

From: Dent, Diane
Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2006 8:59 AM
To: Niemi, Cheryl (ECY)
Cc: Maynard, Chris
Subject: FW: Commercial Fishing -Not Dams

Comment on Dam Guidance:

From: Dorain Dexter [<mailto:dardex@bentonrea.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2006 8:56 AM
To: Dent, Diane
Subject: Commercial Fishing -Not Dams

Sept.7, 2006

Diane Dent
Water Quality Program
WA Department of Ecology

Those who use words such as breach the dams or open the dams and other light phrases are talking with crooked tongues. It is logical and easy to understand that holes in the dams, or merely opening the flood gates, will not be the final chapter. Once the fish people get what they seem to want; they or others who are lined up behind them, will want the dams and everything that went with the dams removed also. The dams and the power lines and towers and the irrigation facilities will then be called *worthless giant monstrosities, eyesores, ugly monuments, still a deterrent to the rivers flow, still a deterrent to the fish, etc?* These will be the follow-up targets.

They are using a tactic that now seems to be a favorite of many public agencies in dealing with the public or any private entity. First they want some relatively small thing, something that would be easier to sell. Once they get that accepted, they add a little more, and a little more again; like any slick salesman. Once they get enough of their plot begrudgingly accepted; they lower the boom, and you then begin to get an idea of what the full plan is. But it's too late "we've gone too far to turn back", they'll say. They can not and will not deal openly and honestly.

The **Idaho Rivers United** from Southern Idaho want those dams destroyed, but mention nothing of the dams and other obstructions in their area; C. J. Strike, Bliss, Idaho Falls, American Falls, Twin Falls, Walcott, on the Snake; and the Ririe, Anderson Ranch, Magic, Palisades, Lucky Peak, Black Canyon, etc., etc.. They are not totally honest, nor fair about their wants. They are apparently another of the self serving groups?

The final costs will be in the multi-billions not merely a few million or a billion dollars they want us to assume.

- 14 Reestablishment of recreation areas and facilities along the new shoreline.
- 15 Loss of permanent long-term jobs in all of the above fields.
- 16 Other... ?

.....:.....

More concerns:

Who would get the excess lands that would be left out of the water? Lands that we spent millions for; to construct the dams and, to provide room for the backwaters.

This is perhaps a diversion by the proponents to achieve approval of some lesser but still radical changes at the expense of taxpayers, rate payers and/or rivers benefits users .

There is a need to consider the negative aspects vs. positive aspects of the dams for everybody affected.

Ignoring the normal advance of evolution; does not stop it from continuing.

The population and industrial growth in the Northwest will require even more power resources. Power now sold out of the area will need to be returned as the area grows. More power will be needed to pump water the addition heights from the river.

Loss of the power resources also affects other areas that now buy the electrical power from the Northwest. The loss of this power source will have to be replaced. They will have more coal burning, more oil burning, more generators in the tidal zones, more dams in someone else's backyard.

Humans and human affects are part of the natural element; part of the environment.

-xxxxxxxxxxxxYxxxxxxxxxxx-

To help the salmon runs:

(1) Restrict the off-shore fishing until salmon populations show improvement.

(2) Reestablish the vegetation along the rivers. There are hundreds of miles of shore lines that have had vegetation replaced by bare rock riprap slopes. This riprap was placed for railroads, highways, local roads, flood control, water diversions, and other riverside projects.

The vegetation affects all of the elements that fish need and use -

- a. Shade from the daytime sun
- b. pH control from the decaying of the leaves, old plants and trees and roots of plants that are washed into the streams.
- c. Oxygen, the swirling and splash of water passing around and against the vegetation, imparts air (oxygen) into the water.
- d. Shelter for fish that are feeding and/or spawning.
- e. Food; insects from on and in the foliage, stems, in and around the roots, and richer soils provided by the existence of vegetation.

f. Temperature control by shade in the summer and open to the sun in winter.

The various government agencies are responsible for 99+% of this shoreline construction including providing lands and funds and approvals for the projects.

Was the word gill used to describe native fishing rights in the various treaties?

Will the proponents guarantee the implied success of the salmon runs due to the removal of the dams? And will they also guarantee that the overall benefit will be positive? Will they back these guarantees with their own money and/or other viable assets?

Sincerely,

Dorain L. Dexter, P. E.
Citizen