



To: editpage@seattlepi.com

Feb. 5, 2007

Your Jan. 30 editorial supporting the Salmon Planning Act misses the mark.

If this bill honestly sought to study salmon recovery, it also would look at harvest, habitat and hatcheries. But it only seeks to study dam removal. This is completely disingenuous since this bill was written by American Rivers, whose platform is removing dams.

However, removing the lower Snake River dams already has been studied exhaustively – and has been rejected.

In 2002, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released an Environmental Impact Statement that evaluated dam breaching and alternatives to helping juvenile salmon. The Corps' EIS conclusions called for helping fish *around* the dams, not dam removal. These efforts are paying off. Downstream fish survival through the Snake and Columbia rivers is as high as it was in the 1960s, before the construction of the Snake River dams.

Also, while we're trying to meet the need for more green power, removing clean, renewable hydropower makes no sense whatsoever. Dams "back up" wind power when there's no wind, and reduce the need for fossil fuel-fired generation.

This bill isn't necessary. The studies have been done and we know the answers – dam removal interests simply don't like them.

Terry Flores
Northwest RiverPartners