

Re: Proposed Condit Dam Removal Project, FERC No 2342 Draft Supplemental EIS

Dear Mr. Sandison:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have followed the Condit Dam removal issue closely since I lived in the Columbia River Gorge area from 1997-2002. I am now a resident of Spokane, but I hope to return to the White Salmon area to raise my family. My grandparents settled in Goldendale in the late 1800s, and I have strong ties to Southwest Washington.

I have spent countless hours rafting the river, hiking in the watershed, and cleaning up it's banks. I also committed countless hours at community meetings and around the table with stakeholders, working towards a goal of restoring salmon to the White Salmon watershed. I am an enthusiastic supporter of dam removal, and while it has taken a considerable amount of time to come to this point, I am enthusiastic and supportive of moving closer towards the goal of a free flowing White Salmon River.

After closely following the issue for quite some time, I realize that the river will suffer short term harm and it will negatively impact some species while the sediment makes it way downriver. However, there is also no doubt in my mind that in the long term, removal of the dam will benefit these same listed species. It is important to put the dam removal in perspective, and realize that the short term harm will offset the long-term benefit to the same species.

The river has been experiencing short-term harm since before my grandfather settled in Klickitat County. Logging methods frequently scoured fragile salmon habitat, the dam prevented the natural hydrological of the river for decades, and agricultural run-off affects the river's health on an annual basis. Humans have already significantly damaged this river in the short term. It is our responsibility to do what we can to restore the damage from the last century, and it should start with removing the outdated Condit Dam.

It has almost been 12 years since the original FERC relicensing hearing. We have a powerful coalition of the private company-owner, environmentalists, recreationalists, tribal governments, and federal government stakeholders, all in strong support of dam removal. The support to restore the river is unprecedented. It is inevitable that there will be some local interests resistant to change. Indeed, the West is changing quickly and many people are fearful of disenfranchisement. However, short-term human interests and fears, just as short-term ecological effects, will quickly give way to a long-term benefit when the river is fully restored.

I am confident that the WDOE permitting process will allow FERC to make a final ruling, and make way for the White Salmon River to fully recover after 90 years without fish passage. Indeed, salmon in the White Salmon River will truly be a restoration of not only the species, but of a region.

Here are my specific comments on the SEPA SEIS:

Section 1.6.3: Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

I5-1

Comment acknowledged.

I5-1

All references to "Northwestern Lake" should be changed to reflect the inaccuracy of this common name and add or replace it with the word, "reservoir". The water impounded by Condit dam is a reservoir and not a lake. This is important because the rhetoric of many of the arguments for preservation of a lake are spurious when regarded as a natural impoundment. In reality, reservoirs are temporary contrivances and eventually the 93 year old dam will be removed or fail in an uncontrolled way.

15-2

15-2

Comment acknowledged. While technically correct, longstanding convention, including in maps and earlier documents, uses the term lake. It may also be true that a manmade structure may deteriorate and fail, given enough time and the right circumstances. When those things might occur is a matter of speculation.

The sum of sediments only increases by the years that the dam is left in place past the nearest opportunity for its removal. The final SEIS should address this fact in a more forthright way.

15-3

15-3

Likewise, the adverse impact on wildlife is an eventuality that cannot be denied at some point. Postponement of potential adverse effects do not negate the eventuality. The nearer term of mitigation by action should be forwarded as a positive alternative to postponement of what is to come at an uncertain and perhaps accidental date at time of failure of the reinforced concrete structure.

15-4

It is correct that additional sediment would collect behind the dam and eventually be released. However, the complexity of flood scouring as a dam fills and the uncertainties in the length of time to filling and breaching would render such analysis speculative.

The final SEIS should be explicitly consistent in its language to direct the reader to realize that the environmental damage of removal is part and parcel of its original construction and not a temporally recent event to contemplate. The seemingly potential damage is actually kinetic in the time frame of hydro-electric dams.

15-5

15-4

One must acknowledge that if there was an accidental failure of the dam, there would be adverse consequences. It would be speculation to presume to predict when or under what circumstances such a failure might occur. It does seem likely that a planned and controlled removal of the dam would have fewer adverse consequences than an accidental failure.

These comments above are made in a specific section, but the general changes I suggest should be made throughout the document.

#### Water Resources

In various places in the document, WDOE notes the turbidity and sediment transport that will occur as a result of dam removal. Geologically notable events on Mt. Adams that occur at about biannual intervals, such as land slides like the recent collapse of the Castle above the Big Muddy Creek in the Klickitat drainage, have not been dampened as similar events in the White Salmon drainage as a result of the absorptive dynamics of the slack waters of the Condit Reservoir. This is an unnatural condition that will be lost with dam removal. The DOE needs to evaluate and compare turbidity levels of the release of Condit Reservoir sediments relative to what can be expected from naturally occurring mountain events and also lahars such as the one entering the White Salmon at MP 17 on WA Hwy. 141, a few years ago.

15-6

15-5

Comment acknowledged. Specific statements have been added in various parts of the FSEIS (e.g., Chapter 3).

Glacial silt from rivers such as the Klickitat and Hood River and during late summer high temperature days need to be quantified and brought into the relative perspective. A very high initial load of sediments entering the Columbia River at a selected time to miss fish migration should be better emphasized. In addition, WDOE should describe the probability and potential impacts of accidental breach of the Condit Dam in the event that it is not removed in a timely fashion.

15-7

15-6

As described in Section 4.2.2 Impacts, subsection Drain Tunnel Construction and Dam Removal, suspended sediment concentrations in the White Salmon River could briefly reach 250,000 parts per million (ppm). During the first day, while the reservoir is draining and soft sediments are sliding into the river, the average sediment concentrations could be 150,000 ppm. These suspended sediment concentrations are predicted to become episodic and fall off rapidly to about 3,000 ppm in the White Salmon River after 3 months and 200 ppm after 6 months.

15-8

The estimated suspended sediment concentrations in the White Salmon River immediately after dam breaching would be similar to concentrations measured in the Toutle River near Castle Rock, Washington in May 1980

after the eruption of Mount St. Helens. At gaging station 14242690 on the Toutle River, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) measured suspended sediments concentrations as high as 960,000 ppm in May 1980 (USGS 1980). By August 1980, concentrations of suspended sediment in the Toutle River had decreased at this station to 4,000 ppm. In subsequent measurements, turbidity spikes as high as 234,000 ppm were recorded in March 1982, but over time these spikes decreased and the suspended sediment levels began to stabilize. While the magnitude of the sediment released by the two events is very different, a similar pattern with respect to spikes in suspended sediment concentrations is expected. As the volume of sediment is much smaller, the magnitude and frequency of the spikes are expected decrease more rapidly on the White Salmon River than on the Toutle River.

The USGS also conducted a water quality study for the Skokomish, Nooksak and Green-Duwamish Rivers (Embrey and Frans 2003), which drain into Puget Sound. Under high flow conditions in these rivers, maximum suspended sediment concentrations ranged from 787 to 3,210 ppm. This range of suspended sediment concentrations is similar to the predicted concentrations in the White Salmon River 3 to 6 months after the dam is breached. The relatively high levels of suspended sediments are typically related to high flow, and as the streamflow is reduced, the levels decrease to more typical levels, with median values ranging from approximately 25 to 70 ppm.

How local events derived from Mt. Adams may compare is not known, but could be reasonably assumed to be within the range described above. Pulses of sediment in the White Salmon River as a result of such events would not be trapped by the reservoir after dam removal.

15-7

See response to Comment 15-6 above.

15-8

See response to Comment 15-4 above.

## Aquatic Resources

The SEIS asserts that "one year-class of chum salmon" will be lost due to high concentrations of suspended sediments and deposition, and that this impact will be long-term for at least 4-5 generation cycles for chum. This seemingly overstates the expected impact on chum. First, based on the fact that adult chum salmon return to the White Salmon River at various ages, as noted on p. 4.3-18 of the SEIS, an "entire year class" of chum will not be lost. Rather, only part of a year-class will be affected. A year-class generally refers to those juveniles that emerge from the gravel at the same time.

This important clarification should be made in the final SEIS. In addition, the adult chum salmon that will return to the White Salmon River, of which there are few, will return after the initial breaching. This later timing will result in lesser impacts on chum salmon from dam removal. The final SEIS should discuss both factors. It should also better clarify the potential impacts to 4-5 generation cycles of chum salmon. As WDOE is probably aware, this has been interpreted to mean that the sediment could "wipe out a population of endangered chum salmon for as long as four or five generations." The SEIS should provide greater clarification to prevent future misunderstandings.

Also with regard to chum, the document notes that spawning substrate will be impaired during the second year after removal. While this is likely accurate, it should also be noted that additional habitat above the dam will be available by that time. The final SEIS should more adequately account for the significant additional spawning habitat that will be available to chum salmon.

The SEIS finds that displacement of fish in the Bonneville Pool during damremoval would likely result in a "take" under the Endangered Species Act, however, it does not provide the basis for why displacement would constitute a take. Since Endangered Species Act determinations are to be made by NOAA Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, we urge WDOE to refrain from making any legal conclusions in its environmental analysis document. If this passage is left intact in the SEIS, WDOE should explain the basis of its assumptions that the fish will be displaced at all, as well as why its legal opinion is valid or warranted.

## Table 1.1.

On p. 1-17, the table states that with regard to sediment transport, the "longer the high concentrations continue, the longer or more difficult it will be for recolonization of the lost species." The White Salmon is a stopover for migrating anadromous fish, because it provides cold water respite. The impression of impact on a presently non-existent population of fish races that were lost at the time of construction in 1912 should be eliminated. The final SEIS should more accurately state the impacts to the limited spawning species in the three miles of the slack waters between the dam and confluence and only to those species that are known to reproduce here. Cage-reared steelhead should not be considered as a lost resource without also calculating the high factorial gain in liberated up-river habitat.

## I5-9

The FSEIS provides further clarification. Only two chum salmon have been documented in the White Salmon River in recent years and there is no evidence that spawning is occurring in the White Salmon River. However, the statement that "one year-class of chum salmon" would be lost is accurate. A year-class describes the salmon smolts produced during a single reproductive season. Adult chum salmon spawners returning in a single year represent several year-classes.

## I5-10

The statement that "one year-class of chum salmon" would be lost is accurate. The statement in the DSEIS concerning the long-term impact was that "at least several 4- to 5-year generation cycles for Chinook and chum salmon" would be affected, not 4 to 5 generation cycles. The DSEIS also stated that variation in age-at-return would allow a lost year-class to rebuild over several generations. Depending on the salmon stock, the majority of returning adults from a given year-class of fry would likely have a dominant age-at-return. If the dominant age-at-return is 4 years (the general case for chum salmon), with a subdominant age-at-return of 3 or 5 years, then 4 years after the loss of a year-class the run would be composed primarily of 3- and 5-year-old fish from the previous and subsequent year-classes (and hence, greatly reduced). An unusually high survival of 3- and 5-year-old return adults would speed recovery, while a low survival rate and small return of 3- and 5-year returning adults would lead to a slow recovery. Because of this, it is impossible to predict how many generation cycles would be required for a complete recovery, but it would likely be several generation cycles before recovery is complete.

In the case of chum salmon, the number of spawning adults is very low and likely represents strays from a population below Bonneville Dam that have the potential of eventually recolonizing the White Salmon River basin and establishing a viable population. Section 4.3 of the FSEIS has been changed to reflect this fact to avoid overstating the expected impact on chum salmon. It also acknowledges that NMFS (2006) Biological Opinion permits the incidental take.

I5-9

I5-10

I5-11

I5-12

I5-13

I5-14

I5-15

**I5-11**

Chum salmon have less capacity to leap water falls and generally do not migrate as far upstream as Chinook, coho, or sockeye salmon and steelhead trout, particularly in higher gradient rivers with frequent falls, such as the White Salmon River (Johnson et al. 1997). Reiser et al. (2006) set the maximum jumping height of chum salmon as 4 feet. The fall at RM 2.6 on the mainstem of the White Salmon and other falls on the mainstem may be barriers to the upstream migration of chum salmon adult spawners. Because chum salmon characteristically utilize the lower reaches of high gradient streams, they may not be able to access this habitat, and additional year-classes may be affected until clean spawning gravels are formed in the lower couple of miles of the river channel. The documentation of two adult chum salmon is not evidence that chum salmon are reproducing in the White Salmon River at the present time, but represents the potential for eventual recolonization of the river if suitable spawning habitat is available. The long-term effect of dam removal would be an improvement of spawning conditions for chum salmon, but it is not known at this time if chum salmon would be able to utilize additional habitat above the dam.

**I5-12**

Short-term increases in turbidity within the Bonneville pool after the removal of Condit Dam would likely cause avoidance behavior and “displacement” of some fish in the Bonneville pool. These fish would not be displaced from the Bonneville pool, but would seek out areas of the pool with lower turbidity. Korstrom and Birtwell (2006), found that the ability of sediment-exposed Chinook salmon to escape to cover was impaired and that there was a significant increase in stuporous behavior and a significant reduction in cover-seeking response in sediment-exposed fish. They concluded that exposure to elevated levels of suspended sediment could indirectly jeopardize survival in the wild, as such overt performance and behavioral changes would probably render juvenile Chinook salmon more conspicuous and therefore more susceptible to avian and aquatic predators. NOAA has considered this a “take” (NMFS 2006). The sentence regarding “take” has been modified.

**I5-13**

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) mandates the recovery of listed species, including Distinct Populations Segments (in the case of steelhead and bull trout) and Evolutionarily Significant Units (in the case of salmon). In the case of anadromous species where much breeding and rearing habitat has been rendered inaccessible by the creation of manmade barriers such as dams or culverts, removing a species from the threatened or endangered list requires ensuring that adequate viable populations exist to reduce the chance of extinction or extirpation by recovering historical habitat. The FSEIS is required to accurately state the impacts to all listed species within the action area, which includes the watershed above the dam. This includes habitat essential to maintain functions necessary to maintain all life stages of a listed species, which in some cases can include non-fish-bearing streams that deliver large woody debris, nutrients, and water to fish-bearing streams. The recovery of historical habitat is a goal of salmon recovery plans and must be addressed in the SEIS, especially when the stated goal of the action is the recovery of historically accessible habitat to listed salmonids in the White Salmon River basin.

**I5-14**

Comment acknowledged. With the exception of a pool at the mouth of the White Salmon River, the lower 3 miles of river are not slack water, but rather a rather steep gradient and confined river channel. The DSEIS accurately states that, with the possible exception of some fish flushed into the Bonneville pool, all fish present in the lower 3 miles of river below the dam will likely be killed by high levels of suspended sediment that will be present in the river immediately after dam breaching. It also states that by the time water temperatures in the Bonneville pool reach a point where migrating adult salmonids seek thermal refuge in tributaries of the Columbia River, levels of suspended sediments will be low enough to permit fish to seek thermal refuge in the river above the present reservoir (with 16.2 miles of the river eventually available for thermal refuge as levels of suspended sediments subside and the stream scours fine sediments from the lower river). Finally, it states that it will require 2 to 5 years for spawning and rearing habitat to return to pre-breaching levels in

the lower 3 miles of the river below the dam. The FSEIS has been modified where modifications are appropriate to further support the estimate of 2 to 5 years for recovery of salmonid productivity in the lower 3 miles of river.

#### 15-15

In regard to the ESA listing, hatchery steelhead were not considered a lost resource in the DSEIS. However, naturally spawned descendents of hatchery steelhead are considered part of the steelhead DPS and were factored into the ESA analysis of the DSEIS. In addition, the recreational value of hatchery steelhead were considered. The DSEIS and FSEIS both conclude that there is a potential for a short-term loss of all or part of the winter steelhead year-class immediately following dam removal. This year-class would have represented all or some of the steelhead juveniles produced during the spring following dam breaching. The DSEIS also states that long-term benefits to steelhead derived from dam removal far outweigh the short-term loss of all or part of one year-class of winter steelhead. Please do not confuse a year-class (juveniles produced during one year) with the ages of returning adult steelhead spawners, which can vary considerably.

The discussion of aesthetic and scenic resources, notes that new recreational opportunities would help mitigate loss of aesthetic/scenic resources. (SEIS, p. 1-21). I disagree strongly with the notion that aesthetics will be harmed by this action. Indeed, I believe just the opposite, that is, that the ugly scenic eyesores will be removed and replaced with a free-running, salmon-bearing, crystal-clear river. I don't even understand the DOE's aesthetic arguments here. Also, it's not clear how additional recreational opportunities will provide the mitigation, or what mitigation is even being considered here. I recommend deleting this in the final SEIS.

I5-16

### Section 2.3: Need for State Environmental Review

There is no doubt, whatsoever, that the greatest adverse environmental impacts would occur if the non-removal (temporary) "no action" alternative were chosen. Countless biologists and federal and state agencies and environmental groups groups all agree on this. Again, this should be an absolute no-brainer. However, WDOE's draft SEIS appears to infer that "no action" does not have greater environmental impacts than dam removal. That is clearly not the case and should be stated so explicitly. As the FERC FSFEIS concluded, the dam removal alternative is the best alternative for the resources of the White Salmon River, period.

I5-17

#### Section 2.3.1: Issues Resolved

I agree with the resolution of Issue 4 regarding impacts on winter steelhead. However, for the reasons noted above with regard to chum salmon, I disagree with the assertion that an entire year-class of winter-run steelhead are expected to be lost as a result of turbidity levels during dam removal. The SEIS appears to recognize that adult winter steelhead return during various years, thereby supporting the notion that an entire year-class will not be lost. Assertions that entire year-classes of any salmon or steelhead species will be lost are overstatements of the expected impacts and should be modified accordingly.

I5-18

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. I look forward to seeing the final EIS.

Sincerely,

Kimberly R. Burkland  
2414 W. Mission Ave.  
Spokane, WA 99201

I5-16

Aesthetics involves the perception of one's surroundings, which includes more than views. There would be a short-term significant unavoidable adverse impact to some residents living along the existing lake until the area transitions from a lake to a stream environment. Long term, there would be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the aesthetic perceptions of residents who participate in recreational activities such as lake fishing and boating. However, the aesthetic perceptions associated with new recreational opportunities such as kayaking, white-water rafting, and stream fishing may help offset the effects.

I5-17

The SEPA DSEIS and FSEIS have adopted, as adequate for SEPA purposes, the treatment of the no action alternative as addressed in the FERC EISs. The comment is acknowledged that the ongoing impacts that resulted from the original construction of the Condit Dam could be greater than the impacts of removal of the dam.

I5-18

The entire year-class of age-0 (juveniles produced during the spring of the year of dam removal) winter-run steelhead are expected to be lost as a result of turbidity levels in the river associated with the proposed dam removal. This would substantially reduce the number of expected returning adult steelhead 4 years in the future, when the majority of the lost year-class of steelhead would have been expected to return. During that year, the return of winter-run steelhead would be primarily composed of 3-year-old steelhead and strays from other river basins. Returns of winter-run steelhead would likely be reduced every fourth year for several generation cycles. A portion of the previous year-class of steelhead juveniles (age-1 fish) would also be lost. Section 2.3.1 of the FSEIS has been clarified

**Sandison, Derek**

**From:** PATRICK W CAMPBELL [pat777campbell@msn.com]  
**Posted At:** Wednesday, October 12, 2005 1:35 PM  
**Conversation:** Comments on Condit Dam  
**Posted To:** Condit Dam  
**Subject:** Comments on Condit Dam

I am concerned that the Condit Dam has been in place for nearly a century or more. The shoreline of Northwestern Lake behind it has developed into a special environmental area of its own which includes a community of folks who respect it and enjoy it. This community is part of what has brought some life to a sort of environmental/recreational economy zone in a county that otherwise is in a precarious economic circumstances.

I6-1

I have fished and visited Northwestern Lake numerous times. One of the very obvious things about it is the sedimentation. If Condit Dam is removed, that sediment will move downstream and will likely displace the area that returning salmon in the Columbia currently use to cool off and rest in the oxygenated waters. During times of high temperatures in the Columbia River the inlet area of the White Salmon River Mouth has been noted as a place where fish can survive.

I6-2

I6-3

I have been told that underneath the silt and water of Northwestern Lake is a large falls that was covered up due to the dam. I was told that this will certainly impede the upstream movement of fish if uncovered following dam removal.

I6-4

Given my personal observations and the scenarios I have envisioned and what has been described to me, I would be hesitant to remove the Condit Dam. Perhaps a better approach would be to make the necessary structural repairs to the dam, make it part of a public utility, and use the power generated as a revenue source to bond construction of a fish ladder.

I6-5

Sincerely,  
 Pat Campbell  
 P.O. Box 873206  
 Vancouver, WA 98687-3206  
 Cell: 360.904.0815  
 Home: 360.254.1645  
[pat777campbell@msn.com](mailto:pat777campbell@msn.com)

**I6-1**

The adverse effects on current recreational users and the existing community were acknowledged in the DSEIS. There would be economic changes, but in the long run, it is likely that the replacement river-based recreation may provide an economic benefit that would outweigh the adverse effects on the communities.

**I6-2**

Following the 1980 eruption of Mount St. Helens, many fishery managers predicted that recovery of aquatic organisms would take decades because riverine habitats had been so extensively damaged. Major sections of the Mount St. Helens volcano rushed downslope as debris flows into the Toutle River and its tributaries. These debris flows dwarfed any possible release of sediments from behind Condit Dam. The two major Toutle River tributaries (South Fork Toutle River and Green River) eroded through mudflow or tephra-fall deposits and returned to preeruption streambeds within a few years (Bisson et al. 2005).

After an initial population crash from direct mortality from debris flows and exposure to high temperatures and levels of suspended sediments, a rapid posteruption rebound in primary productivity, aquatic and terrestrial invertebrate populations, and rearing salmonid populations occurred (Bisson et al. 2005). Within 2 to 3 years, productivity and the abundance of invertebrates and rearing fish reached preeruption levels and by 5 years, productivity and abundances exceeded preeruption levels. A gradual return to the range of preeruption abundance occurred after the initial spike in abundance, with a return to the natural range approximately 15 years after the eruption (Bisson et al. 2005).

**I6-3**

River temperatures below the dam site will be slightly cooler after dam removal, but the pools present in the White Salmon River below the dam are already sufficiently cool to provide thermal refuge from elevated water temperatures in the Bonneville pool. Thermal refuge lost from the filling and conversion of the pool at the mouth of the White Salmon River to a stream channel (eventually with additional spawning gravel area) will be initially replaced by river habitat above the dam, becoming available to

anadromous salmonids. As the high energy of the steep gradient river channel removes fines from the river channel presently buried by the reservoir and pools in the river below the dam that are partially filled by fines after dam breaching, additional thermal refuge habitat will become available to anadromous salmonids, far exceeding what is currently available.

16-4

A topographic map from before the dam was built was examined as part of the analysis and did not show additional falls that would be covered by the reservoir.

16-5

Comment noted. These ideas are more in the realm of economics than environmental impacts. Fish ladders were considered in earlier FERC EISs.

**Sandison, Derek**

**From:** James J.Contos [jcontos@fhcrc.org]  
**Posted At:** Thursday, October 20, 2005 1:13 PM  
**Conversation:** DSEIS comment  
**Posted To:** Condit Dam  
**Subject:** DSEIS comment

Dear Condit Dam removal committee,

I would like to voice my strong support of removal of Condit Dam on the lower White Salmon River for the following reasons:

- 1) I have floated the sections of the White Salmon upstream and realize what an amazing whitewater recreational resource the river is in the area. The ability to complete the river journey out to the confluence with the Columbia will be much more appealing to me and other kayakers and rafters.
- 2) I am also thrilled to see the dam removed as this will allow migrating salmon to return to the upstream habitat of the river system. One of the primary causes of the >95% decline in salmon of the Columbia River system is the existence of dams on the mainstem and nearly all major tributaries that block migration upstream and kill salmonids floating downstream.
- 3) Removal of the dam and restoration of the original river system will add a beautiful scenic area to an area that has been tainted with the manmade intrusion of a reservoir.

I applaud you for seeking to decommission this dam and hope it demonstrates how much benefit is actually gained by the restoration of a river.

Sincerely,

James Contos, Ph.D.  
 Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
 1100 Fairview Ave. N., A3-020  
 P.O. Box 19024  
 Seattle, WA 98109-1024  
 (206) 667-1021 lab  
 (206) 667-1031 fax  
 jcontos@fhcrc.org

I7-1

Preference acknowledged.

I7-1

**Sandison, Derek**

**From:** Daniel Dancer [daniel@inconcertwithnature.com]  
**Posted At:** Tuesday, November 01, 2005 11:53 AM  
**Conversation:** Comments  
**Posted To:** Condit Dam  
**Subject:** Comments

Hello,

My name is Daniel Dancer and for 8 years I lived at the mouth of the White Salmon River on the cliffs above its confluence with the Columbia River. Though I live now across the river in Oregon, I kayak, fish and hike on the White Salmon often. These are my comments regarding the removal of Condit Dam.

I encourage WDOE to issue a Clean Water Act Section 401 certificate, so that the dam removal and river restoration can proceed. The SEIS shows that dam removal can proceed safely and that sediment and pollution issues should not be a significant problem. Further, the SEIS identifies a number of excellent mitigation measures that will minimize many impacts from dam removal. We are making an investment in the long-term health and well-being of the river and our community. The long-term benefits of a healthier river and abundant salmon runs will be much greater than the small, short-term costs. At some point, the dam will have to be removed. It is far better to do it now with the dam owner being willing to foot the bill.

To have a free flowing Wild and Scenic river all the way from it's source on Mt. Adams will be wonderful and will provide amazing white water rafting all the way to the mouth of the river. The SEIS analysis shows that many of the identified impacts, such as sediment associated with construction areas, water pollution, accidental spills if any, and, impacts from reinforcing the Northwestern Bridge, will not be significant. PacifiCorp is going to implement a multitude of mitigation measures to minimize the impacts resulting from Condit Dam removal. Those measures include a Revegetation Plan, Erosion Control Plan, Woody Debris Management Plan, Spill Containment and Prevention Plan, and a fall Chinook capture and release program. The SEIS acknowledges that all the non-removal alternatives will have greater impacts on the river than dam removal.

The SEIS also acknowledges that the two resources most affected by removal – Lower Columbia River chum and macroinvertebrates – will rebuild within 3 to 5 years of removal. The impacts, while significant in the short-term, will be outweighed by the long-term benefits. As a society, we need to be willing to accept some short-term impacts when we have the opportunity to remove a dam, restore a free-flowing river, and greatly improve the long-term health of the White Salmon River.

The removal of Condit Dam will further regional salmon and steelhead recovery goals. The Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Plan recognizes the importance of removing fish passage barriers throughout the watershed. Due to the potential adverse impacts noted in the SEIS, I urge the state to prohibit supplemental hatchery actions intended to help salmon and steelhead become established after dam removal. (SEIS, p. 4.3-24)

Also, I urge WDOE to work with PacifiCorp and the Corps to facilitate the lowering of the Bonneville Pool during dam removal, the benefits of which are discussed throughout the SEIS.

The FEIS should clarify that an "entire year class" of chum will not be lost as a result of dam removal. As discussed in the SEIS, adult chum return to the White Salmon River at various ages, resulting in loss of only part of an age class. (SEIS, p. 4.3-18)

The FEIS should include reference to the following:

The Northwest Power Planning Council's Big White Salmon Subbasin Plan found that the most limiting

18-1

18-2

18-3

18-4

18-5

18-6

18-1

Preference acknowledged.

18-2

Preference and comment acknowledged.

18-3

Comment acknowledged. Management decisions concerning hatchery fish planted in the river are subject to decisions of the appropriate state and federal agencies (i.e., Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and NOAA Fisheries) and not subject to the FSEIS. In the case of many salmonid species (coho, chum, Chinook, and possibly others), native fish populations may no longer exist.

18-4

Comment acknowledged. As described in Section 4.2.3 Mitigation Measures of the FSEIS, PacifiCorp would consult with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to determine the feasibility of lowering the Bonneville pool prior to dam breaching, in the event that the pool elevation is near the higher end of its range of fluctuation.

18-5

The FSEIS provides further clarification. Only two chum salmon have been documented in the White Salmon River in recent years and there is no evidence that spawning is occurring in the White Salmon River. However, the statement that "one year-class of chum salmon" would be lost is accurate. A year-class describes the salmon smolts produced during a single reproductive season. Adult chum salmon spawners returning in a single year represent several year-classes.

18-6

The FSEIS concurs with the Northwest Power Planning Council's subbasin summary (WDFW 2000) and Washington Conservation Commission's limiting factors report (WCC 1999) that the removal of Condit Dam would increase the available habitat for anadromous fish within the White Salmon River basin, increasing the long-term viability of existing anadromous fish populations in the basin.

11/15/2005

factor for salmon and steelhead is the construction and operation of Condit Dam. The plans call to increase the quantity and quality of reduced and degraded fish and wildlife habitat to amounts that will sustain native fish and wildlife species. Condit dam removal furthers this objective.

The State has recognized the Wind River/White Salmon Watershed (Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 29) as a historically important source for production of salmon and steelhead in the Lower Columbia River Basin. However, it recognizes that hydroelectric development in the White Salmon River has had a serious detrimental effect on the aquatic resources in the WRIA 29.

In sum, I support restoration of a free-flowing river system and the reestablishment of a natural, complex aquatic ecosystem.

Sincerely,

Daniel Dancer  
 POB 693  
 Mosier, OR 97040  
 Nov 1, 2005

I8-6  
 Continued

I8-7

I8-7

The FSEIS references the WRIA reports.

Page 1 of 1

**Sandison, Derek**

**From:** Karen Hensley [karen.hensley@gmail.com]  
**Posted At:** Saturday, October 22, 2005 3:14 PM  
**Conversation:** Support for the settlement agreement that calls for removal of Condit Dam on the White Salmon River.  
**Posted To:** Condit Dam  
**Subject:** Support for the settlement agreement that calls for removal of Condit Dam on the White Salmon River.

Dear Derek Sandison,

I am unable to attend the open house on October 25 so I am writing my comments in support for the settlement agreement that calls for removal of Condit Dam on the White Salmon River.

As a white-water paddler I will celebrate the opening of another section of river in Washington State. My husband and I routinely drive to neighboring states, such as Idaho, Oregon, and Utah to paddle rivers. The opening of this section of river will help my husband and I plan one of our trips to be more local, and this is better for our environment.

--  
Karen Hensley  
(I am Vice-President of Paddle Trails Canoe Club, although I am not writing in that capacity at this time.)

515 Whitworth Ave S  
Renton, WA 98055

11/15/2005

I9-1  
Preference acknowledged.

I9-1

**CONDIT DAM  
REMOVAL  
PROJECT**

**OPEN HOUSE and  
PUBLIC MEETING**

**October 25, 2005**

**COMMENT FORM**

**Please drop off at tonight's  
meeting or mail to Ecology**



**Derek Sandison  
WA Dept. of Ecology  
15 W. Yakima Ave, Suite 200  
Yakima, WA 98902-3452**



If you would like to be on this project mailing list,  
please provide your contact information below:

Name: Stewart Johnston

Address: P.O. Box 505

City: Lyle

State/Zip: WA 98635-0011

E-mail (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Send Comments to:

**Derek Sandison  
WA Dept. of Ecology  
15 W. Yakima Ave, Suite 200  
Yakima, WA 98902-3452**

**Email: [ConditDam@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:ConditDam@ecy.wa.gov)**

Please provide your comments below:

I want to see salmon/anadromous fish able to reclaim spawning sites upstream from Condit Dam. This is important. The impression we had from the opposition to dam removal was that only a short distance of river would be gained for spawning salmon because there was an insurmountable waterfall at Husum. Turns out this disinformation campaign was a load of rubbish - The insurmountable falls is much further upstream. I have observed Bald Eagles frequently all along the Kluckitot River throughout Kluckitot County: the reason for this is that salmon spawn & die in all this stretch of river. So it seems reasonable to assume that dam removal on the White Salmon River would have a secondary benefit in giving Bald Eagles access to a much greater source of food post-spawning - i.e., much more river with dead & dying fish. As a wildlife biologist and I favour expanding salmon & Bald Eagle potentials.

The residents of homes on leased lands from the power company stand to lose their lake but in a very short time the current lakebed will re-vegetate and beauty will return. I think their opposition is self-serving, yes, even selfish. The benefits to the majority of citizens and to wildlife far outweigh the selfish demands of New Lake residents.

Please return this form to the sign-in table or mail it to Ecology at the address on the reverse side.

Thank you for your comments!

I10-1

Preference acknowledged.

I10-1