

22 10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing
 Friends is concerned about the length of time
 23 that the permitting process has taken so far, and we
 24 recommend that Department of Ecology put the final EIS
 25 and the issuance of the Section 401 Water Quality
 COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 23

1 Certification on a fast track. We also urge the
 2 Department of Ecology to work with the other agencies
 3 and the dam owners to facilitate the lowering of
 4 Bonneville Pool during dam removal.

5 Friends believes that the long-term beneficial
 6 impacts of removal will far outweigh the short-term
 7 impacts. We're excited about having a restored free
 8 flowing river and the recreation opportunities that
 9 will come with dam removal.

10 We also believe it will benefit scenic resources,
 11 and especially natural resources, by restoring native
 12 salmon runs and increasing habitat for salmon and the
 13 species that depend on them.

14 We did want to point out that we agree with the
 15 statement on page 2-3 that the nonremoval alternatives
 16 will have greater impacts on the river than dam
 17 removal. We agree with that statement.

18 We disagree with FERC's statement on page 2-5
 19 that an entire year class of chum will be lost. So we
 20 disagree with FERC's statement that an entire year
 21 class of chum will be lost as a result of dam removal.
 22 We think that's not accurate.

23 Several individuals of that year class may not
 24 return at the time of dam removal and therefore will
 Page 22

PM8-2

PM8-3

PM8-4

PM8-5

PM8-6

PM8-2

Comment acknowledged.

PM8-3

Comment acknowledged.

PM8-4

Preference and comment acknowledged.

PM8-5

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. It is acknowledged that the ongoing impacts from the original construction of the Condit Dam could be greater than the impacts of removal of the dam.

PM8-6

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 modified to clarify the information.

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

25 not be impacted by the removal. And over the
COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 24

1 long-term, that year class will build itself back up.
2 We think that's accurately discussed in the rest of
3 the document and we disagree with the statement on the
4 statement on page 2-5.

5 And then finally we had three things that we
6 recommend referencing in the document. The first is
7 the Northwest Power Planning Council's subbasin plan
8 for the White Salmon. It specifically recommends
9 removing Condit Dam. It says that Condit Dam is the
10 most limiting factor for salmon and steelhead. And
11 Condit Dam would further the objectives of improving
12 habitat.

13 The second thing is that the State of Washington
14 has recognized the Wind River and White Salmon
15 watershed resource inventory area, No. 29, as a
16 historically important source for production of salmon
17 and steelhead in the lower Columbia River Basin. And
18 it also recognizes -- The State has recognized that
19 the White Salmon River should -- the aquatic resources
20 in the White Salmon River should be improved by
21 removing Condit Dam and reducing hydroelectric
22 development in the river.

23 And then finally another document, the Lower
24 Columbia River Salmon Recovery Plan, recognizes the
25 importance of removing fish passage barriers

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

Page 23

PM8-6
Continued

PM8-7

PM8-8

PM8-9

PM8-7

Comment acknowledged. The FSEIS references the mentioned document and acknowledges the contribution the removal of Condit Dam would make toward addressing the limiting factors for the listed anadromous fish species in the river.

PM8-8

Comment acknowledged. The FSEIS references the WRIA reports.

PM8-9

The benefits of the proposed Condit Dam removal project to the region's salmon and steelhead recovery efforts are noted. The FSEIS acknowledges 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.

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 25

1 throughout the watershed. And we believe that removal
2 of Condit Dam would further this and other regional
3 salmon and steelhead recovery goals.

PM8-9
Continued

4 So those are a few specific points on the content
5 of the EIS, but generally we're very supportive. We
6 feel that the environmental impacts have been looked
7 at and we encourage DOE to fast track the process for
8 issuing the final Environmental Impact Statement and
9 the Water Quality Certification.

PM8-10

10
11

12 STUART JOHNSTON

13

14 I'm in favor of the dam being removed. My
15 focus, I'm a wildlife biologist. And my specialty or
16 what I am real good at is bird stuff.

17 There will be some negative impacts if they take
18 the dam out for some birds, like Bufflehead in the
19 winter. A lot of Bufflehead ducks winter on the lake.

PM9-1

20 And then when the dam is taken out, other ducks
21 will benefit, like Harlequin ducks and Common
22 Mergansers that nest along the river. But the one
23 thing that I think might be especially interesting to
24 most people or a lot of people are bald eagles.

25 If you look at the Klickitat River, bald eagles

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 26

PM8-10
Comment acknowledged.

PM9-1
Comment acknowledged.

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

1 go all the way up the river. wherever salmon spawn,
2 they eat dying and dead salmon after they're spawned
3 out. well, you don't find that on the white salmon
4 River because the salmon can only go up as far as the
5 dam. And once the salmon start spawning upriver all
6 the way up to Trout Lake, bald eagles will have more
7 places to find spawned out salmon. And I think that
8 would be a positive thing for them, as well as of
9 course people like to fish for salmon and all those
10 other aspects of the salmon having more spawning area.

11 And also I notice that they have highlighted some
12 areas along the shores of the Northwestern Lake where
13 there's wetlands, and there are certain birds that are
14 in those wetlands that would not be there if the
15 wetlands dried up because the water table dropped down
16 to where the river was.

17 But I suspect that new wetlands will form along
18 the shores, a natural wetlands area that will probably
19 form along the shores there. And I think there's
20 probably going to be some mitigation possible that
21 they will engineer to perhaps make new comparable
22 wetlands at least in some spots. And that's it, I
23 guess.

(HEARING CONCLUDED AT
7:30 P.M.)

COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741
6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 27

PM9-1
Continued

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2

10-25-05 Condit Dam SEIS Hearing

3 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
 4 COUNTY OF YAKIMA) ss.

5 THIS IS TO CERTIFY that I, Dorene Boyle, Notary
 6 Public in and for the State of Washington residing at
 7 Yakima, reported the within and foregoing HEARING; said
 8 HEARING being taken before me as a Notary Public on the
 9 date herein set forth; that the deponent was first by me
 10 duly sworn; that said examination was taken by me in
 11 shorthand and thereafter under my supervision transcribed,
 12 and that same is a full, true and correct record of the
 13 testimony of said deponent, including all questions,
 14 answers and objections, if any, of counsel.

15
 16 I further certify that I am not a relative or
 17 employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor
 18 am I financially interested in the outcome of the cause.

19
 20 IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand
 21 and affixed my official seal this day of ,
 22 2005.

23
 24 CERT/LIC NO. 2521

Notary Public in and for the State
 of Washington, residing at Yakima

25 COURT REPORTING SERVICE (509)457-6741 (800)317-6741
 6 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 413 LARSON BLDG., YAKIMA, WA 28

Page 1

1 CONDUIT DAM REMOVAL PROJECT DRAFT SEIS
2 OPEN HOUSE
3 PUBLIC MEETING
4 OCTOBER 25, 2005

5

6

7 WILBUR SLOCKISH

8 I think the river needs to be returned to
9 its original status like it was prior to the dam
10 being put in there. Because that river, when my
11 people would go from this area up there to Mt. Adams
12 for fish, for huckleberries and they would take
13 salmon out of this streamway up there by Glenwood
14 and those areas. But some of these guys here say
15 the local, what they call sportsman that fish for
16 trout, say salmon and trout don't get along. And if
17 we allowed the salmon to come back into that river
18 then it would destroy the trout fishing. That's the
19 biggest falsehood you ever heard because up in the
20 Klickitat River there's numerous trout. And salmon
21 and steelhead go up into that river. So if that was
22 the case there wouldn't be any trout in that river.
23 And salmon and steelhead and trout are related
24 they're not going to fight. Animals don't fight.
25 The water ones unless they're predators, other

PM10-1
Comment acknowledged.

PM10-1

Page 2

1 species they have the predatory ones, lions, tigers
2 and those things that feed on other animals. If
3 there's predators that they want to do away with
4 then why did they release the Walleye here because
5 that's a big destroyer of salmon.

6 Also, consider agricultural activities and
7 industrial practices that use the water and warms
8 it. Chemicals. I can give you a for instance.
9 They always say it's progress, their farming
10 activities. Where I grew up in Wakikus there was a
11 creek that used to come by out into the main
12 Klickitat River, it was called Swaoe Creek. We used
13 to go over there and cool off there. And it was
14 nice, cold water. And also, that's where some of
15 our real old village sites were because that's what
16 was there in that area. It was a real old village
17 site because there was a trail coming down into that
18 area and went back up to Glenwood. So now there's
19 now water in that stream because of up there around
20 Centerville area they were diverting water for their
21 agricultural purposes. When I was young, very
22 young, I can remember hearing those rocks roll down
23 that river in the spring time when it would be
24 flooding out of that little stream and through the
25 main stream. And you could just hear the rocks

PM10-1
Continued

Page 3

1 rolling down that river. It would make a lot of
2 noise. We lived there. So after they really
3 started farming activity up there around the
4 Centerville area and damming the water and taking
5 it, then it dried up. There's very little water in
6 there. And now there's all kinds of rocks and
7 gravel there that used to be a sand -- like a beach
8 underneath there. And it's covered up now from the
9 other rocks coming down. But that used to keep that
10 clean in there. So water, you know, has its uses
11 and it cleanses the streambeds. It cleans it out so
12 that the salmon can survive.

13 My father used to spear salmon in this river.
14 He used to go down and spear salmon. And they used
15 to be big, big fish. So the fish have been there
16 and no person has the right to destroy animal life.
17 They have a role to play in this environment. And
18 they not only provided food for our people, the
19 native people, but they also are, what is that
20 called, nutrients after they spawn. And they're
21 food for the baby fish and all of the other fish
22 that can go in there and partake in the nutrients
23 from those. So they have a role. They are our food
24 source. Not just for people but also animal life
25 and just for economics or recreation.

PM10-1
Continued

Page 4

1 I think man has gotten too big-headed because
2 of economy, because of recreation and to have any
3 regard for any animal life. Animals have a spirit
4 and a place in this world. They need to be
5 respected whether they have four legs and antlers or
6 wings and feathers. They have a role here. And I
7 understand that now they're talking about endangered
8 species using that to try to save this dam down
9 here. Well, they have thought that long before that
10 dam destroyed prime spawning grounds. So after
11 the -- and if anybody can remember how the river up
12 there, the Toutle River, after that river, the
13 Cowlitz River and all of those ones there. Now the
14 ash from Mt. St. Helen's blew, got into those
15 streams, those streams produce fish. And the elk
16 and all of those wildlife over there have survived
17 and they're multiplying. So nature takes care of
18 themselves. If they would leave them alone
19 nature would rejuvenate and reproduce those runs in
20 there.

21 And that's one of the things there that the
22 economists always use sound science. Well,
23 scientists are human. Scientists make mistakes.
24 Scientists aren't really knowledgeable about
25 everything and about salmon. So they make mistakes

PM10-1
Continued

Page 5

1 that effect them.
2 Water quality. Water quality, water
3 temperature and all of those have to be taken.
4 water has to move to cool itself off. So using that
5 word sound science is just a smoke screen in my
6 mind. And I have seen a lot of things because I
7 used to fish around down there and in that area
8 where that stream blew and they said the salmon were
9 dying out there. But yeah, you do down and there's
10 a lot more fish. A lot more other animal life. So
11 they take that out -- when they take that dam out
12 there will be an abundance again. And that's one
13 thing there that people need to understand. Five
14 years, 10 years is not very long. And in the frame
15 of what that is, the eons, and over all time.
16 That's just like maybe a half a second. So it
17 could be a bush or however they want to phrase it.
18 But they'll be there and our grandchildren will
19 enjoy those benefits. Maybe we won't but our
20 grandchildren will. No matter what color they are.
21 No matter if they're brown or they're white or
22 they're black or Chinese or Asian, they'll see it
23 and they'll enjoy and they'll say thank you for
24 people for thinking about us and not thinking in
25 the forms of how much money can I stuff in my bank

PM10-1
Continued

Page 6

1 account or how big of a house I can build or how can
2 I have more than my neighbor. But just use what you
3 took. Use our philosophy. Use what you can use
4 because it will come back a lot more. And be
5 thankful for what you have. You don't need all of
6 that.

7 And I know some brothers, I don't know how many
8 of them are left, but they sure think they don't
9 have enough money. And I know that's one of their
10 things is they want to develop that for housing
11 there. That wasn't a housing area. And then you
12 hear -- I hear the grape industry, the apple/fruit
13 industry get mad about elk herds and deer herds
14 destroying their plants. But they got to remember
15 those animals were there. That was their area where
16 they foraged. And they're just lining them up on a
17 table, so they're going to go there and eat it,
18 yeah. They're going to strip that bark. But maybe
19 if they had any commonsense they would fence off an
20 area solely for those animals. Put a high fence up
21 and let them go in there and let them eat there and
22 just then have their own that they use for their
23 economic benefit. Share it with them. And that's
24 what's the matter. Nobody likes to share. They
25 want all they can get. But, you know, that's what

PM10-1
Continued

Page 7

1 they need. They'll learn to share with those
2 animals because they're -- I imagine they
3 displaced rattlesnakes. This area is known for
4 rattlesnakes. Displaced rats and mice and all of
5 the other animals. All kinds of snakes. All kinds
6 of ground animals that borough. And they had to
7 find a different area to live. And they call pest
8 control. They want to kill them. Why is it that
9 they need to kill everything? So, you know, that's
10 what they need. They want to put their income in
11 producing plants, trees, and then they need to put
12 aside an area for those animals whether it's an elk
13 or a deer. Elk can go where he wants to go. But,
14 you know, if he can put aside an area for him and
15 really fix it where he knows it's his, he will stay
16 there. Just like a buffalo. Buffalo go where he
17 wants to go. So one of the things there is they
18 need to think along that instead of this is there's
19 80 acres here and I have got 80 acres of grapes or
20 80 acres of trees and I want all of those. Maybe
21 use 70, put 10 acres aside for those animals and let
22 them have that. That sounds like a lot. But it's
23 not in the long run. You look at the damage that
24 they have done to those trees in that one plot and
25 it will take care of it and they'll be there. But

PM10-1
Continued

Page 8

COUNT REPORTING SERVICE (CRS) #576741 30/01/11
 8 SOUTH SECOND STREET, 113 LANSON BLDG, YARRAM

1 share with them and in that frame of mind, that's
 2 what they need to do. And that's the same with that
 3 water.

4 This river here needs to be restored so that
 5 the land can restore itself. And the sediment --
 6 well, if that dam wasn't there that sediment
 7 wouldn't have been built up there. That's the
 8 reason it's built up because they didn't let it go.
 9 And there's an example of it at Swaoe Creek and the
 10 Klickitat River there used to be a beach there. Now
 11 it's rocks. Nothing but rocks there because the
 12 stuff comes down. But when that river -- that
 13 little creek would come out there and the spring
 14 floods and it would clean that out and it was a nice
 15 beach there. We used to play down there. It was my
 16 playground. Now it's just a rock place.

17 Well, I'm voicing my own experiences and I hope
 18 that they understand it. And I hope they take it
 19 here and think about it instead of their wallet.
 20 And I think they'll all get along with the animals
 21 and us.

22

23 EMILY PLATT

24 I'm the director of the Gifford Pinchot
 25 Task Force. Our group represents over 3,500

PM10-1
 Continued

PM11-1

PM11-1
 Comment acknowledged.

Page 9

1 members. And we work to protect and restore the
 2 ecosystems in communities of Southwest Washington.
 3 On behalf of the task force and our members, I'm
 4 here to testify in support of removing Condit Dam.
 5 and while the Supplemental Environmental Impact
 6 Statement notes the dam removal will have short
 7 term impacts, we believe the long term benefits will
 8 far outweigh the costs. Restoration of 33 miles of
 9 Steelhead habitat and 14 miles of salmon habitat
 10 currently blocked by the dam. This is a significant
 11 and exciting opportunity for the region. We're very
 12 glad to see that the SEIS acknowledges benefits
 13 beyond additional habitat such as increased angling
 14 opportunities; additional refuge for migrating,
 15 threatened and endangered fish; additional stream
 16 habitat for resident fish; decreased water
 17 temperatures and increased recreation.

18 And we would like Ecology to consider the
 19 following one when drafting their final EIS. We'd
 20 like to more clearly expound on and support the fact
 21 that non-removal alternatives will have far greater
 22 impacts on the river than dam removal. We would
 23 like them to clarify the long and short term impacts
 24 on the chum salmon and any mitigation measure that
 25 can be taken due to the potential adverse impacts.

PM11-2

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. It is acknowledged that the ongoing impacts from the original construction of the Condit Dam could be greater than the impacts of removal of the dam.

PM11-3

Comment acknowledged. The FSEIS has been modified where modifications were appropriate.

PM11-1
Continued

PM11-2

PM11-3

1 We urge the state to prohibit supplemental hatchery
 2 actions intended to help salmon and Steelhead
 3 recover. We'd like to continue working with the
 4 Corps of Engineers and PacificCorp to lower the
 5 Bonneville pool during removal. We'd like the final
 6 EIS should include reference to the Northwest
 7 Planning Power Council's Big White Salmon Basin
 8 Plan.

PM11-4

PM11-5

PM11-6

9 But in summary, we want to urge the Department
 10 of Ecology to issue a clean water action exception
 11 to permit PacifiCorp and Pacific Dam removal of the
 12 project.

PM11-7

13
 14 JERRY HESS

15 I'm on the Board of Director's of the Gifford
 16 Pinchot Task Force and secretary. And my thinking
 17 is I live in White Salmon. I'm a fisherman. I love
 18 all kinds of fish. I'm absolutely for fish
 19 survival. And this is what I feel is going to
 20 happen with the removal of the dam. The White
 21 Salmon River is a wonderful river. It's a big,
 22 positive thing for the entire area. And the
 23 removal of the dam is only going to make things
 24 better. With the opportunity then of fishing
 25 besides the kayaking, the hunting, the boating and

PM12-1

PM11-4

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.

PM11-5

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.

PM11-6

Comment acknowledged. The FSEIS references the mentioned document and acknowledges the contribution the removal of Condit Dam would make toward addressing the limiting factors for the listed anadromous fish species in the river.

PM11-7

Comments acknowledged.

PM12-1

Comments acknowledged.

Page 11

1 things that go on there now. It's just going to
 2 make everything better. The main point here is that
 3 there's nothing unique about dam removal. It's been
 4 going on all over the United States.

5 I used to live in Minnesota and there was a
 6 huge dam there that was removed close to Duluth. It
 7 just provided all kinds of opportunities for
 8 recreation fishing and et cetera. So outside of
 9 reiterating what Emily already discussed, I'm
 10 definitely in favor. And I hope that things go on
 11 with eventual removal of the dam as soon as
 12 possible.

13

14 JONATHAN GRACA

15 I'm interested in supporting or I am supporting
 16 the removal of the dam for several reasons. First
 17 economically. I think it will be an advantageous
 18 for rafting companies to pull out the dams and
 19 bringing more recreation to the area. I think
 20 ecology it's obviously going to help animal
 21 restoration and turn a variety of fish to the stream
 22 itself. So for that reason I think the dam should
 23 be pulled out. And it seems like one way or the
 24 other the dam is going to have to be pulled out in
 25 the near future, the next 20 years. So if we don't

PM13-1
 Comments acknowledged.

PM13-2
 Comments acknowledged.

PM12-1
 Continued

PM13-1

PM13-2

Page 12

1 do it then or I think it makes sense to do it right
 2 now because it's going to have to happen. And the
 3 economists say that it would make sense now to pull
 4 it out. It seems it's like one of the main issues.

5 I was concerned with the sedimentation that if
 6 there's dangerous amounts in the pools. I think
 7 that would be a valid reason to proceed. But from
 8 what I'm hearing, there isn't as big of an issue
 9 which brings me to support this much stronger.

10

DAWN STOVER

12 I live on Snowdon Road in White Salmon. I'm a
 13 local of the area. And I am really excited about
 14 the prospect of having salmon back in the White
 15 Salmon River. So I'm definitely a supporter of the
 16 dam removal and I have been waiting a long time to
 17 see this happen.

18 I can remember coming to many, many meetings
 19 over the last decade. In fact, somewhere at home I
 20 have a t-shirt that says Condit Dam out in the year
 21 2000. That's what we were hoping years ago.

22 And so I guess I need to say something about
 23 the specific EIS. I haven't read through every word
 24 of it, but my general take is that there obviously
 25 is going to be some short term impacts and some of

PM13-2
 Continued

PM13-3

PM14-1

PM13-3
 Comments acknowledged.

PM14-1
 Comments acknowledged.

Page 13

1 them may be fairly pronounced. But I think we
 2 really need to look at the overall long term
 3 picture. And my take on what the impact is this is
 4 really going to be a benefit to our community in the
 5 long run. It's going to be great for getting salmon
 6 back in our river. So I'm very much in favor. And
 7 I think that the impacts to our community and to our
 8 view in the short term are going to be worth it.
 9 And that we really need to take the long view and
 10 I'm going to be submitting some written comments.

11

12 THOMAS O'KEEFE

13 We're one of the signatories to the settlement
 14 agreement. And I just had one question, actually,
 15 on access that I'd like a little bit more addressed
 16 in the EIS. It talks about public access at the
 17 Northwestern Lake Bridge and extending the road down
 18 to access the river there. But I had some questions
 19 from our constituents to see what's going to happen
 20 with the Power House. The EIS says that the Power
 21 House will remain in place, but it's sort of left
 22 unresolved. What's the access going to be there.
 23 And maybe that's not known, but if that could be
 24 addressed a little bit.

25 And also, is there -- has any consideration

PM15-1

Since there are residences adjacent to the power house and the road to them is public, that road will remain. Therefore, access to the river at the power house is potentially possible. That would depend on the ultimate ownership of the land containing the power house.

PM15-2

PacifiCorp is willing to consider what can be done on lands they control, but has no control over most lands near the mouth of the river.

PM14-1
Continued

PM15-1

PM15-2

1 been given to public access around Highway 14 down
2 near the river mouth. So those are my questions.
3 And as I said, our organization is -- well, we're
4 signatories to the settlement agreement. We are
5 strongly in support of the dam removal moving
6 forward.

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

PM15-2
Continued

PM15-3

PM15-3
Comment acknowledged.

**Condit Dam Removal
Draft SEPA SEIS
Comment Summary**

A public Open House meeting regarding the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) addressing the proposal by PacifiCorp to remove the Condit Hydroelectric Project on the White Salmon River was held on October 25, 2005 in White Salmon, Washington. Sixty people attended the open house and seven left written comments. A number of people also left verbal comments with the Court Reporters.

Of the seven comments, four expressed direct support of the project, but (1) one insisted that removal costs not be capped. The remainder of the comments expressed concerns over the dam removal. (2) One concern was the short and long term impact to the supply and quality of drinking water both in private wells and in the White Salmon municipal supply.

(3) Other concerns were regarding adverse impacts on endangered species in the Columbia as well as (4) to the wildlife that may die or be displaced when the lake is no longer there. (5) Another comment was that the short and long term impacts, both to lost values and direct financial impacts to neighboring landowners should be evaluated and landowners compensated for their losses. (6) A concern was also expressed regarding the potential loss of leisure activities associated with Northwestern Lake, such as canoeing, swimming, and lake-based recreation. (7) One commenter wanted to make sure that all dangerous non-natural materials, such as rebar, be removed from the river.

Other comments expressed at the meeting included:

(8) Concern about the trophy resident rainbow trout fishery in Northwestern Lake that would be lost. A "Larson Bowdan Report" by the USFS dated September 1, 1995 was cited as having addressed the trophy fishery.

PM16-1

(9) A concern that the White Salmon River may not produce many salmon was expressed. Undocumented reports from kayakers indicate that the temperature is 38 degrees F., supported by other indications of a large aquifer above RM 16 that provides about half the downstream flow at about that temperature. Is this too cold for optimum salmon production? Also mentioned was an anecdotal account of the original dam proponent preferring a location on the Klickitat River, but choosing the White Salmon location because it would affect few fish by comparison.

PM16-2

(10) One commenter asked if the river might be closed to kayaking to protect spawning salmon at certain times of year.

PM16-3

(11) One comment requested that statistically valid fish and aquatic resource surveys be done prior to dam removal so that a valid comparison of conditions and populations before and after could be made. It is important to document the benefits and the losses to provide better information for future dam-removal proposals.

PM16-4

PM16-1

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.

PM16-2

The DSEIS made no prediction as to the number of salmon the river can potentially produce after removal of the dam. Various documents produced by regulatory agencies have made productivity estimates that were based on planting hatchery smolts, and these estimates are not relevant to natural smolt production numbers, which would be lower than artificially maintained salmon runs. The thermal regime of the White Salmon River and its tributaries with the range of anadromy available after dam removal is well within the preferred thermal range of the native salmonid species. Extreme cold temperatures that would restrict production of salmon and steelhead smolts are limited to the watershed above the potential range of anadromy. Dam removal would increase the available spawning and rearing habitat in the watershed and increase the population size and distribution of all anadromous salmonids within the system.

PM16-3

Comment acknowledged. A temporary closure of the north fork of the Nooksack River in Washington State to protect spawning concentrations of Chinook salmon under exceptional low flow conditions occurred in August of 2003. These closures are rare and are not likely to occur at flow conditions preferred by kayakers and river rafters. In addition, the confined nature of the White Salmon River in a narrow bedrock channel makes it somewhat unlikely that the situation in the north fork of the

Nooksack River will be duplicated. The north fork of the Nooksack has reaches where a combination of a wide floodplain and more sediment recruitment than the river can transport has caused the river channel to become wide and shallow. A USFWS (2000) biological assessment concluded that recreational boating activity between August 15 and October 21 had the potential to adversely affect spawning bull trout in the river below RM 6.5 (if bull trout spawners were present). It also concluded that it was unlikely that recreational boating had any potential to disturb bull trout spawners above RM 6.5. It is impossible to rule out the possibility of closures to protect spawning salmonids, but this is not within the scope of the SEIS.

PM16-4

The Settlement Agreement did not provide for such studies, and no regulations demand them. While such study results would undoubtedly be useful, there is no mechanism to require that they be done.