

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

PM1-1  
Comments, perspective, and preferences acknowledged.

1                   CONDIT DAM ROMOVAL PROJECT DRAFT SEIS  
 2                   OPEN HOUSE  
 3                   PUBLIC MEETING  
 4           Park Center Building, 170 NW Lincoln Street  
 5                   White Salmon, Washington  
 6                   OCTOBER 25, 2005

7  
8  
9                   JOHNNY JACKSON

10  
11                   Well, I live down at Underwood at the  
 12           In-Lieu site, the west side of the mouth of the river,  
 13           the tribal Indian site, fishing site. I've been  
 14           waiting for the dam to come out because -- My reasons  
 15           for seeing that is I made a lot of studying on that  
 16           fishing and that river fish, and what we've been  
 17           fighting for a long time is contamination of Hanford,  
 18           the pulp mills and then other industry upriver.

19                   And looking at what happens to the fish up there,  
 20           some of the fish that we've caught that are from way  
 21           upriver and go down out to the ocean and come back.

22                   And my reason for wanting to see the dam out is  
 23           to develop better fish and Brookway salmon, white  
 24           salmon where the Condit Dam is. I think that if  
 25           people looked at it right, if we develop more fish in

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 1

PM1-1

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing  
 1 these rivers down here and build these runs up, we'd  
 2 have better fish that wouldn't be contaminated like  
 3 fish that go way up and spawn.

4 The fish that come down from upriver and go out  
 5 to the ocean, they are coming through all that  
 6 contaminated water to get to the ocean. And then they  
 7 come back and go back up and people catch them. But  
 8 if we had more of these rivers developed down here, I  
 9 believe that people will see better quality fish and  
 10 cleaner fish and wouldn't have so much contaminants in  
 11 it as the fish that are in way upriver.

12 For years I've been -- we've been looking at and  
 13 studying our fish. And we hear a lot about a lot of  
 14 contaminants that are in the fish from way upriver.  
 15 And I feel that if we had these rivers down here like  
 16 Big Hood River, Hood River and Little White Salmon and  
 17 Upper white Salmon and Klickitat, all these lower  
 18 rivers, the fish runs built up on them, in them, to  
 19 where we would have cleaner fish and better fish, fish  
 20 that we wouldn't have to worry about that has so much  
 21 contaminants in it.

22 Because I eat fish all the time and I just wonder  
 23 a lot of times how much of that contaminants I'm  
 24 eating. And that's one reason for wanting to see  
 25 Condit Dam out. Because a long time ago I've listened

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 2

1 to the elders talk about how they used to go up to the  
 2 berry fields. They didn't have to come all the way  
 3 down here to get fish if they wanted fish while they  
 Page 2

PM1-1  
 Continued

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

4 were up in the mountains. They would just come down  
5 around Trout Lake and get their fish and come back  
6 because there were good spawning grounds up in the  
7 Trout Lake area where the fish used to go.

8 And even listening to some of the ranchers that  
9 had been there for a long time, the ones that were  
10 kids and young people the time before the Condit Dam  
11 went in, they talk about how the fish used to be in  
12 all those streams, a lot of those streams up there,  
13 the steelhead and the Chinook. And that's the reason  
14 why I would like to see the Condit Dam taken out and  
15 the fish resupplied into this river.

16 And I hear so many stories about if the dam goes  
17 out, that where I live is going to be all flooded out  
18 or something. I don't think it is. I think that it  
19 may fill in, but it won't hurt -- it won't bother me.  
20 It won't bother my people, my site, my place. But I  
21 may even get some of my land back. It might fill in  
22 to where I will have more land space. Right now, even  
23 looking at the slides last night, I've seen like the  
24 narrows that showed where the dam is, that's not going  
25 affect my place at all if all that comes out of there.

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741

6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 3

1 It may fill in here and there coming down river, but a  
2 lot of it will go out into the Columbia.

3 I think that the next few years they will see  
4 better quality of fish that will start spawning and  
5 going back up there. Just like a lot of people over

Page 3

PM1-1  
Continued

6 10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing  
 7 on the Toutle River and the Cowlitz River, they say  
 8 that the fish wasn't affected, wasn't hurt. In fact,  
 9 it's coming back. It came back strong there, back  
 10 into that area again. And so this is the reasons why  
 11 I'd like to see that dam out, because I'd like to see  
 12 a better fish quality built up out here without  
 13 worrying about what -- seeing what our fish are going  
 14 through when they go way up to spawn and then all the  
 15 fingerlings that come down, you know, the little fish  
 16 after they hatch that come downriver on their way to  
 17 the ocean. Well, them fish, they come through all  
 18 that contaminated water and then they go out into the  
 19 ocean, but the contamination a lot of times doesn't  
 20 leave them. It stays in there body and they grow with  
 21 it.

22 Then when they come back, they have got the  
 23 contamination in them when they come back upstream  
 24 when they go back up to spawn. Then we catch the  
 25 fish, everybody catches them, and they don't know what  
 they're eating a lot of times.

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 4

1 There's dioxin and there's other chemicals.  
 2 There's a lot of other chemicals that come out that's  
 3 from upriver. And we found that out by these studies  
 4 that they make on these fish. That's the reason.

5  
 6  
 7

JOSEPH A. GROGAN  
 Foster, Pepper & Shefelman.  
 Page 4

PM1-1  
 Continued

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

9  
10                   Klickitat and Skamania Counties' Remarks for  
11 October 25, 2005 Hearing on Department of Ecology's  
12 DSEIS for Condit Dam Removal:

13                   Both Klickitat and Skamania Counties welcome the  
14 opportunity to offer testimony this evening and  
15 outline a number of concerns they have associated with  
16 PacifiCorp's Dam Removal Plan, the Department's Draft  
17 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and the  
18 upcoming 401 and 402 permitting processes.

19                   First, the Counties want to restate for the  
20 record that Ecology has, in the Counties' opinion,  
21 already compromised its role as an objective  
22 permitting authority charged with protecting the  
23 environment for the welfare of the citizens of the  
24 State of Washington. A number of years ago Ecology  
25 was led down the road by PacifiCorp to sign an SA that  
COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 5

1                   committed the agency to not commenting adversely on  
2 any aspect of project removal and (I think any  
3 conditional judge will conclude) committed the agency  
4 to prejudicing the environmental review and permits  
5 for the project before SEPA was even completed and  
6 before a single permit application was ever filed with  
7 the Department.

8                   As the Counties' Public Disclosure Act requests  
9 have revealed, Ecology's back-door negotiations with  
10 PC and the SA parties extended into developing

Page 5

PM2-1

Opinions acknowledged. Please see the responses to Comment Letter A6.

PM2-1

11 10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing  
 12 exceptions to the State's Water Quality standards to  
 13 allow the SA alternative to circumvent existing water  
 14 quality regulations designed to prohibit the very  
 15 destruction that the Department is prepared to permit.

16 Ecology staff have had internal disagreements  
 17 regarding the impacts of this proposal, have expressed  
 18 reservations concerning the ability to permit this  
 19 project under existing laws and have even debated the  
 20 appropriateness of processing the 402 as a general  
 21 permit.

22 while we have all been exchanging letters and  
 23 comments at hearings like this for years without real  
 24 consequence, the various agency records, including  
 25 Ecology's, will begin to be aired next year if Ecology  
 continues to ignore its statutory responsibilities,  
 COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 6

1 continues to work behind the scenes with the SA  
 2 parties, and continues to simply look in the other  
 3 direction when faced with the true impacts of this  
 4 proposal.

5 Faced with this record, the Counties have been  
 6 left with no choice but to serve as the guardian of  
 7 the public interest and the local environment. The  
 8 Counties work every day to protect the environment  
 9 through the application of local regulations such as  
 10 critical areas ordinances, the Shoreline Management  
 11 Act and SEPA. Many of these regulations are designed  
 12 to protect existing resources such as listed species,  
 13 wildlife and water quality. The Counties support  
 Page 6

PM2-2

Comments acknowledged. Please see the responses to Comment Letter  
 A6.

PM2-1  
 Continued

PM2-2

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

14 salmon recovery throughout the Columbia Basin.  
 15 Without question, the Counties' solid position has  
 16 been one of ensuring that if the dam is removed, that  
 17 it be done in an environmentally responsible manner.  
 18 So I think the key question is this: Can the dam be  
 19 removed in a more environmentally responsible way? I  
 20 challenge any biologist or engineer on either side of  
 21 this controversy to truthfully answer that question in  
 22 the in the negative. The simple fact is that it can,  
 23 that is the Counties position, and that is why we are  
 24 investing the resources we are and asking the hard  
 25 questions. By way of contrast, the applicant's

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 7

PM2-2  
 Continued

PM2-3

Opinion acknowledged. Please see the responses to Comment Letter A6.

PM2-4

Opinions acknowledged. Please see the responses to Comment Letter A6.

1 strategy, and apparently that the settlement parties,  
 2 is simply one of cost avoidance in the expense of the  
 3 environment.

PM2-3

4 The Counties are greatly disturbed by  
 5 PacifiCorp's recent filing with FERC seeking an order  
 6 preempting local environmental regulations and  
 7 protections. This action is directly contrary to  
 8 representations made to the County Commissioners in  
 9 the past that PacifiCorp would work with the counties  
 10 on local permitting issues. This disappointment  
 11 extends also to Ecology and the other settlement  
 12 parties who, according to Gail Miller, endorsed  
 13 PacifiCorp's recent filing. It also is contrary to  
 14 the settlement agreement itself. In the settlement  
 15 agreement PacifiCorp agreed to "apply for and use its

PM2-4

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing  
 16 best reasonable efforts to obtain in a timely manner  
 17 and in final form all applicable federal, state,  
 18 regional, and local permits, licenses, authorizations,  
 19 certifications, determinations, and other governmental  
 20 approvals... necessary to commence project removal."

21 Before I address the SFEIS itself, I want to  
 22 reiterate what the existing record already illustrates  
 23 with a few important quotes from FERC, PacifiCorp and  
 24 the Corps:

25 "[T]he "settlement agreement dam removal  
 COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 8

1 alternative" seems to have serious, long-term adverse  
 2 impacts. Shoot dam be removed, we urge a more  
 3 conservative approach that does not wipe out the  
 4 existing fishery in the White Salmon River and deposit  
 5 2.42 million cubic yards of sediment and debris in the  
 6 Columbia River."

7 -Portland district, Corps of Engineers

8 "The no sediment treatment option presents such  
 9 significant adverse water quality and aquatic resource  
 10 impacts that this alternative is not viable due to the  
 11 environmental concerns."

12 FERC 1996 FEIS at 4-85.

13 "The effects of mass sediment transport on the  
 14 downstream reaches of the White Salmon River would be  
 15 severe. The volume of sediment would be twice as  
 16 large in the no sediment treatment option as compared  
 17 to the dry excavation option, resulting in greater  
 18 sediment loads and longer residence time of lake  
 Page 8

PM2-4  
 Continued

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

19 sediments in the lower river. The applicant  
 20 (PacifiCorp) estimates, and we concur, that it would  
 21 take 10 to 20 years for lake sediments to be  
 22 transported through the lower reaches of the river to  
 23 the Bonneville Pool (PacifiCorp, 1993f). The  
 24 environmental impacts to the in lieu fishing site in  
 25 this area would be unacceptable as the habitat would

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 9

1 be covered by the silty clays and fine sands for a  
 2 minimum of ten years and likely longer, causing a  
 3 long-term degradation of this valuable habitat."

4 FERC 1996 FEIS at 4-81.

5 I can go on. I can assure you that as a project  
 6 applicant, this is not the sort of record I would want  
 7 in place to support 401 and 404 permit decisions.

8 I will briefly switch gears to the Draft SEIS and  
 9 offer a few remarks. The Counties continue to work  
 10 with perhaps the most qualified fish biologists, water  
 11 quality experts, geologists and hydrogeologists in the  
 12 State. This team is working on a comprehensive set of  
 13 comments that will be filed with Ecology next month.

14 Ecology's statutory responsibilities associated  
 15 with their 401 review are clear. The Battle Mountain  
 16 Gold case reminds us that a Section 401 certification  
 17 means that the state must have reasonable assurance  
 18 that there will be compliance with water quality laws.  
 19 Even at this early stage, our consultants have  
 20 concluded, based on their professional opinion, that

PM2-4  
 Continued

21 10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing  
 22 the SA Dam Removal Plan together with its approach to  
 23 post-removal mitigation and monitoring will fail  
 24 miserably in terms of providing reasonable assurance  
 25 and consistency with State law.

First, Ecology has made a fundamental mistake and  
 COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 10

PM2-4  
 Continued

PM2-5

Please see the responses to Comment Letter A6.

1 has placed all of its eggs in one basket by concluding  
 2 that the existing environmental documents contain an  
 3 adequate assessment of alternatives to the Dam Removal  
 4 Plan. The FSFEIS and the Ecology DEIS erroneously  
 5 conclude that other dam removal alternatives will have  
 6 a greater adverse impact on the environment. When  
 7 critically reviewed both on a qualitative and  
 8 quantitative basis, any conclusion that a sediment  
 9 removal option (even with an associated spoils site)  
 10 will have greater adverse impacts is simply arbitrary  
 11 and unsupported by the facts.

12 Anyone who carefully reviews the Dam Removal Plan  
 13 and supporting studies can see that the proposal  
 14 relies on numerous assumptions that, in the opinion of  
 15 the Counties' experts, contain critical flaws that  
 16 drive erroneous conclusions concerning impacts. Even  
 17 if discharges from the dam are as envisioned by  
 18 PacifiCorp, the Gathard Sediment Report underestimates  
 19 sediment volumes and the duration of impacts. There  
 20 are internal inconsistencies in the Draft EIS itself  
 21 concerning the duration of impacts and reliance on  
 22 technical papers that, when reviewed, do not even  
 23 support the proposition cited for.

PM2-5

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

24 An unfortunate outcome of the failed assumptions  
 25 and technical errors is the fact that impacts to  
 COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 11

1 listed species, including the number of classes  
 2 impacted, and critical habitat are grossly  
 3 underestimated. The explanation of mitigation for the  
 4 loss of thermal refuge at the mouth of the river is  
 5 not supported by the facts and is supported by science  
 6 that is at best, weak.

7 Perhaps the most glaring flaw is the short  
 8 attention given to the fact that the proposal is not  
 9 consistent with the existing antidegradation policy or  
 10 existing State Water Quality Standards. While we  
 11 recognize that Ecology and PacifiCorp are working very  
 12 hard on solving this dilemma, that fact does not  
 13 permit Ecology simply to ignore the discussion of  
 14 these impacts in an SEIS.

15 The Counties' wetlands experts were simply  
 16 astounded at the proposed treatment of wetlands in the  
 17 Dam Removal Plan and Draft SEIS. The wetlands  
 18 proposal lacks reasonable assurance of no net loss in  
 19 wetlands functions and values as requires under  
 20 Ecology's administration of the Federal Clean Water  
 21 Act and 401 Certification. The wetlands plan is  
 22 inconsistent with Ecology's 2004 Guidance and Best  
 23 Available Science which uses the functional assessment  
 24 methodology, doesn't account for temporal loss of  
 25 functions, doesn't account for risk of mitigation

PM2-5  
Continued

PM2-6

PM2-7

PM2-6

Opinions acknowledged. Please see the responses to Comment Letter A6.

PM2-7

Opinions acknowledged. Please see the responses to Comment Letter A6.

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing  
COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 12

1 replacement under the "stand back" or the contingency  
2 plan for standard mitigation compensation, doesn't  
3 account for future protection of mitigating wetlands,  
4 and proposes only two years of success monitoring,  
5 whereas the typical standard is ten years of success  
6 monitoring in recent 401 certifications.

PM2-7  
Continued

7 Finally, the Monitoring Plans offered by  
8 PacifiCorp are really meaningless in terms of their  
9 ability to avoid further impacts of this project.  
10 Turbidity and other water quality parameters are only  
11 monitored to provide data for future projects, not  
12 adaptively manage this one. Principally, PacifiCorp  
13 appears to rely on its ability to drive heavy  
14 equipment up and down a reach of scenic river  
15 containing critical habitat and listed species or to  
16 blast away at will on an as needed basis to remove log  
17 jams and provide fish passenger. That proposal may  
18 have been environmentally acceptable at the turn of  
19 the century, but it should not be acceptable today.

PM2-8

20 We urge the Department to take a step back and  
21 assess where this train is headed. The record is not  
22 a good one for Ecology. However, there is still time  
23 for the Department to step up and address the hard  
24 questions head on.

PM2-9

25 The Counties respectfully request that the  
COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 13

PM2-8  
Opinions acknowledged. Please see the responses to Comment Letter A6.

PM2-9  
Opinions acknowledged. Please see the responses to Comment Letter A6.

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

1 Department address the issues and concerns that will  
 2 be outlined in their November submittal and we extend  
 3 an invitation to you to sit down with us to discuss  
 4 the project's impacts and reasonable alternatives and  
 5 mitigation. Thank you.

PM2-9  
Continued

8 WILLIAM PAULSEN

9  
 10 Well, I represent myself as well as the  
 11 white Salmon Steelheaders, which is a local sports  
 12 fishing and conservation club. And I am and we are  
 13 very opposed to the method of removal of Condit Dam as  
 14 proposed.

PM3-1

15 Our main areas of concern are the resident  
 16 Rainbow Trout that now reside in the Upper white  
 17 Salmon River as well as Northwestern Lake. The Upper  
 18 white Salmon River is a wild and scenic river and  
 19 those rainbow trout are an outstanding remarkable  
 20 value. And at least theoretically they are protected  
 21 by the Forest Service, who's responsible for them.

PM3-2

22 Introduction of steelhead and salmon into the  
 23 Upper white Salmon River will displace the Rainbow  
 24 Trout from their spawning areas, which in that area  
 25 are very limited. And, in fact, the spawning areas

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 14

PM3-1

Comment acknowledged.

PM3-2

The fish are under the management of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and may or may not qualify as a recognized resource under the wild and scenic designation.

Salmon are fall spawners and will not displace rainbow trout from limited spawning areas. The literature cited in both Section 4.3 of the DSEIS and Appendix C, supports the conclusion that anadromous rainbow (steelhead) are unlikely to displace rainbow trout from available spawning habitat. Resident salmonids require limited spawning habitat in comparison to anadromous species. The major concern for the resident rainbow trout fishery in the White Salmon River will be to limit the take of larger rainbow trout, because a steelhead fishery would be likely to increase angling pressure on the resource and deplete the number of larger "trophy" trout. Mature summer-run steelhead can be almost indistinguishable from large stream resident rainbow trout.

1 are the limiting factor in the populations of those

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing  
2 trout. The trout also travel between the lake,  
3 Northwestern Lake, and the Upper white Salmon River.  
4 And removal of the lake and introduction of salmonoids  
5 will in most estimates reduce the population of those  
6 trout at least 75 percent, if not more.

7 My other concern is the Lower white Salmon River  
8 below Condit Dam, the destruction that will occur I  
9 think is apparent to everyone. Not only to the  
10 wildlife and fish that reside in that river now and  
11 would be in there at the time of the release, but even  
12 of more concern is the role of the white Salmon River,  
13 the Lower white Salmon, the mouth of the white Salmon  
14 River provides -- or the role it plays in rejuvenation  
15 of upriver salmon and steelhead, which are endangered  
16 species.

17 During the summer, late summer months the white  
18 Salmon River or the Lower white Salmon is a refuge and  
19 recuperation point for these fish. And allowing  
20 sediments into that area, which would take many years  
21 to clear, will make that uninhabitable to those  
22 upriver fish. So it's going to have a detrimental  
23 effect on endangered species that are heading up to  
24 points beyond white Salmon River, including your  
25 uprivers into the Idaho area.

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 15

1 If removal of the dam would result in a large and  
2 vigorous run of salmon and steelhead over the years,  
3 it might be a little more palatable. However, all  
4 studies show, because of the nature of the white  
Page 14

PM3-2  
Continued

PM3-3

PM3-4

PM3-5

PM3-3

Comments and opinions acknowledged.

PM3-4

Thermal refuge in the White Salmon River and other tributary rivers of the Columbia River represent refuge from elevated water temperatures present in the mainstem of the Columbia River. 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 conversion of the pool at the mouth of the White Salmon River to a stream channel (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.

PM3-5

Opinion acknowledged. With respect to barrier falls, the fall at RM 2.6 on the mainstem of the White Salmon River may be a barrier to the upstream migration of chum salmon adult spawners. The falls on the mainstem of the river and most tributaries have been accurately reported in the DSEIS, and their capacity to impede the upstream movement of fish has also been accurately stated. Even with the limitation of habitat by falls, the number of large rainbow trout is expected to be greater when the anadromous steelhead are established than occur in the reservoir and river prior to dam removal. In addition, the river would have various stocks of salmon. The total diversity, as well as numbers, would be substantially higher. Therefore, the main tradeoff is between a reservoir fishery and a river fishery.

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

5 salmon River and the upriver natural blockages, that  
6 there is a limited spawning area for salmon and  
7 steelhead up there and that the runs would be minimal.  
8 So in my view and in our view, this removal will be  
9 more detrimental than advantageous in the long run.

PM3-5  
Continued

10 I personally find it remarkable that this is even  
11 being considered. If any private citizen owned land  
12 on any of these tributary rivers that feed into the  
13 Columbia or where endangered species reside and wanted  
14 to do a little backhoe work on their property down  
15 near the water line, there would be virtually no  
16 chance of getting a permit to do anything because of  
17 the worry about sediments released, and properly so.

PM3-6

18 And to even be considering the release of 60  
19 million cubic feet or more of sediment into the lower  
20 White Salmon River and then the Columbia River to me  
21 is ridiculous.

22 My feeling is that the estimates of the time  
23 required for the sediments to clear in the Lower White  
24 Salmon River are far too optimistic. Because of the  
25 nature of the White Salmon River canyon in

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 16

PM3-7

1 Northwestern Lake, with the high gradient sides which  
2 have been under water for 90 years, and thus have no  
3 vegetation, I feel that there's going to be many years  
4 of slough off and runoff of mud and other sediments  
5 that will continue for many more years than the five  
6 years that are projected right now. End of statement.

PM3-6

Comment acknowledged.

PM3-7

Steep rock canyon walls visible in the pre-reservoir photographs indicate a strong rock mass. This basaltic rock mass is sufficiently strong to resist repeated mass failures, even though it has been submerged. According to the Sediment Management Plan, unstable sediment would be removed or stabilized after dam breaching, thus minimizing the duration of impact.

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BRENT FOSTER  
Columbia River Keeper

I just want to comment. The Columbia River Keeper believes that the Supplemental EIS certainly meets all the requirements of NEPA. It's a good document that reasonably describes the impacts of the proposed dam removal and, as a result, we think that the effects of the dam removal would be extremely positive for salmon, steelhead and anadromous fish species, and that the adverse effects can be mitigated to the point where they would be insignificant, especially in comparison to the benefits that the removal would have.

PM4-1

PM4-1  
Comment acknowledged.

PM5-1  
Comment acknowledged.

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 17

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

BOB HANSEN

I live in Lyle. I'm a resident of the Columbia Gorge. I support removal of the dam. I'm also involved with a group called the Society for Ecological Restoration, the Northwest Chapter. I'm also a retired professional civil engineer.

PM5-1

And we in the professional engineering business have done a lot to modify our planet, mother earth.  
Page 16

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

10 And many of the things that have happened, we didn't  
11 really understand the ultimate consequences of those  
12 undertakings, and they were done for a purpose.

13 But certainly the dams that we've created on the  
14 Columbia River Basin system have been very destructive  
15 to fish and to ways of life, and I think that removal  
16 of this dam, in terms of the benefits to the cost, the  
17 benefits of removing it, compared to the costs that  
18 are incurred, those benefits are much greater than the  
19 costs. So the ratio is much greater than one.

20 So in terms of economic issues, you can address  
21 it that way. But just simply in terms of health of  
22 the planet and the health of the environment and  
23 health of the ecology long-term, I think that history  
24 will show that removal of the dam not only locally,  
25 but across the nation and across the world, are a

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 18

1 positive step forward.  
2  
3

4 DANIEL DANCER  
5

6 I've lived on the white salmon River for  
7 many years. I don't live there anymore. I live in  
8 Mosier, Oregon now. And I think dam removal is like  
9 the most exciting things I've been involved with in my  
10 life, and I'm really excited and my children are  
11 excited.

PM6-1

Comment acknowledged.

PM5-1  
Continued

PM6-1

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

12 And I think I'm really going to encourage the  
13 Washington Department of Ecology to issue the Clean  
14 Water Act, Section 401 Certification, so that dam  
15 removal can proceed and the restoration of this  
16 ecosystem can begin.

17 And one thing I wanted to comment on is the  
18 Endangered Species Act and all the different laws that  
19 are out there to help us decide what to do in a  
20 situation like this, they don't cover deconstruction  
21 of a dam. They have been written for evaluating the  
22 impact of something going in on the existing  
23 ecosystem. There's nothing that's really been written  
24 about restoring an ecosystem.

25 So this is very historic. And I think it's  
COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 19

PM6-1  
Continued

1 really important that we take this opportunity so that  
2 we can learn from it and begin to craft new laws and  
3 guidelines, so when we take out other dams and start  
4 repairing other ecosystems, we have some vision to  
5 guide us on how to do that because we don't have that  
6 right now.

7 So we can't really evaluate something like  
8 deconstruction of a dam with laws that were written to  
9 evaluate the impacts of something going in. We're  
10 taking something out, so it's a whole different  
11 situation.

12 And I'm really satisfied that the impacts on the  
13 watershed and the salmon from the runoff when the dam  
14 is purged and the river begins to float through it,

Page 18

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

15 that it's going to be -- the force of the water will  
16 be enough to carry most of the sediments out into the  
17 Columbia without doing much damage.

18 And the fact that when the river starts flowing  
19 through the hole that's blasted through it, it's only  
20 going to be a quarter of the amount during the 1996  
21 floods. And so I really feel very strongly that  
22 everything has been well covered by PacifiCorp and the  
23 destruction process has been extremely well thought  
24 out.

25 I've been involved with it from the very  
COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 20

PM6-1  
Continued

1 beginning, going to all the meetings, and I've been  
2 impressed by how thorough all the different players  
3 are in it. And I'm really excited about the fact that  
4 salmon runs will be restored. We'll have a wild and  
5 scenic river that starts at Mt. Adams and flows all  
6 the way to the Columbia River wild and free. And  
7 white water rafting on a contiguous river  
8 uninterrupted by dam is going to be just incredible.  
9 So I just want to state my support in general for  
10 taking it out as soon as possible.

11  
12  
13 DANIEL LICHTENWALD

PM7-1

14  
15 One concern that is being presented as a  
16 consideration against the dam removal project is

Page 19

PM7-1  
Comment acknowledged.

17 10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing  
 18 concern with the Endangered Species Act. And while on  
 19 the face, if the Endangered Species Act is interpreted  
 20 mechanically, there is a case to say that listed  
 21 species are going to be harmed potentially. I mean,  
 22 the way dam removal is described and the effects of  
 23 it, the immediate effects and near term effects,  
 24 undoubtedly are going to affect habitat and a good bit  
 of the ecosystem below the dam.

25 However, the Endangered Species Act was written  
 COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 21

1 and the spirit of the Endangered Species Act deals  
 2 with projects that are being introduced that are  
 3 intended to have a permanent effect on the  
 4 environment, on the biosphere. And to use the  
 5 Endangered Species Act to address the effects of  
 6 deconstructing impediments, or I guess we would  
 7 say --.

8 So the Endangered Species Act was conceived to  
 9 deal with proposals and projects that were proposed to  
 10 have detrimental permanent changes to listed species  
 11 habitat and then to see what mitigations there are or  
 12 whether the benefits are balanced. But to apply  
 13 something like the Endangered Species Act to something  
 14 that is remedial, in effect, I don't believe that the  
 15 arguments of damage to listed species should work, nor  
 16 should be applied.

17 Anyway, my take on this is that the short-term  
 18 negative effects are not inconsistent with  
 19 catastrophic events that happen naturally. The

Page 20

PM7-1  
 Continued

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

20 adaptations that took place after the dam went in 100  
21 years ago that have settled in there now and are now  
22 being considered as being vulnerable to damage by  
23 taking the dam out are going to be the same forces  
24 that will restore the damage that taking the dam out  
25 would have caused. So those forces haven't gone away.

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741  
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 22

PM7-1  
Continued

1 In other words, I think it's more valuable to  
2 connect both parts of the river, to have a complete  
3 ecosystem running the length of the river, which will  
4 be better for the strength of the fish, be better for  
5 the genetics of the fish, and will expand usable  
6 habitat for listed fish.

7  
8  
9 NATHEN BAKER  
10 Staff Attorney with Friends of the Columbia Gorge  
11 522 Southwest fifth Avenue, Suite 720,  
12 Portland, OR 97204

PM8-1  
Preference acknowledged.

13  
14 Friends of the Columbia Gorge is very  
15 supportive of removal of Condit Dam. We will be  
16 following up with written comments, but we just wanted  
17 to express our support for the project that all the  
18 different agencies and Indians have agreed to.

PM8-1

19 As far as the environmental impacts, we feel that  
20 the Department of Ecology has actively explored the  
21 environmental impacts.