. WANN: My name is Frank Wann. I am a private consultant in the agricultural, golf course, and nursery industry. My job is basically to switch growers either or to a sustainable organic farming practice or switching a commercial farm into an organic practice, where eventually their yields are increased, disease and insect problems disappear, and the reduction in water use, let's say, in eastern Oregon and Washington can be reduced by 75 percent.

I was back in the back room and I see ten ways irrigators can save water. And the number one thing that I look at isn't even on this. It's building organic matter, soil fill, rock, minerals in the soil, which gives you, in a tablespoon of soil, billions of microbes.

In the average farm you are lucky to find thousands of microbes in a tablespoon or soil. Then, building soil, you also don't need any more erosion control and you also don't need sediment ponds because the earth is a natural filter down to the ground water.

To better help you people understand the economic plight of the American farmers, especially the apple growers in eastern Washington and Oregon and the wheat growers, we are getting a lot of pressure from China because of free trade and they are dumping their produce on our markets right now. Most of the apple growers in Washington are going out of business like worse than the great depression.

A lot of juice, every one of us is involved every time we eat, supporting the salmon. So that the farmers going broke are going to do anything they can to stay in business. Which means wind erosion, water erosion.

But this water, the sediment is going into our rivers, filling up the Columbia River, which the sediment -- I see I am running out of time.

The sediment fills up the dams. Eventually the river will want to go over the dams because it's a natural process for free flowing.

Rider & Associates

We are trying to prevent that. Every time that we support the farmers on paying more for our food instead of supporting China growers dumping on our market, that will save one scale on one fish. So if a million people do that, we can save one fish.

It takes every effort from every individual, that we can come together and work together as a nation, as a people, to be one and work together. Because it's going to cost us more money than what you said up there on our farming and irrigation costs and all that.

We are rolling the dice. Where it's going to land is 100 years down road in the future. I don't even want to think about what could happen.

I can go into heavy metal issues around the farming issue. One last thing to try to lighten up this issue tonight, however. I love that traffic light. Moving back into the city, green means slow to moderate speed, yellow means go faster and red now means go even faster.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Frank. Jim still here? No?

A. Kerr. No?

All right. Bruce Hanson?

Moving right along. Is it Darey Schultz? No?

Holly Forrest.

MS. FORREST: I am really nervous about this, but I really do want to talk to you. I won't be anywhere near as articulate as the other people who have spoken. I am afraid to be argumentative or to be confrontational except to my husband and to my children.

When I got here and I was looking at the open house tables, I met a man who represents several labor unions. He opposes the breaching of the dams. This is really true.

I came planning to speak in support of the partial dam removal. But I did not have the confidence to disagree with him on a face-to-face basis. We talked about our children, and chit-chatted, and so forth. Then I started asking him some questions about the union's position.

He said that 95 percent of the salmon made it through each project. Now, I want to teach my children -- by the way, this is Katy -- to analyze and think critically on issues; not critically of me.

Rider & Associates

"Each project" was what he said. That caught my attention. Because that was kind of a qualification. I thought: What does that mean? I had enough arguments with my husband to know if he starts to qualify stuff I need to pay attention.

Assuming his statement is correct, 95 percent of the salmon makes it through the first dam. I asked what the total kill of salmon was, and he said -- and he kind of looked at me. He said -- I'm not a math major and I can't necessarily calculate that in my head, but I figured that if it was 95 percent for the first one, then 95 percent was what was swimming through the next one. You understand the argument.

Anyway, he said basically some 60 percent made it through. Well, that's pretty grim. He sort of looked at me. I didn't say anything again. I wasn't about to confront him.

This new friend that I made said some other things, too. He said that other factors are responsible for the decline in salmon and that they should be dealt with. He talked about other things that you have heard a million times, things like Caspian Terns.

But the point is that the dams are significant blocks to salmon. The other factors that reduce salmon population should be addressed, too, but dams are a biggy.

The unions and the workers are worried about the loss of their jobs. And I share that worry. I have a lot of friends who are employed in different occupations that might be affected.

But salmon recovery, I think, will mean jobs. And extinction worries aside, we can have economic benefits from dam breaching that I think are worth considering.

I wish I had said these things to him. I don't know. Maybe he is still here. But in any case, you are here. You are the decision makers. So here are some of the points that I came planning to make.

THE MODERATOR: I need ask you to wrap up, please.

MS. FORREST: On the Corps DEIS, the analysis exaggerates cost of possible removal by ignoring the huge cost of dam retention and salmon extinction. For example, the disappearance of salmon.

You know all these things. I am not going to take your time up. But I thank you for letting me speak. I look forward to what you have to produce for us.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Claud Leinbach is next. And then Doug Riggs, and in the wings is Greg Beeker.

MR. LEINBACH: Well, I guess I have the privilege of being the only one so far that -- probably the only one. My name is Claude Leinbach. I am a power line mechanic. I work for the Corps of Engineers. I also am the union secretary for United Power Trades Organization. We represent the people that operate and maintain all the Corps hydroelectric dams in the Northwest.

The wild salmon people have just recently put out a new video and I'd like to address a couple of the segments of that video. One of the things that's quoted on there is that hydro power on the lower four Snake River dams only affects five percent of the region's power.

I would like to give you some perspective on what that amounts to. The four dams, according to the Corps' own records, average 1250 megawatts per year. It takes about a thousand megawatts to operate the City of Seattle or a thousand megawatts can operate the whole State of Idaho and Montana.

American Rivers people that I have heard quote directly from American Rivers spokesman in, I believe, it was in November in Seattle that the dams only average 950 megawatts. My research shows over 1250 with the Corps' own records. My figuring averages about 1600 megawatts over the last several years.

The other aspect is, last June I testified in front of the Oregon Legislature that the dams were producing 2500 megawatts the day I spoke. The fact is, those plants have a capacity of 3483 megawatts. Granted, that was the spring runoff time while they were able to generate 2500 megawatts.

But the fact is that energy was being generated, being sold and being used. That one day -- not that we want to talk money, because it's fish and dams we are concerned about. But it was worth \$1.2 million to the federal government, that one day of wholesale energy.

Rider & Associates

Another aspect is flood control. It's been said in this same Wild Salmon tape that there is no flood control from the four Snake River dams. Granted, they were not authorized for flood control. But they are part of the flood that most of you will probably remember in February '96. They were instrumental in helping with the flood. All the dams were in the whole Columbia basin.

So -- and hydro power is the cleanest energy mass produced in the whole world. It's one of the reasons we have the clean air we have in the Northwest, because approximately 80 percent of the power in the Northwest is from hydro power.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Doug Riggs. Is Doug still here?

Greg Beeker? Greg is here. After Greg is Gillian Lyons and then Meghan Moore.

MR. BEEKER: My name is Greg Beeker. I am a science teacher in Beaverton, Oregon.

I am here tonight that to tell you all the information I've read and the fish biologists I have talked to would lead me to the conclusion that breaching the four lower Snake River dams needs to happen to restore healthy salmon population in the Columbia River basin. I would like to share a story with you from a class of mine and kind of give some evidence, some support for the idea of saving salmon for spiritual needs.

This last November my students and I had a wonderful experience that most people don't have a chance to see, much less appreciate. The students spent a wet, cold, and rainy afternoon witnessing the migrating and spawning behavior of Columbia River fall chinook.

The task of our field trip was simply to observe and record the behavior of a bunch of fish. When you put it that way it doesn't sound so exciting.

As many of us know it's not very easy to hold the attention of a group of seventh graders. Usually some sort of a video game or latest pop musical group is needed. However, they were anxious and eager to witness an event that they had been studying for weeks in a classroom.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

The students knew it was tough for salmon to make a return trip to the spawning grounds. When the students looked in the waters to see this for the first time in their lives, they couldn't believe the salmon they were seeing.

This wasn't a textbook. This was the real deal.

By the end of the field trip the students had spent over three hours making sketches, counting fishes and documenting behavior. The students left the river that day with a genuine admiration and respect for salmon that only comes from such a personal experience.

In conclusion, 50 or 60 years from now these same children and their children's children will grow up and realize that for the first time the human species took a giant step towards saving an endangered species or they will realize that they were extremely short-sided and sold out in the interests of politics by maintaining an economic status quo at the expense of the Snake River salmon. So I urge to you take the dams down and show future generations that economic progress is not really progress if salmon are brought to extinction.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Greg.

Is Gillian Lyons still here? Then after Gillian is Meghan Moore and then Lynn Ford.

MS. LYONS: Good evening. My name is Gillian Lyons. I am here tonight to testify on behalf of the Oregon Natural Desert Association.

ONDA and its 1500 members here in Oregon and elsewhere are dedicated to protecting and restoring Oregon's desert wildlife and waterways, and also recovering salmon in the Columbia River basin one day.

We are also interested in preserving the liveability of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest.

The decision now before the federal government on whether to protect Snake River salmon cuts at the very heart of the Pacific Northwest. I fear the government may not fully understand its import.

Salmon are the symbol of the Northwest. Their spirit and wildness are part of who we are. The Northwest has been described as the place where salmon can go. Allowing Snake River salmon to go to extinct is akin to cutting out the heart of the Northwest.

Rider & Associates

We need salmon. The communities of the Northwest were built around salmon. Recreational fishing provides enjoyment for hundreds of people living throughout the regions in the large cities, as well as smaller towns. Coastal communities depend on both recreational and commercial fishing.

Liveability of communities is dependent on saving Snake River salmon. If we do not breach these dams, the salmon will go extinct and may be followed by many urban, rural, and coastal communities. To preserve our liveability, dam removal must be the centerpiece of any optional chosen to recover Snake River salmon.

What should make the decision so easy here, the science, law, and economics all point to dam removal. The only thing that seems to be holding us back is lack of political will.

The science is clear. A team of federal, tribal, state, and independent scientists found the best option to recover all species of salmon in the Snake River system is to remove the four dams. If we don't make the decision now, all species of salmon and steelhead will be extinct by 2017.

My governor said it best. The science here is a no brainer.

The law also points to dam removal. There is only one option that complies with the Clean Water Act, and that is dam removal.

We have broken a promise to native people that they would always have salmon to catch. We could stand by our word or break our promise again. I believe this country should keep its promise and remove the dams to bring back the salmon and meet our treaty obligation.

Finally, restoring salmon in the Snake River ecosystem will benefit the system economically. We will see significant increases in recreational, as well as tribal and commercial fishing industries.

With all due respect, it's almost inconceivable that we are discussing this issue here today. The science is clear, the law is clear, and the economics are clear. The dams must go.

Again, what is holding us back? We must step up to the plate and do it right for the fish, for the region, and for the country. We must remove these four dams and we must save our Northwest salmon and northwest heritage. We need salmon and those dams don't make sense.

Rider & Associates

Thank you very much for your time.

THE MODERATOR: Meghan Moore. Is Meghan here?

Lynn Ford, Brent Foster, John Denison, John Kart. You are here?

After John is Dr. Jack Straton.

MR. KART: Thanks for the opportunity to speak tonight. I appreciate your stamina and hope you are all paid by the hour.

My name is John Kart. I am here representing the Audubon Society of Portland and our 8,000 members region wide.

I would like to start off by quoting Richard Nichols, who said, "Nothing is more priceless and more worthy of preservation than the rich array of animal life with which our country has been blessed. It is a many faceted treasure," when he was signing the Endangered Species Act in 1973.

It requires we do what is in our power to protect species from extinction. The people of this country overwhelmingly agreed that morally and ethically we do not have the right to drive species to extinction, that plants and animals that share this planet with us are an integral part of our world, and that our long-term health is tied to theirs.

Keeping Snake River salmon alive and healthy requires the removal of the four Snake River dams. Dam removal, coupled with a sensible economic transition plan, brings a region salmon and a strong rural community. In fact, studies show that the economic benefits of dam removal will benefit the entire Pacific Northwest region.

Removal of the four lower Snake River dams are the most effective economical way to restore the essential habitat for salmon. The alternatives we heard earlier tonight that might be under consideration have no clear evidence of effectiveness, would be far more expensive for the purpose and economically disruptive to far more people.

There is no evidence that habitat measures alone, even aggressively pursued, will lead to salmon recovery. Assertions that habitat activities might be effective are based on assumptions, not science.

If we avoid making the tougher choices today, it is likely the Snake River salmon will go extinct. Now, while the economy is booming, is the perfect time to make changes and move forward to a brighter future.

Rider & Associates

Dam removal is the cornerstone of any viable plan to save Snake River salmon. The Audubon Society of Portland and our 8,000 members many not sit idly by for inaction to kill our salmon in the Snake River. We are here to ask you to a take the tougher steps.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, John.

Is Dr. Straton still here?

Kathleen Juergens.

Robert Mosier.

Grant James.

Patricia -- Patrick Norton. Patrick? No?

Catherine Thomasson.

Melissa, I think it's Poners. No?

I think it's Lenny -- I can't tell whether it's Buse or Brume. No? Could be slaughtering that. Could be sitting right in front of me.

Rene Grosso. Rene still here?

Judith Swinney. After Judith I have Steve Chase, and then I have one I think just one more name, Gary Hunt.

Go ahead.

MS. SWINNEY: Thanks for your patience. I am Judith Swinney, a mediator and attorney in Portland.

The Lewis and Clark expedition reported that you could walk across the mighty Columbia on the backs of the salmon, it was so abundant. If we continue on this present course of expensive folly we can wipe the salmon out in eight to 17 years.

We are at a unique crossroad. We can have the dubious distinction of extinction or the opportunity to preserve the species for our children's children's children. Woe is we and shame on us if in 17 years Ken Burns is documenting the demise of the salmon and its devastating impact to us all.

Please breach the dams. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

Steve Chase. Steve here?

Gary Hunt.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

MR. HUNT: Am I the last person? My name is Gary Hunt. I am a small animal veterinarian here in Portland and a very concerned citizen on the issue of Snake River salmon.

There are many points that I would like to make, but I don't want to take up much more of any people's time. With all the ideas and issues that have come up here tonight since I have been listening, one idea keeps coming back into my mind, which is another local controversy that's been going on recently. That's Kennewick Man.

Kennewick Man, which for those of you who may not know, is a skeleton of a presumed Native American found on the banks the Columbia River recently, which through carbon dating has been found to be between 93 and 9500 years of age. And I think it's more than coincidence that Kennewick Man was found on the banks of the Columbia River.

In thinking of why he was there, there's one obvious reason. That's the salmon. The salmon have been sustaining human civilization and life for people in the Pacific Northwest for 10,000 years. And the Snake River dams, all the other dams, all the other issues regarding its demise in the last 100 to 150 years have almost run the wild fish extinct.

We have in the Snake River a still surviving major run of wild salmon and steelhead. These fish are a very valuable resource. They are part of the resource that have sustained people's lives in the Northwest for thousands of years.

I don't think in the course of 30, 40, 50, 100 years that we have the right or that we should be stupid enough to let them become extinct. These fish have sustained us. They have been the life blood of the Northwest for thousands of years. And the dams need to go to bring them back.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: David.

MR. BEAN: Thank you for letting me testify. My name is David Bean. I am a carpenter with United Brotherhood of Carpenters. I am a veteran and I am a grandfather.

And I feel and have felt for a long time that the salmon are essential to the character of our region. We're known for giant mountains, giant trees, and giant fish. And there's no coincidence that the fish feed the trees to gain their size. It's a multi million ton injection of fertilizer every year. Carpenters respect this.

I have broad experience. I've been in the Merchant Marines. I know about the tremendous efficiencies of transportation by sail. I was in the military, and I know that the military does not have priorities and that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' first priority, I believe, is transportation.

I have been on the delegation that established sister city relations with Fuzhou, China. We celebrated their 2,500 year anniversary. I went along the Grand Canal with David Woo and Mike Lindberg, and others, celebrating the tremendous commercial fecundity of that canal. A thousand miles long and it's the equivalent of our I-5 as a transport corridor.

I feel the same could be true if we set a canal for transport up into the nether reaches of Lewiston. But we can't do this at the sacrifice of our biological heritage.

I have seen many commissions, in the time I've been observing the salmon, such as yourselves. I know how taxing these nights are. I know it takes about four years to get up to speed on all the complexities, of which they are legion.

I just would like to say for my grandchild and others, as well, that this is a moral issue. And I think that we all can honor our charges, and still honor our children, and see that salmon continue to make rich the Northwest. I feel that that would only be done by the breaching of the dams.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, David.

I missed one person. Sir, you want to testify? Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here tonight. My name is Bruce Hansen. I'm a Columbia River commercial gill net fisherman.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

I am 58 years old. I have lived in the state of Oregon my whole life. I am in favor of breaching the four lower Snake River dams. I am a life long commercial fisherman on the river and third generation. My grandfather came over from Denmark and he fished on the river starting around 1800.

I, too, am an endangered species. If you want to hear about economics, I could be here all night with you because I've lost literally thousands and thousands of dollars. I had two boats here on the river. Boat averages around \$80,000. I just had to sell the other one today to somebody in Alaska for \$20,000.

When I was a very young boy my grandfather used to take me down where he hung his nets and did repair work down where the airport is today. We fished on the brick yard drift. When Bonneville dam was built shortly after, he told me this dam was the beginning of the end of the great runs of salmon and steelhead and fish here in the Columbia River.

And boy, he wasn't too far off. I have seen just in my short lifetime the sockeye, fished those, spring salmon, I fished those, both commercial and sport fishing. Then the magnificent june hog that are all on endangered species list now.

When I was in college in 1961, I gill netted the seasons, and there were over a quarter of million spring salmon came up the Columbia River. They were high quality eating fish. And now they are on the endangered species list. That's just been in the last 30 some years.

I have not fished this stock for approximately six life cycles. No june hog fishing, no spring salmon fishing, and yet these fish are still on the endangered species list. So it's not a matter of me devastating a fish run with my nets and fishing when there is surplus fish. It's something else, and it's the dam. Something drastically wrong.

I've been to hundreds of salmon meetings, and I was at the first Northwest Power Planning Council meeting they ever had. Since then I've seen millions of dollars spent on all kinds of studies, as indicated tonight.

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111

Right now I have no faith in any of the panel members up there tonight except for the lady on the right hand that runs the clock. Trucking and barging of fish does not work. There were lots of steelhead and now they are on the endangered species list.

What I see needs to be done to take care of this thing is no politics involved in any way on the Columbia River. Put in place a panel of the finest independent salmon and steelhead biologists in the world. One head salmon czar directly responsible to the president of the United States to take care of the full funding needed.

If this person doesn't do a good job, we will just hang him in Pioneer Courthouse Square at noon. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Chris.

That's everybody on the list. I did have a request for one more speaker, if you will indulge us, please.

Sir, did you want to make a comment?

MR. SHAW: My name is Tom Shaw. I represent the Community Action Directors of Oregon and the Oregon Energy Coordinators Association. We work with hundreds of thousands of low income families across Oregon.

I know there is a concern about what happens if you lose hydroelectric load and what happens to electric rates. We've been very active in the last couple years legislatively and in regulatory forums to protect low income families and make sure their bills are affordable.

That's why we support breaching of the dams. There's been a lot of money spent. It's kind of like the poverty strategy, where you don't really help families get ahead. You just fix the problem with a Band-aid for now.

The success stories with human beings welfare to work is by, if you get someone in a situation where they have a job and they have child care, they can nourish. But it takes an investment. You have to really fix the problem.

Same thing with salmon. We should treat salmon as well as human beings and human beings as well as salmon. Whatever the short-term rate impact would be from amperaging, which we don't think is that much, at least we'll fix the problem. In the long run we think it will cost them a lot less to fix it right and fix it now than go on with half measures that don't work.

We really support the dam breaching. And don't listen to the arguments that it's going to hurt people, especially low income people. We've heard that and we don't buy it. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: That's it for our speakers tonight. I want to thank everybody for coming out tonight and offering your comments. It's been a real pleasure for me to be your moderator.

I just want to ask the panel if they want to say any closing remarks. Anyone?

(The public comment session concluded at 10:30 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Sarah C. Thomas, a Notary Public for Washington, certify that the hearing here occurred at the time and place set forth in the caption hereof; that at said time and place I reported in Stenotype all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting under my direction; and the foregoing transcript, pages 1 to 198 both inclusive, contains a full, true and correct record of all such oral proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

I further advise you that as a matter of firm policy, the Stenographic notes of this transcript will be destroyed two years from the date appearing on this Certificate unless notice is received otherwise from any party or counsel hereto on or before said date;

Witness my hand and notarial seal at Vancouver, Washington, this 14th day of February, 2000.

Sarah C. Thomas, RPR, RMR, CSR
CSR No. TH-OM-AS-C47307
Notary Public for Washington
My commission expires: 9-22-01

Rider & Associates

(360) 693-4111