Andrus Conference Transcript – 2019

John Freemuth: Okay. We had a lot of last-minute registrations, so we had to add chairs over here. But if you see an empty chair at a table, join that table, please. You're more than welcome, if you have a friend or a colleague, to sit with them if you enrolled here at the last minute.

John Freemuth: My name is John Freemuth, I'm the Cecil Andrus professor of environment and public lands here at Boise State University. And on behalf of the University, the Andrus Center, the School of Public Service, we'd like to thank you all for coming today. It's going to be a very interesting day. The goal of an Andrus conference, as it's always been, back in the day when we started them, is to get people in the room and see if their conversations, both up here and in the halls and in private can perhaps move the ball a little bit on these related issues of energy and salmon. We know, maybe, that perhaps a policy window may be opening with changes in certain things regarding energy, regarding BPA, regarding the state of the salmon, all of those things. We don't know if it will lead to anything, but that is our hope. That has always been our hope here.

John Freemuth: In your program, if you are not as familiar, and maybe some younger folks in the room are not, who Cecil Andrus was, and I would say is, when we get things together like this, there's a description of his background on this particular issue, how he worked closely with the northwest governors from both parties to support and defend the power system and seek bipartisan solution for salmon restoration. That's part of his legacy, and I think he'd be smiling down on us, or is, to see you're in the room trying to deal with this.

John Freemuth: He once said "It is at White Bird Hill that I get steamed up over my greatest frustration in politics. The Salmon River gets its name from the hundreds of thousands of fish that one spawned in its pools, eddies, and side streams. Meriweather Lewis was fed one of them by friendly native Americans after staggering over the Continental Divide at Lemhi Pass into the valley of the upper Salmon. In the mid 1950s about 400,000 returned up the Snake River System each year, most heading for unspoiled tributaries as the Salmon Clearwater and Imnaha Rivers. I would picnic with my young family," and one member of that young family is now the president of the Andrus Center, Tracy Andrus, who's with us today here in front. "On the Clearwater and wade into the river with hopes of hooking a Chinook salmon or steelhead in the northwest fighting, famously tasty, [inaudible 00:03:21] of seagoing trout. No more. The fish are disappearing for the river systems."

John Freemuth: So our goal, as always, is, can we move the ball on this? The Andrus Center is not here to solve the problem. We cannot solve the problem, but you can. And our hope is, in those conversations, both here in public and in private, that something might happen to move that ball. I'd also like to thank the people who got you here, who have spent a lot of time on this issue. Pat Ford, Rocky Barker, Tom Stewart, Andy Brunell, Jenna Wetlock, Tracy Andrus, Rick Johnson. They knew who to contact to get the right people in the room, and without their insights, none of us would be here. So thanks to all you guys.

John Freemuth: Thanks too to Katie, to Katie Rob, who is now actually the executive director of the Andrus Center. I'm just the Andrus professor. She does the real work. And as she reminded us as we did all this, how is that sponsorship coming? And we did pretty well. And in your program is a list of all the folks who helped sponsor this, and I'd like to thank them for stepping up and helping make this happen. So thank you to all the sponsors.

John Freemuth: We will produce both transcripts of this and a white paper that will be a readable white paper. I'll be writing it with a lot of help, and I'm tasked, and I will have that out as quickly as possible, in less than 90 days. It's time to keep a focus on this issue.

John Freemuth: So to kick off the conference today, we are more than pleased to have someone who has been a panelist and a speaker at past Andrus conferences, though every time he's come he seems to have been promoted or gotten himself promoted. Now he's our governor, and we can't think of anybody more appropriate to kick off the day and inspire us and challenge us. And it's also appropriate that today he is doing his first capital for today, and what better place to do it than his hometown of Emmett, Idaho? So it is my pleasure to introduce to you the governor of the great state of Idaho, Brad Little.

OPENING REMARKS

Governor Little: Thank you, John. Yeah, that's true. And you've had the same job all the time.

John Freemuth: I have tenure.

Governor Little: Oh, oh yeah. You do have tenure. I don't have tenure yet, so ... Well, good morning. It's great to be here. I've been to quite a few of these, everything from the floor of the Century Link Arena to many times in here, to various places. But thoughtful discussion is always the right thing to do, particularly on some of these issues that can often be contentious. I see some of the same players and I see some new players, so welcome. Just briefly, most of you know kind of what my policy is, that my one overarching goal that I talk to directors, staff, appointees, is that above all else, my overarching goal is, how do we create the

best possible environment for us to thrive, for our kids and grandkids to want to stay here?

Governor Little: That means meaningful careers and increased incomes. That means a great quality of life with diverse landscapes and water bodies that provide habitat, fish habitat and wildlife. And it provides recreational, tribal ceremonial opportunities. Those are the bait to make sure that our kids want to stay here in Idaho. When it comes to salmon and steelhead, I want to state publicly right here this morning, get your pen out, Rocky, that I am in favor of breaching the status quo.

Governor Little: You know, I think everyone agrees that the current efforts are not enough to produce the results that we need to have those populations continue to go forward. We need several things. We need predictable salmon and steelhead runs, we need predictable power supply and costs, and we need a predictable regulatory environment. Predictable means that investments in our salmon and steelhead is an investment in Idaho's economy, especially our rural communities. Recreational fishing is an important component of state and local economies, providing thousands of jobs and contributing hundreds of millions to retail sales, wages, and salaries. Towns like Riggins, Kamiah, Salmon are in part dependent upon predictable fishing opportunities.

Governor Little: I also want to dismiss ... do not want to dismiss the great progress that we've made to date. Idahoans have made many sacrifices to strike a balance between species recovery and a vibrant economy. Shining example is that map that shows the increasing habitat that we've got, particularly over in the Lemhi area, in those sub-basins and basins over there. That's an impressive piece of geography that now creates, as Pat Ford would say, four-star hotels for a limited population of occupants. But now it's time to double down on our efforts and maximize the benefit that hard-earned water by improving the habitat and maximizing juvenile salmon survival. This will in turn increase the numbers of healthy smolts headed to the ocean.

Governor Little: Last week I signed, and yesterday both Idaho and Oregon announced, a significant advancement in the uncertainty of river guidance with our Hell's Canyon settlement. This agreement will improve water quality, both cleaner and colder. It'll increase habitat and fish production, over 800,000 additional Chinook smolts. It will also assure affordable and reliable non-carbon power. These are the things that we've done in the past, but that we need to accelerate going forward in the future. We need predictable energy costs, affordable energy generation with minimal environmental impact from varied sources, including hydro-power, which provides a renewal, reliable carbon source, and it's an integral source to move towards a more low-carbon power portfolio.

Governor Little: In Idaho, we enjoy some of the lowest utility costs in the nation. However, operational and mitigation costs have increased while the energy market becomes more and more competitive. I am eager to work with Administrator Manzur and others to discuss how we can keep our energy costs affordable in this changing market.

Governor Little: We also need a predictable regulatory environment. We grow and produce and transport millions of tons of food and commodities to feed not just the citizens of our state, but the nation and the world. Our agriculture community must navigate a complex web of regulations. We've talked about them at these conferences many times, the Endangered Species Act, NEPA, Clean Water, FLPMA, the National Forest Management Act. All impose higher costs on businesses and inhibit job growth and impede investment. Time and time again, issues have come up and people have rolled up their sleeves, got to the table, and said "Well, if we'll just do this one thing, then you're going to have predictability going forward." And then the next thing comes up. I understand these are necessary to a degree to safeguard our environment, which I am all for, but I think we need more agreement, and there's room for more improvement in protecting our resources while having a predictable regulatory environment.

Governor Little: I don't have all the solutions, but I look around this room and I see a lot of brain power, a lot of passion, and a lot of motivation. That's why I'm tasking my office of species conservation to establish an Idaho State working group to find consensus in developed Idaho-based innovational approaches to these many problems. Things change. Idaho must adapt to the change. There's changes in the climate, there's changes in ocean conditions, there's advances in science and technology. What stays the same is our cumulative desire to maintain our incredible quality of life in this beautiful state. Thank you very much.

John Freemuth: The governor has time to take some questions from you, he's actually giving me the mic. Raise your hand, I'll come to you, and please ask a question. Don't give the governor a speech, okay? That way I can get to as many as you as he's have time, and you just cut us off when you've got to go. Okay? So who's got a question for the governor? Right here.

Governor Little: That's not fair. You've worked me over all day yesterday.

John Freemuth: Yes, I know he did.

Governor Little: This is not fair.

John Freemuth: And for others, just, Justin, identify yourself.

Justin Hayes: Hi, Justin Hayes with the Idaho Conservation League. Governor Little, thank you very much for your comments this morning. I'm wondering if you can give us a little more information about how we can be involved in working with the office of species conservation and others to bring people together to find solutions through the work group that you're talking about.

Governor Little: Well this room's a good place to start. You know, and that's one of the things I've learned at this conference year in and year out, is you start with having the right people in the room. You know, there's always going to be a certain group of people that want the whole enchilada and aren't willing to compromise. And sometimes it takes a while to get to that point. But you know, the players are abundantly clear that have to be involved. And the issues change, change every time there's a change in administration at the federal level, what we have to do there.

Governor Little: But in Idaho over the years, my experience has been, regardless of the changes in administration, there's a general consensus about what we need to do. As I alluded to at the end of my talk, what we need to do is say, what's changed? What new technology's there, what old technology do we need to implement? And are we doing it right? What are we doing right and what are we doing wrong to move the ball on increasing recovery and the returns of the salmon back to Idaho? So most people that need to be there are in this room.

John Freemuth: Governor. Another question? Right here. I can get to you.

Bill Siffert: My name's Bill Siffert, and I just happened to run against Steve Thayn last legislative session, in 2018.

Governor Little: You would have been my senator if you'd won.

Bill Siffert: Yeah. Yeah, I know, I was trying. I was trying. But I'd like to know, there's a lot of concern in Valley County about the Stibnite mine, and also in Boise County about the molybdenum mine that they're proposing. I'd like to know where you stand on those two mines, since one of them is right at the head of the east fork, the south fork of the Salmon.

Governor Little: Well, you know, mining is always at the point of the spear on a lot of these issues. But the technology we have today to do those mines, I don't know ... I know that they're down the road a long ways on Midas's project at Stibnite, if they can get in there now, given what happened to the road two weeks ago. But all that litany of alphabet soup that you have to comply with is going to be the big issue. Both of them have a forest service component, and the hurdle in my mind, my experience has been, the hurdle at forest service on a forest service project's always a lot higher than it is on the old interior grounds. And particularly given the location, any time you get to an [inaudible 00:17:22] fish,

you bring into play a lot of issues that don't exist anywhere else. 'Cause you've got the Department of Commerce, you've got the Forest Service, you've got the EPA, you've got the Army Corps, all of those get there. So you have to to get through that entire litany.

Governor Little: And I know that the permitting process, I believe it's further along on Midas than it is on the molybdenum mine that's between Garden Valley and Grimes Creek. But I think that's going to be a heavier lift, just by proximity to where it is. But the footprint of the Stibnite mine is a legacy mine, that then the net impact of it could be more positive. At the end of the day there's going to be more salmon habitat if that project's done right than less. And we'll just have to see the process go through. But I think the antimony part of it, you know, we have to look holistically at strategic minerals in this country. Cobalt, antimony, I don't have anything against gold and silver, but it is a high priority for this country to be competitive, and unfortunately a lot of those minerals are in pretty precious areas to Idaho, and that needs to be done right, but it also needs to be made available if this country is going to be self sufficient.

John Freemuth: Way in the back. You come this way. It'll take me forever to get there otherwise. Introduce yourself, too.

Xavier Ward: Hi, Xavier Ward, Idaho Press. I'd just like to know, or could you expand a little on how you'd like to create a more predictive regulatory environment while maintaining protection?

John Freemuth: Well, as I alluded to, because of, these issues are so complicated because of that litany of the issues we went through. National Marine Fisheries and Department of Commerce, Army Corps, EPA, Fish and Wildlife Service. One of the things the state can do in our office to species conservation, that's why they're tasked with that, is to bring all those groups together collectively to say "What do we want to do?" Actually, there's a CEQ rule that exists that actually Mark Johnson edited for me in a trip that Governor Anderson and I made going to Toronto one time. And Idaho can help implement that, and the big issue there is, how do you align all those things to where, oh, you made this timeline but you didn't make this one. That CEQ rule that I believe myself, as one of 50 governors, and our office of species conservation, we can say, let's align these things up so that the permitting process, whether it's for a salmon recovery project or whether it's for any other project, that they're done more efficiently.

John Freemuth: Time and time again at these Andrus conferences we've talked about basically the fog of regulation and not getting things done. My commodity friends are not in a lot different arena than my conservation friends, because they just say "Well, we can't do that because we didn't get that permit done." I believe that the state's acting as kind of a traffic cop for those regulatory hurdles, can cut

through that morass better than anybody else. And this administration as well is interested in what we do there. But that's why this group that I talked about under the office of species conservation can make those recommendations.

John Freemuth: Gary, do you have a question?

Gary Richardson: Gary Richardson, citizen. You had us breathless there when you said breach the status quo.

Governor Little: That was Sam's idea. That wasn't my idea.

Gary Richardson: Well, let's get to the point. What about those damn dams?

Governor Little: Well, I've already been on record as saying, look, that's a hurdle for me. That's a pretty high hurdle for me. Timing, flows, flow augmentation, the most recent agreement that BPA is doing about the timing of the flows, better survivability. Those are all things that we need to look at. You know, but I just, because of the progress we've made, and of course part of it's because of the recent basically collapse of ocean conditions and recovery, we need to look at all those other options. But that is a very, very, very high hurdle for me to get over. So ... Yeah, it's a high hurdle for the fish also. I don't disagree with that.

John Freemuth: Just so y'all know, this is not a "breaching the dams" conference per se. It will come up. It just did.

Governor Little: I knew better, though.

John Freemuth: it's open.

Governor Little: Yeah.

Amy C.: Amy Christianson, Sun Valley Institute and the Andrus Center board. On behalf of my mom, who's been collecting signatures for these salmon for 40 years to breach the dams, but as a political strategist I understand you're in a difficult position here. What I wanted to ask you, is the working group that you're setting up, which I think is great, to get the right people around the table, to get a clear plan in place, and let's make sure that folks are taken care of, but the salmon can't wait. So I'm wondering if you have a set timeline for that working group process and where you see that outcome leading, to potentially do it in time, because they're just not coming back and we don't have much time. Thank you.

Governor Little: Well, Amy, obviously I'll look for their recommendations, but I'm not one to wait around a lot and study something to death. A lot of the science, a lot of the different options are already declared, but the first thing to do is to bang out the

low-hanging fruit. What impediments do we have? What things should we be doing that'll increase the returns and what things are we doing, what things are we doing we need to do better? That would be my expectation. Some things we can implement right away. A lot of them collectively we, the Pacific northwest states, need to get together collectively with our federal partners and try and make progress in that point.

John Freemuth: See a hand back there, I can get there, hopefully. Sorry. Here I come. There you go.

Arnold Tongs: Mr. Governor, I'd like to say good morning to you. Arnold Tongs, Shoshone Paiute tribe, Duck Valley. On the behalf of my forefathers, grandfathers who lived right in this basin here, like to welcome all you kind relatives that come from across the ocean, from wherever your ancestors travel from, and welcome you to our lands here, original people of this land. And through that welcome, my hope, Governor, is regarding the committee, that our tribes will be involved with your committee that you mentioned. Because we have knowledge about the streams, the rivers, the lakes, and the oceans that are not written in current day texts, books that are taught in colleges. So that's the first statement I would like to make, and hopefully we could be involved as Shoshone Paiute, Shoshone Bannock tribes of southern Idaho, who fish the Snake and the Owyhee, now all the way down into Columbia, into the ocean.

Arnold Tongs: And you got me excited regarding the breach of dams. And although we know that there is no official ladders for our fish to get up over some of those dams, up into the Owyhee, up into the drawbridge, we'd love to continue to collaborate and discuss that issue of, those are not enough fish up over those dams. Because our stories go back thousands of years regarding the king salmon, and the stories regarding their legacy here within Idaho. We're told throughout the world that no matter how much economy and funds we produce off the economy, water is life. Water quality is a must. If we can't guarantee clean water for our children, we're lying to them. Shoshone Paiutes always have had that stance with governance within the region, and we'd really encourage the governor to maintain the quality of water standard for Idaho, for our children, for many, many generations to come. Thank you.

Governor Little: Thank you.

John Freemuth: I think ... How much time do you got, Governor?

Governor Little: I have-

John Freemuth: -does the governor have? Time for more questions? Staff?

Governor Little: I'll do one more.

John Freemuth: One more. I see a hand over there, let me get to that.

Kris Grimshaw: Governor, thank you for your kind words. My name's Kris Grimshaw. You alluded to energy in your opening remarks, and I am asking you to elaborate on what you believe the energy mix in Idaho might be in 10 years, 20 years, and so forth.

Governor Little: Well Kris, I'm probably not a very good predictor of that. When I first started my legislative career, the legislature wrote an energy plan and said they're going to have 20% renewable, and that was not counting, exclusive of hydropower. I thought "Man, that was what we call at the ranch a BHAG, a big hairy audacious goal." And lo and behold, we got there. And you know, what I see is, some of it's, a lot of it's consumer-driven. You know, society's recognition of, that non-carbon power is something they want, and there's all the other benefits of cleaner air, you know, fill in the blank. What I do know is that mandating something sometimes has a deleterious effect to the market coming out and doing the right thing. And the curve in Idaho from, and particular if you're gonna go to 2025, 2035, 2037, the curve to almost all non-carbon is unbelievable.

Governor Little: And so allowing that to work as fast as possible and not getting in the way of it, I think probably one of the next issues from a power standpoint is a grid that's more defensible. I've spent enough time in the cyber area that it makes me very, very nervous. And whatever we do, we need to make sure that that predictability of a source of power is very protected. And I believe it'll be great for Idaho and for the Pacific northwest that we have that mix of non-carbon energy production that fits together well, so that families, businesses can count on a very robust, predictable, and safe power supply. You know, I don't know what's going to happen in the nuclear energy field with the small modular reactors and the other new safe nuclear, and that could be part of it, but those are all market decisions.

Governor Little: What are we gonna do about the storage and the disposal of those products? Every advancement we make there changes the game. I love the trajectory where we're going in the state of Idaho, to a much lower carbon and a much cleaner air atmosphere. And I'm reluctant to jump out in front of it and say "We gotta go this way," because it's pretty hard to argue with the success we've had in the last 10 or 15 years. So kind of a, let the market work. All right, well, thank you very much.

John Freemuth: Okay, as the Governor leaves, if we have empty chairs, you guys on the wall want to come up, sit at a chair, please feel like you can. If you're a speaker, whether it's the next panel or throughout the day, we have three tables up here for our speakers. Let's take a minute to get the first panel up here, and the moderator and we'll get it going here in a second. Thank you. [inaudible

00:08:32] We want to get started again ... All right, so it's my pleasure, at this point, to introduce the fellow who will be the moderator for our two morning panels, that's Mr. Marc Johnson. Marc, among other things that he's done, was the Chief of Staff for Governor Andrus in the last term of office, and did other things before entering press secretary for Governor Andrus.

John Freemuth: I'd also like to draw to your attention that Marc has a new book out. Political Hell-Raiser, this is not the book, it'd be a thin book if it was. The Life of Burton Wheeler From Montana. Marc's actually doing a book tour now, there's been a lot of good buzz about the book. I don't know if they're around, I'm sure I'm going to volunteer him to sign them if you happen to have one during the day. It's my pleasure now, to turn this panel over to Marc Johnson. Marc.

SALMON AND ENERGY PANEL ONE

Marc Johnson: John. Thank you. Good morning everyone. It's a great pleasure to be back in Boise and to be back at an Andrus conference. My personal thanks to Tracy and John for extending the invitation to participate this morning. Tracy, the Governor would be proud of you, convening such a tremendous conference and such a great cross section of Idahoans and Northwesterners here this morning, so congratulations for that. There are some seats up front here, if you're still looking for a good vantage point to lob things at the panelists, please come on up to the front.

Marc Johnson: Since John mention my book, I have to tell a quick story related to the Pacific Northwest dams that comes right out of my book, a biography of Montana senator Burton K. Wheeler, who was a big deal in the Senate from the 1920s to the 1940s. In 1934, Wheeler went to the White House one afternoon, to talk to President Roosevelt about the construction of Fort Peck Dam on the upper reaches of the Missouri River, in extreme Eastern Montana. Fort Peck had been talked about for years and years, as a flood-control project, as a navigation project on the Missouri.

Marc Johnson: With Congress having appropriated seven billion dollars for the construction of various public works projects in the country and given sole discretion to the President of the United States about how that money was meant to be spent. So, Wheeler goes down to the White House, has a 15-minute meeting with Franklin Roosevelt, who literally, with the stroke of a pen, authorizes the construction of Fort Peck Dam. No Environmental Impact Statement, nothing related to any kind of review, not even congressional authorization of Fort Peck.

Marc Johnson: Wheeler benefited greatly, politically, from construction of the dam, but he was also kind of cynical about the political process. He said, and I think I can almost quote him, he said, "When Roosevelt wants to curry favor with a senator, he

builds him a dam. He did it for McNary in Oregon, that would be Bonneville. He did it for Dill in Eastern Washington, that would be Grand Coulee and he did it for me in Montana, that would be Fort Peck." So, that little story illustrates, sometimes, the capricious nature of public policy decisions and how decisions that were made decades and decades ago continue to ripple through our economy with all the benefits of the hydropower system but with all the challenges as it relates to salmon. That's what we're going to focus on for the next few minutes here this morning.

Marc Johnson: Distinguished panel here. At the far end, a late breaking development is a replacement for the person who's mentioned in your program, Michael Garrity is the Columbia River water policy manager for the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. We're delighted to have him this morning here. Next to Michael is Darrel Anderson, chairman and CEO of Idacorp. More complete bios are in the program. Next to Darrel is Nancy Hirsh, represents consumers and utilities interested in energy efficiency, renewable energy and other tools to provide affordable power, and recover salmon in the Northwest.

Marc Johnson: Next to Nancy is an old friend of the Andrus Center, an old friend of the Governor's, Jaime Pinkham. Jaime is a member of the Nez Perce Tribe, but he's here today wearing his hat as a representative of the Columbia River Tribes and his work related to representing the Tribal interest on the Columbia. Last but not least, certainly not least, the administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, Elliot Mainzer. Please welcome the panel. By the way, we'll go for about 45 minutes, with conversation among the panelists and then, it'll be your opportunity to ask questions. There are cards at all of the tables, so please form a short question. No essay questions, just short questions and we'll circulate around and try to ask as many of those questions as possible.

Marc Johnson: I want to start with Elliot Mainzer, administrator of the BPA. Mr. Administrator, welcome to Boise. First off, how would you have us frame this conversation today, between the demands that you confront on a daily or hourly or minute-by-minute basis, to provide energy to the Pacific Northwest, and the reoccurring discussion, the continuing discussion about the future of the [inaudible 00:21:08] fish? How would you frame that discussion for us today?

Speaker 2: ... There it goes. All right, is that working?

Elliot Mainzer: Well first, I want to say hello to everybody, it's a pleasure to be here. This is a really important topic, set of issues that I know are very dear to a lot of people's hearts. There's a lot of passion in this room, lot of intensity, it's a really important set of issues and so, actually, in answering your question, Marc, I actually think, to a certain degree, the initial set-up this morning was pretty

good. I mean, I think there's a lot of people in this room who recognize that that status quo is changing.

Elliot Mainzer: There's a lot happening, the energy markets are evolving, there's new technology. The demands on utility space, the demands on local communities, the agricultural sector. We're all feeling a lot of strain from a variety of different forces and so I think that, certainly, the world is moving, it's moving more quickly than it has in a long time. I think there's also that desire, you know, we talked about moving the ball forward. I think people kind of want to get out of the perennial churn of fighting and being in other sides of the courtroom and looking for a more constructive and collaborative way to work with each other.

Elliot Mainzer: I share that at BPA. Yesterday was actually, maybe ironic, but yesterday was my 17-years anniversary of working at Bonneville. I started there as a young guy, really interested and concerned about climate issues, very interested in renewable energy. Wanted to try to help get renewables to scale, get the wind on the grid and 15, 17 years later, it's amazing what the West has accomplished with a lot of leadership from a lot of folks to scale up our renewable fleet, to have lots of new options, new technology, et cetera.

Elliot Mainzer: I would say that now, moving much more actively into the issues of salmon, salmon restoration. These issues are even more important and more complex in a lot of ways. They require, as you can see, just look at this audience today. The number of different interests that are represented in this room, up and down the Columbia-Snake Basin is kind of astonishing. There's so many different perspectives and so, I think the art and the act that we have to try to do is to figure out how to bring folks together around a more constructive way to engage with each other and to listen a lot more carefully.

Elliot Mainzer: I know I have a little bit of a chance to talk a little bit more this afternoon about closing out. I'll talk a little bit more about the flexible spill agreement, but I will say that, for me, being able to sit down with folks that we've been on other sides of courtroom for many years, particularly our friends from the State of Idaho, the Nez Perce Tribe. Then complemented by strengthening relationships with Washington State and Idaho and Montana and to be able to put ourself in each others' perspectives, to sort of carry water for each other and think a little bit differently, it feels good.

Elliot Mainzer: It feels good to work collaboratively and to work constructively and to recognize that we do have some very, very significant differences, but we all share a common interest in, I think, a healthy Columbia Basin, vital economy and certainly, for me, a decarbonized power supply. Those are big objectives and I think we have an opportunity today, to hear from a lot of different perspectives

and see if we see some daylight, for some additional ways to move the ball forward.

Marc Johnson: I'll come back to that daylight in just a minute. Jaime, you know, it's been almost exactly 25 years since Judge Marsh issued his famous or infamous ruling, saying that the situation with salmon on the Columbia and Snake River system cried out for what the judge called a 'major overhaul', not incremental tweaking of the federal dams. Yet, there's really been no major overhaul and the salmon remain in great peril. I think you probably remember Cec Andrus saying, on more than one occasion, that he thought the federal strategy was just to stall, so that there wouldn't be any salmon to save, at some point in the future. So, give us a sense of where you think we are, with regard to the fish today.

Jaime Pinkham: Thanks Marc, and let me begin by saying that it's great to be back out West after spending eight years in the Midwest, and then to be back in this forum with the Andrus Center and the tremendous work that you do. My heart still feels that void, but I feel honored to have known him and to have sought his guidance over the years and the difference he made in my life.

Jaime Pinkham: That's not an easy question, Marc. In part, I think about how far we've come. I've moved home to work for the Tribe in the 1980s and I remember the debates we had back then. We couldn't get into a room like this and have this kind of a conversation back in the 1980s. I remember coming to one of the address forums and talking about how tough life is in Idaho if you're a salmon or if you're an Indian. I said, "Well then, look at me, a salmon-eating Indian Democrat in Idaho, it's an extremely tough life."

Marc Johnson: Talk about an endangered species.

Jaime Pinkham: You know, but, the thing is, if you look at, and let me use the Nez Perce Tribe as an example, I'm proud of the work we've done. We've done our part with salmon restoration. You see it in a habitat, you see it in our partnerships working with private industries, working on agreements. I mean, we've been some of the staunchest negotiators in this state on a variety of issues; Snake River Basin adjudication, working with Idaho Power, Avista Corporation, but still, the struggles are there.

Jaime Pinkham: We haven't reached a good point where we can get those salmon negotiated past those dams, but we haven't given up hope. I want you to hear this, I'm looking forward to Elliot telling the story about the flex spill. It's going to be tough political lift, to get to breaching the dams. I know we've had that conversation here, but I don't think we've had a deep enough conversation within the halls of Congress to see if they're prepared to make the political lift.

Jaime Pinkham: It's great to have a conversation here, but until we can get to the tipping point in Congress, I think we've got to continue to look at the alternatives, whether it's flex spill, looking at the huge predation issues that we're facing within the Columbia River system and the challenges it's facing on smolt survival. I mean, we're able to get a sea lion bill passed, that took us 15 years, to pass a sea lion bill, but it's passed and it's giving us more tools.

Jaime Pinkham: In the meantime, until we get the political strength to really talk about the long-term future of the dams, I think we've got to continue to do a full court press on the other issues around the hatcheries and the habitat, the ocean conditions and the harvest conditions in the international waters. I'm kind of dodging your question, but I think-

Marc Johnson: I noticed that, but I'll come back to you.

Jaime Pinkham: Okay.

Marc Johnson: Pass that microphone to Nancy and I'll ask her for her take on how we ought to be framing this conversation today, and welcome.

Nancy Hirsh: Well, thank you very much for the opportunity to be here, it's very exciting to see this room and the diversity of perspectives we have, both on this table and in the room. Marc, I appreciate the question. I frame our conversation as an opportunity, right? If I look back, 20 years ago, nobody said we could integrate renewable energy beyond hydropower. Wasn't going to happen, it was going to collapse the grid. No way, energy efficiency, customer-side, resources were going to actually meet energy needs.

Nancy Hirsh: Here we are, fast-forward, well, it's actually been a slow, slow progress, but here we are, 20 years later and in fact, we're integrating 1000 megawatts of wind and are coming up on, across the region, almost 500 megawatts of solar. Idaho Power's an example of integrating that solar into its system. Energy efficiency is the second-largest resource serving the region, after hydropower. That, to me, shows evolution, as Elliot mentioned and the Governor mentioned, technology's evolving. We don't know what the portfolio of resources will be over the next decade, but we know we can do it, because we've seen it.

Nancy Hirsh: We've seen the economic vitality in the region, we've seen the new jobs created in these new industries and new sectors. We've seen the environmental benefits that come from investing in new technologies. So, if the environmental challenges from a resource, whether it be a coal plant or a renewable energy project, are in front of us, we need to take action. My vision is to not let the risk of the margin stop us from taking action. That margin might be a little bit of uncertainty on science, on climate change, or coal, or meeting peak energy resources, our needs, 80 hours a year.

Nancy Hirsh: We can solve those problems, we can take action with new resources and put our ingenuity together. So, to me, that's the vision. Being in this room and having a conversation about what you need, as a constituency, is really important. We all need to hear from each other, because I think there are lots of options that can help us solve this problem.

Marc Johnson: Thank you. Darrel Anderson, Idaho Power obviously is in the middle of this change from embracing a new energy future of renewables. Your recent announcement about a carbon-free future for Idaho Power, I couldn't help but remember Cec Andrus' fight with the big company back in the 70s, over building a coal-fired power plant between here and Mountain Home, so give us your take on how we should frame this conversation, as we think about all these issues today.

Darrel Anderson: Thank you Marc.

Marc Johnson: Yeah, you need to just flip the switch there.

Darrel Anderson: ... There we go. Okay, Marc, thank you. First of all, it's great to be here and I shout out to Rocky Barker too, he's the one who kind of extended the invite to me. Rocky covered my first annual meeting when I was CEO at Idaho Power. He noted in that meeting that it was quite contentious and he, I think, sensed the tension in the room and all those sorts of things. Five years later, I'm in my fifth year, just finishing my fifth year as CEO at Idaho Power and we have, I think, for the most part, have worked with those constituents who, at that point in time, shareholders at that time, who had a message to send and they shared it with us and we worked with them. Collaborated with them as it relates to how we would incorporate clean energy into our future.

Darrel Anderson: Some of them are in the room today, I believe, but I think the thing, that I look at this, if this was an easy solution, we wouldn't all be here today. There are so many different constituents that this energy and fish and water affects. We can get emotional about it, which sometimes happens, but I think once, if we can get through that part of it and then just have the opportunity to sit across the table and have civil conversations, where, from time-to-time, we may agree to disagree, I think we have a much better opportunity to move the ball forward.

Darrel Anderson: Now, you mentioned our move, our recent announcement to clean energy, and we did. For those that haven't heard, we did announce that we are, by 2045, we strive to be 100% and from that perspective, the reason we did that, was because we were on that path. We have had a conscientious effort to move out of carbon already, we were in the process of getting out of our participation in coal-fire plants in Oregon and the coal-fire plants in Nevada. Our bigger lift is getting out of our coal-fire plants in Wyoming, but we are working with our

partners there to do that. But, as I was telling Nancy earlier, we rolled this out without all the Is dotted and the Ts crossed, because we have to look to the future for, is evolution and technology advances, because-

PART 1 OF 11 ENDS [00:35:04]

Darrel Anderson: ... Evolution and technology advances because technology today would not allow us to be 100% clean today. No matter what people will tell you, it can't be done if you're going to run a grid reliably and affordably.

Darrel Anderson: However, if we look to the future and we look for technology changes that we see on the horizon, then I think the goal is achievable. I look at this issue as we balance the interest of many folks similarly. But, we have to be able to have the conversations and everyone has to give something when it's all said and done.

Darrel Anderson: So, I look forward to this conversation. I believe that Idaho Power has been a good steward of the resources that we manage, and we will continue to be that good steward. But, we're also open to opportunities that ... as we look to the future, and I look forward to talking about some of the things we are already doing, in order to enhance some of the challenges that we see now. So, I'll stop there and hopefully we'll get a chance to talk about this later.

Marc Johnson: Thank you Darrel.

Marc Johnson: And again, Michael Garrity is here representing the state of Washington, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife, where he is the Columbia River water policy manager.

Marc Johnson: Welcome.

Michael Garrity: Thanks.

Marc Johnson: Give us your frame on the discussion today.

Michael Garrity: Yeah. Thanks for having me here today. It's great to see a lot of old colleagues and friends, including Justin Hayes, who kind od got me into all of this and at American Rivers in Washington D.C. in 2000.

Michael Garrity: For Washington, there's some new urgency around these issues due to the understanding of the connections between Columbia and Snake River salmon, and the health of southern resident orcas, which Stephanie Solie is going to talk about more on an afternoon panel. But, that I think has spurred a lot of conversation, is opening the door for some collaborations like we're talking about here, and some near-term actions that are meaningful as well that I think

have the opportunity to help address some of the energy side, as well as the fish side.

Michael Garrity: We've been focused, along with Bonneville in Oregon, and Nez Perce and others on negotiating and implementing the flexible spill agreement that took effect this spring and involved raising gas caps to 120% [inaudible 00:37:47] this year. Now, I've been working with the Department of Ecology to get to 125% for additional spill in 2020, and that has significant potential to improve small to adult returns for Snake River spring/summer Chinook, and other Chinook in the system. It also has the potential for ... Hmm. Okay.

Michael Garrity: Lot's of urgency to this conversation. It also has the potential to help Bonneville adjust to changing energy markets. The idea is that there'll be more spill during times of the day when energy demand is lower, and less spill during a period when Bonneville can better market at better rates ... energy from lower spill levels. That happens to be ... Raising gas caps in a flexible way like this, is an Oregon Task Force recommendation.

Michael Garrity: Also, an Oregon Task Force recommendation is to encourage maybe the kind of collaboration that could come out of maybe a conference like this. In the governor's budget and in the Oregon Task Force, there's a call for exploring the social and economic costs and benefits of reaching the lower Snake River dams.

Michael Garrity: As a whole, I think Washington is supportive of those kind of collaborations. We've shown success in places like the Yakima, where the Yakima Basin Integrated Plan brought together the Yakima nation, irrigators, county commissioners, conservation organizations, around a plan that involved really looking at how you fulfill principles, and putting away some long held positions in the process. You saw in that process irrigators supporting fish passage into places where Bureau of Reclamation dams that blocked salmon habitat for a century. And, you saw conservation organizations being open-minded to new water storage in a way that hadn't happened before. Some of that same kind of thinking is happening in western Washington in the Chehalis Basin right now and, I'm hopeful that the sort of spirit in this room will lead to more conversations on near-term and long-term actions.

Marc Johnson: Thank you, and thank you for being here.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Mainzer, I want to come to your point about maybe thinking that there are some avenues as daylight, as I think you put it in your remarks a moment ago. But, before we go there, I want to quote back to you something that you said I think almost exactly a year ago ... Well March of 2018, when you were talking about the challenges that the Bonneville system faces cost wise and salmon recovery, and the transition to bringing wind on to the grid in such a big way.

Marc Johnson: And you said, "I'm not in a panic mode, but I'm in a very, very, significant sense of urgency mode." You noted that there was ten years left on a lot of the power sales contracts in the region. And that, "The time for action, and I think real action, is now."

Marc Johnson: So follow up on that. That was a comment you made a year ago. I think I've quoted it correctly. What is the sense of that urgency from your point of view?

Elliot Mainzer: You have quoted me accurately, so thank you for that. And, quite frankly this theme of the changing energy markets, the impact on Bonneville, our competitiveness, and at the end of the day, the economic vitality of our customers has been sort of the abiding theme of my time of administrator.

Elliot Mainzer: I became an administrator back in 2013, 2014, and at the time, a series of forces had really conspired to put some serious economic pressure on Bonneville. We had had some significant new costs put into our cost structure, you know, fish records ... which again, were tremendous investments, but it's a billion dollars worth of investment residential exchange settlement. We had the great recession in 2009, which really hit the low side of the equation. Then we had natural gas fracking, which collapsed the price of natural gas. We had of course the big renewables boom, where you had a lot of new wind and solar projects built that were embedded in the retail rate base, but the surplus energy was being pumped into the wholesale markets, which were was depressing wholesale prices.

Elliot Mainzer: So, by the time I became administrator, we had had a series of pretty significant rate increases over the course of the last eight to ten years. Our customers, including our customers here in Idaho, who are really quite dependent upon us for the economic vitality of their communities were saying, "Hey guys. This is not a sustainable path forward for BPA. If that rate trajectory and effect trend continues, we're going to have some hard conversations in the middle of the next decade because our long-term contracts expire in 2028."

Elliot Mainzer: I took that to heart. I think the customers were right, and that was not a sustainable path. So, we've worked really hard with all of our partners. I include many of you here in this room. Our tribal partners, our federal partners, state folks, folks in the environmental community, the energy efficiency community, the technology community, the renewables community. We really put our heart and soul into kind of bending the cost curves for BPA, and we've been able to successfully get our pattern of rate increases and cost increases under control.

Elliot Mainzer: Now, there was a narrative that was developing, and I had some of our customers saying, "Hey, it's time to panic." My feeling was, panic's not particularly helpful. You're better off just sort of stepping back and saying, "Hey.

What do I really need to do to get this problem under control and work with the people?"

Elliot Mainzer: I think there's a lot we have at the end of the day, I think we feel we have a lot of folks who are supportive of us. There are many people that are depended upon the wide variety of services that Bonneville provides whether it's power, transmission, energy efficiency, fish and wildlife investments. I think we all have an invested interest in a healthy BPA. So, we've had a lot of people leaning in. And, we've also had to basically think about technology differently. A lot of times, "Well, Bonneville's threatened by wind and solar," and everything. Well there's some truth to that, but they pick up on some other things. We also have to look at these new technologies as an opportunity for us. We've been able to use demand respond and energy efficiency technology to alleviate the need for new transmissions lines and [inaudible 00:45:10] cases.

Elliot Mainzer: We're very interested in the energy imbalance market that's developing across the west. It's a very interesting new way for the utilities to work together and optimize the system. We're hoping later this year to make a decision to take a big step forward towards joining that market.

Elliot Mainzer: And, then of course, a role that we've played for years is as a big integrator. We've used the hydro system to get thousands of megawatts of wind energy onto this grid. That fast, flexible capacity of the hydro system has been invaluable to doing that. So, we are going to continue. Especially with the new state policies in Washington and Oregon moving towards cap-and-invest, and Idaho now stepping up big time in terms of their clean energy objectives. We're going to need to more renewables on the grid, and our hope is we'll be working to do that to complement the carbon-free capacity and flexibility of the system. So, it's ... You need to be careful not to get into a trap of seeing all of this as just a threat. You have to be able to also look at it as an opportunity, and I think you'll hear from ... We'll let some of our customers who are speaking later ... They can render the ultimate verdict of whether or not we're getting our costs under control and positioning Bonneville for more sustainability.

Elliot Mainzer: So we can approach the conversations with some new tools and some new perspectives and the capacity to evolve. But, it still requires, as you've heard, these very disparate perspectives on river operations and local economies to be able to come together, and that's hard work.

Marc Johnson: So, I want to foster a conversation among the five of you. So, don't hesitate if you have something you'd like to say. Please don't wait for me to prompt you, if you'd like to speak. It looks like Darrel may have something on his mind.

Darrel Anderson: There is actually. I just want to build on something of what Elliot said, and going back to our goal that we put out there a week or two ago. One of the things that's really important about that goal, is the only way we could do that, is the reliance on our hydro system. The hydro system today for us, provides about 50% of our current capacity on our system. To Elliot's point, for us to integrate that level of renewables that we have on our system today, which is about twelve hundred megawatts. When you talk about twelve hundred megawatts on a thirty four hundred megawatt peak to have a flexible system like our hydro system to allow us to accomplish that allows us to integrate those resources, which then allows us to make a goal of a clean goal ... 100% clean goal by 2045. Without our hydro system we would be very challenged to do that. We'd have to rely on some other resource, none of which, doesn't have an issue with it.

Marc Johnson: Nancy, please.

Nancy Hirsh: Can't help but respond. We value the hydro system, and it is a critical part of the region's power system, and it's not the only part. So, we have to look at it as one piece of the puzzle. One thing I would key off on what both Darrel and Elliot said, is that ... As we've talked about, the power system is changing. It used to be a one-way system, right? The power generated at the power plant. Sent via power lines to your house. End of story.

Nancy Hirsh: Now, it's a two way system. Now the customers are very involved in the energy system. They're generating at home, they're using their chips in water heaters, and thermostats that allow the utility and other market actors to manage loads and systems. So, that the role that the hydro power system plays in fast flex is becoming more diverse. It's changing. And, they're more resources that can play that role, and complement the hydro system, and support it, so that all the pressure is not only on the hydro system, but in fact it's spread out over customers and energy marketers, and in what customers want to have a role in helping shape the power system. So we have to view them as a part of this system, and that allows us to look carefully at all of our power supply options and think about how we can integrate customer side of the equation into meeting customers' needs.

Speaker 5: I just have to add to that real quickly too. I actually agree with Nancy on this one. And, because I think this, as we evolve going forward, the value of the grid, that big machine that keeps all of this stuff balanced, becomes increasingly important. Not only on the distribution side, but also on the transmission side because some of this energy isn't necessarily close to load. Some is, some isn't. If you're going to evolve, then the focus on transmission distribution also has to be there.

Marc Johnson: So, Jaime, let me ask you about how the fish fare in this ... Adding another layer of complexity to the management of the Northwest Energy System, by integrating these renewable resources into the system, and ... I'm speaking as a lamer here, but it seems to add another layer of complexity for the fish.

Jaime Pinkham: Well it certainly does present a hell of a challenge, and Elliot and I have had this conversation in the past. And, it's great that he and I can sit down over a cup of coffee and just talk through our philosophy'.

Jaime Pinkham: One of the things that occurs to me is the model for Bonneville. You know, it was low cost energy at cost, and the question is at cost to who? At cost to the fish or at the cost of selling power? The other one is, the question of how do we determine what is equitable treatment and the allocation of the resources that Bonneville finds itself in?

Jaime Pinkham: In a way, I feel blessed that we have Bonneville. When I compare us to ... Let's take the Missouri River system, where you don't have mitigation. You've got the 1934 Flood Act and the Pick-Sloan Program. They don't enjoy the kind of commitments we have here in Columbia River.

Jaime Pinkham: And certainly, our ability to meet the needs of the fish, is dependent on this creativity, the ability to compete in expanding markets ... As Nancy says, flowing both directions.

Jaime Pinkham: But, we shouldn't be putting that entire burden just on Bonneville. There's others that we've been working with to bring to the table, in addition to Bonneville, creativity. You see this in the Yakama Basin, where tribes are working with irrigators, working with Department of Agriculture. Nez Perce had been working in [inaudible 00:52:20] basin on ... working with in stream flows.

Jaime Pinkham: So, we're coming up with other creative ways because we can't just be dependent on one source of revenue to make this. Especially one that today is so volatile in what they're experiencing.

Jaime Pinkham: But, it always comes back to me as the intentions about at cost and equitable treatment. So, I struggle with how do we assure that with this business model of Bonneville that's evolving? I think the only way we can survive in this interim period, is to make sure other people are doing their part. We're looking the Columbia River Treaty. What can we do to assure we get good, cold water at the right time, the right quantity, to help with out- migrations?

Jaime Pinkham: So, there's these other processes that are in play in addition to what Bonneville's going through in the current market trend. So, it's unfair I think to look at one entity, and say, "What are you going to do about it?" without asking

all of ourselves, "What are we willing to lay on the table to get us through this challenging time?"

Marc Johnson: Michael?

Michael Garrity: Yeah. I appreciate Jamie's comments there. I think one question here is ... for the long term future, is if we're asking Bonneville to expose itself to more risk to adjust to future changes, what do other entities in the region and nationally do to maybe help mitigate for some of that risk?

Michael Garrity: Washington depends on ... I think a lot of other states and tribes depend on a solid fish and wildlife program from Bonneville. We've seen some risks to that funding in recent years, and we're hoping that innovative operations like FlexBuild, maybe provide some relief there. But, as things move forward, ensuring that you have good mitigation going on in the Columbia and the tributaries, which is really important, regardless of the needs on the main stem. How do we keep that intact in the future?

Marc Johnson: So, Elliot, it sounds like on the one hand, you're ... They're cutting you a little slack. On the other hand, they're saying, "Get on with the innervation."

Elliot Mainzer: Yeah. I think that's fair.

Elliot Mainzer: I also want to be clear, that for me, our strategic plan is focused on delivering on our public responsibilities to a commercially successful business. I think sometimes, folks think that Bonneville is, because we're ultimately rolled up into the Department of Energy, that we're sort of this big, appropriated agency. We're not. Every dollar that we invest in the region on your behalf, is collected through our customers, through our para transmission revenues.

Elliot Mainzer: So, we have to figure out how to navigate all this. At the same time, I think our fish and wildlife investments are really important. Any time I come out to Idaho, or I go up to Washington, or get out into the John Day, and I see the work that we're doing together ... A lot of it is with the state agencies, and particularly with the tribes. It's very meaningful and very important, and very impactful work. This region as a whole, still has a ton of work to do on habitat restoration. The climate issues are serious for the cold water refugia, the way upstream. Lot of trip [inaudible 00:55:56] we need to still take care of.

Elliot Mainzer: I have been very committed, even in an environment, of extreme cost sensitivity to sustaining our fish and wildlife investments. So I've said to folks, "Listen, we're going to have to make some trade offs if we're going to do a bunch more of spill and lean in, and test whether we can get those SARS numbers up. We're going to have to look for some other stuff that may not be quite as cost effective, or quite as helpful to the fish."

Elliot Mainzer: We've really appreciated the perspective of Oregon and the Nez, and others in the tribal community, [inaudible 00:56:32] very involved in flexible, Washington state very constructive, Idaho and Montana both supporting us to say, "Hey, how can you co-optimize for these variables?" And that's been very helpful.

Elliot Mainzer: And I think that's where the word creativity has come up a couple times. It's opening up new ways of thinking about things, which I think is really helpful. So, we own our responsibility to continue to innovate and evolve and adapt. Quite frankly, we've had to for years. The world continues to change a little faster right now I feel sometimes. But we want to do that. I think that my commitment, and again, maybe I'll talk a little bit about this afternoon. I'm in a, what I characterize as a deep due diligence, phase right now with the Columbia River System Operation Review.

Elliot Mainzer: When I come to Idaho, even an even like this today, it does afford me a tremendous opportunity to listen and hear the different perspective of folks, and see if there's some additional changes that we can make.

Elliot Mainzer: Will we get to everybody's perfect version of every solution? It's hard to say. But, I am optimistic that there is a spirit of creativity that started to creep into this conversation that I haven't seen before.

Marc Johnson: Marc?

Speaker 1: I'd just like to kind of build on a little bit of that too, from a creativity perspective. The governor mentioned in his opening comments that there's a reason agreement that we had with the state of Idaho and the state of Oregon on our water quality certification for our Hells' Cannon relicensing efforts.

Speaker 1: For those that aren't familiar, this is a ... The relicensing effort has been going on since 1995. Now we're sitting here in 2019, and still are probably a few years away from getting a license. So, we're into this about 25 years or so, and probably 300 million dollars. However, a big milestone we've reached just this week, whereas the governor reached agreement with Oregon and Idaho on the water quality. A couple things that came out of there is, they're going to reintroduce fish above Hell's Canyon and into Pine Creek in Oregon. Under the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife groups going to manage that effort.

Speaker 1: And I think that's a big step. Again, it's a pilot. We're going to see how that works out. We're going to manage it for about ten years to see what happens there. We think that's a positive direction.

Speaker 1: We've also reached agreement on water temperature below Hells Canyon, which we think is absolutely imperative for the continued survival and development for both spawning and reemergence. So, those are two things that

I think are really important. But, again, it's chipping away at those things to continue to work to enhance water quality, water temperatures we think are really important.

Speaker 1: So, I think it's a big agreement, and it's a heavy lift for both states. It took getting to both of the governors' office to get there, but we got there. And, that's another step forward for us as we continue to move forward on the relicensing process.

Marc Johnson: Nancy Hirsh.

Nancy Hirsh: From the advocacy perspective, we want a healthy Bonneville. We want affordable power for consumers. The cost structure for the power system is changing. The new resources we've been talking about are lower cost than a lot of the existing infrastructure. I think it's driving utilities to make bold decisions about their resources and looking to new, renewable resources, and customer side resources because they're lower cost.

Nancy Hirsh: So, we need to take advantage of that. Having a dialogue about how we integrate that and the path and the time that we need. But, we shouldn't wait for some magical, new resource to appear. We have these resources now. We can begin to make decisions that incorporate changes to the system because the resources we need to rely on are here, and they're viable, and they're affordable, and they provide reliability to the system. It requires creative thinking and perhaps changing the way we do things and operate our systems. But, it's something that I think will make Bonneville more competitive in the future.

Nancy Hirsh: That is something they're looking at with the new power contracts. How competitive are they? Well, embracing with their customers new resources will make them more competitive.

Marc Johnson: Michael. Nope? Okay.

Marc Johnson: Just a reminder for the audience, if you have questions, hold them up. We'll collect them, and we'll get to those questions quickly.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Administrator. John was admonishing us earlier, that this is not a discussion about breeching the lower Snake River dams, but ... That is kind of the concrete elephant in the room here. Just as a baseline for our understanding, how would removal of the lower Snake dams ... How would the Bonneville system look if that were to happen?

Elliot Mainzer: Well, I think there's probably entirely simplistic answers to that question, and then there's probably very complicated answers to that question, depending on how far you want to go into the details and the technical issues, et cetera.

Elliot Mainzer: I think for today ... Certainly those dams are a fairly integral part of the system in terms of providing flexibility and reserves and capacity. So, you would have a smaller system, and you would absent other changes. You would be looking at having to put flexibility and capacity and energy focus on other parts of the grid.

Elliot Mainzer: So, I mean I think certainly, there's just a basic physical change to the system that we would have to grapple with. I think one of the things that we're going to have to be doing here in the months ahead, and this is going to get a lot more intense later this year, as we start having the latest round of analyzes on this question coming out of the Columbia system Operations Review.

Elliot Mainzer: Recall, we are looking at this issue as part of that review process, as coming out of Judge Simon's court. That question was looked at in depth back in the early 2000s. Some things have changed in that interim period. We're updating the analysis, taking a lot of input from a lot of people across the basin. We will start coming out with a freshened look on both the operating consequences on the Bonneville system and the replacement issues. Evaluating all available information that's out there in the public domain on this conversation, and then of course having to understand the non-power elements, which, I think, we all know sometimes are deviously more complicated in some ways.

Elliot Mainzer: So, we have to look at all those different dimensions to try and understand ultimately, what's the best choice for the system and the affected users. We're on a schedule to come out with a draft of our environmental impact statement on this topic next February. So, I know that there will be a lot of interest in that.

Elliot Mainzer: Anybody want to embellish?

Marc Johnson: Yeah. Jaime.

Jaime Pinkham: I agree that we've got to make communities whole ... I saw Christian Mirror earlier, and her story about what the river system provides in terms of transportation and the benefits. I mean, it's a very compelling story. So, how do we make the rest of the communities whole?

Jaime Pinkham: And maybe I'm not the optimist that I should be. Actually, I was on tribal council and helped draft the resolution that made dam breeching the official position of the Nez Perce tribe.

Jaime Pinkham: I'm proud of that time, and I felt it was necessary when we did it. But, just let me use an example here. Nez Perce was also responsible for the reintroduction

of the Grey Wolf. And, I felt that that was a huge success story. But, look what happened. We just saw this litigation time and time again that prevented the delisting of the Grey Wolf.

Jaime Pinkham: So what happens? We get an appropriation's writer that goes with the old role, and wolves were legislated in the delisting.

Jaime Pinkham: And, that's what I meant about, do we have the political appetite in Congress for a big policy left like this? I worry, through this effort here, if it comes out and says, "Yes. The removal of the Snake River dams is the best way to restore these fish, it would not surprise me to see legislation introduced to either change the Endangered Species Act or do something as drastic like we did with wolves, when we legislated their recovery.

Jaime Pinkham: So, until we get this ... I think the deeper conversations amongst this region at the political level, I think there's still this risk that we'll have intervention from the outside who'll determine the fate of the dam. Not on the inside. And, that's my fear.

Marc Johnson: Let's go to some of the questions from the audience. See if I can sort through them in some kind of orderly fashion here.

Marc Johnson: A couple have to do with fishing impacts on salmon. One of the questions here is, what would be the effect of a five year moratorium on all salmon fishing on the Columbia River Basin? Would that be ... Well, Jaime, I won't elaborate on the question. That's the question. What would the effect be?

Jaime Pinkham: Anger. I'd ask myself, "What the hell am I doing in this room ina conversation?" What would the effect be ... a moratorium?

Jaime Pinkham: Honestly, we've been under this moratorium on [inaudible 01:07:19] for I don't know how many years. When you look at the historical records of the salmon that return. I appreciated how the governor acknowledged the tribal use, even down to [inaudible 01:07:33]. We're even worried that we won't even have a ceremonial harvest this year.

Jaime Pinkham: I don't think it's the harvest ... The moratorium on harvest does not address what I think the more significant issues are. How do we get more adults to return for harvest?

Jaime Pinkham: Since I've been back on the commission, just learning more about smoke survival. Just on predation issues, and I think what the governor's ... Or like a task force. That's one of the most immediate things that we can do to get more adults to return, is how do we take care of the predators in a lower river?

Jaime Pinkham: And the task forced recognize that we can do. It's going to take some policy changes too. So, even the court cases have said that you can't place that burden of harvest on the tribes, unless everything else has been exhausted. Before you can ... over right a treaty right, everybody else has had to have made equitable sacrifices. And, if they haven't seen that, you can't ask harvest to be stopped or curtailed until everybody else has done their part.

Marc Johnson: Yes, Michael. I've got a question for you, but go ahead.

Michael Garrity: I'd just add, our system hatcheries, and all that is set up that you're supposed to use harvest to catch hatchery fish and release ESA listed fish. That kind of plan in addition to being inequitable would take a reconfiguration of the whole management system.

Marc Johnson: There's a question here I'm searching for, for you.

Marc Johnson: Why have the state of Washington and Oregon lifted the ban on gill nets in the Columbia River below Bonneville?

Michael Garrity: Well, can you repeat that?

Marc Johnson: Why have the states of Washington and Oregon lifted the ban on gill nets in the Columbia river below Bonneville?

Michael Garrity: I might need to get back to the person who's answering that question if they can follow up with me individually. I'm not very involved in harvest regulations, but I would say that it's been a delicate negotiation between lower river-

PART 2 OF 11 ENDS [01:10:04]

Michael Garrity: In a delicate negotiation between lower river commercial fishing and sport fishing and that we don't see gill netting as currently implemented as a conservation issue as much as an allocation issue.

Marc Johnson: Darrell Anderson, a couple of questions for you. How does Idaho Power decrease the water temperature below hell's canyon? And as you move towards your 2045 goal, how much of your resource will depend on hydro?

Darrel Anderson: What we do is selectively, in the fall that we will do is draw down the reservoir system and ensure that the temperature is managed within the two degrees C that they're trying to manage, between 13 and 15 degrees C. So the plan would be if we run a consecutive number of years below a certain temperature or above a certain temperature, then we would have a significant draw down in the fall. We don't expect that to be very frequent, but it would be a significant measure that we would take to make sure that the water temperature is

appropriate for downstream activities. It's a new plan that we put out there that would be drastic, but we've communicated with all the various communities around the area and, but we also think it's something that's important to do for, to help survival of the fish as they move downstream. So we think it's an important component of the bigger plan. And then the second part is I think was around what are we doing on hydro as we go forward?

Marc Johnson: Yeah, right.

Darrel Anderson: As we look forward, we don't see any new hydro in the system. What we look to do is maintain what we have. Even though, even with relicensing we do lose some of the capacity as a result of re-licensing. But we continue to plan on what it is we have today without growing.

Marc Johnson: Elliot Mainzer, if BPA is relying on new innovation and technology to promote the 100% clean energy initiative, how will BPA reach this goal if the technology turns out to not be as substantial as you're predicting?

Elliot Mainzer: The thing to recall, first of all is the Columbia River power system is, I think, the single largest carbon free power system in the United States, if not North America. So we are blessed that amidst a lot of changing legislative frameworks and decarbonization objectives that we don't have to scramble to replace a bunch of carbon firing resources. And so in a sense, we're in a position to be able to help aid and abet and facilitate and support our partners in the utility and environmental committees to meet those goals. We did that early on, getting the first 5,000 megawatts of wind onto the grid from 2007 through 2013 and there's more common. And so certainly we will be watching technology and watching the curves and Darrel knows it better than anybody, they're out there buying from these resources.

Elliot Mainzer: They're getting the firsthand visibility and seeing costs and capabilities. And Nancy, of course watches this both at the bulk and retail side of the equation. And I think there's some reason for optimism that the technologies are going to continue to evolve. Risks will be in places where we've laid big bets. A couple of years ago I made a decision not to build a big transmission line through the I5 corridor of Washington state because the costs were escalating out of control and we said, "We got to find a different way to get this problem solved." Now there's going to be other places in the world where you're not going to have that much population growth and the issues will be different. I'm going to be the last person to tell you we've done building transmission. Okay?

Elliot Mainzer: But for that particular situation, we said, "Hey, we're going to have to rely on demand response and potentially some battery storage and some new tools to get that done." And we bought a piece of land at the bottom of that

transmission congestion. Said, "Hey. We don't know what we're going to put there yet, but someday we maybe need something." So if the technology doesn't show up, I'm going to have a big problem on my hands with the congested transmission corridor, but we're going to lean in, we're going to look at all elements of the problem and continue to evolve and try to solve it. That said, not every problem leads itself to a completely new solution. So we're still building and reinforcing the existing grid and we'll be doing that for some time forward.

Marc Johnson: Nancy, do you have a comment on that?

Nancy Hirsh: No, I think the one thing I would add, Elliot mentioned it briefly, is the market and the market is expanding and utilities are working more closely together across the entire West. When utilities need resources, other utilities are leaning in and providing those resources. There's lots of a solar coming out of California, which is a benefit to the northwest. Times we have lots of hydropower, we're sending it to California and we're using our hydro resources to support closing of the coal plants. And that's all a good thing. And we're trying to diversify the resource base so that the utilities and the system operators have more tools in their toolbox to meet the challenges that we have on the environmental front. And that's a good problem to have. I believe the toolbox will be full for Elliot and Darrel when they're meeting their customers needs.

Marc Johnson: So let's devote the last few minutes here of this discussion to this idea that you broached in your opening comments, Elliot, regarding little bits of daylight that you might see. Where would you have us focus on those little bits of daylight, understanding that we're trying to convene a discussion today that leads to further discussions that might actually, as John Freeman said at the outset, help move the ball for the region on these difficult, complicated historic issues. Give us a little optimism that there is some daylight peeking out behind the curtain somewhere.

Elliot Mainzer: I don't have a perfect answer that question yet. I may have a better answer at the end of the day. I think what we've been trying to do and what we're going to continue to do, operating as a federal agency with massive stewardship responsibilities on multiple dimensions and with partnerships and relationships with governors and tribes and other organizations in this region is we've been trying to keep the levels of communication open as much as we can with our, with the other sovereigns and the other state leaders in the region. And so it was very important to me to be able to get to a better place with Governor Brown in Oregon, to work with Chairman Wheeler at the Nez Perce tribe. Certainly with Jamie. He's been an amazing leader in tribal country for many years.

Elliot Mainzer: And then of course to be able to have opportunities to sit down with the governors and the other states. And then to be able to also find opportunities to sit down face to face with with some and eventually many of you in this room and to try to make sure that the leadership of the region, the folks that ultimately have to make big decisions that span entire states and multiple constituencies and have big balancing acts are communicating and creating space for collaboration amongst themselves. Sometimes the big tent kind of construct gets a little bit unwieldy. It kind of gets away from you. So what I'm trying to figure out is maybe building on some of the positive steps we took forward in the flexible agreement. Are there some additional things that we could look at that can continue to make progress?

Elliot Mainzer: My world is kind of operating at the kind of the federal, state, tribal, nongovernmental organization interface. And my experience has been some times that you got to get a kernel of people, kind of an essential cone of folks with a shared interest who want to solve problems and build out from there. There are other ways to do it. I don't know. Let's kind of see what else comes up today in terms of solutions and maybe at the end of the day we'll have a couple more reflection points, but you got to find folks who are serious about collaboration to get stuff done. And I feel great that this last year we actually took a step forward.

Marc Johnson: Jamie, does daylight come from ... does it percolate up from the bottom or does it come down from the top? And I guess that's a way of saying, how much leadership do we need at the gubernatorial level, at the congressional level on these issues as opposed to guys like you that are in the trench every day working on these issues sort of from the bottom up?

Jaime Pinkham: Well, I think it needs to come from every level and again, thinking about the work that the Acoma nation is doing with irrigators in the ditches. I mean, it starts at that level. But I also want to kind of just comment on the daylight, and I think there are a couple of areas. One, the accord agreements. 10 year agreements. It provided fish managers with a level of certainty. In the past it was two year planning cycles is what we had to go through. Now we could enter into long term agreements with not only Bonneville but with our partners on the ground in implementing habitat projects, retrofitting irrigation diversions and so forth. There was daylight in that. We're hopeful that's a kind of partnership that we could go forward with because not only did the accords bring Bonneville in as a partner, but it bought the army corps of engineers who is important.

Jaime Pinkham: I think the tribes had put the word Lamprey in the conversation, the Pacific northwest. I mean, here's the species that's just as, has a greater mystery than salmon. But look at the investments we were able to do the accords to have the

corps of engineers make investments on lamprey passage. So I think there's daylight in these kinds of partnership agreements long term. The other day light, again and I want to come back to this is we've been doing all the techno fixes that we can, but it's the adaptive fixes. The adaptive solutions. And I think the flex bill is one of those things where we need to adapt. Techno fixes can only take us so far, but that creativity's important and I see daylight in that kind of creativity going forward.

Nancy Hirsh: I would say we've done a lot of techno fixes except one and that's the one we've talked about which is dam removal and we ... it has to be a direct part of the conversation. We have done a lot of other investments in lots of other measures and we're still in a recovery crisis. So a direct and open conversation about the impacts of dam removal is why we're all here, in part, and we need continue that conversation. It's going to be hard. And yet that's not a reason not to do it. And all the other agreements that have been talked about are examples of how you can get past the hard part to the solution part. And we need to do that in order to take advantage of the opportunities and the recovery that will come if we sit together and we discuss the hard stuff.

Marc Johnson: So Nancy, let me ask you a follow up on that. Invoking, C. Sandra's name here today. I can vividly recall him saying 100 or 150 times that maybe the best thing for the salmon would be to remove those dams. But the political reality is simply, in his mind, was simply unthinkable. How can you do it? How can you get the political consensus in the region that you could actually undo those massive investments with the consequences obviously that attend to that. So can you envision that in our lifetimes that we actually have some kind of a consensus about that?

Nancy Hirsh: I sure hope so. Because I'm not getting any younger. I think the political landscape is changing and has changed some. I think folks are in a different place than they were 10 years ago. And we can create the political will by the people in this room sitting down and talking about what they need and how they can get what they need to make the system whole and to continue to operate and provide reliable and affordable power as well as the services that everybody depends on. And that creates an environment where the political leaders can say, "Okay, we can do that. We can give you what you need." And I agree with Jamie that it is not just at Bonneville. It's not just coming from Bonneville. We need the feds and Congress to lean in and provide resources to communities to make upgrades to transmission, to make upgrades to transportation system and what the agriculture community needs. It's going to take a whole portfolio of solutions. But I think the people in this room can create that political will that moves mountains.

Darrel Anderson: So Marc, what do you want me to talk about?

Marc Johnson: Well, do you, do you see any glimmers of daylight emerging from this conversation?

Darrel Anderson: I do. And I think as I said when I started this discussion, if this was an easy fix, we wouldn't be here today. And it involves, I think, so many different constituents. And to Nancy's point I, in my lifetime, I don't know what will actually happen, but I think we have to try some things and I think that, I'm not going to, say, comment on dam removal directly because I think that's a, I think that is a heavy lift. And I think that there's all kinds of other issues that go with that as long, everything needs to be looked at when that does, when that gets taken into consideration. There are multifaceted numbers of issues that go with that, I believe. But I think we have to try some things and I point to some of the things that we've been continuing to try to enhance the environment, to enhance fish survival, all those sorts of things.

Darrel Anderson: One of the things we were doing a upstream as it relates to the Snake River is our Snake River stewardship program, that we are actively managing upstream on the Snake to make it more viable for instance, as I mentioned earlier, the notion of putting fish up Pine Creek above Hell's Canyon, which will be an interesting pilot program to see what, how will that work? It's a sort of a small bit in the big scheme of things, but it's still multimillions of dollars in which to do that. And so there's things like that I think that we need to do and need to look at as an industry. We kind of balanced it around the edges and I know Amy's, I think here somewhere, and I heard her comment earlier about the timing and the, what that timeframe looks like.

Darrel Anderson: Unfortunately, I just don't think it's going to be that short a time period. I think it's going to take a long time to resolve these things, unfortunately, because we've been doing this and you think about it, it's been 50 years or so since some of those dams have been in place and we're not going to get out of it overnight. And I think it might be, it'd be wishful thinking if we want to think that, but I think that's the reality of where we are. But we have to continue to then look at other other things that can help enhance the environment around the fish and that's, I think, what we're trying to do and I, and I actually believe that Elliot is trying to do the same thing. Again, it's a heavy lift.

Marc Johnson: Michael.

Michael Garrity: Well, I think certainly the flex spill conversation and the implementation of that gives me some hope and optimism that we can build on that. I think the model that that came out of is more of the cone model that Elliot spoke to. And so how do we expand on that and make it get more sort of buy in and understanding of technical issues like that from the region. It's kind of a hard one to explain exactly how it works, but it's going to make a difference. A larger forum that it is

given me some hope is that the Columbia partnership that Noah has convened to, which is moving into a second phase, looking at actions for how you reach the recovery goals that they're, they've identified in their first phase. That I think gets to a lot of issues we've talked about today in the Snake and also can contribute to maybe reintroduction above chief Joseph and Grand Coulee dams.

Michael Garrity: A lot of these bigger issues are being discussed in the CRSO process and in the Columbia River treaty process, and maybe not, well, I think it's, it'll be a challenge to integrate sort of the creativity that can come from a larger dialogue or a more open dialogue into those processes in a way that makes that, where those processes move the ball forward. So I think there's going to have to be a lot of work on that. And a lot of exchange between sort of the inside and the outside on those processes if they're going to be successful.

Marc Johnson: Please.

Nancy Hirsh: I would just add that we're in the power system. We plan. Like with anything. So we're not talking about tomorrow. We're about planning. Utilities operate in five year planning windows, 10 year planning windows. And so we need to start the conversation now for that five year look and that's gives us time to make changes. I had a great conversation with, many years ago, with a Bonneville Transmission vice president who said, "We can do anything as long as we have a lead time and we can plan." We can support a whole new generation of renewable resources if we plan ahead. We make the right investments today that will allow us to see that future in the future. We need to start planning now.

Marc Johnson: So Jamie, just as a final thought here in this segment of the program. How much time do we have?

Jaime Pinkham: Well, I don't know how much time we have. I mean, it's up to us to be qualified in our lifetime. And let me just close by just sharing, according to my grandfather, there was a time when all the animals could talk and the creator called them all together to say a great change was coming and that not all the creatures would survived this great change. And so one by one that the creatures appeared before the Creator and the very first creature to come before the creator was the salmon and the salmon told the creator, "From my body there will be flesh for them to eat. My skin will be glues for fascinating bows." And Creator agreed. And so salmon qualified. And other species, including the wolf came forward and said, "I'll teach them about natural constitutions and how to function as a clan."

Jaime Pinkham: And so the great change did occur and when it occurred, the human beings, the Nez Perce came to this world. And according to my grandfather, that was their

time. How they came together as diverse as they were, the creatures, the land, the skies and the waters came together. They both had a common purpose. They committed themselves. And really, that was the first treaty, the treaty between the creatures and the Creator. And so I always thought that story was, that was their time to become qualified. Now it's our turn to become qualified. And that's my hope with conversations like this and building these bridges and these friendships, developing the common understanding and the mutual respect to work with one another. How much time do we have? I can't answer that. It's just kind of what do we do with the time that's given to us?

Marc Johnson: I think that's the perfect place to end. Thank you all for your very thoughtful comments, your responsiveness to the questions. You're excused, but don't go too far. We might want to call upon your later in the day and Mr Mainzer will be back at the end of the program today. So thank you again. Thank our panel again.

Marc Johnson: We'll have a short break and then we'll reconvene with a second panel. [crosstalk 01:32:39]

Marc Johnson: Yeah, okay. You bet. You bet. [crosstalk 01:41:39]

Marc Johnson: I think that's right. Yeah. [crosstalk 01:43:06]

Marc Johnson: I do indeed. [crosstalk 01:44:40]

PART 3 OF 11 ENDS [01:45:04]

Marc Johnson: [crosstalk 01:47:09] How the heck are you? [crosstalk 01:48:36]

speaker 1: Ready for the [crosstalk 01:50:36]

Marc Johnson: Come up whenever you're ready yeah.

speaker 1: On your mark [crosstalk 01:50:44]

Marc Johnson: No just pick a spot.

speaker 1: I don't want to sit...

speaker 1: I didn't hear what you said did you say pick a spot?

Marc Johnson: Just pick a spot.

speaker 1: Hey.

Marc Johnson: Hi.

Speaker 9: Hi.

Marc Johnson: Let's see if we can't get that, okay.

speaker 1: I'm gonna go grab a bottle of water do you know where they are?

Marc Johnson: Uh...

speaker 1: I'll go grab one don't worry. [crosstalk 01:52:20]

Marc Johnson: Okay great. I'd ask you all to find your way back to your tables please. Hi Chris how are you, nice to see you again. Thanks.

Chris Wood: Thank you for doing this. Excuse me.

Marc Johnson: So I'm determined to keep us more or less on time so please find your way back to your tables.

Chris Wood: Hello Jason, Chris Wood.

Jason Miner: Nice to meet you.

Chris Wood: Try the lemon.

Jason Miner: Nice to see you again. Are you the grandpapa?

Chris Wood: Well I don't know I guess so.

Jason Miner: Are you in DC or...

Chris Wood: Yeah, Arlington.

Jason Miner: I've heard of it, you'd be across the river by now. I worked for TNC and [crosstalk 01:54:03]

SALMON AND ENERGY PANEL TWO

Marc Johnson: Okay everyone let's get going please find your seats and we'll engage with a second distinguished panel. If anyone sitting down front here has an extra place at their table just raise your hand there's plenty of seats up front if you need a place to get closer to the action. So, almost every table up front here has at least a seat or two. We'll use the same format we used on the first panel with questions for the panel so compose yours subsequently please and when you

have it written out hold it up and we'll come around and collect those question cards. I'm told if anybody is, and several are, Tweeting, the hashtag is Salmon Solutions cause we want to be trending on Twitter.

Jason Miner: Wow. Tough goal.

Marc Johnson: So now, thank you. Just to document that you were here. So we have another distinguished panel and I won't go to any great lengths to introduce them to you because the biographies are included in your program and I want to just go right down the line beginning with Giulia from NRDC. And ask for a quick comment on what you heard from that first panel this morning. Just like that.

Giulia Stefani: Good morning, I'm a litigator so you'd think I'd be used to being put on the spot but I'm not quite ready for that question. I think I'll start and buy myself a little bit of time by just saying hi, good morning my name is Giulia Good Stefani, I'm an attorney for the Natural Resources Defense Council. I work in our marine mammal protection project. So what is a whale lawyer doing in Idaho, I love Idaho and actually so do the southern resident killer whales who depend on salmon from this region and in the Columbia Basin throughout much of the year and so I've learned a whole lot about fish. My organization sort of internalizes the conversation that we're having here today, we have a very strong and active energy component.

Giulia Stefani: Folks that are working very hard to help secure the goal of transitioning to clean energy and simultaneously we have a fish and wildlife folks like myself who see the need to balance those goals and to work together to find a way to make sure that we're building a resilient future particularly under the cloud of climate change. And so my comment on initial panel is for me what was lacking a bit was with two things, one I see it as a litigator and so that fact that the current system is illegal. It has been illegal for a couple of decades here folks and so we need to do something differently and there are serious [inaudible 01:57:46]that are court, not only ecological but also court inflicted and at the same time I recognize that the litigation has just not worked. We are still stuck.

Giulia Stefani: And the other piece that I think, for me needs to be part of this conversation is the climate change piece. And there was some mention of temperature in the rivers and I worked very closely at times, I live in the Columbia basin in Mosure, Oregon with Columbia River keeper who has done a lot of work on river temperatures and highlighting the Snake River Basin is one area that is particularly hot and impacted by climate change and so I look forward to the conversation thank you for inviting me thank you all for being here.

Marc Johnson: Thank you, next to Giulia is Bear Prairie who is the general manager of the Idaho Falls Electric Utility. Your name sounds like some place we might visit to fish for salmon.

Bear Prairie: Yeah I guess the statement is, be careful of nicknames that you give your kids because they can stick so. So my formal name's Travis but about six months old got the nickname Bear and it stuck so, there you go. And it pairs pretty nicely with Prairie and generally people that don't, the first talk to over the phone, and then I meet them in person they go, I thought there'd be a tribal connection there, whatever. Nicknames can stick so, there you go.

Marc Johnson: Let me put a fine point on the question to you based upon what you heard from that first panel because you are a customer of the Bonneville Power Administration. Are you heartened by that presentation this morning or are you harboring some deep dark concerns about the future?

Bear Prairie: Well so for Friedel Falls, our portfolio's a mix of Bonneville and then a mix of our own hydro. We own and operate four downs in the upper Snake River Basin and for us our concern is as we look to talk about transitioning resources, bringing on new resources to me, growing loads and future demand and make sure we keep a vibrant economy is making sure that we make this transition in a methodical and thoughtful way and that we don't rush to any silver bullet because it truly is a difficult question and a difficult path to not put all your eggs in one basket.

Bear Prairie: The previous panel, you heard statements of, if it was easy, we would already be there right? I think that it's amazing that we have the diversity of thought and the diversity of opinion I think it's welcome the fact that you have energy and electricity, utilities because part of the group that's not in the room that I've seen as much of that I feel like I need to represent is the community that pushes on me as an electricity provider to make sure that it's reliable and everybody assumes that when we're here the mics are going to work, lights are going to stay on and we take that for granted most of the time unless you have a blip of an outage but we have a very reliable power system and a very economic power system. So I want to make sure as we talk about things like, “let's put breaching on the table”. If we're going to have those type of conversations let's make sure that we understand the impacts, both physically and economically and I think that the dialogue is changing to where we can have this. Which is different than the 80s where we can get in a room and start working through the problems in a methodical way.

Marc Johnson: Thank you. Hand that microphone next to Roger Gray who fairly recently took over as the CEO of PNGC Power which markets power for a number of public utilities and Roger used to be the head of the Eugene Water and Electric Board,

the largest BPA customer in the state of Oregon. I think Roger if my memory serves me that Governor Andrew says a young man growing up in Oregon actually worked one summer for the Eugene Water and Electric Board so, the world does turn. Welcome.

Roger Gray: Thank you.

Marc Johnson: Glad to have you here. So, as you think about your future, is Bonneville going to survive? And what's it look like?

Roger Gray: So that there's... Elliot talked about that in his talk and you quoted him about panic and I'm not panicked about Bonneville but I'm deeply concerned. And I think that I don't like to wait till we panic to solve problems. We see a problem, we need to address it. We should be trying to solve it well ahead of time. And I think that's the goal of Elliot and the Bonneville Power Administration, that's the goal of the customers. Both power customers rely heavily on Bonneville. I call it the... it's this golden goose that served this region since 1937 and it's this wonderful thing that's I think the key to our prosperity in the Northwest. But it's under pressure and I think we need to be concerned about it.

Roger Gray: And I'll frame it up as, this is an intended design to opportunity but it sometimes it sounds like a threat. I don't mean it to sound like a threat, if power can't solve this problem with Bonneville, then we... all the things you heard about technology and changes, those are all very real. And they are coming at us with an amazing force and opportunity and as Bear said, power managers are responsible for delivering really fundamentally reliable, affordable and increasingly importantly seeing our society, clean power to our customers. And how we do it is going to change. I see it as this amazing opportunity and my concern is, if we don't solve it for power all the other interests and needs associated with these river systems that we haven't really even talked about water, agricultural, navigation.

Roger Gray: Power is going to be the easiest thing to solve. I hate to make it sound so simple. We're going to solve power. I worry about if we destroy Bonneville, the funding that funds this system, we hurt that. And I really worry that we leave behind these gigantic challenges: travel interests, water interests, agricultural interest, flood risk management. And who's going to pay the bill, and power today picks up a lot of that bill because Bonneville was so far below market for so long and that's no longer the case. They're right on the edge of being competitive or not and we have about 10 years left in these contracts and there are very serious challenges that Bonneville is addressing, that remains for customers. I told Elliot that Bonneville is our Plan A. We need to make Plan A work, but we need to be very serious about Plan B in case Plan A fails.

Marc Johnson: Thank you. Chris Wood, and old friend of Andrea Sinner here for one more go around talking about fish. Chris is the President of Trout Unlimited. Welcome. What's your takeaway of what you heard this morning?

Chris Wood: Uh thank you Marc. It's a pleasure to be here.

Marc Johnson: You might have to turn that mic on Chris, sorry.

Chris Wood: Maybe I just turned it on.

Marc Johnson: There you go.

Chris Wood: Okay I think that's better. I was thinking that Bear, we need to hook up with my friend Kurt Fish and three of us could form an awesome consultancy. (laughing) Fish, Wood and Prairie, I can see it. I was trying to think of how to monetize this nonprofit thing and this may be the answer. The takeaway I had from the first panel is twofold. One, it was really heartening, and this has been said before but, to see these dispersed interests come together and have a real focus on solutions I think is really encouraging. And again, I really don't want to be a skunk at a garden party but, the point that I think was missing was maybe twofold. I think we have to solve this problem in a much bigger scale than we're thinking right now. I think the opportunities like the spill agreement, and dealing with predators and tinkering with hatcheries, that's great. That stuff is all incremental though.

Chris Wood: We know what the problem is in the Snake River Basin, it's that these fish can't migrate to their natal streams. So, I just want to give... again I'm not... I don't want to be Debbie Downer here, or David Downer but I just want to give a sense of where we are with these fish right now. So historically there were two to six million fish give, or take in terms of Snake River, Spring, and Summer Schnook that would return to the Snake River Basin. We're returning about 7000 right now and steelhead, it's equally bad. Historically there were about 600000 steelhead that would return. We're averaging somewhere around 20000 now. And we're very close to losing the fabled Bee Run steelhead, these big giant steelhead. Last year we had fewer than 2000 make it back.

Chris Wood: The middle fork of the salmon river is an area that I spent time when I began my career. It's some of the finest habitat on the planet and while I truly admire the Bonneville fish and wildlife program, and we've participated in making some of its habitat even better, you're not going to find better habitat than we have for these fish. Tinkering around the edges on habitat improvements even though we participate in that work because it benefits resident fish as well, is not what's going to bring back these salmon and steelhead. But I just want to mention the middle fork in 2017 had 500 salmon come back. That was one percent of what would historically come back. Last year they had about 850

salmon come back. These are wild fish not hatchery fish. That's about two percent of what historically would come back. So the point I would make is we don't have a lot of time. If the issue is how to protect these wild fish we are running out of time, and we have got to think at a bigger scale than we have historically to solve this problem.

Marc Johnson: Thank you Chris, and at the end of the table is Jason Miner. Natural Resource Policy manager for Oregon governor Kate Brown. My governor now I'm happy to say is a resident of Oregon. Give us your takeaway on the first discussion this morning Jason. Thanks for being here.

Jason Miner: Well first I want to respectfully recognize that I probably can't join the consultancy of Fish, Wood, Prairie and Miner.

Chris Wood: And Miner.

Jason Miner: So...

Chris Wood: It's a big table!

Jason Miner: Yeah, so I'd love the opportunity but...

Marc Johnson: That would cover a lot of territory though.

Jason Miner: First I want to say thank you to everybody, thank you to Idaho for welcoming the Oregon governors office. I am appropriately holding down the left flank of the table here from the audience's perspective. Takeaways, I think I will... it's been a real honor to serve with Governor Kate Brown on these fish and energy issues, and I have come to it more as a fish person with a background in Oregon trout and nature conservancy that it is an energy person, so I'll be able to speak more to those elements but Governor Brown herself is deeply committed to a carbon free power future, and I think also deeply committed to the notion and that does not and cannot, should not come at a cost to native fish. So, we sort of share in our office we share two goals, coequally of restoration of abundance native fish and salmon and to their natal streams and reliable carbon free power future.

Jason Miner: So that's what guides our office and things that I heard as a takeaway from this morning's first panel is really that a couple things... the resources to move forward on this problem are people and creativity. I think that resonated the most with me. And I choose those words somewhat carefully. I enjoy sitting in a room inspired by the notion that we should work together to solve problems, but I walk away with the intent to move forward on problems because it is a large issue, and I think moving forward is at least the goal that I carry forward in the governors' office and in our time there. And also the word creativity came

up earlier, and I do think the creativity of the people in this room, and the people that you represent, and their willingness to engage on hard issues and in hard conversations, is what resonated from the first panel for me. And then I guess I will say one additional item, which all I really have to reflect on in this conversation in many ways is my own experience in working with Governor Brown on it and that in working towards the Flex Bill agreement that has been referenced several times from the stage. I do think one of the most critical aspects of creativity is thinking about how to stay true to your goals while also questioning some of the fundamental assumptions that you carry into the room while pursuing those goals.

Marc Johnson: So I want to ask each of you to participate in the discussion and don't wait for me to prompt you as we go forward if you have a comment that you'd like to follow up on or make a point, please jump right in. But let me pick up on the... what I think of as the dilemma that is on the table here today. A regional energy institution in the Bonneville Power Administration that is facing by the administrators' admission, and you gentleman who are customers know a certain amount of financial stress going forward. The same time the region looks largely to that institution to fund the efforts to save this iconic species that in many ways defines the region. So is Bonneville the solution to the problem going forward? As it relates, particularly as it relates to salmon.

Bear Prairie: I don't know if they're the solution or the problem or just stuck in the mix of this. At the crossroads of having to deal with the issue, but a little bit of background I guess of what we see and what we do in our community is being a purchaser of power from Bonneville, I always ask people in our community do you want to fund, and do you believe in abundant acronymous fish returns, and it's something we hold near and dear in our heart in the Northwest. I spent a lot of my time salmon fishing, steelhead fishing, fly fishing. It's what we do for, as our recreation hobbies that's what, it's truly part of our culture and what we cherish.

Bear Prairie: When I tell people in our community you already spend 15 dollars out of every 100 dollars on your power bill, goes straight to funding fish and wildlife efforts through Bonneville rates, they look at me with shock. Yes we're contributing a tremendous amount of money into this fixing the problem, which is these fish returns. That's the problem that we need to focus on and do that in the most economic and efficient manner for the region. At the same time we need to look at the power system because everybody expects there to be a reliable power sector. Bonneville rates and there's a lot of conversation of well "Bonneville's the impediment standing in the room so if we get rid of Bonneville isn't that the solution?" The reality is Bonneville keeps the lights on. It's 100000 megawatts lasts this past March, when energy was very scarce in the market during the cold snap.

Bear Prairie: You want to remove the four lower Snake dams, go away that was 1700 megawatts that was being produced over those peak periods of which wind and solar contributed almost zero to that so. We need to talk about the physics of how this gets done, so there's solutions that we can work on, but those aren't easy either we're working on. And Governor Little touched on it, small modular reactors. There's probably mixed emotions in this room on what your point of view is on nuclear technology. The environmental community's mixed on that whether that's a solution to our carbon future or just creating another problem of nuclear waste.

Bear Prairie: I don't know, but that's part of the conversation it's still, we're hoping to develop and deploy a small modular reactor with the help of the Department of Energy and in a partnership to get that price down in the mid to low 50 dollar per megawatt range. Bonneville's currently 37 dollars. So a lot less than what we are looking at other dispatachable base load generation.People say well "batteries the answer. Get rid of Bonneville. Just build batteries." We just heard this morning concerns about mining Where Earth minerals is what builds batteries. So it builds solar panels. So if the price of those goes up tenfold, how much land are we going to want to rip out to go get those? So these are tough, so I don't know if the answer or the solution or it's..., but it's not a silver bullet to do one thing, or the other.

Marc Johnson: Yes sir?

Roger Gray: The question about whether Bonneville is the solution I don't think Bonneville is the sole problem, or the sole solution they're a part of both, and I think that's... the honest answer is that there's multiple factors that are a part of both solutions and the problem. The question I think Marc you asked the last panel about I think Elliot, "what happens if we took out the Snake River Dam?" Just remove them from the equation there's a... the Snake River Dam are one of the cheapest parts of Bonneville's portfolio today. So if you remove the Snake River Dam's you can do the math, it's a smaller more expensive system. It actually makes the problem that we have worse.

Roger Gray: I think we would move from serious challenge to potentially crisis if we did that in terms of the Bonneville competitiveness. Then that even begs the question about who would pay the decommissioning cost? That could also contribute to the problem. Whether those dams will make a material difference in fish recovery, I don't know I'm not a fish expert. I'm very comfortable with the power market, but I do feel like if we were to do something that drastic we better believe that it's going to make a big difference in terms of the outcome because it's a serious expensive move that's going to have profound spillover effects. As I said in my opening remarks, the power industry is going to be the easiest thing to fix. I don't know what you'd do without the other interests that

are out there, and what their alternatives and solutions look like or whether they've studied for them as much as we have from the power side. And whether they have the technology revolution we've seen in power to replace power overnight.

Bear Prairie: Again, I don't believe in silver bullets. It was said earlier today that if there was one we would have found it. I actually don't believe in four silver bullets either. I think there are silver bb's out there that all of us control and can contribute. We need to figure out what's the mix of silver bb's that's going to solve this problem.

Marc Johnson: Chris, that sounds like a perfect tee-up for you.

Chris Wood: Man this is feeling a little bit like a set up here. I'm seated between two power guys and a miner. I think it's important to remember that the fish and wildlife program is not without cost. We're spending somewhere like 480 million dollars a year on fish and wildlife costs associated with marginal... I mean important efforts, but really not addressing the core problem. I'm not a fishery scientist either but I practice one in real life, and I have seen what the sciences said and the science is pretty clear it's been out there at least 20 years with the... I think it was called the path document that the surest fire way to bring back the fish is to remove the impediments that 'cause the problem in the first place which are these dams. We spent 16 billion dollars on salmon recovery. Rate payers have paid 16 billion dollars in salmon recovery and again I... conservation is this really optimistic informative idea. When I come to a conference like this I feel like I'm such a downer. But, given those numbers that I shared earlier, we're not succeeding. We've spent 16 billion dollars in one of the least successful recovery programs in the history.

PART 4 OF 11 ENDS [02:20:04]

Chris Wood: ... in one of the least successful recovery programs in the history of the world. I mean, that's where we are right now with the status quo, and I think if we did some of the kind of thinking and had some of the conversations that we're having in this room today about replacing that power, about providing that stability in that certainty that the grid needs about planning in advance as someone, Nancy pointed out this morning that we need to do, I think we'd be in a far better place in five or 10 years than we are today.

Marc Johnson: Giulia, I invite you to get back into the conversation here.

Giulia Stefani: Well, I'll step back in with my initial point that we have an obligation to do that, and we are in a situation that is on an extinction trajectory. We are facing the very real possibility of losing these runs forever. I don't really even know what a silver bullet is or does. I guess, I don't own a gun, and maybe I would if ...

understand if there's a little more Idaho in me, but I came at this issue because, actually, someone from an agency called me and said, "We're going lose this population of orcas," and a government agency person called me and said, "This is a crisis," and what I discovered terrified me, which was that they depended on salmon, which we've just devastated across the Pacific Northwest. I mean, if you start looking seriously at all of the problems that salmon face, yes, they are myriad. I mean, they are everywhere.

Giulia Stefani: They connect the ocean to the mountains, and they're impacted by everything we've done to industrialize this West, but it's not that complicated when you ... I mean, I live on the Columbia River. I drive by the dams every single day, and you can understand ... I mean, my kids swim in that river, and they enjoy it at 70 degrees, but the salmon don't, and it's only getting worse. I have dived into the energy part of this equation. I mean, this is a very complicated situation, and I ... no doubt, and I've spent a good deal of time on the phone with Nancy and her team last year trying to get to the bottom of what would happen if we took out those Snake River dams? We commissioned an external firm that we paid a lot of money to take a look at this, and it is a firm that I ... I've spoken to Bonneville about the results of that study and been told that, internally, the messages don't disparage that study.

Giulia Stefani: You're going to be in trouble. Those are some serious numbers, and those numbers came back and said, "You take out the Snake River dams, yeah, you're going to have an impact on rate payers, but guess what? It's not going to be big. It's going to be in the ballpark of a dollar a month," I think it was. Nancy can correct me. We did a poll in Washington state; wasn't Idaho, was Washington, full disclosure, but asking folks how much more they would pay for salmon restoration. You want your wild salmon back; how much are you willing to pay? Even up at the $7 a month rate, we had ... I can't ... I don't ... The figures are not right in front of me. I mean, but I think it was about 50% of folks were willing, and at lower rates, at the dollar rate, you had 70, 80%. I mean, the numbers were high.

Giulia Stefani: Salmon are the backbone of the Pacific Northwest psychology, and people who live here, for us, this is our second paycheck, the natural world, right? Being able to fish and ... I mean, I've rafted the main fork and the salmon in it is gorgeous. I mean, that is why we live here. So, I can't ... It's a long-winded answer, I'll confess, but it may not be a silver bullet, but it is the only thing ... it is the [inaudible 02:24:12] ... We've tried so many other things. If there was another silver bullet, it would have been tried. The science is in as far as I'm concerned, and I'd like folks ... I haven't seen other suggestions on the table. I mean, if you told me there was another way to bring back salmon and restore those runs, I'd be in. I mean, I didn't come at this wanting to have to learn about energy. Trust me.

Speaker 10: [inaudible 02:24:40]

Giulia Stefani: I do think it's something that deserves a serious conversation, and figuring out how do we all get to a place where we can be open-minded about it, and we can think, when we can look for these kind of solutions. I am glad that we're all in this room together, and I'll let others step in now.

Jason Miner: You're not going to make me follow that, are you?

Marc Johnson: Yes, I am.

Jason Miner: The original question was is BPA the solution or the problem? I just wanted to ... I don't have ... that dichotomy doesn't help me think through these issues, but I do know that in working with BPA, something that, I think, has helped the state of Oregon think through our complicated relationship is not just the competitiveness of BPA power, but the role of BPA in a future that holds more renewables, solar, wind, renewable energy, and the role the hydropower system can play in ramping up or ramping down as different renewables come on at different times a day and are periodic and have their role to play in this system. I think that that, in addition to the competitiveness conversation about the future of BPA, I think recognizing that BPA, the hydropower, will play a different role in a future where energy is generated from a different mix of sources. It helps think through how they can contribute to this, to moving forward towards a solution.

Marc Johnson: Chris, I see you shaking your head. Do you want to comment on that?

Chris Wood: I was just thinking about what was for lunch. No, I was actually thinking of-

Marc Johnson: Salmon.

Chris Wood: It's salmon. That's not funny.

Speaker 11: But it might be true.

Speaker 12: It's better than power.

Marc Johnson: Well, it-

Chris Wood: That's right. It's better than power point. So, the [crosstalk 02:26:49]-

Marc Johnson: As the famous Idaho politician said, "It can't be endangered. You can find it at Albertsons in a can all the time."

Chris Wood: That's right. Rest in peace. What I was actually thinking was a little bit of a non-sequitur, but what I was nodding my head wondering if the governor or his people were still here, and I'm not going to ask the question because I want to make the point regardless, but I was somewhat cynical when I heard that the governor was appointing a task force from the Office of Species Conservation. Having worked in several federal bureaucracies for about 10 years, I don't have great confidence in those entities, but then I thought it was another governor of Idaho about 10 years ago who created a similar group and brought together a diversity of interests, and it led to the creation of the Idaho Roadless Rule.

Chris Wood: So, one of the things that I cut my teeth on back when I had a full head of brown hair was this so called Roadless Rule. We protected 60 million acres, and frankly, it was totally a top-down thing, right? We jammed it through in 2001 after 18 months of analysis, and by God, it has withstood every legal challenge, and it remains the law of the land, but they were unhappy about it in Idaho. Idaho was the one state where we had people who really didn't like the Roadless Rule, and what it does is it protects national forest system lands that don't have roads in them, big, big expanses of wilderness quality land.

Chris Wood: So, what then Governor Ridge did was appoint a panel of about 12 people, and I was one of the representatives who got to work on this so called Idaho Rule, and when we started, we were completely antagonistic to one another. After about a two year process of having beers with one another and breaking bread in each other's homes, I began to understand what the timber industry was worried about, and the timber industry began to understand why fish heads cared about roadless areas, and we began to advocate for one another, and we now have an Idaho Roadless Rule that protects 8.9 million acres of some of the finest fish and wildlife habitat on the planet, and the timber industry supports it. The off road vehicle community supports it. County commissioners support it. We support it. ICL supports it.

Chris Wood: So, I don't think this is a ... the governor's committee is a bad idea, and I think we have precedent right here in the state for making committees like that work.

Chris Wood: I have completely deviated from where you wanted me to go, Marc, but-

Marc Johnson: Skillfully so, though, I would say. So, for the two energy guys on the panel directly involved in serving customers, if it's difficult to envision a future of the Northwest without those four lower Snake River dams, could you see a future that has even more renewable energy?

Bear Prairie: Yeah, I think it's clear that's the trajectory we're on. That's the path that makes sense. Societally, we continue to focus in the last 10, 15, 20 years on climate change. We feel as a society and science ... and you can get on both sides of

this, but we ... society said and science is speaking towards they feel that it's carbon. So, the direction that we're getting from our stakeholders, which is the community we serve, is we want to make sure that we maintain our carbon-free future. What we enjoy right now is a carbon-free portfolio, thanks to our own hydro assets and the Bonneville Power system being carbon-free. So, if you talk about changing that mix, and you still want to maintain resources that don't emit carbon and greenhouse gases because the concern is ... and if you read the articles and what's going on up in Canada, because I spent the last 25, 30 years from the time as a child fishing in the British Columbia coast, and the salmon runs up there are collapsing.

Bear Prairie: Places I used to go and catch 120, 130, 140 in the ocean, silvers, is ridiculous. You just tried to get through the silvers to catch a spring. Now you go up and you fish all day to try and catch one or two, and these are fish runs that are on undammed rivers. You look at what's happening on the Fraser. So, when you read the articles, what's going on in Canada and Alaska, they're pointing to we got to do something to solve this climate change and the ocean conditions and the warming of the oceans. So, then you look at a carbon-free portfolio, and say we need to get rid of ... remove some of this hydro and go to other resources. Wind and solar will not keep the lights on in those peak periods. We saw it in March. It's just when in the early mornings when it's 20 below in Idaho Falls, the wind's not blowing. The wind's not blowing much across the Northwest period, and you want to talk about, well, let's just build it other places and import it.

Bear Prairie: Nobody wants to see 500 KV high tower transmission lines built across the West. That has an environmental impact. Nobody wants to see, "Well, let's build four or five times the amount of Gateway West." That's a tough solution. So, it really is wrestling with these different paradoxes of what society and what we value and how to truly get there. The nice thing is we have these discussions and we're having this coming together of figuring out how to chart the environmental and energy resources and barging and transportation, all the things that our modern day society depends on. How can we get there and what does that look like?

Marc Johnson: Roger, do you want to make a comment on that?

Roger Gray: I think that the issue of power ... We're in the midst of a transition that we've been in for some time now, and Darrel talked about what Idaho Power's recent announcement is. We're seeing the closure of coal plants on just pure economics going forward right now, and we're seeing the midst of an important transition. I think we're going to see more renewables across the country as there's no absolutely no doubt about it. The question is going to be for me is it's the pace at which we go and the cost at which we bear, are we going to let technology feed this? Are we going to try and speed up the pace? Then, the

question becomes is ... For example, right now the storage technology that seems to be in favor, and California is leading the way as they always do, is on batteries.

Roger Gray: Batteries are extraordinarily expensive. We need to find other solutions. Nancy talked about some of the other solutions, and those kinds of things will merge. It's just, for me, it's a question of the pace at which we try and tackle this, but again in the end, I think power is going to be the simpler thing to solve here. The other interest and needs that I keep going back to are way more complex and are going to be much harder to solve in my judgment. I like frame it in this way. If you look at a map of the United States, if you remember your history, and go on Wikipedia, look at the 98th Meridian, and then look west of that. It's basically we accept this little teeny corner of very Northwest. It's arid, and we have about 100 million people; about a third of the nation lives there, and we live here because we have engineered the heck out of this territory.

Roger Gray: So, good or bad, I'm not talking about just the Snake River, I'm talking about the entire West, if we want to change that, this is going to be an enormous challenge, and that to me is the challenge before us, and so whether it's incremental changes or four Snake River dams, we have got challenges in terms of endangered species and human needs and other needs that are going to compete with each other. In the end, I don't think power is going to be the driving equation for this. Figuring out those other major issues and needs for society is going to be our biggest challenge.

Marc Johnson: Chris Wood, I'm switching to questions now, and one of the questions is from one of our audience participants. "Declining fish populations appear to be a worldwide trend. The Fraser River in Canada, for example, is undammed and seems to be having similar issues with declining populations. So, why are we acting as if the dams are the major problem?"

Chris Wood: Well, I mean it's true, and to ... I really appreciated Bear's comment about climate change. If we had a margin for error with these fish before, it's gone now. Those reservoirs are lethal bathtubs for smolt, and it's not going to change. It's going to just get worse. So, I did appreciate that comment. Look, fish populations go up and down, but there has been a steady trend since the dams were built down for these fish, at least the wild fish, and we can mask that with hatcheries, but in the end, if we care about protecting and recovering this ... and I'm not even talking about what Giulia is talking about in terms of just the bare legal obligations of the ESA, I think we ought to be much more audacious than that. We ought to be shooting for fishable, harvestable populations of these fish, not smolt to adult return ratios that meet the bare minimum to keep things off the endangered species list.

Chris Wood: These populations are cyclical, but historically, when we didn't have the dams, even though the ocean conditions, for example, would be in bad shape, we'd still have abundant fish populations back here. So, I would say we can't afford to roll the dice and see if the fish will last a little bit longer because these populations are cyclical. We need to take care of the limiting factors right now, and we need to come together and do that as a region. It shouldn't be driven by court cases. It should be advocates willing to advocate for each other, for communities of place and communities of interest to see the perspective on the other side and try to reach some reasonable solutions that maintain everyone's social and economic well-being while also recovering harvestable, fishable populations of wild fish.

Marc Johnson: Giulia, you indicated earlier that the legal strategy is not working. We've had 20 years of operating a system, technically, in violation of the law, and I think one of the great frustrations that my old boss, the former governor, had was that these federal judges would hand down a ruling and nothing seemed to change, that we go through the next cycle of environmental impact statements and we still have the problem. So, there is not a legal ... Is there a legal solution to this, or is it merely that the legal approach is putting the pressure on the policymakers to do more?

Giulia Stefani: Well, I'm always wary of someone that thinks there's a legal solution to anything because I've seen the inside of how the sausage gets made, and this is one of those stories. NRDC has been involved in this since the early '90s when the fish got listed, and the agencies have known that there's a problem and yet that just status quo gets repackaged and represented to the public, and then it gets challenged again by a bunch of lawyers and federal courts take forever to make a decision, and then it all starts over again. "Oh, give us five years to do another EIS or ..." I think there's a good amount of pressure at the moment on the federal agencies, the three of them, it's not just BPA, to give us something better.

Giulia Stefani: Now, I don't think that that's just coming from the courts because that's sort of on all of our shoulders to push on those agencies to give us an honest answer to some of these questions. I mean, what does the world look like and how do we get to sustainable fish runs? Believe me, I would love to be above listing, but even that seems at the moment ambitious. So, let's get there and find a way to get there.

Giulia Stefani: So, I think the legal process has served a purpose, but I don't think it can do it alone. It's sort of the theme of the day. It's a lot of pieces working together. So, I appreciate there is some lawyers in this room, I understand, who've worked really hard on that case, and [Todd Trues 02:39:29] out there somewhere and others. So, it's important. It's very important. At the same time, I think

everybody understands that we're just going to be knocking our heads against each other in the courtroom; only gets us so far, and there's a lot of work to be done on ... and the solutions, it's not just power. I mean, this is a very power-focused day and discussion, but obviously the point is there are a lot of stakeholders in this conversation, and we need to all get together and figure out a different way because for a number of reasons, the current way is not working, and it's only going to ... The pressure cooker is on. Climate change is that other piece of it that we, unfortunately, have to deal with now and figure out a way out of this.

Marc Johnson: Jason Minor, this question's for you. The questioner says, "Oregon is the signatory to several agreements which are leading to the restoration of the Klamath River Basin. Are there any lessons from that process that we could be applying or are relevant to the discussion we're having today?"

Jason Miner: Thanks for that question. The Klamath is an amazing system, a beautiful system. In working in Oregon rivers for quite a while, I am often reminded that it is the other river that breaches the Cascades. So, the Rogue, the Umpqua, a lot of ... the Santiam, a lot of Oregon's great rivers arise in the Cascades, but the Klamath crosses from the dry side to the wet side and where it goes through that area of southern Oregon and Northern California is truly beautiful and a remarkable place. I think lessons ... First let me say that process, that place, is a deeply challenged place and a deeply challenged process, and to say that the ink is dry in any way on all of those agreements is probably ... or to say that the ink is entirely dry and there isn't a tremendous amount of hard work to do going forward is too great a statement to make, but we are a couple of years into and a couple of years away from imagining and then envisioning a Klamath River in which the major hydropower dams are removed or breached, and the parties step up to various responsibilities that they will have in that action and afterwards.

Jason Miner: I think two lessons I might draw from those long relationships ... Oh, maybe three lessons. One, collaborative solutions are important, not just because they enable us to sit in a room together and enjoy scones and coffee. They're important because they're more durable than the litigate of solutions, or winner takes all solutions, that might last one administration or a couple of years. In that Klamath agreement is a collaborative solution between a lot of diverse parties, and despite a change in federal administrations and a lot of other changes, it has currently stood the test of time.

Jason Miner: I think the second part that I would emphasize is the role that First Nations, the role that Oregon's tribes, the role that indigenous people play in or brought our fellow sovereigns in Oregon brought to that agreement is critical. Including them in the conversations, including our fellow sovereigns in the conversation

as partners as fellow sovereigns, was critical to crafting a solution that, I think, has continued to motivate people to do the hard work. There are things ... You can visit the Klamath and recognize that Klamath tribes and our neighbors to the south have relied on salmon returning to that river since time immemorial and that the shape of that river was different in previous iterations, and you can see the boat dance and you can see of the Yurok, and you can see the importance of that river, and to allow that to resonate with the sovereigns that currently govern that space, Oregon, California in the United States, has helped that, has helped people put in the hard work to make that river whole again.

Jason Miner: Maybe lastly I'd say the crash in ocean conditions has brought ... or the crash in ocean fisheries rely on the Klamath off of Oregon's coast has built a political base for removing the dams, or breaching the dams, that doesn't otherwise exist. Deeply blue collar, deeply placed based iconic group of people living on Oregon's coast who had been a fishing in the ocean for generations, to have the season closed, I think it was two years ago, 2017, that brings a political will to the state of Oregon, the state of California that motivates change.

Chris Wood: Can I mention we're also a party to that agreement, and the only other lesson that I would add to that is that it was solved in the region. We were trying to get federal legislation passed to sanction the removal and then the restoration of those four dams in the 550 miles of salmon habitat that it will open up that had been lost for a hundred years, and we couldn't, and so we created a private corporation, nonprofit corporation, and could not have done it without the states of California and Oregon and certainly without the tribal interest as well, but that was a totally homemade solution in the region and there's no reason that we can't do the same thing here.

Chris Wood: I know the comment was made on the earlier panel that Washington may undo what we've done, but these people work for us. We elect them. If as a region we came together with a solution for bringing these fish back to abundant levels and making sure that we take care of people's social and economic wellbeing, there's not an elected leader in DC that's going to turn against that, that wants to get elected again.

Marc Johnson: So, Chris, I think this question is for you and for Giulia. The questioner says, "Despite my best efforts, I didn't get the answer to the harvest question during the first panel this morning. Exempting tribal harvest rights, how would a multi-year commercial harvest ban affect salmon returns, and what's the position of a Trout Unlimited and NRDC on commercial harvest of an endanger or threatened species?"

Chris Wood: Giulia, go ahead. Softball.

Marc Johnson: Easy question.

Giulia Stefani: You know what? There is an outdated study that NOAA is redoing at one point that said that commercial and recreational fishing doesn't have any impact on the southern resident killer whales, and that study is being redone, and it's been called into question from the day it was written. So, I have my intuition, but the science isn't there yet. Harvest is a significant piece of this. We have, with our Canadian partners, done work to work with fishermen, NRDC has, to reduce harvest to ensure that there's an allocation for the southern resident killer whales when they're in Canadian waters. I could foresee doing similar work here. I was on the prey working group for the Washington State Task Force, and I will say harvest was very difficult for folks to sort of get behind. Part of it was that there was a large sort of representation of indigenous and tribal fishermen, and there was a deep desire not to be singled out or even in some sort of exemption.

Giulia Stefani: So, I think harvest is complicated, and it is not an area that I've traditionally worked in are. There are other folks at NRDC who do a lot more with the Pacific Fisheries Management Council on the fish side. So, it is an area that we're looking at, but I can't say I've done a ton of ... a tremendous amount of work.

Marc Johnson: Chris.

Chris Wood: Yes. So, I'm not a fisheries biologist, as I mentioned earlier, and I mean, I can't imagine that it wouldn't make a difference to have a cessation of harvest for five years for the fish. Of course, it would, but I think we need to be very clear-eyed given the condition of these fisheries that dams are really the elephant in the room right now. That's the issue we really haven't addressed. We've done ... and to be very clear, if there is a comprehensive solution, there will need to be changes made to how we operate the hatcheries and in how harvest management occurs and where and how we focus on habitat restoration. But I think if we want to really tackle the one issue that can make the biggest difference, it's probably the dams.

Marc Johnson: So, I want to spend the last few minutes here talking about sort of how you might envision creating the political will to make some of these changes, whether it's dam removal, whether it's reconstitution of somehow how the Columbia system is operated, whether it's more renewables, whether it's big batteries and solar, whatever it might be, or a combination of all of those things that play into the solution here. I'm reminded of something that Governor Andrus used to say. He said ... Maybe this is an apocryphal story, but he used to quote Mohandas Gandhi. Sitting on a rock on the side of the road and watching a long progression of people go by, presumably headed to a demonstration against British Imperial rule in India, and Gandhi supposedly said, "There go my

people. I must get out in front and lead them," meaning the political leadership follows, often follows, a grassroots movement or coming up from the bottom.

Marc Johnson: So, we don't have that kind of leadership, apparently, in the region right now at the federal level. No one's really stepped forward and said "I'll be the champion" in the way that may be a Scoop Jackson might once have or a [Cecil Andrus 02:51:21] tried to on a number of occasions. So, where will that leadership come from, or where should it come from, I guess? As we think about the importance of all of the talk about collaboration and cooperation and thinking bigger about these problems, but at some point we need political leadership.

Bear Prairie: I think the leadership's going to come from us, the people. We've had that ... Statements have been made before that we're the people that control our resources, we're the people that elect our officials, but I think it's going to have to be a two-way street with elected officials pushing at the federal level and at the state levels to put the right people in the room so that all those stakeholders are represented so that we can truly and honestly look at the facts, the science, the socio, the economic, the pollution concerns, from replacing the energy sector piece, which, like Roger alluded, to was probably one of the easier things to solve. The transportation, barging, where do all these things go?

Bear Prairie: Putting all those people in a room to work on solving the problem, which is we want to protect and preserve our natural resources and enhance them and get things back to the way they may be used to be 100 years ago, 150 years ago, but the reality is there's a lot of people that live in the Northwest and rely on all of the natural resources in agriculture and farming and electricity in industry and manufacturing. So, there's that segment needs to get pushed in a room together with the right stakeholders and not a top-down solution, but it's got to be back and forth with clear marching orders to honestly look at solving this issue and having the fact-based dialogue, not the "We'll just do this."

Marc Johnson: Okay, so nominate somebody to do that.

Bear Prairie: Way beyond my pay grade.

Jason Miner: I might jump in on this question before it gets too, too hard.

Marc Johnson: Yes.

Jason Miner: First I think-

Marc Johnson: Good to get in early.

Jason Miner: Yeah. I would just echo what I've already said that stakeholders, there needs to be a space where stakeholders, this room, brings creative solutions to the table. One of the great joys of working in state government and the executive level has been realizing actually what we're not good at, and you may have your own answers to that. I don't want to hear them right now. That's for later, for lunch, but I do think it's been remarkable to realize why do all these multi-party, multi-interest stakeholder groups get put together. It's because state government actually isn't very good at figuring out which portion of which problem gets fixed by whom, how much, and what your percentage is that goes into that solution. That's what stakeholders and stakeholder groups can do a fantastic job of helping on complex problems.

Jason Miner: So, somewhere, I don't have a great answer to where it starts, but I do have a decent answer to what happens next, and that is, I think, that litigation sets the sideboards. It does not craft solutions. The solution has to exist. Litigation crafts the sideboards for those solutions. The four governors are very capable of stepping up and leading on moving a solution that is generated from the people in this region forward, making that durable, collaborative, and successful. They represent a great diversity of interest from Idaho, Montana, Washington, Oregon. We all couldn't be more ...

PART 5 OF 11 ENDS [02:55:04]

Jason Miner: Idaho, Montana, Washington, Oregon; we all couldn't be more different at different times, so if you can bring that group together, and I think you can, behind a stakeholder fueled solution that also ... like I said, on the Klamath process, recognizes and involves in consultation, the tribes and our fellow sovereigns, I think you can bring forward an agreement that can make progress towards a real solution.

Marc Johnson: Roger?

Roger Gray: In the absence of solutions and adult behavior, we go to court for adult supervision. I'm a great believer in the court system to resolve differences, but they aren't ... great respect for judges of all nature, but they aren't the big solution providers. It's the role of people as citizens, as Bear was saying, but [also 02:55:54] it's a role of the sovereigns, the states, the federal government, and our tribal sovereigns, to try and provide both top down as well as bottom up solutions.

Roger Gray: I think the questions like dam removal or banning harvest ... I just don't see things where ... any solution where you say, "You cut off your arm, but I won't trim my fingernails," that's not going to work, top down or bottom up. We've got to figure out how ... this is not a ... this is why I'll never be in politics, I don't

think there is a win-win-win-win solution here. It's going to be, everybody probably has to give a little bit to figure out how to solve the fundamental problem. You start with the fundamental objectives of ... I don't want my power source to ever be near an endangered species again. I would love them to be abundant, but I would like to see abundance so we don't have to worry about this in perpetuity.

Roger Gray: How do we achieve those things, how do we manage our ... again, I keep on going back to, the interest and needs are so complex, the deeper I get into it, not to become an expert at fish or water systems or agriculture, I realize that my problems on the power side are probably the easiest. I'm worried that, until we start to address those more complex ones, this is going to be a really hard problem to solve, but we have to do it.

Marc Johnson: Giulia, thought? You want to nominate somebody to lead this process?

Giulia Stefani: I don't think it's going to be one person, obviously ... One of the things I found interesting, from this morning's discussion was that, the idea that the customer in the energy equation increasingly wants to be more a part of that dialogue. I think that there is something going on with all this crappy social media, that maybe is a little bit good.

Giulia Stefani: There is a way in which we are all taking a bit more control of our daily consumer choices, and realizing the fine grained-ness with which we can actually interact ... I think there are people who think that, as NRDC, basically what I do is hand over stacks of petitions, right? We just email our members, and they click on things, but we get incredible data now. The very highest response rate we had to any petition so far, this year, has been on the Southern Resident Orcas. We know what people care about.

Giulia Stefani: We have the click through rate ... I think all of this is coming together in a way, around this issue here, where, the Washington State Task Force could not hold a meeting without having almost every single public person that participated, talk about Snake River dam removal. The masses are, I think, getting energized around this, and there is a new sense of ... yesterday was Earth Day, and the protests around the world, on climate change ... I think the desire for this dialogue, and to be a part of it, and not to be just under the government in a way that's not interactive, and not have some sort of sense of autonomy and control over our energy choices, our future, what's going on with the environment. There is an increasing understanding that all of that is impacting us.

Giulia Stefani: How do we get all of those people that now, are starting to wake up to what's going on, moving and talking to each other. I think that what I heard this

morning was encouraging, and what I've heard on this panel is encouraging, is that people are more open minded, and that people are sensing that we are at a moment of transition and a tipping point.

Giulia Stefani: Thanks for everyone for being here, and everyone for being open to the discussion. I too will strive to continue to see other ways forward, and believe that we can find the solution.

Marc Johnson: Chris, with some danger, I'm going to give you the last word.

Chris Wood: My wife would have counseled against that.

Chris Wood: I'm going to do something unpopular, and offer a defense of our politicians, because we do have good politicians in the Pacific Northwest, I mean, Congressman Simpson rolled the big old rock up the hill and delivered the Boulder White Cloud Wilderness bill, without [applause 03:00:39] yeah, he deserves it.

Chris Wood: Without Jim Risch's leadership ... Senator Risch, we don't have nine million acres of Idaho's high quality wilderness areas protected, without the Oregon and the California delegation, we don't get the Klamath agreement, so I do think there are some great leaders.

Chris Wood: I think the lesson in this goes back to something Jason said. The lesson is that, the answer is probably in this room. If we can sit down and do what Roger said, and be willing to ... understand that I'm not an expert in energy, but if Roger's willing to listen to me talk about fish, and I'm willing to listen to Roger talk about energy, we might be able to figure out solutions that can bring these fish back, and that can make sure that we don't leave losers in these communities of place and interest in the process.

Chris Wood: I think if we came up with that answer, it would be very unlikely that our elected leaders in the delegation wouldn't take that and support it.

Marc Johnson: I'm reminded, as I have been so many times today, of Governor Andrus. He often couched his views on conservation, and education, and the future, on the basis of the moral responsibility, the ethical responsibility that our generation has to the next generation. A questioner here prompted me to think about this, saying, "I'm surprised there are," with all due respect, the questioner says, "I'm surprised there are no young people on these panels."

Chris Wood: Now, hold on. When did that happen?

Marc Johnson: In essence, what are we going to say to them about the kind of environment, and rivers, and creatures that we are going to leave to them? I that's, maybe a

fundamental question, worth pondering as we think about the complexity of all of this. We have a responsibility, as the governor knew, to another generation, the generation that will follow us, and the generation beyond that. We have a time frame, we have to deal with that.

Marc Johnson: Join me in thanking the panelists for their insight. Doctor Freemuth has an announcement, I believe.

John Freemuth: I have to move from the nice way Mark ended that, with a good profound thought, to the mundane. There are buffet tables in the back, but I have to divide the room in half. This side of the room go first, so we don't have a mess with everybody trying to get in line at once. When they've gotten their food and come back, then this side of the room can go get their food, so we can be ready then, for the remarks of Congressman Simpson, as our lunch speaker. Go get in line, this side of the room, then this side of the room.

Crowd: [crosstalk 03:03:47] Jason, it was a pleasure ...

Jason: ... great to sit next to you.

Crowd: That was fun. Thanks Pat. [crosstalk 03:04:05] Jason, thanks for coming over, appreciate it.

Jason: Thanks for having me.

Crowd: I live in Manzanita these days, do you know Manzanita? [inaudible 03:04:24]

Crowd: [crosstalk 03:05:48] I'm good, how are you? Gosh, it's nice to see you. [crosstalk 03:06:02]

John Freemuth: Okay folks, you can certainly keep eating, somewhat quietly, but keep eating.

John Freemuth: It's my pleasure to introduce the person who will introduce Congressman Mike Simpson, Rick Johnson is on the board of the Andrus Center. He's the executive director, soon to be emeritus, of the Idaho Conservation League. I've known him since I started at Boise State. We were both young and very opinionated back then. He's now, I think, one of the elder statesmen of collaborative environmental problem solving, and has done a lot for Idaho in all sorts of ways, and of course as you'll see, developed a wonderful relationship with Congressman Simpson. Rick.

Rick Johnson: Thank you very much, it's wonderful to be here. As John said, I'm the executive director of Idaho Conservation League, a job that I've had for 24 years, and I'm also on the board of the Andrus Center. On behalf of the Andrus Center, I just want to thank everybody for being her today.

Rick Johnson: I've been walking in and out of Congressman Mike Simpson's office, his congressional office in D.C., for close to 20 years. For as long as I've known him, over the door, there's a quote by Henry Clay hanging right over the threshold of the door. When he walks out to take a vote, when he walks out to go home, when he walks out to come back to the district, he always walks under this quote, and it says, "Politics is not about ideological purity or moral self righteousness, it's about governing. If a politician cannot compromise, he cannot govern." I think that's a remarkable thing, and this quote, as much as anything, defines the Mike Simpson that I've come to know.

Rick Johnson: Mike Simpson was elected to the Idaho State Legislature in 1984. From 1992 to 1998 he served as speaker of the Idaho House. In 1998, he was elected to the US Congress. Just few months after his election, led by Congressman Simpson, Idaho began a 15 year journey to designate the Boulder White Clouds as wilderness. It was trail initially blazed by Governor Cecil Andrus, first as a candidate in 1970. I walked a little bit of that trail myself, and along the way, I've learned a few things about Mike Simpson. I learned that he painted watercolors, and that he supports the arts and humanities. I learned about his curiosity and spirit of inquiry, and how long he has been a supporter of education. I watched him look at both sides of an issue, and at times when it mattered, he could differ with his colleagues. For instance, just earlier this month, when he voted to reauthorize the Violence Against Women act.

Rick Johnson: My work is conservation, however, and Simpson brings a common sense approach to many conservation issues. These range from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, maintenance backlog of our national parks, funding our federal agencies, and very significantly, he led the years long effort on how our nation pays for wild land firefighting. I've stood with Mike Simpson at a high mountain lake as we watched mountain goats in the White Clouds, and we've stood together in the Oval Office of the White House.

Rick Johnson: You can also be sure that I've been reminded numerous times over the years, that he's a Republican. This is not a state secret, but I'm not. He's a Republican in a conservative district, in a conservative state, and he gets elected and re-elected over and over for a reason. We can disagree, and we have, but we do it through that spirit of that Henry Clay quote, "You can disagree without being disagreeable."

Rick Johnson: In the state of Idaho, if I've learned anything from Mike Simpson over the years, that in this conservative place, conservation most certainly can reflect and complement the conservative values of our state. If you want to make progress in Idaho, it has to.

Rick Johnson: Both Mike Simpson and Cecil Andrus' career reflected caring about getting things done, more than caring who got the credit. Simpson provided a moving eulogy for Cecil Andrus, here in this room. Mike Simpson's work in the White clouds was cheered on the whole way through by Cecil Andrus. I'm very confident that today, as we wrestle with the issues before us, particularly restoration of salmon, maintaining an energy infrastructure, maintaining our communities, rural and urban, and looking towards a future we can be proud of, the great state of Idaho, that Cecil Andrus is still cheering us on and cheering him on.

Rick Johnson: It is my great pleasure to introduce the congressman of the second congressional district, and my friend, Mike Simpson.

LUNCH KEYNOTE

Mike Simpson: Thank you Rick, I don't really deserve that, but if you'd like to keep talking ... I'm going to take off my jacket, 'cause this could get heated ... no, I'm just kidding.

Mike Simpson: It's good to be with you to day, I just wanted to note first, a couple of things. First of all, the speech ... the remarks that I were going to give today, were reduced substantially, because Mark Johnson kept taking my speech and making it questions. He even took my quotes that I was going to use, and used those, so you might say, "Hey, I've heard that before," but then it got longer, because I kept adding on as I learned from these panelists and their remarks and so forth.

Mike Simpson: When I was asked to do this, I looked at the schedule of events and who was going to be on the panels, and I said, "I'd like to be there for all of this," and my chief of staff said, "Really?" I said, "Yeah." So we decided to come and listen to these experts that you have listened to today. They've got great ideas and are worth all of us listening to.

Mike Simpson: For Bear Prairie ... you still here? I want you to know that my father nicknamed me Moose. Fortunately, mine didn't stick. You're right, those nicknames have a tendency, sometimes, to stick around. When I was in dental school, this was back when OJ Simpson was a good guy, everybody called me OJ. Then when I came back, of course nobody knew that, so it wore off, thank God.

Mike Simpson: To the individual who wondered why we don't have any young people on the panel, at least you have young luncheon speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to talk to you about this issue. It's just like Cecil and his daughter to put a very non-controversial subject before us.

Mike Simpson: My goal here today ... my goals, are two things in these remarks. One is, to let you know what brought me to the point that I am at today in this debate, why I'm asking the questions that I'm asking, that are raising some concerns among,

probably many of you and others in the communities ... and why it's making so many people so very nervous.

Mike Simpson: I've had people say, to my chief of staff, not to me, "We don't even like someone of Simpson's seniority asking these questions," and I go, "Really?" If you can't defend what's going on, then why are you afraid of these questions, if you can defend it. If you can't, then these questions need to be asked.

Mike Simpson: We had people call my chief of staff earlier ... late last week, and say, "What's Simpson going to say at this?" And of course my chief of staff said, "I got no idea," ... said, "He doesn't really write a speech out and read it, he kind of writes down remarks and thoughts and things like that, and then whatever's on his mind kind of flows out there," That's why my staff here, is to make sure that I don't say anything too bizarre.

Mike Simpson: My second goal here is not to set anybody's hair on fire. If you have matches or a Bic lighter, please hold it up, they will come around and get it ... because this is, obviously, a very sensitive subject that everybody has a stake in, and everybody has an opinion about.

Mike Simpson: I'm going to start by telling you three stories, and then I will expand on those stories in my remarks. First one starts with, every year we get an update from the BPA, sometimes twice a year, sometimes more often as necessary. Elliot comes out with his staff and talks to us about what's going on and keeps us in congress informed about the BPA, the challenges they face, and so forth. I got a little concerned when I read the remarks of Mr. Elliot ... let me say right now, we're very lucky to have Elliot as the administrator for the BPA, he is doing a fantastic job, sometimes with his hands tied behind his back, but I think he is absolutely doing a fantastic job, and so is his staff.

Mike Simpson: My alarm bells first went off when Elliot spoke at the Northwest Power planning council a year ago. You heard the quote that Mark gave earlier, that was verified by Elliot, so I'm going to say it again. He said he was not in panic mode, but he is in a very significant sense of urgency mode. Then he added, "The risks facing Bonneville are real. I feel that even though we've got ten years left on our power sales contracts, that it is time for action, and I think real action, and that time is now." That got me a little concerned about the BPA and the future of the BPA. We heard this, and then other things that we had looked at, me and my chief of staff, when I say we, it's me and my staff, really.

Mike Simpson: A day later, Lindsey, my chief of staff sat down with me and we kind of went over what Elliot had told us and the things we'd been reading and stuff, and we looked at each other and said, "The BPA is in trouble." I don't think anybody here would deny that they are facing serious challenges. Their ability to borrow

money, 16 billion dollars in debt, I think it's 2023 or something like that, their ability to borrow runs out, and congress has to reauthorize that. I'm telling you, I don't know that congress will reauthorize that. I have seen over my period of time, more and more pressure in congress, to do away with power marketing administrations. Presidents have suggested it, this president suggested doing away with the transmission of ... selling off BPA transmission.

Mike Simpson: Then I had the strange occurrence of someone coming in to me, that is preferential customer, rural electric co-ops, not saying that this is their policy, but I've had a couple of them come into my office and say, "You know what? We think that the BPA ought to be able to sell us power at market rates." Ten years ago, five years ago, you would have never heard that, because the BPA rates were the lowest on the market. Market rates were not going to be lower than BPA rates, but all of a sudden, BPA is not the lowest cost producer in the country ... or in the region, so that creates challenges.

Mike Simpson: I'm sitting here going, "Okay, you want the BPA to sell you power at market rates that are below their cost rates, when they're the lowest, but when cost rates get the lowest you want to be able to buy from BPA." What that will effectively do is drive BPA under the table quicker. But this president suggested in his budget, that we allow the public utilities or the rural electrics and so forth, to buy power at market rate ... or the BPA to be able to sell it at market rates.

Mike Simpson: Why is BPA, the hydropower system, not the lowest cost producer of electricity? When I first heard that, I was kind of stunned. It don't cost a lot of money to let falling water go through a turbine and spin it and create electricity. You don't have a resource out there, whether it's natural gas or coal, or whatever that you're creating and having to burn to create your energy. Hydro power has always been the lowest cost. How can BPA not be the lowest cost energy producer in the country?

Mike Simpson: It's because in 1980, when they rewrote the Bonneville Act and created the Northwest Power Planning and Conservation actually, they added on a whole bunch of requirements that the BPA has to pay for. In fact, the BPA was seen as the piggy bank for every program in the Pacific Northwest. They were also the indemnitor of last resort, which means if no one else will pay, either a judge or an administrative office will have the BPA pay for it.

Mike Simpson: As has been mentioned on these panels about some of the costs, let me go through a few of the costs that the rate payers of BPA pay for, that are not really energy production costs. In 2015, Fish and Wildlife investment was 757 million dollars that year. The rate payers paid for that. We have residential exchange program. That was a good program, and it was meant to spread the benefits of the BPA throughout the region, whether you were a BPA customer or not, you

should get the benefits of this incredible hydro system we have in the Columbia river. If you got your power from an IOU, your rates got reduced a few dollars each month, BPA paid for that. In 2023, the cost of that is estimated to be 286 million dollars. You got to ask yourself, if they're not the low cost energy producer, does the residential exchange rate still make sense? That's a question we're asking.

Mike Simpson: We fund the Northwest Power planning council, and all of their actions. They make a decision and they say, "BPA will pay for it." We fund a significant amount, through the BPA, of the Northwest energy efficiency programs, whether it's weatherization or other types of programs. Then, we do some things that, to me, are kind of silly. We pay Idaho farmers not to farm, so that we can use the water on those farms to flush ... 487 thousand acre feet of it annually, so that we can use that water to flush salmon through dams. We spend 300 million a year for Canada, for flood control of Portland ... probably going to go up when we get this treaty negotiated with Canada, now. We pay wind and solar generators not to produce electricity when there's an oversupply. BPA pays states and tribes for the accords, so that they won't sue the BPA over fish.

Mike Simpson: When you add all these costs on top of what the BPA spends on power ... to create power, they are no longer the lowest cost energy producer in the Pacific Northwest. I've been asking myself, me and my staff, is it time for a Northwest Power Planning act 2.0? Currently the BPA is operating under a regulatory regime set up in the 1980s, that worked well in the 1980s, and I'm not being critical of it, it was a good act that worked at the time ... but it was set up in the 1980s with a regulatory regime designed for the 1980s and the 1990s, and we are now 2020, almost.

Mike Simpson: We need to stop thinking about what currently exists, and ask ourselves, what do we want the Northwest to look like in 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 years? It is difficult for the BPA to sell power contracts out there, at 20 years, if they don't know with certainty, what their costs are going to be. How do you create certainty of the cost for the BPA? I think it's time that we re-look at the Northwest Power Planning Act, and write a new Northwest Power Planning Act. Either we can do it, or it will be done for us. Someone else will write it and impose it upon us, so it's time we start looking at that.

Mike Simpson: Strangely enough, I think the ... challenges, is the word I'll use, I guess ... facing the BPA, also creates the opportunity for us to solve the salmon crisis, because the reality is, you cannot write a new BPA Act ... you cannot write a new Northwest Power Planning Act, without addressing the salmon issue. You can't address the salmon issue without addressing dams, and you cannot address the salmon issue without addressing the challenges that the BPA have; they are

interwoven. Perhaps, this challenging time gives us the opportunity to both address the power challenges that we face, and also the salmon crisis.

Mike Simpson: I went last year ... this is the second story I'm going to tell ... I went last year with some of my staff, up to Marsh Creek, up by Stanley, to watch a salmon come back and create its red and lay its eggs and die. It was the end of a cycle and the beginning of a new one. These are the most incredible creatures, I think, that God's created. It's a cycle that God created, we shouldn't mess with it. When you think of what these salmon go through when they came back ... I say salmon, not salmons, we saw one. One. She swam 900 miles after swimming around in the ocean for five years, after being flushed through dams and out into the ocean. She swam 900 miles to get back to Marsh Creek, increased in elevation about one and a quarter miles, all to lay her eggs for the next generation of salmon.

Mike Simpson: You got to ask yourself, after spending 16 billion dollars on salmon recovery over the last, however many years, is it working? All of Idaho's salmon runs are either threatened or endangered. Look at the number of returning salmon and the trend line is not going up, it's going down. Yeah, we have blips, a few years pass and you can see numbers come back up, then they go down again, but the overall trend is down.

Mike Simpson: The salmon recovery efforts that we've been engaged in so far have probably kept the salmon off the extinction list, but we should not manage just to keep these salmon off the extinction list. We should manage them to bring back healthy, sustainable salmon populations in Idaho.

PART 6 OF 11 ENDS [03:30:04]

Mike Simpson: Does anyone seriously think or believe that when the BiOp comes out in 2020 or 2021 that it will end the controversy over dams, that all sides will put their lawyers and their lobbyists back in their boxes and say, "Okay. That's the end of it?" I don't think so. I think those suits are already being prepared for whatever the BiOp might say. As I said, we can either sit back and watch it happen or we can do something about it. Now, it seems every time people talk about ... I have heard conversations of people that [inaudible 03:30:47] said, "Hey, we talked about are there solutions to this? Can we find compromises?" and so forth, and we had really good conversations going on, but as soon as we got to the question of dams, it was over. Everybody just went their own way. It's not as easy as just taking out dams. I know you asked Brad this morning, or Governor Little, "You in favor of taking out dams or not?" It's a bigger question than that.

Mike Simpson: First, there are an awful lot of contributing factors to the decline in the salmon runs. They need to be addressed, also, beyond just the question of dams. I'm

not trying to belittle the issue of dams and the importance they play in blocking the salmon runs, but you got the ocean, there's not a lot we're going to do about that over a short period of time, but people will stand up and say, "Hey, you can't do anything about salmon runs because it's the ocean conditions." Well, okay. It was the ocean conditions 20 years ago, 40 years ago, 80 years ago, 100 years ago, but yeah, it does play a part.

Mike Simpson: Harvest. Start talking about harvest and there are fishing industries at the mouth of Columbian in Washington and Oregon that don't much like talking about harvest reductions. There are predators. Can we control the predators? Predators are smarter than you think. When you start barging salmon around dams and dumping them in the river, it's like, Smorgasbord, guys." Can we try to control the predators? What about the water quality? We don't have the Columbia River anymore. What we've got is a series of pools, stagnant pools behind dams. How do we restore a river? That's the real question.

Mike Simpson: But the second issue that makes it not so easy about just talking about taking out dams is we have an economy and a culture that's been created around dams on the Columbia and lower Snake River system, whether it's the 3,000 kilowatts of power that the lower Snake River dams create, whether it's the agricultural farmland that's in Washington that's been broken out because of the water that we flush down the [inaudible 03:33:42], whether it's the transportation issue with barging and how does grain get in its cheapest transportation mode down the river, and if you say, "By rail," what do you do with captive shippers when railroad says, "Once you get 100 cars, we'll talk to you, but before that, we don't really want to talk to you?" How do you address that? There's recreation as well as many other things, and you cannot just ignore them.

Mike Simpson: So, what we've been doing in our office over ... for, really, the last two years is asking questions, trying to get stakeholders together, and we've been asking the "What if," questions. If the dams were to come out, how would you address Lewiston? If the dams were to come out, how would you address the barging issue that the grain growers have of getting wheat down the river? If the dams were to come out, how would you address the Washington farms who have concerns that they would have to lower all of their intake valves or intake pipes and everything else to be able to farm? There are an awful lot of questions that need to be asked because you need to address these if you are going to solve this problem. So, that's what we've been looking at in our office. Some people are nervous that we are asking questions. They're questions that have to be asked. It was asked this morning, "Who's going to solve this problem?" The answer was right. It's everyone in this room as well as well beyond this room staying involved.

Mike Simpson: The third story I was going to tell you that kind of set everybody off and thought, "What the hell is Simpson doing?" is I talk every year to the Northwest Waterways Association, which has the bargers and all that kind of stuff. They come back to Washington, have a conference, and most of us, most of the delegation from the Pacific Northwest spend 5 or 10 minutes talking to him. A couple of years ago, I said to then, I said, "I got to tell you in all honesty, I am from the second district in Idaho. I'm getting tired of Idaho paying all the costs of those dams and getting none of the benefits," and they kind of looked at me like was I crazy? Well, all the power that the BP produces, about six percent comes to Idaho. It's very important in Washington and Oregon, but we pay for it by sending 487,000-acre feet of water down the river, which means, yes, the farmers get paid for that ...

Mike Simpson: I can remember a time when if you talked about selling water out of state, you'd have your head handed to you on a platter, but that's essentially what we're doing. But if that money was in Idaho and you were planting crops, it means the communities would be stronger because those farmers would be going to the markets and they would be going to the agricultural dealers and other things like that. Most of all, we're not getting salmon back in Idaho. I said, "Frankly, I'm tired of it." Of course, for the next week, all I heard was, "Has Simpson lost his mind? Has he gone over to the dark side? What's he doing?" all of that kind of stuff. I've come to the conclusion that I'm going to stay alive long enough to see salmon returned in healthy populations in Idaho.

Mike Simpson: I would love ... I don't think I can stay along this live, though, or stay alive this long. I would love to see why they called Red Fish Lake Red Fish Lake. I don't know if we can do that during my lifetime, but we need to do it for our future generations, and that's a hard pull.

Mike Simpson: My fear is we all get together here in this room and we listen to these experts and we all go home and say, "Yeah, that was a good conference," and, "Yeah, there were some interesting ideas there," and everything, but then what we do is try to protect what we've got. How can we bring salmon back to Idaho and save whatever, whatever my interest is? We need to stop thinking that way. We need to say and ask ourselves, "What do we want this to look like in 20, 30, 40 years?" That means making the BPA the low-cost energy producer in the Northwest again and that means making sure that we do whatever is necessary to bring salmon back to Idaho.

Mike Simpson: Now, some people will say, "Why am I, of all people, doing this?" Yeah, I was chairman of the Energy and Water subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee for the last six years and I'm the ranking member now, but I am not an expert on energy production and transmission. I am not an expert on salmon, fish biologist, any of that kind of stuff. I'm like Chris Woods. We're not really

experts in anything, are we, [inaudible 03:39:45]? But I think everyone here would agree that there is a looming problem, and it's approaching quicker than anyone might think. It's kind of like the side-view mirror on your car, objects may be closer than they appear.

Mike Simpson: What I am good at and what my team is good at is solving problems. That means getting people together that have diverse points of view and sitting in a room and talking and reaching a compromise that can solve the problem, and that's what it's going to take. Make no doubt about it, I want salmon back in Idaho in healthy and sustainable populations. Can this be done? I honestly don't know. I don't know if the willpower is there to do it. I don't know if the willpower is in Congress to do it, but I will tell you that I'm hardheaded enough to try. So, thank you all for being here. Thank you. Thank you all very much. I appreciate that. I guess, John, you wanted me to ask question or did I ... I was going to try to run out of time so that there wasn't any questions. Ah, damn. Okay. Let's go for it.

John Freemuth: We've got the question cards, but you probably haven't written the questions yet. If you have, just wave the card around and we'll come pick them up. We already got some. So, bring them up here and I will ... I'll screen them, sir. [crosstalk 03:42:12]-

Mike Simpson: Okay.

John Freemuth: ... set up.

Mike Simpson: Okay. Don't ask me ... When we got into this, when Lindsey and I started talking about this ... If you go into my chief of staff's office now, you'll find that there is ... Three of his four walls are covered with questions. On one of them is a whole satellite picture of the Columbia River and stuff and then it's the da, da, da, da, da, and if you do this, what happens here, and if ... If you remember when President Trump said, about a year ago after the healthcare repeal and replace issue went down ... I was watching him on the news one night and he said, "Whoever knew that healthcare could be so complicated?" We got into this and I'm looking at Lindsey going, "Man, who knew this could be so complicated?" But every time we ask a question, seven more pop up, and that's the challenge we have. It's not just simple. Go ahead.

John Freemuth: Okay. Let me start with something that we did here 15 years ago. We ask a breaching question, and not surprisingly, opposition to breaching was the plurality position, but then Congressmen, we asked those opposed, "If we could craft policies to make those harmed whole, would they support breaching?" and breaching became the plurality position. Now, it's an old survey, but the

question becomes, "Yes, making someone whole." Got some ideas about how we can move in that direction that might change the discourse a little bit?

Mike Simpson: We've got a whole bunch of ideas because as we've been talking to different groups and industries about their interests and how do you make them whole, how do you make Lewiston whole if you're going to take out the $1.6 million budget of the Port of Lewiston and seven or eight employees? I don't know how many there are. But that's important to Lewiston. Can you make Lewiston whole? I think so. We've got some ideas.

Mike Simpson: You got Lewis and Clark State College, you got the triangle with the University of Idaho and Washington State University. Who uses power from the BPA? Well, it turns on the lights and the heat in Seattle and Portland on cold, winter nights. I've actually never heard anybody say it turns on the lights and power [inaudible 03:44:49] or Boise or Idaho Falls or [inaudible 03:44:51], but it does do that in Portland, and guess who's in ... I mean in Seattle, and guess who's in Seattle? Some pretty big companies. Google, Microsoft, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Mike Simpson: Could you create the type of research triangle park that is in South Carolina right now, High-Tech, in the Lewiston area? I don't know, but believe me, we've been having conversations about it. You got the grain growers that are saying, "Hang on. It's the cheapest way to get the grain down there, and if you take the barges out, how do I know that I'm going to have a car to take my grain to Portland if all I'm seeing is Union Pacific Railroad saying, "Well, you get 100 cars, then we'll talk to you, but until then, you're a captive shipper." Could you buy a railroad line that's operated and run by the grain producers? Possible.

Mike Simpson: Some of the things that we've come up with, you might look at and go, "Wow. That's kind of crazy." It is. Some things are, but we're trying to think outside the box of possibilities. How do you replace the 3,000 megawatts of power and how do you do it with clean energy or non-carbon energy? One of the keys was mentioned right here, SMRs. Doesn't have the same problems that large ... that the reactors have being developed in the Idaho National Laboratory. These are, like, 300 megawatt reactors. You plunk them down, they run for a long time, you pick them up and take them.

Mike Simpson: There's some interest in the micro-reactors that they are talking about now. You could make the tri-cities and Hanford and PNNL the center of this stuff. What about battery storage that they're working on? You could make PNNL the leader in battery storage in this country. How much of that 3,000 megawatts do you really need to generate? Because we have excess power that we can no longer sell in California because it's not the low-cost power anymore. So, do you need to produce power you can't sell? Those are all questions that need to be

debated, and believe me, I'm not the master that has all the answers to all those things. Again, I just keep asking questions.

John Freemuth: You don't have to answer this one, but I have to read it. It says, "Simpson for president."

Mike Simpson: Yeah, I'm right on that. No, let me answer that one. Absolutely not.

John Freemuth: On a more serious note, how about ... Would you be willing to hold some town halls throughout your district to discuss with all of us, the public, some solution to salmon sustainability in the development of a program to do those sorts of things?

Mike Simpson: Absolutely. That will be an essential part of anything that's done. I have no legislation that I've written or planned or anything else. We are still in that development mode, and this is a development mode that's going to take a little bit of time, but once you start ... As I said, there are some ideas that we have that are probably crazy, but they need to be flushed out, and some that have real good chances. A lot of things that we can do if we're willing to think outside the box. We need to flush it down to what maybe the possibilities are.

Mike Simpson: I was actually a little nervous about coming and speaking to you today because it was almost a little premature. I wanted to have something more substantial, I guess, of what we might be able to do. But all of you will help develop what it is that we might be able to do. Some of you would look some of our ideas, kinda go, "Yeah, he's crazy all right," but once we get it flushed down so that it makes ... so that we can explain it better than I am explaining it right here, then it's essential that you have town hall meetings, not just in Idaho, but in Washington, Oregon also.

John Freemuth: This question came from a number of people, and I think it's sort of a global question, but it effects what we're talking about today. What should Congress try to do about climate change?

Mike Simpson: Well, because the president dropped out of the Paris Climate Accords, everybody thinks that we're not doing anything about climate change and we don't care about climate change. The reality is is having been chairman of the Energy and Water Committee for the last six years and now the ranking member, I can tell you that we are still investing in those technologies, the renewable technologies, like never before, whether it's EERE or RPE or any of those types of programs that invest in the renewables, whether it's wind, solar, battery technology, or those types of things. We continue to put more and more money into those things, and we will do that, but nobody things we did that because we dropped out of the Paris Climate Accord. That doesn't really effect

how we appropriate money in Congress. We will continue to do what's necessary.

Mike Simpson: Now, admittedly, this administration doesn't like a couple of those programs, and I'm not sure that it's the president as much as it is the budget director or then budget director, Michael Mulvaney, but there's an old saying that the president proposes and Congress disposes. We look at the president's budget and sometimes they have neat ideas in them and a few things like that, but the numbers don't really make ... they don't really follow those because the president has to present a budget that meets the current law, and the current law is sequestration, which would be devastating all across the country.

Mike Simpson: But that's not what the final budget's going to be because, hopefully, the Senate and the House will come to an agreement on what the new budget numbers are, and then we'll go down and do our budget, and those programs that deal with climate change will be sustained within our budget, and I'm sure because they have both Republican and Democratic support if you can believe it. I want you to notice, none of these knuckles are scrapped. I actually do believe in climate change. I do believe it's happening. I don't think we need to do what AOC wants to do. She makes it ... AOC makes it almost impossible for people to talk rationally about climate change, and so ... Even with the Democrats, they're a little nervous about what's going on there. But climate change is a reality. It's not hard to figure out. Go look at your thermometer. So, we're going to do our job.

John Freemuth: We often ask you to help us, but let's turn that around. What can citizens do to help you and others approach this issue, whether it be [inaudible 03:52:34] as you put it earlier, but what can citizens do to get involved in this to help?

Mike Simpson: Educate us from your perspectives. I suspect you all have a different perspective. Come back to Washington if you're back there and come into my ... I shouldn't say my ... into my chief of staff's office and sit down and let him take you through what we've been doing. There are an awful lot of people that go, "Oh, my God. What the heck are you doing?" and then you sit down and as we explain it, they kind of go, "You know, that makes a little sense, but our association won't like it." Well, go educate your association. Things are changing. They're not the same as they were 40 years ago. Let's think about the future. Let's think about who's going to inherit all this and do what we can. As I said, when Rick and I did the [inaudible 03:53:36] so that future generations might stand up and say, "You know what? When it was our time to do our job, we did it." That's all I ask. Okay. One more?

John Freemuth: One more and then a nice closing comment from a member of the audience. Is there a first idea or a first step that you're starting to see getting a little traction

on this, maybe it needs a little more work, but that might be a first step as it were?

Mike Simpson: One of the challenges that I'm going to face sooner rather than later is I'm going to have to sit down with Pacific Northwest Delegation, Republicans and Democrats, and tell them what I'm doing, because I'm sure they've been hearing from some of their associations and that kind of stuff. Obviously, this will not be done without ... I won't say the unanimous support of every single member ... the strong support from the Pacific Northwest, both Republicans and Democrats. Can't be a partisan issue. I haven't done that so far because I haven't had that, "This is what we are going to propose," and, "What do you think about it?" and get that reaction yet, but that will be coming relatively soon, and I know I'm going to have a challenge with a couple of my fellow Republican representatives from Washington because the dams are in their district, and any changes of that, they're going to be very cognizant of and concerned about.

Mike Simpson: McMorris Rodgers had a bill last year that she wanted me to put on the energy and water bill that essentially said, "Dam removal can never be considered." I said, "I can't do that because I'm not sure that it won't be the option at some point in time." I'm not the one advocating that, but I don't know what's going to happen next year, 10 years, 5 years, 10 years down the road. But I've started to see a division within the Pacific Northwest Delegation. It used to be that we were all very, "You do something with the BPA," we were all supportive of the BPA, Republicans and Democrats, and I'm starting to see some division within the Pacific Northwest Delegation, and maybe I'm causing some of it because I asked the question, "You guys get all the benefits. We pay all the costs. What the hell's going on?" They don't want to address that.

Mike Simpson: There was just recently a letter. The president proposed speeding up the BiOp to September of 2020. I think it's supposed to be done in 2021 or something like that. A letter was sent to the Division of Environmental Quality with about 20 signatures, all Democrats. Didn't even ask for any Republican signatures. That's challenge. We got to keep our delegation from the Pacific Northwest together to the best ... to the extent we can. So, that's going to be a challenge. That's what we're going to be working on over the next few months.

Mike Simpson: One of the other challenges for us is I don't think we got forever. These are, as I said, incredible animals, but they can't continue the decline that they're on forever. I actually asked the question, "Should we just write them off and say they're gone? Quit spending $757 million every year on them. If that's what we're going to do and all we're doing is watch them slowly decline into extinction, why spend the 750? Why not just let them go and say, 'Okay. It's over?'" That would be highly and totally irresponsible on our parts. Some people

have [inaudible 03:57:55] me and said, "Maybe you're right." No, I'm not. This is one of the more challenging issues that I've come up across, but is it not unsolvable if good people get together and say, "We're going to save this animal from extinction."

John Freemuth: Let's close with this. It's a comment from one of you that, "My 16-year-old son wanted to be here, but was worried he was going to miss school. On his behalf, thank you for what you have said. You are good at solving problems."

Mike Simpson: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you all very much. I appreciate it.

Mike Simpson: [crosstalk 03:59:06]

PART 7 OF 11 ENDS [04:05:04]

John Freemuth: Okay. About one minute. Back in the room.

Speaker 15: So, where are you? Here?

Speaker 16: [inaudible 04:22:39].

Speaker 15: Oh, you are? Oh, okay. [crosstalk 04:22:41]-

AGRICULTURE AND COMMUNITIES PANEL ONE

John Freemuth: Okay. If you've looked at your agenda, we have two afternoon panels that represent very important points of view on this issue and we have someone that will be moderating these two panels. Her name is Amanda Peacher. She is here with Public Radio at Boise State. She came to us from Oregon, where she did public radio, and some of you might remember, a couple of years ago, we did an Andrus conference on public lands, Governor Bullock was one of the keynoters, but Amanda opened the day with a marvelous set of interviews and story about the occupation of the Malheur reservation that was just fascinating and set the stage. So, it's my pleasure to introduce our afternoon moderator, Amanda Peacher.

Amanda Peacher: Thank you, John, and thank you to all of you for being such an engaged and lively audience already. I want to welcome and thank our distinguished set of panelists we have before us here. I'll briefly introduce them. To my right, we'll be hearing from McCoy Oatman, vice chair of the Nez Perce Tribe. We'll also be hearing from Sam White, chief operating officer of the Pacific Northwest Co-Op Green Division. Sitting next to Sam is Steve Howser, president of the Idaho Water Users Association. We also have Jeff Gordon of Gordon Wines from Pasco, Washington, and Same Mace, who is the Inland Northwest director of Save Our Wild Salmon. Please join me in thanking and welcoming our panelists.

Amanda Peacher: So, I am thrilled to be able to moderate this afternoon discussion because not only do we have a fascinating set of people before us to hear from today, we also get to respond to Congressman Simpson's remarks, which ... Wow. I had Mark Johnson sitting right next to me and he whispered, "That's the most important political speech of any Idaho politician for 15 years." So, what I want to do here today is react and follow on that speech and what we've heard from this morning and tread some new territory. We know that at the heart of this issue, this is a long and evolved issue that's been playing out in our region for the past 30, 40 years, but at the heart of it has always been communities, and I mean that in a geographic sense. We're talking about Lewiston, we're talking about the Puget Sound communities, but there are also agricultural communities, fishing communities, what we might call economic and cultural communities that have stakes in energy and salmon and water in the Columbian, Snake River basins.

Amanda Peacher: Now, there's no way that we could possibly hear from all of the communities involved today. We'd be here till June if that was the case. So, what we've tried to do in these afternoon panels is have a select group from Eastern Washington and Northern Idaho and Central Idaho because that's where we're rooted here, that's where we're located, talk with us about what's at stake, share their perspectives, and to go a little deeper, to delve into those "What if," questions that Congressman Simpson brought up, and maybe talk a little bit more about reaching a compromise that can solve a problem. So, that's what I'd like to do today.

Amanda Peacher: As a reminder, we welcome your questions. Those will come about a little bit later in our program, but for each panel, you have your little white sheets on your table. When you're thinking about your questions, I'd encourage you to ask questions that do help us move the dialogue forward. We're not here to rehash the numbers, we're not here to argue about whether or not salmon are in trouble ... there are some facts in this issue ... but we want to talk about what are the next steps and what do we as a community need to do to be ready to even start a new dialogue about this.

Amanda Peacher: So, with that, I'm going to give a little bit more of an introduction for each panelist as we move forward. So, first off, McCoy Oatman is the vice chairman of the Nez Perce Tribe's executive committee on the Nez Perce Reservation in Lapwai. The Nez Perce has a relationship with salmon in rivers that extends for thousands of years, which is why I wanted to start with McCoy. McCoy, you're the seventh generation descendant of one of the Nez Perce leaders who signed the original treaty guaranteeing the rights the ... guaranteeing the tribes the right to fish in usual and accustomed places. So, can you talk to us about what the stakes are for the Nez Perce and do you agree with Congressman Simpson that it's time to seek a regional solution here?

McCoy Oatman: [foreign language 04:28:01], everyone. My name is McCoy Oatman. As stated, I serve as the vice chair and been on the council for about 11 years now. I'm in my fourth term. When I first decided to run for council, I used to run out community center, and at the time, we had Snake River Basin Adjudication had just been settled in 2008 and lot of angst about that and my mother was complaining to me about things that are going on in tribal government because, like all governments, there's not agreement amongst the members. So, I told her, "I'll run, and I can do just as good a job as anybody else." I don't have a degree. I'm not a biologist. I'm not a scientist. I just think of myself as, "I'm an Indian. I'm a Nez Perce Indian," and that provides me an education in and of itself.

McCoy Oatman: But as been stated, I am a seventh generation of Old Chief Looking Glass, and Old Chief Looking Glass often gets confused with his son Young Chief Looking Glass who was in the war of 1877. I'm actually a descendant of Young Chief Looking Glass's brother [inaudible 04:29:22]. So, what I wanted to talk about was some of what Simpson had talked about. He talked about who's going to inherit what we leave behind, and for me, I have three daughters, three young daughter, six, four, and two, and so to be blunt, I am scared. I am scared for their future. I am scared for the generations that will come after them and the one that'll come after them. I have to think ... My mindset has to be like my ancestors. I have to think just seven generations ahead.

McCoy Oatman: So, when Old Chief Looking Glass rode back from Buffalo Country and rode to Walla Walla with his warriors and came and tore that agreement up and said he didn't agree with that treaty, and he was one of the principle negotiators, and the foresight and the knowledge that he had to craft that treaty in a way that it still holds today ... I think about every word, and the treaty has been litigated in the courts and is still being litigated today. You got the Cougar Den, you got the Washington decision, and so these things are still going on. We're still fighting for our way of life.

McCoy Oatman: When the war broke out, my family lived on a salmon river in between the twin bridges around Skookumchuck. There's a little creek called Sleepy Creek. Well, my great-grandfather was born on that creek. My great, great-grandmother, when the war broke out, she had a garden. She had to leave her garden, she had to join the White Bird Band, and as the story goes, she made it all the way up into Canada and survived and then came back home, and that's a lot like what the salmon go through, all the obstacles that they have to go through. Well, all the things that she had to go through just to make it home, and I think that that's what we're always trying to strive to get back to as Nez Perce people or like the salmon. We're always trying to get home.

McCoy Oatman: We're always trying to get back to how things used to be when he had millions of fish up and down our streams, when we had people, Nez Perce villages on every stream running in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, Buffalo Country. We all lived in all these areas when there was hundreds of thousands of Nez Perces. In a way, it's kind of sad to report there's only 3,500 of us left in this world. You think about ... In and of ourselves, we could be classified as an endangered species. But my goal and my job and my position as being a father and as being a leader of my tribe is to look out for those future generations to help set the stage so that what they inherit is going to be better than what I inherited.

McCoy Oatman: So, the Nez Perce, we're a very peaceful people, but we will fight for our way of life and what we need. A lot of times, we have to go to court, we have to litigate for decisions to ensure that our wildlife and our fish and other things are protected. A lot of times, people may think we're out here trying to create enemies or look for enemies. Well, in all reality, we're not. We're always looking for allies. Those that'll stand by us and help us fight this fight. Following Congressman Simpson, I thought, "Well, that's a tough act to follow." As one person stated, you could hear a pen drop. I think everybody's pretty captivated by what he had to say, and I think rightfully so because there is ... Somebody said, "Well, how much time do we have left?"

McCoy Oatman: Well, we're past the eleventh hour. We, as tribal people, know that. We feel it every day. We feel climate change. We feel the plants coming back late, the fish coming back late, and just all the struggles that we have to go through as tribal people in order to maintain our regular diet. If you're not aware, not only Nez Perce, but other tribal people have high cancer rate, high rate of diabetes, and the reason why is that we're not able to, on a daily basis, eat our traditional diet. A lot of times, we have to eat processed foods, and our bodies are not geared to process that.

McCoy Oatman: My stepfather just recently was taken off of Metformin, his diabetic pills, because he went back to a traditional diet and his doctor told him, "If you cut out the sugar and you cut out the carbs, you won't have to take the medication," and so he's been without his medication for about seven months now and he's doing really good, but it just goes back to that ... We just want to be able to live as Nez Perce people. In my eyes, that's not a huge request, but I know it's a complex problem and there's a lot of players, there's a lot of players in this room.

McCoy Oatman: When I looked at the list of names that were on there, the question popped in my head, "That's very interesting panels. Well, why is everybody agreeing to come here to talk about this?" It's an important enough issue for the Pacific Northwest, but it's an even more important question for all of us here in this

room, and I think Simpson presented that challenge to everybody. What can we do? We all have to sit down and we all have to talk.

McCoy Oatman: The tribe has shown that we've been able to do that with the recent spill agreement. We haven't gotten along with the BPA, but we sat down, we hammered that out. It wasn't easy. There were some compromises, but we thought, "It's best ..." that's was what was best for the fish. I had seen some of our members from the [inaudible 04:35:45] Irrigation District. We set aside litigation and worked with them as well to find a different water source so that we could protect the Sweetwater Lapwai Creek so that the steelhead and the other ... the salmon can have cold water instead of that water going to water people's lawn. It'll go to ensuring that we have fish in our waterways.

McCoy Oatman: So, I just wanted to share that with you guys to let you know that we're more than willing to stand with you guys. We're more than willing to have the difficult discussions that need to happen, but we're also willing to be generators of those ideas. Look to us as tribal people. We've been here for tens of thousands of years. Who better to know the landscape, to know the waterways? Because we're out there on the water all times of the year fishing and ... If the fish were ever to go extinct, that's the thing that's always in the back of mind that scares me to death, then what happens to us as Nez Perce people, because we've always coexisted with the fish.

McCoy Oatman: Like Jamie said, talked about the story about the salmon, saying that we will give our lives for these humans that are coming. Well, the other part of that agreement ... It was a two-part agreement. It was us as tribal people, as Nez Perce people, saying that we will speak for you, the salmon. We will speak on your behalf because you cannot speak for yourself, and I think that's a large part why we're here. We're speaking for the salmon and, in a way, we're speaking for ourselves so that we can keep this resource and that we can keep the waters clean for them as well, and I hope that all of you are in that type of mindset as well. Thank you.

Amanda Peacher: Thank you, McCoy. So, next, we'll hear from Sam White, chief operating officer at the Pacific Northwest Farmers Cooperative. Sam, your cooperative call itself a family of farmers. You help agricultural interests and farmers move commodities into the marketplace, and that means using barges down the Lower Snake River, and it also means using rail and truck options. So, talk to us about your family of farmers' stake today, and I'm really curious to hear your reaction to what Congressman Simpson said in thinking about that "What if?"

Sam White: All right. Thank you, Amanda. Got maybe a couple quick housekeeping things I'd like to take care of first. Would also like to thank Rocky Barker, and especially, the Andrus Foundation for the invite here today. It's an honor for me and a

great crowd and I'm excited to be up here, voice my opinion, and hopefully that's something that we can sit down and visit with. Also, this morning, Governor Little took my breadth away when he said he agreed with breaching. I was happy when he said, "Didn't finish it with dams," because that one scared me. As was mentioned before, I'm going to apologize right now. I'm not making the panel any younger, so you can get somebody ... I'll send somebody younger next chair if they invited.

Sam White: I don't feel that I'm an expert. I know that term was used a little bit. I've been in this business and been raised on a farm. That's all I know. In the grain business my entire career. So, I'm not an expert, but I know about grain, I know about how grain moves. Maybe to answer Amanda's question about how our PNW family of farmers would feel regarding some of Congressman Simpson's remarks, we call ourselves a family of farmers because it's a small, close-knit group. We have facilities that run from Lewiston, Idaho, to Spokane, Washington, the heart of the Palouse. It's a great place to have been raised, great place to raise a family, but we're not the only ones there. There's other in ...

PART 8 OF 11 ENDS [04:40:04]

Sam White: We're not the only ones there. There's other in Lewiston alone you've got Union Town Cooperative, another small cooperative, Primeland Cooperatives, Columbia Grain International. So, there's that just in Lewiston you've got four different companies there, and if you look up and down the river I believe there's 27 barge loading facilities between Lewiston and Portland.

Sam White: Being able to maybe buy a train, have our own train, I think that's exciting idea. We have a rail loading facility that is farther north up by Rosalia, Washington just about 30 miles south of Spokane. So, we know how to operate a train, but if there was dam breaching was on the table and we could have one there. That's what it would take, but it would fix our problem. It wouldn't fix the rest of them down the river.

Sam White: Then the second question becomes is there enough trackage to get those trains up and down the river? If you drive down from Umatilla to Portland there's tracks on both side UP-BP. Some places there's double track, but not the whole way and it's tight. I don't know where they put it. It would be terrible expensive. But the idea is a great idea. I'm sure there's other ideas out there. It would get us to come to the table. We have a huge investment not only in Lewiston, Idaho, two other facilities farther down the river. Port of Almota and the Port of Central Ferry we have facilities there as well.

Sam White: So, it's a huge investment, but our growers, that family of farmers would look at something had we been made coal, but I don't think just one train is going to do that. And you add too many more and I see problems with getting that product to and from market. 90% of the grain in Northern Idaho, Eastern Washington, and Oregon goes to feed the world of Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Philippines, Southeast Asia. We have a very specific product of soft white wheat that they love. But we also have competitors. Canada. Australia. Our farmers aren't market setters they're market takers. So, they can't just say, "Well, it's going to cost me another $2.50 a bushel to get it to the marketplace. I'm going to just raise the prices. Our customers will go elsewhere." And they can.

Sam White: So, it's something that I'm glad to be here today and be able to talk about new ideas, but let's be cautious about making rash decisions. Thank you.

Amanda Peacher: And Sam, one of the challenges as I understand it with rail or truck right now is that you have so little control over pricing with rail and truck, right? So, is part of the appeal of what Congressman Simpson said about owning a rail train or an entire cooperative. We don't know exactly what that would look like. That you might have some more sense of control there?

Sam White: Yeah, but it's such a different concept that I don't know how those costs would be because you wouldn't, I don't think he's going to build rail lines. You would think that you'd want to use as much of the existing track that is owned by the BN or the UP to cut down on the cost. So, they're going to charge you to run on them. Truck, it's a known cost whether it's 15 miles or 30 miles or 70 miles, you know what that cost is going to be. You work it into your deal. The problem is if you were to truck it from Lewiston, Idaho to, if we took the Lower Snake River dams out. You take that economical freight of a barge that holds approximately 535 trucks for every four barge tow, and if you took that out that is clean transportation, that puts 535 trucks on the road to Pasco, Washington just for one four barge tow. That's 400 some odd thousand bushels and there's probably 30 million bushels going out of the port of Lewiston.

Amanda Peacher: Thank you for your candor specifically addressing that. Let's next hear from Steve Howser President of the Idaho Water User's Association, which represents Idaho farmers and a diverse set of irrigators across the state. So, Steve you were heavily involved in the Nez Perce water judication process that went on for more than a decade. So, talk to us about the stakes for Idaho water users here, and again I'd like to ask you to specifically address what Congressman Simpson said here.

Steve Howser: Is this on?

Amanda Peacher: You might have to turn that on, yeah. Okay.

Steve Howser: I think it's on. Great. First I'd like to make one small correction, Amanda.

Speaker 17: It's not on.

Speaker 18: It's not on.

Amanda Peacher: You've got to turn your mic on there, Steve, yeah.

Steve Howser: It's not on? Well, I'll have to put my glasses on to do this. It says that it's on. Okay, how about that?

Amanda Peacher: Good.

Steve Howser: You mentioned Washington, Oregon, and Western and Central Idaho, and even though I'm president of the Idaho Water User's Association I'm also general manager of Aberdeen-Springfield Canal Company. And we're one of the largest storage space holders in the Upper Snake River reservoirs. So, Eastern Idaho needs to be included as someone that's involved here too.

Amanda Peacher: Absolutely.

Steve Howser: During the Nez Perce negotiations we believed that we as water users really stepped up to the plate, and it came to a long hard decision to provide water on a willing buyer willing seller basis to the Bureau of Reclamation to enable flow augmentation to occur on the Lower Snake and through the Columbia. That water that we provide for flow augmentation, and I know folks tell me all the time, "You guys get paid for that." Sending that water downstream for us is a huge risk and we can't grow our crops with dollars. We need the water to grow those crops. And now we hear that flow augmentation isn't working, and we signed a 30 year agreement to provide that water.

Steve Howser: It does come at considerable risk for those of us in the Upper Snake, and I think what we're worried about is, from the standpoint of dam removal, is that there's no guarantee that dam removal is going to remove the requirement for additional flows from the Upper Snake. And I think it frightens us a little bit also when we start hearing conversations about temperature and we're at the top of the river and that's where the water's cold and it bothers us, I think, that we maybe look to yet again to solve the problem. And mind you, we don't have salmon, right? We have Shoshone Falls between us and the ocean, and the salmon have a real tough time with that 130 foot waterfall there.

Steve Howser: So, we don't have salmon up there, and we really feel that we're providing this benefit, as Congressman Simpson said, we're taking this risk and we're not really seeing a benefit to us. Now, we're not complaining about that, but we are worried that there's going to be additional demands upon our water supply.

There's so much to unpack from today. I've heard several folks talk about Klamath as being a success story. Well, you should talk to the people that farm those 40,000 acres on the Klamath that went dry for a year. 20,000 acres of that were orchards which are never coming back. Those folks might have a different opinion on whether or not what happened on the Klamath was a success. Now, maybe they've achieved some degree of recompense and success there now, but one of the reasons that we are glad that we got ahead of the ball and negotiated a settlement with the Nez Perce, which eventually became the Snake River Water Act so that we weren't in that same position where we suddenly saw our reservoirs drained to take care of a fish that isn't even in our river system.

Steve Howser: That being said, Idaho Water Users represents agriculture, municipal, and industrial water users throughout the state of Idaho and I think that probably our biggest concerns with the idea of dam removal is certainly transportation for grain out of the Port of Lewiston, and the power it produces. Congressman Simpson made the point that only 6% of the power produced by those dams is used in Idaho, but most of that power is used by Bureau of Reclamation Irrigation facilities in South and Central Idaho. Things like A&B Irrigation District, Minidoka Irrigation District, those folks would be out of business if they saw a substantial increase in their power costs because they're pumping water.

Steve Howser: I think that in general if those folks could be made whole then that might ameliorate some of our opposition to dam breaching, but we depend on those dams even though we ship through them. And I think it's important to remember a couple of things. One is we're growing food with our water, right? And a very large part of the economy of not just Idaho, but of the entire Pacific Northwest, and I think that we are often being asked to decrease our production in order to increase the production of another commodity and that's salmon.

Steve Howser: One of the things that I think that I like to point out most often to folks is that this is the endangered species that we get to eat. And when you think about it that doesn't make a lot of sense. With exempting tribal and even first nations in Canada harvest of these fish, last year the US commercial fishery off of the Pacific Northwest Coast took just about a half a million metric tons of Pacific Salmon. And I've heard that they estimate that in the past 50% of their salmon catch was Snake River salmon, and now it's about 5% of their catch is Snake River salmon.

Steve Howser: I think we'd like to see them have a successful industry. We'd like to see the folks in Central Idaho have a successful industry. And we'd certainly like to satisfy the cultural and ceremonial needs and just the living needs of the tribal folks Nez Perce and the Sho-Bans and the other folks that we deal with on a

regular basis. But we'd like to see the rest of you pony up. If we could take the money that the NGOs have spend on attorneys, just attorneys , right? Forget the 16 billion dollars that we had rate payers spend on fish sliders and mitigation, right? If we could just take the money the folks spend on attorneys and turn that into research and hatcheries. We've hardly built any hatcheries at all and we keep making this weird distinction between hatchery fish and wild fish, and I guess I should preface this.

Steve Howser: I spent a few years as a fisheries biologist for the Idaho Department of Water Resources. I'm sorry for the Idaho Department of Fish and Game. I've been 22 years in this job, Department of Water Resources sticks in my head. I did my dissertation work in Yellowstone National Park. And I've been a habitat ecologist, and statistician. But 22 years ago I took a job as a water master and a canal manager, and I think one of the things that we don't see often enough is practical answers. We see a lot of science, right? A lot of graduate students have got their education by studying what's wrong with the system, right?

Steve Howser: Our academics society here in the United States, outside of engineering, doesn't really look at practical applications, right? What do we do to fix the problem? And it seems like a huge hammer is not the answer. And a huge hammer being remove the dams. So, I could go on and on. I'll stop at that.

Amanda Peacher: Well, you covered a lot of territory there. We'll get into more of what you brought up, but I want to give our other panelists a chance to share their perspectives as well. Next we'll hear from Jeff Gordon. Jeff is a pioneer in the Eastern Washington wine industry. His family turned what was just a sagebrush hillside along the Snake River into one of Washington's longest running wine estates. Now, that industry is a staple for the region's economy. So, Jeff, I'd love for you to talk about what's at stake for Gordon Wines in this whole discussion and also react to Congressman Simpson's proposal of envisioning a what if.

Jeff Gordon: You know what they call 50,000 lawyers at the bottom of the ocean? A good start. And then I got one more. Do you know what the best Western water adage is? Water law adage? Whiskey's for drinking. Water's for fighting. So, and there's a lot of truth to that, because I used to spend time with my brothers down in Colorado and they would get up every spring and they would talk to the guys in Arizona and tell them how much water they were going to have. And they weren't real happy about it, but I think you can identify with that.

Jeff Gordon: We're five miles upstream from Ice Harbor Dam right on the river. We started planting wine grapes 38 years ago and this is our 35th year of selling wine. So, when we started there were 19 wineries. Now there's 1,000 wineries in Washington. And there was about 4,000 acres of wine grapes. Now there's 55 or 60,000.

Jeff Gordon: So, I've been involved in this salmon issue since the beginning, because ... They built Ice Harbor Dam in 1962 is when it opened. And that year when they could count the fish they counted about 35,000 for the year. And then in 1995 or right there abouts there were less than 5,000 for the whole year. So, things were not good and the Endangered Species Act was implemented and I spent a lot of sleepless nights going, "There goes my water. There goes my farm. There goes my livelihood."

Jeff Gordon: But there was the ... Our governor at the time, Gary Locke, he says, "Look, we're going to use sound science. We're not going to go off half cocked on anything. We're going to use sound science to get through this problem." And so we went from less than 5,000 fish and implemented over a period of years different operations in the main stem and also habitat, well everybody in here knows the habitat restoration has been going on, and that figure has climbed considerably. In the last two or three years it hasn't been very good. But before that we were up at 150,000 fish for the year so I'm not saying that's the ultimate goal, but I think it shows that there was some major restoration and major modifications to the operation.

Jeff Gordon: Is anybody from the corps of engineers in here? Hi guys. We have made some mistakes. I was the guy that asked the question this morning. Just recently the state of Washington Fish and Game Commission and Oregon allowed putting commercial gill nets from the mouth of the Columbia River up to Bonneville. A couple of weeks ago they says, "Okay, you sports fishermen. There's going to be no fishing for the spring and summer. We're just not going to allow it, because the number of fish aren't coming back." And what that tells me is that there isn't a coordinated effort and I think that that's one of the things that we're really missing.

Jeff Gordon: I think there's a lot of really good pieces out there, but it needs to be coordinated. Last two or three years we've been really down in numbers. A lot of that is in 2015 weather indications dictated that we should barge more fish and we actually barged less fish. And we should have done more and it should have been, again, a coordinated effort and done for the right reason and that's for the fish.

Jeff Gordon: So, I think that ... Oh, and there's one other thing that I really don't understand is that the fish the salmon spend three to five years in the ocean. That has not been designated critical habitat and most of its life it's in the ocean and it's not critical habitat. I don't understand that at all.

Amanda Peacher: Jeff, I just want to jump in here real quick, because I think we could get into a lot of discussions about ocean and salmon recovery and looking at some things that have gone well or have not. But I think we would really like to hear from you

specifically what are the stakes for your business and your industry as we're looking toward the way forward for salmon, energy, and agriculture.

Jeff Gordon: Well, if they breach the dams I'm gone.

Amanda Peacher: Are you saying specifically because you pump water from Ice Harbor Reservoir? Is that? I'm understanding correctly?

Jeff Gordon: We have a well and the water depth is within an inch of the river. I told the well driller when he was drilling that if he was any good he'd hit the middle of the river and he came pretty close, I think. So, but, yeah that's basically there is no plan to breach the dam and then I don't see how we could-

Amanda Peacher: So, you're saying there's no other way you could get your water if those dams are gone?

Jeff Gordon: I haven't seen anybody come up with a plan of how I was going to be able to do that.

Amanda Peacher: Okay.

Jeff Gordon: Nobody has offered anything.

Amanda Peacher: Okay. Well, is there anything else you wanted to bring up in terms of looking at your industry and you as a wine grower what you think is important as we're discussing how do we move forward? How do we have all of these things, salmon and a different energy future? What do we need to be thinking about?

Jeff Gordon: What I think is I think that the answers are there. I think that we have to have a very coordinated solution and everybody needs to work together. Nobody has to lose anything here. We need to do. We need to make sure that the plan that we have in place takes into consideration all elements and it's well coordinated.

Amanda Peacher: Okay. Thank you. Let's hear next from the second Same on our panel. Same Mace has worked for the Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition from Spokane for a number of years. So, Same your organization has taken the position that dam removal and restoration of the Lower Snake River is the way to bring back salmon for, gosh, 20 years now? So, talk to us about that organizational mantra, I guess. And also react to what you heard about Congressman Simpson calling for a new way forward.

Sam Mace: Yeah, and thanks so much to the [inaudible 05:02:48] Center for this opportunity. This has been a really interesting day and some interesting conversations. Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition was formed back in '91 when the listings had happened. And it came from a need, a recognition that we had a

crisis on our hands then and that lots of folks weren't working in a coordinated fashion like Mr. Gordon just mentioned is how we get ahead on things. And all the different many different user groups and interest came together as part of our coalition. It was the conservation groups. It was the commercial fishermen which included the trollers and the gill netters. It was the sport fishing groups in Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska, and it was the conservation groups. And it was groups and businesses and a collection that came together realizing that they had been fighting over some scraps and differed on opinion on some issues, right? But what we needed to do was focus on the elephant in the room that was responsible for 70% of the salmon mortality and that was the hydro system.

Sam Mace: And for a number of years the coalition did work and research and support other measures. We weren't supporting dam removal. We were looking at draw downs. We were looking at better techno fixes at the dams. All those kinds of measures to see whether that could get us on the trajectory of recovery. Clearly it didn't or we wouldn't be here in this room today.

Sam Mace: It was after seeing the continued decline of the runs and seeing what the fishery scientists were telling us and also what some economics economists were telling us that 1997 our coalition came together. Had a very robust discussion and endorsed removal of the four lowest Snake River Dams.

Sam Mace: It's not the only thing that we needed to do for salmon, but it had to be the cornerstone for an effective program to bring us back healthy, harvestable, sustainable numbers of fish that would provide for sport fishing families and mom and pop shops and riggings. That would provide for the rivers and species that depend on those fish. That yes, would provide for the commercial fishing communities. One of which I'm from one of the commercial fishing towns on the coast.

Sam Mace: And would also allow us to meet out treaty obligations with the tribes which we have not been meeting. And that's when we started focusing on dam removal. And I think one thing that, I've been working on this issue now for 20 years. I am now one of those two old people up here on this. You need younger people up here on his panel. Back during the first DIS process that went on when these issues were being discussed and dam removal was being discussed. And there's lots of people in this room who were involved in that in that effort.

Sam Mace: It did not get us to recovery. And I think one of the things that we came away from that process is our coalition is that we had not been doing a good enough job reaching across to the other stake holders and interests. The opposition quote unquote and starting to have some conversations. And perhaps and learning more about what their concerns were and their interests and educating

ourselves more. But also then telling our story. Sharing our stories of what our commercial fishing towns were going through. What the sport fishing businesses and folks who rely on salmon were going through to see if we could have some a little more mutual understanding if not agreement.

Sam Mace: And in 2008 we did a bunch of. In 2007 started doing a lot of kitchen table conversations around Eastern Washington and Northern Idaho. Sitting down and talking with growers and others just to learn more. And I think what came out of that we didn't come to an agreement, but what did come out of that was an understanding, a little more of an understanding of farmers some farmers going, "Oh, wow. I had no idea that the commercial fishermen were in that sort of situation or that your communities were going through that."

Sam Mace: And then folks like me learned to not say, "Oh, it's just going to be X percentage of bushel if those dams come out." And me learning it was a lot more complicated than that. And also learning about all the great things that growers and farmers and others are doing on behalf of salmon. And so what I was so encouraged by Congressman Simpson's remarks here today is him kind of allowing us and giving a platform to have those sort of conversations in a more substantive way that may get us to a solution here.

Sam Mace: Back in 2008 we couldn't get democrats or republicans to really listen or acknowledge that any kind of conversations were going on. If fact, two very brave individual wheat growers and two commercial fishermen went back to DC to meet with congressional offices and we weren't able to even get meetings with members of congress, you know?

Sam Mace: And I thought, "Wow, that's pretty impressive even if we just have two farmers and two fishermen going back." But I see a shift happening and I think Congressman Simpson's comments reflected that. That we are at such a crisis now. There's lots of things at stake, and we need to come together and have our leadership and our electeds help lead that conversation.

Sam Mace: The other thing that is encouraging too is that we have sort of a similar process being proposed on the other side of the state in Eastern Washington, in Washington state where I live. Where because of the orca crisis we now have going on that's captured the attention not just of people in Washington state, but the world frankly. We're down to 75 animals at functional extinction for our orcas. Which prompted the governor, our governor Inslee to convene an orca task force to look at how what can we do to bring these orca back and get them in part a big piece of that is getting them the food they need.

Sam Mace: And so, a couple of his recommendations among many were one to support spill, which is something that has been talked about already. And the second

thing was to initiate a stakeholder process to bring Washingtonians together to talk about study it. What would dam removal mean for our region? What would it mean for Eastern Washington? And ask those and have those what if conversations that Congressman Simpson was talked about in his keynote. And we're really encouraged about that, and we're not seeing it as a rehash of what that EIS process that's going on. Which Congressman Simpson I think a lot of us in this room haven't had a ton of faith in. This is to have that what if? If those dams come out what? Do you buy a rail line? What are the options? If those dams come out what are the ways to make sure that Mr. Gordon can keep making his amazing wine. Which I highly recommend.

Sam Mace: And that Mr. White in P&W can keep growing those amazing lentils so that I get in my grocery store in Spokane. So, what I'm hoping to come out of this perhaps in these conversations is a these sort of what if conversations happening in Washington. And those what if conversations happening in Idaho and then bringing in those other affected states so that we can get to a shared solution here. And these fish that come into Idaho here. You guys really stand to lose a lot if you lose those salmon, right? But this basin of salmon and whether we get them back to healthy harvestable numbers it affects Astoria. It affects the communities there. It affects communities clear up into Alaska. They need to be part of the conversation, and it affects communities down on the Oregon coast where I grew up.

Sam Mace: So, I'm feeling encouraged and I do want to say that our coalition our fishermen and our sport fishing folks who have suffered. We've lost thousands and thousands of jobs. They do not want a solution that is created on the backs of any of the folks here sitting at up here with me. That's not the way that you get progress and it's just not right. Thanks.

Amanda Peacher: I would follow on that, Same, by asking you specifically. We've heard this idea of keeping everybody whole, but how do you think you and the conservation community can make that promise. Are you committed to saying, "No, the dams can't be breached until everybody is made whole." Will you make that promise?

Sam Mace: Well, we actually passed a resolution back in 2008 that came from our year spent talking around kitchen tables in Colfax, and in Genesee and in Ritzville, and elsewhere. And I wish I had, I should have brought it with me, and it did not ... What the resolution was not that we will ... We're not going to wait until the last salmon is swimming upstream. But we did commit to working towards a solution that made sure the other stakeholders that we had been meeting with and that were my neighbors that their needs were met. And that those investments happened.

Sam Mace: So, we are very committed to that. I think another thing that we started working on is finding ways that we could come together and work on things that weren't dam removal, but that helped each other out. And one example was after we had a transportation forum that was hosted at WSU with about 80 port folks and shippers and rail folks and others. One thing that came out of that was at that time it was Whitman County Growers and Genesee grain growers were looking for short rail funding in the legislature. And Save Our Wild Salmon and American Rivers signed a letter with Genesee and Whitman County Growers and a few individual growers and sent it to the legislature. And also to our conservation partners working in Olympia saying, "Please put this funding up at top, because the growers need it and we also recognize that those investments are important if those dams come out."

Sam Mace: And so I think also we need to be moving quickly and doing some big item, big actions, bold actions for salmon, but I think we can also explore ways to work that way in the interim.

Amanda Peacher: Okay. I think the first question I have since the Nez Perce Agreement has come up here quite a bit, for both Steve Howser and McCoy Oatman, on a different scale you've reached a deal on water. So, can you talk about what lessons we can glean from that process as we're looking at salmon.

Steve Howser: You want me to start?

Amanda Peacher: Yeah, sure. Go ahead. And then McCoy if you want to go next.

Steve Howser: All right. I'll start. I think probably the most important lesson we learned is that folks here in the Pacific Northwest and Idaho in particular, when we get together and talk about things even if there's some argument at the beginning eventually we come to a reasonable compromise and we come to what, at that time we believed was going to be the solution: flow augmentation.

Steve Howser: I remember one conversation that we were having and I actually think it was here in Boise at one of the 4-H public meetings at that time. And a comment was made, at that time the demand from the Upper Snake River for flow augmentation was four million acre feet. And four million acre feet is the capacity of our reservoirs up there. And of course we said right away, "Well, that's a non-starter. That's not going to happen. We're not going to give you all.

PART 9 OF 11 ENDS [05:15:04]

Steve Howser: Right away, well that's a nonstarter. That's not gonna happen, we're not gonna give you all of our water right, to save these fish. And, the next day it came back and I don't remember which environmental group it was, but they said okay we'll give up 2 million acre feet, and my comment to them was: well you really

haven't given up anything at all. Right? You're asking us to give up half of our supply and you really haven't given up anything at all. But in the negotiations, right. Those were science based, what we thought flows were necessary. How much water needed to go down and when that water needed to be timed, and in fact the timing of that water is so important that for example in the last three years where we've spilled, well almost 10 million acre feet down the river below Milner, right. The 3 to 4 million acre feet every year when we have a zero flow policy at Milner besides the flow augmentation. None of that water counts towards flow augmentation when the flood control is over, right? The Bureau of Reclamation shuts off for a day, and then we provide that 400 hundred and, well 427,000 acre feet in there per snake. And the additional 60 from the lower snake. We continue to honor that agreement, even though everybody's telling us now that it's not helping.

Amanda Peacher: Can I jump in here real quick though? So if there's an agreement that leads to no longer needing some of that water could you do something with that water, would you want it back?

Steve Howser: Oh, certainly. We would love to have that water back. One of the biggest problems we have in Idaho is the declining aquifer for the Eastern Snake plain aquifer. And currently we're making really great strides in doing recharge to recover that aquifer. And of course the recover the aquifer results in increased spring flows and longer term flows in the river than the way that it happens now where we dump all that water in the early spring. One of the things tht I would like to hear from lots of folks, and we brought this up in Nez Perce negotiations all those years ago in the In Stream Flow Coalition, we asked will you promise us that if those dams are breached no water will be required from the upper snake river, and the answer was no, we will not promise that if those dams are breached we're not gonna come and take your water also, right.

Steve Howser: We need guarantees too, right and we could be taking that water and we took acres out of production to provide that water. So if we had that water back those acres would come back into production, we'd grow more McDonald's frenchfries for you folks for you folks and more of the best baked potatoes on the planet and not to mention if any of you out there drink beer, right? We have three large multi-plants in East Idaho and most of the malted grain, the malted barley that goes into Modelo, and Budweiser and most of your smaller brewing companies. A large portion of that comes from Eastern Idaho so we grow more of that. More beer, more potatoes, what more can Americans ask for?

Amanda Peacher: I'm guessing there's at least a couple of beer drinkers in this audience. McCoy, I'd like to give you a chance to talk through that as well.

McCoy Oatman: I guess we could have more salmon if we had... that's one of the purest farms of protein that you can get. It's brain food and it's some of te healthiest stuff you can eat on this planet, the entire planet. As far as the SRBA, I wasn't on tribal council at that time and I know it took decades to negotiate that but I can tell you that it was a sore spot for many tribal members that felt that we gave up too much. I understand that there is an agreement and we did all that we could through that agreement given the circumstances that we were in to try and ensure that the water for our fish and were still implementing that agreement and it's been as far as the dollar side of that we're able to invest those dollars and start to buy it back, portions of our reservation.

McCoy Oatman: Nez Perce Reservation is checkerboard and that's one the big things that we're trying to accomplish also buying property where we can gain water rights back as well. I think there's others that were in those negotiations that could speak to the benefits, I mean I think there was, we were I don't want to say forced into the agreement, but there's something that we were pinned in the corner and a decision had to be... difficult decision had to be made at the time and all respect given to those that were involved in that, I think we're still analyzing the impacts of that decision.

Amanda Peacher: But since we're talking about what if's here, can you imagine a scenario McCoy where if we reach the dams you would agree to give Idaho's water back to not, need that flow augmentation.

McCoy Oatman: Yeah, on that spot I can't do that as far as giving water back, I mean I wish we could get some of that water back as well for the Nez Perce people and for how we would use that water. I mean I think that you look at what the tribe has done through our restoration in Columbia Basin in the region. In my eyes there wouldn't be salmon still in the water if the tribe was not here. There wouldn't be no treaty right to ensure that there's fish in the water. I think if you look at other tribes that aren't part of the Columbia River tribe, have very strong treaties some of the strongest in the United States that ensure a lot of protections for fish and wildlife and without that I guess I don't know if there'd even still be salmon here today.

Amanda Peacher: Okay, well we're gonna open it up to some audience questions, this is a reminder you can submit your questions and a friendly volunteer will collect them if you wave it around. So, Jeff Gordon we have a couple questions specifically for you. One person asks, why would dam reaching mean you can't stay in business, is it water rights or is it not enough water, would you need to dig a deeper well, or need new pumps? So think a little bit more detail on what the block is there. Sorry.

Jeff Gordon: We're just above Ice Hover dam like I said, that's a pretty big body of water where we're at. It's at least over a quarter mile wide and 90 feet deep. My sense is that, water would be too far away for us to get to and I don't think you could just lower, dig your well deeper and get water. We're really affected by the Missoula floods and I think everybody in here knows about the Missoula floods. We have a lot of river rock and gravel aquifers and it's an amazing filtration system but I just think it would be too deep, that's what I think.

Amanda Peacher: We also have a few questions about this idea of a rail system and that being owned and operated by growers so for Sam White. Somebody asked could the subsidies for barging the waterway that's currently being used in the system be used now to update the rail system?

Sam White: I'll be honest with you, if there are subsidies that are being paid to operate the barge lines I don't know about them. We as sellers of that wheat get charged by the buyer for that total freight. If there's a government subsidy then that would have to be something within the dam itself, so I am unaware of those.

Amanda Peacher: What about subsidies for say, dredging or lock maintenance, that kind of thing? I think that might be more of the vein this questioners asking about.

Sam White: Okay. Again, lock maintenance, yes that is something that is done usually on an annual basis. They shut the river down for three to four weeks. Some years it's longer maintenance schedule. Dredging, we, at least in the Port of Lewiston we share in that cost so I don't know what those exact costs are I'm sorry Amanda that I don't know what those are, I could find those out but I'm guessing it would be a drop in the bucket for what would be needed to build a rail, to buy locomotives, to buy cars and to operate them on an annual basis, again that's just one port with four players in that port and we're talking about PMW that's got 1700 members active growers. If you have to do that for every one of them, I just don't see that it would be cost effective. You're moving grain today on the cleanest most efficient way you can through the river system.

Amanda Peacher: We have a couple of questions specifically about like whether the weather dam removal of four lower Snake River dams is the answer? And somebody asks about the Fraser River. We heard a little bit about that this morning. So maybe Same and McCoy do you want to talk about why dam removal. Why is it necessary in your perspective to go that route when these other rivers are also suffering.

Sam Mace: Yeah, and some of these pieces were touched on I think on earlier panels. But yeah there's all kinds of impacts and issues with various salmon rivers up and down the coast. Where I grew up, and what got me involved, my salmon and steelhead river was the over logging that happened and the habitat destruction

which collapsed the runs that were on my river. It took a long time to rebound. But the interesting thing, and I didn't work on hydro issues until I moved to Eastern Washington, starting in '94, and started researching and wanting to get involved in salmon steelhead issues and thought wow gosh we have the best habitat left in the lower 48 why aren't the fish coming back? And I think that's one of the key things.

Sam Mace: It is the number of dams that we've built, and we have an easy control like the way you can see the impact of the lower snake dams is by comparing the runs, say in the John Day basin, with salmon and steelhead they only have to go up four dams versus Idaho salmon they have to go up eight and there's a significant difference in the smolt to adult ratio, and how far they are from recovery. There's other issues we need to do, and temperature issues we need to deal with but it becomes abundantly clear when you look at those, that these four damns are a serious problem. And then you can also just look at the trajectory of the graph of what happened to the runs when those dams came and it was very significant. It's quite the visual.

Sam Mace: The other thing too that has been touched on several times today is climate change. I firmly believe what a lot of fishery scientists are saying is that the Snake River basin is truly an arc for wild salmon and steelhead here in the Northwest. It is the place where we have the best hope of maintaining those healthy sustainable runs of salmon and steelhead that Congressman Simpson was talking about. And that's because of the integrity of the habitat, so much of it is roadless it's pristine, it's in wilderness, it hasn't been developed so you don't have to do... it's not about doing a ton of habitat projects like Chris Wood was saying. It's there. It is also so you have this high integrity habitat and so much of it is at higher elevation. Some of these fish are spawning at 6500 feet. And so these are the streams that are gonna stay colder longer. You look at other rivers that... I care about their lower elevation, whether it's the Yaccamaw Basin and others. They're gonna have real challenges with warming water. And it's not like we're not gonna have challenges but we have this incredible habitat up there that gives them a real shot.

Sam Mace: Our one problem is we have created an incredibly lethal corridor especially between Pascow and Lewiston. In the summer now behind those hot desert reservoirs if you know Eastern Washington, you know it's real hot and it's desert down there. They're getting over 80 degrees on days and consistent days in the summer. We start doing a hot water report to gauge that and send out report every week during the migration system and so, it is just getting more lethal and more lethal. We've been having huge fish kills, both adult and smolt. So in the warming world if we don't get those dams out, I really feel that Idaho salmon will be gone in a generation. If we're able to take those dams out I think that

Idaho has one of the best shots of having real truly abundance sustainable runs coming back the next generation.

Amanda Peacher: So as we are coming to the end of this panel, I'd like to reflect a little bit about what Congressman Simpson said, asking the question of what do we want this to look like in 20, 30, 40 years, whatever. What are we gonna do know that works towards that so, for each of you what are you gonna do differently as you leave here today? What is something that you might consider or someone you might talk to? What will you do differently than you've down before?

McCoy Oatman: I guess it's really hard for me to say what can we do differently I mean I think that a lot of burden has fallen on us as Nez Perce people and like I've stated before if you look at how was this area before precontact, well we had clean air, we had clean water, we had abundant wildlife, millions of salmon. And so, to ask for me to go back and ask the future generations, to ask my kids what can you sacrifice even further it's very difficult for me to even to think about that. As a tribe, we've been more than willing to sit down across from others that are users of the system to try and come up with solutions but I think dam breaching is one thing that we've looked and constantly and as Mr. Pinkham stated there's a resolution that the tribe passed for dam breaching and at times the tribe has stood alone as far as when through the SCRPS litigation and being the only tribe that's sitting on the other side while our sister tribes sit on the opposing side an we've had stand alone well that's not something that's foreign to us but like I said before we're looking to allies to make this a better system not only for us but for others as well.

Amanda Peacher: Okay, Sam White?

Sam White: Yes, may be kind of a two part thing. What am I going to do personally? One, I'm gonna invite everyone of you in the audience to contact me if you have questions about what you heard from me today so that I can help to explain it to you, and I'd try to listen to what you wanna talk about. I wanna be open. I think we know there's a problem, we suspect it might be the dams, we're pretty sure that maybe it is climate change. But we don't know those answers for sure, I know any time that I've done something and I thought I needed to get there faster, stepping on the gas pedal and get there faster, usually ended up with some cuts and bruises. I've got a few to show. Motorcycles, cars. But if you take your time, make the right decisions, make smart decisions I know we're maybe working on that 11th hour but I still think we can make smart decisions along the way. So that's what I'm personally gonna do. Where do I see it in 20 to 30 years, I hope that in 20 to 30 years we've had enough insight, enough smart people here that we're looking back and saying, we did it. We got everything everybody wanted. A win win situation is kinda like a compromise, nobody's happy.

Amanda Peacher: Thank you, Steve Howser.

Steve Howser: Yeah. Well I don't know that I am going to do anything differently, I believe that the Idaho water users and the upper Snake River water users have always stepped forward and engaged in conversation an negotiation. We've always been open to contact from lots of other groups. I invite ya to take a look at our website iwua.org or contact our executive direction Paul Larington and I think most of you out there that have worked with us in the past understand that we are committed to finding solutions for Idahoans that doesn't require the United States Congress or litigation from our own state legislature. Also I'd like to invite anybody to please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about some of the stupid stuff I said today.

Amanda Peacher: Jeff Gordon.

Jeff Gordon: I'm gonna save up for more pipeline money. No, I still... I'm gonna go back to the premise that I made, that I believe we can solve this problem together and... but it needs to be an effort by everybody. It needs to be concentrated, it needs to be by the numbers, and do it the right way, but we all have to participate and I think everybody's gonna come out on this deal whole. And I have to believe that, so [inaudible 05:35:50] here.

Amanda Peacher: Same Mace.

Sam Mace: Well I think moving forward it's maybe it's doing a little bit of the same but doing it more diligently and more better. Is that good English there? Anyway. I think one thing is really starting to double down and have some more real conversations if folks are willing about the concerns. We did a few years ago did talk to a lot of shippers from that end and growers and others, but we haven't done a good enough job of it all, is talking to the irrigators, at least I haven't. Of coming down the tri-cities and I have visited your winery and partaked but actually talking a little bit more about what the challenges you see are that we might be overlooking, I think we need to do some more due diligence on that so that we understand that.

Sam Mace: One thing that we have done in the past but I think it's time maybe to do it again, is maybe have... I know there are some of our fishing partners on the west side, our commercial fisherman and also some sport fishing folks who would love, who've in the past have come over to meet with growers and others in Eastern Washington because one of the really depressing things about this is seeing food producers at two ends of a watershed pitted each other when we all want wheat and wild salmon on our plate moving forward, and maybe there's a way to have a wheat and wild salmon dinner, or salmon dinner I should say. In Genesee or in Pascow and just have folks meet each other face to face to

put a face on these stakeholders across the state. It will at least allow for some more understanding and better educated stakeholders on both sides of the aisle.

Amanda Peacher: Okay well with that I'd like to thank our panelists. Just a quick note here, this is challenging right, uncertainty is uncomfortable, this is a discussion that's been going on for a long time, we all have our perspectives on it, so I just wanna say thank you for stepping out of your comfort zones a little bit for imagining things a little differently and also for being here and sharing your insights with this audience, we really appreciate it. John has an announcement.

John Freemuth: Before you go to break, I have a quick announcement. I've seen many of you in the past years at our Women in Leadership conference about an hour ago, Dr. Marlene Tromp is named the seventh president of Boise state and somebody ran over with our program and was trying to get it into her hands to know this is something we do here that a lot of people value so I just wanted to make that announcement thank you.

AGRICULTURE AND COMMUNITIES PANNEL TWO

Amanda Peacher: We'll be back here in fifteen minutes.

Amanda Peacher: [crosstalk 05:38:43] Down to the mouth of the... [crosstalk 05:38:44]

Sam White: Oh yeah no no.

Amanda Peacher: Critical time.

Sam White: You know, when I started reading about the orcas and stuff like that, I called a marine biologist[crosstalk 05:38:53] that pod of whales [crosstalk 05:38:53] and I said no.

Amanda Peacher: That's not true.

Sam White: I know that's not true but he's a fish biologist and I know now. [crosstalk 05:39:15] I know now but... [crosstalk 05:39:21]

Amanda Peacher: [crosstalk 05:39:30] Yeah. [crosstalk 05:39:42] Which one was yours? I had took a cab.

Sam White: [crosstalk 05:40:22] Mine was [crosstalk 05:40:22]

Amanda Peacher: Yeah no it did in terms of missing[crosstalk 05:40:29]

Sam White: Well [crosstalk 05:40:26] instead of since we've been talking about [crosstalk 05:40:38] they're not subsidized [inaudible 05:40:45]

Amanda Peacher: Oh I don't know, that did come up huh?

Sam White: That's crazy the way I [crosstalk 05:40:46]

Amanda Peacher: Yeah.

Sam White: Okay well they take something away from you and they're gonna hit you [crosstalk 05:41:04]

Amanda Peacher: Right I mean I think that's a valuable... I bet you do. Hey Tony! How are you? You look exactly the same! Tanner [crosstalk 05:41:20]I have to say. [crosstalk 05:41:51]

PART 10 OF 11 ENDS [05:50:04]

Speaker 19: ...other than masquerading as a biology [inaudible 05:53:36]... Sorry I got off-topic the other day.

Amanda Peacher: Oh, that's okay. I hope you don't mind me steering you back. People want to hear from you.

Speaker 19: Yeah.

Amanda Peacher: Really nicely done, thank you. Nice to meet you.

Speaker 19: Nice to meet you.

Amanda Peacher: Take care.

Speaker 19: I'm actually going to follow up, email a bunch of papers...

Amanda Peacher: There you go. I was like, "Do I even go down that route?"

Speaker 19: So next time you-

Amanda Peacher: There was a lot that could have been said about that.

Speaker 19: I was ready to jump up on my table. Extremely salty.

Amanda Peacher: Okay, I'm going to pull together our next panel here, Brad. Just to get going.

Amanda Peacher: We're going to get going here in a minute. If we could get our panelists to come on up? And if everyone could start moving towards your seats, please.

Speaker 21: I think you're going first.

Amanda Peacher: We're going to follow our line-up.

Speaker 21: ...make sure I say it right...

David Reeploeg: How are you doing?

Speaker 22: Good. You David? Pleasure to meet you.

David Reeploeg: I've been holding onto my water, I don't... That's okay. [crosstalk 05:55:25] Mine are a little hot and sweaty.

David Reeploeg: It's good to see you as well. How have you been?

Amanda Peacher: Yeah, you're good.

David Reeploeg: So what's your job?

Amanda Peacher: My husband [inaudible 05:55:45]...

Roy Akins: The least I can do is speak from the heart.

Stephanie Solie: Are you Roy?

Roy Akins: Yes.

Stephanie Solie: Stephanie Solie.

Roy Akins: Stephanie, nice to meet you.

Stephanie Solie: Nice to meet you too.

Roy Akins: What's your organization again?

Stephanie Solie: The Orca Task Force of the State of Washington.

Roy Akins: We appreciate your guys' support.

Stephanie Solie: Well, thank you. We've been working hard.

Roy Akins: We hope you guys have success.

Stephanie Solie: Oh, you know [crosstalk 05:56:20]... he's on a plane right now heading with Jane to Switzerland, or else he would have been here.

Amanda Peacher: All right, I'd like to ask everyone to take your seats, please, so we can get with the second part of our afternoon program.

Stephanie Solie: Stephanie Solie. Nice to meet you.

Roy Akins: Well, here we go.

Stephanie Solie: Yeah, here we go.

Merrill Beyeler: There are actually-

Amanda Peacher: ... the same kind of thing... I will pre-introduce you...

Merrill Beyeler: So what do you want us to do?

Amanda Peacher: ... and then I'll introduce you a little bit more. You'll have a few minutes, and then I might jump in with questions... you can ask each other questions... Let's make it a good exchange.

Stephanie Solie: I've got to go meet Dustin.

Stephanie Solie: Dustin? Stephanie Solie.

Dustin Aherin: Hello, Stephanie, nice to meet you.

Stephanie Solie: Now you're going to have a hard time getting everybody back at the last panel of the day.

Amanda Peacher: Take that final sip of coffee, y'all. Find your seats. We have some wonderful set of speakers to hear from up here.

Dustin Aherin: How are things in Tri-Cities?

David Reeploeg: Pretty good. [inaudible 00:00:35] Finally, right? I'm David, by the way.

Dustin Aherin: David, I'm Dustin.

Amanda Peacher: Okay, well, welcome back. Again, I'd like to invite you all to submit your questions. If you are running low on cards at your table, you can wave you hand and get some more, or you could snatch some from another table if they've got a good stack. I just wanted to commend you all as an audience for your attention and your focus. I made a list of all the acronyms I'd heard throughout

the day, and nobody was blinking. It include, or acronyms or technical terms, right? SARS, SRBA, FCRPS, SMRS, modular reactor, accord agreements, [flex spill 00:01:18], cone model, and my favorite [BEHOG 00:01:23]. I'm impressed with the level of engagement of this adience, and I think it's telling how nerdy and smart you all are, but also how passionate we are about coming to a new place on this issue.

Amanda Peacher: Let's move forward with our afternoon panel, our second afternoon panel again, focused on agriculture and communities. I'm going to briefly introduce our panelists today. First we have Stephanie Solien, right here to my right, co-chair of Governor Jay Inslee's Southern Resident Orca Task Force. Next to her is Merrill Beyeler, of Beyeler Ranches in the Lemhi Valley, He is also a former legislator here in Idaho. Roy Akins, chairman of the Riggins Chapter of the Idaho River Communities Alliance. Next to Roy is David Reeploeg, vice president of federal programs of the Tri-Cities Development Council. Then we have Dustin Aherin, Lewiston resident and a businessman and Middle Forks Salmon River outfitter. Please join me in welcoming our panelists.

Amanda Peacher: Stephanie Solien, we'd like to hear from you first. You are the co-chair of Governor Inslee's resident orca task force, as I mentioned. You've been tasked with providing Governor Inslee with this road map to keep Puget Sound's resident orcas from going extinct. Can you describe to us a little bit the community of people in Puget Sound who are really engaged in this issue and who made enough of a fuss about it to grab the governor's attention? Also, again, I'm going to ask all of you to respond to this what-if question that Congressman Simpson asked today. Can you see a new way forward on salmon, dams, energy, and agriculture?

Stephanie Solie: Well, thank you very much and thank you for the Andrus Center for inviting the Southern Resident Orca Task Force to present today. I think the work of the task force and more importantly the plight of the southern residents, which are now down to 75 have, over the last year, really helped people even better understand how important salmon is. I think the work of the task force has been as much about saving the southern residents, it's been as much about saving salmon, and Chinook salmon, as it has been about saving our very beloved southern residents, because salmon are beloved, too. Being here today really drives home the importance of salmon across this region. It's great to be here.

Stephanie Solie: The orca task force came to be because people that live in Puget Sound, especially scientists, but people who really have been studying and understand the orca, came to the Puget Sound Partnership, which I serve on. I serve on a citizen's panel called the Leadership Council, to share with us how the orca were starving and that we were down to a number that if we did not act and act in a holistic way, that we would lose this very important pod of orca whales. So

Governor Inslee heard from the Puget Sound Partnership and many of us when we did our State of the Sound, in the fall of 2017. We let him know just how serious the plight of the orcas were, and so he acted, and created the orca task force, which was given the responsibility of looking at both short and immediate actions that could be taken across the state, but also longer term recovery actions.

Stephanie Solie: The people who have been part of this effort, I think in many ways have been part of our task force meetings. We had six task force meetings across the state last year, and the 49 stakeholders, the 49 individuals that are serving on the orca task force represent kind of our state. It is tribal governments. It is the NGO community, the environmental community. It is state, local, and federal governments. It is the Washington Association of Business. It is the Farm Bureau. It is the Ports Association. It are fishermen. All of these people have come together because we had one goal, and that is to try to work to save the orca.

Stephanie Solie: It has been an amazing journey. The people who have come before our task force have come by the hundreds, and they've submitted public comment by the thousands. We received by the end of last year over 18,000 public comments. At our task force meetings, the rooms got so crowded with people wanting to come and talk about how they wanted us to take action and not adhere to the status quo any longer, that we would have to find larger and larger venues. It was a very emotional time. We had the mother whale Tahlequah lose her calf last summer. We as a task force had come together and agreed to work on this problem, but it wasn't until that mother whale swam for 17 days and 1,000 miles carrying that dead calf that all of sudden this issue was put on the world's front burner.

Stephanie Solie: We had people come to our meetings from Europe, from other parts of the United States, to talk about what was at stake. It's about saving these whales, but honestly I think people in our state and I think here, saving the salmon is the same thing. It's about saving us and it's about what kind of future do we want. I think the task force has really tried to grapple with that, and the people involved are just like the people in this room. They love this place we live. They don't want to see the status quo continue. They know we can do better, and I think our task force showed that we could do better. We came together, a very diverse group, we passed out 36 recommendations. The governor accepted those recommendations, put them in a policy and budget package, sent them to the Washington State legislature.

Stephanie Solie: I'm here to say today, the Washington State legislature has taken leadership and passed out four critical policy bills that are going to address several threats that we know the orca are challenged by: lack of food, vessel noise and disturbance,

toxins in our water, and oil spill prevention. We still need more movement on the budget, we need $750,000 so that we can go forward with a stakeholder process that I am heartened by being here today. I believe the stakeholder process in Washington State is exactly not just what we need but what the region needs. We all need to figure out ways each of our states can come together to start talking and resolving these issues around salmon, energy, community, agriculture, and dams.

Amanda Peacher: Thank you. We'll hear next from Merrill Beyeler, who as I mentioned, ranches on the Lemhi River and has also served in the Idaho legislature. Merrill, you've restored salmon and steelhead habitat on your ranch and you're very active in salmon basin initiatives to preserve ranchlands to restore streams and waters in that area. Can you talk about what's at stake for you and other ranchers related to salmon and steelhead protections under the Endangered Species Act? More related specifically to today, how do you think this dialogue that Congressman Simpson is proposing could help you in your community?

Merrill Beyeler: Good questions. This has been a great, great venue for me just to sit and listen and just absorb a lot of good things. Yes, I ranch in the Upper Lemhi Valley, right at the head of the waters of the Lemhi and that's that 6,000-foot level that salmon come and spawn at. So I've got before me just a picture here, and it's of a good friend and then a picture of Martin Luther King. They're side-by-side and you'd say, "Well, what do they have in common?" One thing that they do have in common is that they both have mustaches. Well, they may have more in common than that. I'm just going to read a quote that I got from him. It said ... We were out on the range one day riding, and we were just moving some cattle around. He's my neighbor to the south, and my neighbor to the north, and I'm his neighbor to the south and his neighbor to the north. Our places are kind of mixed up a little bit.

Merrill Beyeler: But he said, "Neither you nor I have time to go fishing. But if we did, we would like the fishing to be good." Then Martin Luther King, his quote, and I think they parallel each other, and it talks a little bit about what we've talked about today. He said, "An individual has not started living until he or she can rise above the narrow confines of his or her individualistic concerns to the broader concerns of all humanity." Today, one of the speakers mentioned the second paycheck. I thought, what in the world is the second ... Well, we know what the second paycheck is. You know, why do we live here in Idaho? If I wanted to raise cattle, I don't think I would raise cattle at 6,000 feet in the Lemhi.

Merrill Beyeler: But I sort of like being down on the river, and I sort of like waiting for that time in the spring when I know when it's time to change from a felt hat to a straw hat. That time is when the sandhill cranes return. So there's some natural cycles that we all experience in our lives. That's the second paycheck. That's why we

work. We work so we can go out and play and do things, yeah, that we enjoy doing with our families and with our friends and within our community. If we lose the second paycheck, I would contend that the first paycheck is not worth a damn.

Merrill Beyeler: So we were faced, you know, back in the 1990s, and I'm going to quote another friend, Jerry Meyers, of mine. I've never forgotten it. This is about the time when we really noticed the decline of salmon in our part of the world. I remember walking the banks of the Lemhi River. We were talking about the changes that we were going to do, and with a biologist. I remember the conversation, they said, "This will be good for the resident fish, but it may be too late for the salmon." Jerry Meyers described this period of time as the dark days, the sad days. They were dark days, they were sad days. Because some of those things that we looked to and looked to experience was to be down on the river and before you could see the salmon, you could hear the salmon working the redds, just like the sound of the sandhill cranes. Before you see the sandhill cranes, you hear the sandhill cranes.

Merrill Beyeler: The question is, and this is the question of our discussion today, energy, salmon, agriculture, and community. Can we come together, or can we make it happen? My answer is yes. If we have the will and if we value it enough, it is possible. That's what we did. We've done, you know, I think if every once and while you need to be in the right spot at the right place with the right people. I think I got that opportunity in the Lemhi Valley. I think we had the right people in all the right places, all at the right time. So that allowed us to do some things that we thought were impossible. When you look over a period of time, I don't know how many tributaries to the Lemhi that we've reconnected.

Merrill Beyeler: I remember when we first started talking about reconnecting those tributaries back to the Lemhi to create connectivity across the landscape, those streams were dewatered and had been dewatered for over 100 years. We would talk about being creative and finding crazy ways to do things and creative those partnerships. That's what we did. We reconnected those tributaries. There are, I don't know, 10 or more tributaries that are in some fashion reconnected. Just this past week there were a couple of Fishery biologists, young ladies, came marching up Canyon Creek, which comes through our place. I said, "Well, what did you see? How did things go?" They said, "Well, you know what? We saw the first steelhead redds in that stretch of Canyon Creek."

Merrill Beyeler: When I look at the, back in, when we thought salmon were gone for sure, then there came those moments of kind of, maybe. So there are years that I remember, 2001, and for us in the Lemhi Valley, 2000 is the number. 2,000 salmon returning and that's going to be recovery. 2001 is the year we all remember. Fish were back in numbers we hadn't seen for a very long time.

Those numbers approached maybe a little more than half of that number. Then 2014, 2015 were other years. I am hopeful. But what I think has to happen is we have to find some way to advocate for each other. That means we do not leave anybody behind. We do not leave those that depend on the Columbia River system to move their grain to the coast. We just don't leave anybody behind. We advocate for each other.

Merrill Beyeler: So I'm going to tell you one more story, and then I'm going to let go from there. So one of the things that we realized had happened in the Lemhi Valley is, well, we knew that for a long time, that they put a railroad track down through. Rather than to build 10,000 bridges, it was easier just to straighten the Lemhi River in places. So that's what happened. Then in the 1950s, they decided to put a highway. They thought, where are we going to put it? They thought, well, let's put it right down the old railroad track. That's what they did. So a lot of the Lemhi River was straightened and it lost a lot of sinuosity. So we got ready to put some sinuosity back into the Lemhi River. We got that done. Took us about six years, but we got it done. It was kind of a fun project to watch, see what happened afterwards.

Merrill Beyeler: The first year we completed it, there had been no, because it had been straightened in the stretch, there had been no salmon that spawned in that stretch of the river. First year it was completed, there were two salmon redds in that stretch of the river. Then came the time we, it was I think, it was either last year or the year ... I think it was last year. We had a group of University of Idaho law students on our place, and I had a Fishery biologist that had worked with us on this particular project. We were there, and this is what it means to advocate for each other.

Merrill Beyeler: We were talking about the, what we had done and grazing and those kind of things. The Fishery biologist said, "I think it's time to put cattle back on the river." I said, "Well, I think we need to wait two or three more years." So you had the Fishery biologist trying to put cattle on, rancher trying to keep them off. I have no idea why that happened. But we do have that opportunity. All it does is requires us to come and think and work, and then do something.

Amanda Peacher: Great. Thank you. Next we'll turn to Roy Akins. Roy, your organization formed actually just last year, is that right?

Roy Akins: That's right.

Amanda Peacher: To defend steelhead and salmon fishing in rural central Idaho, including your town of Riggins. I'd love for you to talk with us about your community's stake in these issues, and specifically respond to what Congressman Simpson proposed

and looking at this a little bit new way. Can you move that mic just nice and close to your mouth, just so we can hear you?

Roy Akins: Hopefully it's on.

Amanda Peacher: I don't know. Talk a little more. Okay.

Roy Akins: All right. The Idaho River Community Alliance just has been recently born. It's a new entity and it was created out of necessity this last fall, because the sportsmen in small business in central Idaho had no voice, and we found ourself in great need of one this last year. We have seen our numbers go up and down as far as fish go. We as fishermen keep to ourselves often, hide our spots and try to be secretive. We like to be positive and always think next year is going to be better, but this past fall, the numbers were down and we were watching closely. Because in 2017 we started the year with reduced fish numbers. The Fish and Game made a decision in '17 of that fall to do a catch-and-release only opening to our season. First time in my career that that had happened. It chased off a lot of business from the Riggins area.

Roy Akins: We knew that the fish numbers were going to be low. Fortunately, mid-September a surge of fish came up the Columbia that added to the numbers enough that the Fish and Game, based on 50 years of practice, decided that we could have a two-fish per person limit. As we went into the '18 season, obviously we were watching closer than ever. As the numbers came over the Bonneville Dam, and we were waiting to see what number of fish we were going to have so we could get an idea of what type of season, what our limits might be. As we moved into October, we were established with a one-fish per person limit. Not great, but it made our clients happy. Lot of new people in Idaho that want to fish for steelhead, lot of folks that love to do the sport. They were all still interested in coming that fall.

Roy Akins: What we didn't realize was the state had been operating without a permit for incidental take of wild fish from NOAA. On October 6th, we were surprised find out that our season had been challenged because of the lack of this permit. The fishing was pretty good. The season had started out with cooler weather than normal, so the steelhead showed up in the Riggins area a little bit earlier than normal. We were busy fishing every day and just assumed that this thing will probably work itself out. Nothing to worry about yet. As we continued into the season, come early November, we were surprised to find out one day when we got in from the river that the Fish and Game commissioners met, I believe it was November 14th, 15th that they made the decision to close our season.

Roy Akins: Obviously it was based on the fact that we lacked this permit. I don't think it was an outcome that a lot of people expected, that the commissioners would make

that decision. Without much warning, or without a lot of knowledge we were immediately facing an issue where our season was going to close the first week of December, closing off the last four months of our season to Riggins. Steelhead fishing in Riggins is the only game in town come wintertime, and it's the lifeblood of our community. We have a large tournament that brings 1,000 women into our community, for the Women With Bait Fishing Tournament. All the outfitters have bookings that time of year, because we are low elevation, great climate for winter fishing, and we have a wonderful steelhead fishery there.

Roy Akins: We organized quickly and it was a scary time. A lot of people in town were upset, frustrated, angry, not sure who to blame, so we organized quickly a meeting with Idaho Fish and Game and our local representatives. I'm also a city councilman, so I took a lead in this activity as a community, elected community leader. We quickly came to the conclusion after holding a town hall meeting with our Fish and Game that we were going to need to get involved to help negotiate this situation, or help become negotiators in this situation. We decided to hire an attorney and organize the Idaho River Community Alliance.

Roy Akins: We had an incredible outpouring of support from the small businesses, motels, tackle shops, restaurants, grocery stores, outfitters in the Clearwater Valley and the Lower Salmon Valley. We had great success hiring a great guy named Bill Mock. Our goal immediately was to try not to make this a more divisive issue, because we realized our fish numbers were down. We knew there was problems with our fish runs. We knew that the issue that came up was more of a clerical mistake and yet we did know that there was a lot more to it. We wanted to try and find a way to compromise.

Roy Akins: Through the process, over about a 10-day period, we came up with an agreement that the entities that were threatening to sue our state for not having the permit helped us to come up with, and we agreed on some river closures that were areas where it was thought to maybe be believed there was more wild fish. We came up with some changes in how we fish for steelhead, things that would be easier on the wild fish to release, not taking them out of the water for photos. To encourage people to keep their first hatchery fish of the day and stop fishing to lessen the pressure on the limited number of wild fish last winter. All of these agreements ended up being made so that we could continue our year and continue our business and keep the town of Riggins alive, along with little towns along the Clearwater, and the town of White Bird, all depended greatly on winter steelhead fishing.

Roy Akins: As we formed and were lucky enough to come to an agreement, we went through the rest of the winter following these new practices. Sometimes in life you don't know why or how you end up in these places, and sometimes it ends

up being a better thing. What we found this winter is by organizing the Idaho River Community Alliance, by changing some of our practices, we ended up making a lot of new friendships. We created a lot of new conversation amongst outfitters who weren't talking. We started conversations with our local politicians, and ended up now in a much better place in the fact that we have these relationships built. Idaho River Community Alliance is growing and thriving, and it's created an opportunity for that region to have a voice and be invited to seminars such as this.

Roy Akins: We really did need to be able to do that. It wasn't pretty. At the time, we were pretty nervous about how everything unfolded. Now that we have a chance to take a deep breath and look back, we're pretty thankful that everything worked out the way it did. We're pretty thankful that we're here today, and I'm absolutely thankful that our senator came today and said the things that he said. My entire adult life, I've been waiting for a politician to champion our fish, and it looks like we might finally be getting there and have that opportunity.

Amanda Peacher: Okay, thank you, Roy. Just a quick follow-up. Just briefly respond to this, if you will. We've been hearing a lot about, what you're describing is a great deal of uncertainty for your livelihood. I think in this discussion more generally, the idea of uncertainty, "what ifs," is uncomfortable for a lot of people. As we're talking about advocating for each other, as Merrill was bringing up, do you feel like you've been, you and your community have been advocated for, by others, by other stakeholders in this discussion?

Roy Akins: You know, it's challenging because ...

Amanda Peacher: Just get that mic up real close, yeah.

Roy Akins: It's challenging because unfortunately sometimes we only have economics to argue for the value of these fish and it means so much more to me than that. The community of Riggins lives right on the banks of the river. We see the fish swim by. We know when they're there. You can see the fishermen come and go from our community. We completely depend on it to get through the year. We've always had a loud voice in our town, the people there have always been willing to speak out. I do feel like, we've been looked after to some degree, maybe not enough from a state level, and/or a federal level, but I think again, we're starting to get there.

Amanda Peacher: Okay. Let's next hear from David Reeploeg. You're the Tri-Cities Development Council's vice president for federal programs. That council is a primary economic booster for central Washington, building on the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory's expertise. We've heard a lot today from Elliott Mainzer, talking about the region's energy challenges, Representative Mike Simpson's call for

creative solutions here. So David Reeploeg, what role can the Tri-Cities play in seeking cooperative solutions, and what are your stakes?

David Reeploeg: Thanks for the question, and thanks for having the opportunity to be here. I thought you were going to add another acronym with TRIDEC to the repertoire. TRIDEC actually started as TRICNIC, as a little bit of background. That acronym meant Tri-Cities Nuclear Industrial Council. The organization actually originally got its start supporting and advocating for federal missions associated with some of the national security efforts taking place at the Hanford site back in the 1960s. That was always sort of the base of the organization, and then over time, it evolved to be more of a traditional economic development organization, as you mentioned. But we've still maintained that strong engagement on federal issues with the National Lab, with the Hanford site, and then the federal dams in our region.

David Reeploeg: The Tri-Cities is sort of a unique community, because our Tri-Cities is actually four cities. We also have two counties, three port districts, and I think four local utilities. There's not really natural, one voice like you might have in a place like Yakima, which is another large city in the area. So TRIDEC has sort of served as a voice for the tri-city community on a number of issues, especially if there's a federal nexus, but on a number of other issues, because we have a board that includes people from all of those different organizations and jurisdictions. The Tri-Cities and TRIDEC have traditionally been very supportive of our federal Columbia River power system including the Snake River dams.

David Reeploeg: Then a little bit about myself. I was kind of chuckling in one of the, our earlier panels, folks were saying, "Yeah, I'm not an expert." I'm not either, but I think I know enough to be at least dangerous on some of these issues. In a previous professional life, I had a chance to go out through any number of dams, both the Lower Snake as well as others. I've been on barges that were transporting juvenile salmon. I've been through hatcheries, I've talked to a bunch of farmers whose livelihoods are impacted by the dams and navigation. I've spoken with folks who supply the sport-fishing industry. Been on tugboats hauling some of that grain. I've been out with the Columbia Intertribal Fishery Committee, Fisheries Commission folks when they were hazing sea lions. Talked to a lot of federal agencies and have spoken with many of the disparate voices on this issue. Recognize that it's a real challenging issue. There's very strong opinions, that it's an extraordinarily important issue for Pacific Northwest tribes.

David Reeploeg: One of the things that I sort of took away from all of these activities is that people do just seem to be talking past each other. That's been going on now really for decades. The Tri-Cities is in some respects, and the dams and the salmon in our region affect a lot of communities, but in some respects, the Tri-Cities is kind of a crossroads for some of these issues. If for example we were to

no longer have barge transportation, then I did the math. If that was all to be replaced by trucks, and as somebody mentioned earlier, most of that would go through past [inaudible 00:33:17] Tri-Cities, that would be on average about 435 additional trucks through our community every day.

David Reeploeg: We have, as you heard from Jeff Gordon a little while ago, we have a lot of agriculture that depends on irrigation that's provided by the dams. Then we also, especially coming from the economic development side, we are able to, and not only the Tri-Cities, but throughout the region, we're able to attract and retain and expand a lot of businesses that see a lot of value in the low-cost energy that we have in our region. I think one of the frustrations that we've had in the Tri-Cities, and I thought again, stealing a quote from somebody from earlier today, that our region has been sort of asked to cut off our arm while others are hesitant to trim their fingernails. While I certainly understand the urgency and the passion that revolves around both salmon, orcas, and many of these other regional issues, I also recognize that there is a lot of communities like ours that are impacted.

David Reeploeg: We have questions. For example, and I take to heart what folks said, that this is an immediate issue, that this is something that needs to be addressed right away, that we can't wait. I mean, under the best-case scenario, though, I think if we were to say, "Tomorrow let's get to work taking out the dams." I mean, after [NEFA 00:34:48] is done, we're years and years and years in the process. It doesn't feel like at least, and this is maybe perception, not reality, but the perception is that the conversation is always about those four dams and not so much about harvest and not to throw other communities under the bus, because I understand there's some communities affected by that.

David Reeploeg: We don't talk a lot, at least in comparison, about predation, the sea lions and things like that. At least that's again our perception. Also, when we look at other systems in the Pacific Northwest, like the Fraser River or others, and the fact that there would still be a bunch of other dams on the river system, I think one question that the community often has is, what assurance do we have that if we were to make this, I guess you'd call it, sacrifice, would that solve the problem? And how do we know? Then I guess one other example of that, and Jeff's daughter was highlighted recently in a Seattle Times article, that I thought the author had a really interesting approach to his article. Because instead of doing an article about pro-dams and anti-dams and getting into that debate, it was really more about the, following some real people and people whose livelihoods and lives are directly impacted by our system.

David Reeploeg: As you do, you know, you look at the comments online. A number of the comments seemed to be kind of circling around the idea that this was just a, almost a propaganda piece, and it didn't, and it was just pure propaganda and it

didn't address the importance of the salmon. But I thought that was particularly dismissive, I guess you could say, of the real people who were being highlighted in that article, whose lives would change very definitively if we were to do that. Again, I think that's part of what I said before about us seeming to sort of talk past each other rather than talking to each other.

David Reeploeg: Again, in my previous professional life, I had a chance to participate in a number of regional conversations on some really tricky issues. I was, it was great to see Michael Garrity up here earlier. He and I were part of the Yakima Basin Water Enhancement Project workgroup that first started meeting probably eight or nine years ago to address some really challenging issues in the Yakima Basin that were referenced a couple of times already today. These are people who have been suing each other, fighting in court, fighting in the court of public opinion for decades. At the very first meeting, you know, there was a table about this big that was full of studies that had been done for that basin, and still nothing had really been accomplished.

David Reeploeg: Over the course of eight or nine years, until this year when it got signed into law, that group of people met, sometimes every week, sometimes every month. They met over and over, the tribal nation, the irrigators, the municipalities that again have been suing each other came together at least around a core principle of some things that they could all work together on. That was really refreshing. I think my old boss, Senator Campbell, she refers to it as a new approach to western, how we manage water in the West. The Yakima Basin is different in the dams and the hydropower system, but I think there are some parallels that we can look at.

David Reeploeg: I think from at least from our perspective, that dialogue will be a very tough one, and it will be probably not successful if the narrative, or if the understanding is, that it's a dialogue about how do we remove the Snake River dams and make it just as least painful for you folks as possible? If it's only remove the dams without, I guess if it's either that or nothing, then I think that would be a hard place to start the conversation, and I don't think there would lead to a high likelihood of success.

Amanda Peacher: So you're saying the conversation has to be, if we remove the dams, how do we make that as least painful as possible?

David Reeploeg: Sorry, I probably wasn't, I guess I wasn't clear. But I don't think it would be successful if the dialogue is seen as only focusing on removing the dams.

Amanda Peacher: Gotcha. Okay. I have some follow-up questions for you that I'm excited about, but I want to also hear from Dustin Aherin, who is president of the Middle Fork Outfitters Association. Dustin, you've been a business voice for 19 companies

outfitting on the Middle Fork of the Salmon River. Today you're also wearing your Lewistonian hat? Is that the way we would say that? You're a sixth generation Lewiston resident and businessman. I'm really curious to hear from you how you would characterize your community, the community of Lewiston's stake in this discussion. You might also respond to what David Reeploeg was talking about, or maybe address the issue of like why these four dams, because I know that that hasn't necessarily come up yet. So we might talk about that. I'm giving you a long list here, but I really want you to ask, or respond to what Congressman Simpson had to say here today, and give us a sense for how you think your community might respond.

Dustin Aherin: Thank you. To start with, I apologize if I start rambling and go that direction and then that direction.

Amanda Peacher: I'll rein you in.

Dustin Aherin: When you ask me three or four different questions in one fell swoop, it's a little difficult for a Genesee guy to keep track of things. First I need to make a couple of kind of overriding statements just about me, and that is five generations of the Aherins have been around, in and around Genesee. I currently live part-time south of Lewiston, Idaho, up in the Craig Mountains, and then part-time over in the Salmon Valley, in Salmon City, Idaho. I am a Middle Fork of the Salmon River outfitter at this point. I also have permits to float the Lower Salmon River as well, and then a couple of other in-the-works business interests that will be based out of the Lewiston area, and then one sort of general bigger idea for kind of north-central Idaho.

Dustin Aherin: I will say this as well. I've been, had the good fortune of growing up in a diverse set-up, in that for the first part of my life, until I was about 13, I grew up with my grandparents. My grandfather owned a sawmill up Mission Creek on the Nez Perce Indian Reservation in between Lapwai and Culdesac. And that, as a side, the proper way you say that town's name is Cul-de-sac, not Cul-duh-sac. It's kind of like Boise, Boi-zee. You know who the local is or not. Anyway, so I'm still, I've still to an extent have some tentacles or some friends with tentacles into the timber products industry. Cousin still works for old-timey potlatch in Lewiston. Great-grandfather born in Genesee, Idaho, 1896, another great-grandfather homesteaded Genesee, Idaho, so I can talk a little bit more about that. I went to high school there.

Dustin Aherin: Then getting into the river side of the interests that I have, that started with my grandpa who was more interested in fishing than he was logging. We spent a lot of time on Salmon River. Where I'm going with this is, and then I started, I think there's a Lewiston Morning Tribune reporter here named Eric Barker. He quoted me in a story he wrote about a field hearing, I believe it was, in about 1999 or

2000, 2001, somewhere around there. I was in the crowd being rowdy youngster when I was back then. I'm a much calmer human being now. But my stance back then was the same as it is now, is we as inland northwesterners, more specific, Lewis-Clark Valley residents, Palouse and Prairie, prairie farmers in this particular instance, are underrepresented, and they're the ones that are farthest from the river system. So their voice needs to be heard as well.

Dustin Aherin: But even in 2000, give or take whatever year that was, my stance was, "Let's start building infrastructure, regardless of whether we as a society come to the conclusion that the right and proper way to save the species of salmon is dam removal, we still need infrastructure in that neck of the woods." We need better highways, we need working rail for various things. There's an employee of a company that deals in some chemicals and some other ag-related products that is devoutly devoted the river system, but that company just also built a little rail siding to be able to diversify how they ship things. I think that's the name of the game for our neck of the woods. What I would like to make sure people hear from somebody who isn't directly attached to one of the main industries that's then attached to the river system as it is right now.

Dustin Aherin: That is, we would like a voice, we as the general community of the Lewis-Clark Valley, the general community of north-central Idaho, would like to have a voice, and would like to even go so far as even leading the charge on this discussion. We would relish the opportunity to come into a room with other people who understand that the way it's going right now, which is the way it's been going for the 20-ish years that I've been paying attention, is not working for people who would like to set down roots, would like to make bigger than pocket change type investments in business, that are going to need to be having more knowledge of what the system is going to look like, the system being the river system down the line, if that makes sense.

Dustin Aherin: See, here I go rambling on. What I'm trying to tell you is here, I'm going to try to not represent people who have already been represented, and then I'm going to try to keep my focus to a little smaller demographic of people, if Amanda helps me do that. At this point, I'll ask you for your help.

Amanda Peacher: I think, I'd love your perspective on how you think, either that smaller demographic, or Lewiston as a whole, would respond to what Congressman Simpson had to say today, to envision that "what if." What do you think Lewiston would have to say there?

Dustin Aherin: Yeah, that's a great question, one that I'm comfortable, knowing that if you would have asked me that question 20 years ago, I could have said predominantly, resoundingly the general population of Lewiston would have said, that's, we don't even want to talk about it. That's just a road we don't want

to go down. We're doing fine the way it is. The last time someone came rolling into town with the campaign hat on, we kind of got sold a bill of goods and we didn't like it, so we're just, leave us alone. We're doing fine. I think enough things have changed with various aspects of the way the system is, if that is the uncertainty of whether or not the levees are going to be raised, because that's a thing. There's that uncertainty. The uncertainty of dredging, whether it's going to happen or not. The uncertainty of the aging-ness, if that's a word, the aging-ness of the system itself.

Dustin Aherin: Meaning, like Mr. White said, there's typically a yearly closure for lock maintenance, and that has to happen. Well, unfortunately as those dams get older and the system and the dam's technical features get older, they tend to take longer to fix. Sometimes accidents happen, a tow gets a gust of wind or doesn't come into the lock correctly and bumps the gate. All of a sudden, it's closed for five, six, seven weeks. That's what really, really hurts shippers. I think at this point what I can say is, you wouldn't find, if you couched the question, and hopefully it will be couched as a question of, can you come together? Can you as the community of diverse-minded people, can you come together into a room with people from the Tri-Cities, with people from the Upper Snake Basin water users, from Salmon, from Lemhi County? Can you come together?

Dustin Aherin: I would say at this point, the answer to that question, side of the equation, is yes. I think people want to start to work towards a resolution so we can move forward with whatever direction we are going to go in. That change I can say has happened amongst us who have chosen to live there, in that we've fought for a long time to make things work the way they were designed. They're working pretty good for some people. They're not working great for the whole of the community. Then we're also experiencing, like many other places in the Northwest, an influx of people moving to our fair area. Other than this year, it's a great place to winter over. We don't ever get snow there, until it snows up to your knees for six weeks. Yeah, who knows about that?

Dustin Aherin: I think at the end of the day, when people start to read Congressman Simpson's statements, start to understand that he I think has taken it one step further than Senator Crapo did almost exactly 10 years ago, in sort of asking for the same thing. Getting, asking for the notion of getting all of the diverse groups into the room and starting to work on it. I think, you know, there was a little more pointedness from Congressman Simpson than Senator Crapo did, but at the end of the day, it's still the same ask of those. The elected leaders that we've put forth are asking for our help to get the ball rolling. Then there's obviously going to need to be an epic amount of help on their side. Once we can come, "we" as this group and a bunch of other people.

Dustin Aherin: I want to squeeze a couple more quick ones in here. We've talked about very limited portions of this overall issue. When I say "this overall issue," I haven't talked at all about fish. I typically don't talk a lot about fish. To me, this issue is about pure community situations, where you've got divisiveness in my community right now, based over this notion that if we take the dam out, the community is going to go away. Then you've got the other side saying, "Well, no, that's not true. It'll succeed." I relish the opportunity of using our big brains and our opposable thumbs in realizing that Herbert West in 1935 proposed this audacious plan. Well, we built it. Didn't work all that well. We're not going to take the entirety of the system out. We're talking about working on, you know, a fairly small chunk of it, though it affects a lot of people.

Dustin Aherin: There's a lot of things that benefit my town that people don't know about right now, and I think as the issue progresses, if we can come to this agreement, we need to make sure literally everything is on the table. We've got three port districts within the confluence area, generally speaking. All three of those port districts are working very, very diligently to do good for what the public has charged them with doing. The Port of Lewiston has a place, they're doing great. The Port of Clarkston has attracted the tour boat operators, and I'll tell you if tomorrow a lock got closed and that was going to be for two or three months and we weren't able to get those tour boats to town, I mean, there's a lot of people who make livings off of it. It's like Roy is saying. At the end of the day, Lewiston is not that big a town, and if something were to drastically change without us being involved with that change, it would cause irreparable harm.

Amanda Peacher: I'm going to stop you there so we can get to a few more questions. I'm going to ask you to keep your answers a little bit brief, since I've got a stack here and we want to talk about a few more things here. David Reeploeg, I really want you to address this idea that Congressman Simpson brought up. It's not going to be popular with some environmentalists in the room, but this idea of a nuclear modular reactor, saying that Tri-Cities should be the center for that. What do you think of that idea?

David Reeploeg: I think nuclear is, it's an interesting issue and opportunity for both the Tri-Cities and the Northwest. The tri-city area is very supportive of nuclear. We have the Northwest's only commercial nuclear reactor right now. Makes about 1200 megawatts, called Energy Northwest. We have a lot of expertise with the National Lab. We also have a fairly substantial fuel, nuclear fuel manufacturing facility in town as well. I was actually down in the congressman's district last year about this time, for U.S. Nuclear Industrial Council discussion about small modular reactors. We're very pleased that one is underway or at least in process in the Idaho Falls area right now as well. I think that nuclear is, if there is anything that's almost as divisive as dams, nuclear might be right up there.

Amanda Peacher: Yes.

David Reeploeg: In the tri-city area, like I said, is very, it's very popular, but you get to the Puget Sound area, whether it be Seattle or Portland or whatever it might be, it's seen a lot differently. There's a lot of opportunity and excitement there, but I think we, I think nuclear is part of a broader conversation about, yeah, I mean, if we were to take out the dams, I think my understanding is, in talking with some of the utility folks, you would have to bring in new generation, at least in strategic areas. If it's not hydropower, and it would need to be baseload generation, and you don't want it to emit any carbon, then it has to be nuclear. So how do we do that?

David Reeploeg: Then I think that's, one other point I was going to make about, and it's been mentioned a little bit before, but our governor is running for president on a, with a focus on climate change. We do oftentimes kind of scratch our heads, when the discussion is taking out dams that don't produce any carbon, knowing that at least to some degree you'd have to probably in the short-term replace it with natural gas or something like that. How do we as the Pacific Northwest plan to move forward in doing, in creating new generation to meet our needs, not five or 10, but 20, 30, 40 years from now, in such a way that it doesn't contribute more to climate change? If it's not small modular or some other sort of battery technologies that are not yet developed, then I think we're going to have a rough time doing it.

Amanda Peacher: Gotcha. Stephanie Solien, there have been a couple of questions that came from the audience that get to this idea of the urban/rural divide in this discussion. Somebody was asking, why didn't you hold any of the task force meetings east of the Cascades? Why did the task force want to explore dam removal so early? That kind of thing. I'd love for you to address, and other panelists can jump in, too, but talk about that urban/rural divide. As we're discussing the stakeholder process and getting everyone to the table, how do we get communities from the western part of these states talking to the more rural communities, and make it productive?

Stephanie Solie: Well, thank you in the audience for those questions, because first off, the orca task force was a statewide task force. We did have representation from various parts of the state, probably not enough from eastern Washington. But we did have county commissioner from Okanogan. We had the Farm Bureau which was clearly looking out for agricultural interests across the state. The Association of Washington Business and the ports, also very focused on statewide impacts. We did have a meeting east of the Cascades, in Wenatchee. In fact that was the meeting that was so highly charged, because it was when the mother orca was swimming.

Stephanie Solie: Honestly, we didn't get the kind of participation in Wenatchee that both Les Purce, my co-chair, and I had hoped from eastern Washington. I don't if it was just an emotionally difficult time and no one wanted to come in and defend the dams. I also have to say that when we started out this task force, it was to solve three serious problems facing the orca. Lack of food, they're starving, and to address prey, you have to look at habitat, hydro, hatcheries, and harvest. We looked at noise from vessels. Probably the most immediate thing the task force can do is take action to quiet the waters around these orca. They echo-locate to find their food, and when they're surrounded by whale-watching boats or the increasing number of big ships traversing the Salish Sea, that affects their ability to find the few fish that are there. And toxic pollution.

Stephanie Solie: We were looking as much at solutions in Puget Sound and working with our partners in Canada, and we are making some good headway on transboundary solutions, as we were looking at dam removal. Honestly, when we started the task force, dams were an important part of the issue, but they weren't the only thing we were looking at. They still are important, but we also have to address storm water and the pollution getting into the Northwest. We have to address the issue of vessel noise and disturbance. It hurts me to hear about the east/west divide, because I do live in Puget Sound. I actually live on Orcas Island. I'm very much ingrained, but I grew up and was born and raised in Spokane, Washington. I spent as much time in northern Idaho as a kid, on Coeur d'Alene and Ponderay as anywhere else. Les Purce, my co-chair, is Idaho born and raised. He is the former mayor of Pocatello, he still has his cabin there, his mother Idaho Purce. I think Les is a third generation Idahoan, so this task force did not set out to have urban kind of rural divides.

Stephanie Solie: If anything, the governor was very committed to a statewide solution. I guess I'm heartened by senator ... Senator. Congressman Simpson's comments today, because, and I'm heartened by being here, because the task force decided we had to pull people together to talk about the issues of salmon on the Snake and Columbia. We could not go forward with a recommendation to breach the dams without pulling together the communities impacted. I really appreciate David's comments, and it really does point to, we do need to come up with some conversations and some [inaudible 00:59:02].

Dustin Aherin: Steelhead hasn't worked, and we got to be honest about that. Then we need to realize that instead of giving ourselves lip service and making ourselves feel better by saying, "Well, we need to do stuff for our kids and our grandkids," we actually need to quit being hypocrites and do that. You know, we're $22 trillion in debt as a nation. When the BPA starts to go south, we don't physically have enough money to keep propping them up.

Amanda Peacher: Dustin, I got to jump in, because we got to get to everybody here. But any final word you want to offer?

Dustin Aherin: I just, I hope, I really do hope, hope, hope, and I would be happy to be the guy out front and center, getting more of this. See that nose? That doesn't bother me. If I piss someone off, they can punch me, I don't care. But we need to talk. We need to sit down and realize that by people's saying, "Oh, we can't do something, we can't do this, we can't do that." That's simply not true. We're a very intelligent people. We've got opportunities given to us that we can see this issue into the future and make it work for everybody.

Amanda Peacher: All right, thank you. David Reeploeg, do you want to just talk more about that challenge from Congressman Simpson and give us your vision for 20, 30, 40 years out?

David Reeploeg: I'd echo ...

Amanda Peacher: Just put that mic real close to your mouth.

David Reeploeg: I'd echo what Dustin said about how certainty would be nice. It'd be great to have some sort of certainty over the next 20, 30, 40 years, but also, when you look at the next 20, 30, 40 years, it's likely to be a period of profound changes in our nation and in our world, as you look at climate change, the impacts of that. We continue to push for more carbon reduction, both in terms of our energy generation, our transportation infrastructure, the way that we live our day-to-day lives. It's very hard to sort of predict what that will look like, to know what the politics will be around that, and to really be able to expect a whole great deal of certainty. What I do know is that this discussion is an important one, but it's very multi-faceted. There are so many elements of this conversation, and there are so many stakeholders throughout multi-state, broad region of the country. I hope that there is more dialogue. Again, dialogue never hurts, discussions can't hurt.

David Reeploeg: But I think it will be also important that we do, I don't know what, how you do that from a regional basis that effectively brings those interested stakeholders together but doesn't become so big that it's entirely unwieldy. But also, as kind of to my last point previously, that it also can focus on both realistic, practical, achievable goals that will at least get people to the table and keep them at the table for those conversations. If it, again if it's only seen as only about removing the Snake River dams, at least for a significant group of the stakeholders, they won't come to the table. I mean, I don't know that they'd have a lot of motivation to do so.

Amanda Peacher: Okay. Roy Akins.

Roy Akins: Well, as I leave here today, I will continue to use my drift boat, two people at a time, as a pulpit to preach to them how important salmon and steelhead are, how valuable they are to our future. As our state continues to grow and people move here, we need places like Riggins so they can go out and find out why Idaho is a special place and have those opportunities. We don't need people to fly all the way to Alaska to go fishing. We have it right here in our backyard. We need to preserve it, protect it, and make sure it's here forever.

Amanda Peacher: Merrill Beyeler.

Merrill Beyeler: So the question is what would we like to see in about 20 or 30 years.

Amanda Peacher: Or you can jump into the question I asked from the last panel, too, in terms of what you might do differently out of today.

Merrill Beyeler: Well, I might just talk about what I want to see in 20 or 30 years.

Amanda Peacher: That's fine, too.

Merrill Beyeler: All right. About a week ago, I went to my uncle's funeral, and one of his kids talked about some of the things you maybe should not do. What it was is my uncle and his friend decided they would go fishing on a moonlight night on the Lemhi, and this was some years ago. So they took a pole, but on the end of the pole was actually a fork. And so there they were, in white cowboy hats on a moonlight night, and sure enough the game warden caught them. They said, "Well, it's something we're not going to do again." So I hope that either one of my grandsons and his friend or whoever, on a moonlight night gets caught wearing a white hat.

Amanda Peacher: All right. Stephanie Solein, you want to end us off here.

Stephanie Solie: Thank you. Well, I have to say, this opportunity to be here today and listening to the panels and talking to people in the audience has really given me hope for the future. I mean, this is tough work that we all do in trying to save this place that we love. It's interesting that Dustin is talking about people moving in to southern Idaho, because it's a wonderful place. Well, we've been experiencing that on the west coast of Washington State now for about the last 10 years. Population growth is only going to continue to be an issue. I guess climate also. Those are two factors, actually, that the orca task force is going to start talking about in year two, in addition to our first round of recommendations and whether they were successful in the legislature.

Stephanie Solie: My vision for the future, we can only get there, I believe, and that is to save the orca, save the salmon, make sure that our children have the future they need is if we get together now, over the next five to 10 years, and start solving these

problems and start talking honestly about what's at stake. I just don't see a bright future unless we ourselves act now and start coming together. This conference, it's interesting, we got a lot of criticism, there's been a lot of debate about the task force putting forward this facilitated stakeholder process to bring people together to talk about the future of the Snake and Columbia river, the dams, the people who live there, the impacts on those people and communities.

Stephanie Solie: Yet this conference has really beat us to it. But you've done it in a way that I think has brought together folks and that is, people don't feel like it's a political process. Unfortunately maybe ours did, but it isn't. I guess, I have hope for the future, but I think it's going to take all of us, starting today as we leave here, really committing to work with Congressman Simpson and Governor Little and the Tri-Cities and the Save Our Salmon alliances, and really trying to solve these problems. Thank you for letting me be part of it. I feel inspired to go back and I feel like we have made some headway here, and we can start working together on these issues.

Amanda Peacher: Thank you for that, Stephanie Solein. I think if you think about where we've come just in the course of a day for an issue that has spanned 30-some years. We had governor, 40-some years, that's right. Governor Little promising to create this task force in the morning, we had Congressman Simpson say he wants us to do whatever is necessary to bring salmon back to Idaho. Then we've tread some new territory with these panels here, talking about stakeholder needs. Important work. Thank you all for being here. Please join me one more time in thanking our distinguished panelists. I think we're going to go right into our closing, so stay where you are. We'll just do a quick swap-out of panelists here, but we're ending out the day.

CLOSING REMARKS

Ed Bowles: Got a little bit of a low mic here. All right, well good afternoon and I'm really pleased to be here and get back home to Idaho for a little bit. I want to just say that there's some really strong energy, a good vibe moving forward on breaching the status quo. So we're about to the end of the day. So take a deep breath and help us get through that and I think you won't be disappointed for our next speaker. I am just extremely pleased to be able to introduce Elliot Mainzer but before I do that I am Ed Bowles. I A head up the fish side of Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and I spent the first half of my career though as a scientist and manager with Idaho Department of Fishing and Game working on the salmon science and the salmon restoration and so I've got to tell you after hearing Congressman Simpson over lunch I'm thinking I may want to come back to Idaho and play this out. So very encouraging.

Ed Bowles: As I said, I'm very excited to introduce Elliot Mainzer for your afternoon planary and as most of you know, Oregon hasn't exactly been part of the Kumbaya parade of a party supporting the federal biological opinions for the dam operations over the last two decades. So the irony of being asked to provide this introduction for Elliot has not been lost on me and I don't think on Elliot either, but I have to tell you I really welcomed the opportunity to do this and for the better part of this past year have gotten to know Elliot much better and we've worked together on the Flexible Spill Agreement that hopefully he'll touch on a little bit, but perhaps more importantly is I really have gotten to know Elliot's, kind of his humility, his collaborative approach and his vision that I think are going to be essential moving us forward.

Ed Bowles: I do believe that any comprehensive solution is going to have to come, can and will come through Elliot. So I hope I'm not putting too much responsibility on your shoulders there, but I think the power side of this is very critical. So I guess in kind of the spirit of breaching the status quo heralded by Governor Little, Elliot really truly is a renaissance person. Kind of the right person in the right place at the right time for this pivotal transition that we're making, not just for salmon and steelhead in communities, but for power itself. I encourage you all to take a look at Elliot's background and experiences. It's quite remarkable in your agenda, but as I mentioned what has impressed me more in getting to know him is his actual humility and his actual ability to work with others and open up windows of opportunity, which is a true quality of leadership.

Ed Bowles: Now don't want to mince any bones about Elliot's, his passion as a leader of Bonneville is very strong and he's looking for Bonneville's interest and taking those at heart, but I think Elliot understands that you, when you're standing in this place we're in and looking backwards, it's not going to work and so as Congressman Simpson implored us, standing where we're at, grounded in reality, we've got to be looking forward and I think that is an essential part of this and in my discussions with Elliott and he'll expand on this much better than I can, but this sort of vision of a sort of clean energy portfolio taking us into the future that is not only dynamic and nimble but also reliable and affordable, but coupled with that, recognition of the strong conservation mandate that is Bonneville's and Bonneville being not only a strong component of that conservation responsibility, but also not just relevant in this new energy future, but actual a vital leader in that.

Ed Bowles: But as Congressman Simpson mentioned, the past of having the conservation responsibility play out as a ball and chain on Bonneville's ability to be competitive through this purely powered lens has got to change and we need to rethink Bonneville in terms of this stewardship role is not only valued and important, but actually credited and a part of what they bring to bear on this

dynamic issue and that's the only way I think we're going to really keep Bonneville in this important role moving forward.

Ed Bowles: So I'm not saying this is easy and I think Elliot will be the first to say that his challenges are daunting, but I think he is very much committed to bringing parties together to mindfully lean into this challenge. I know that Oregon is very pleased to be for once standing with Elliott helping partner in this venture. So on behalf of all of us here, I'd like to extend and join me in extending another warm welcome to Elliot who was part of our first panel. I think he's going to help us wrap up the conference and he's going to also shine some light on perhaps some thoughts on the future that we can all rally behind. So Elliott, thank you very much.

Elliot Mainzer: Well thank you Ed. The irony of Ed introducing me definitely is not lost to me. It's also, it's very meaningful and I really appreciate it a lot and I can honestly say it's been neat to think of Ed as a friend after years of acrimony. So thanks a lot. I also want to just to start out with a couple of additional thank you's. I really appreciate all the energy that went into organizing this event and I want to certainly to the Andrews Center, all the organizers. I also just want to really tip the hat to Rocky Barker. Rocky is somebody who I've really enjoyed getting to know as well. Actually the first time I got to meet Rocky, he came over to our office in Portland and he wanted to talk about all of the challenges facing Bonneville and the energy industry and it was really interesting.

Elliot Mainzer: We kind of found some common energy and ground around the changes sweeping the newspaper industry. We say, "Boy, we're both kind of facing heavy duty competition. This is the kind of different and if we don't adapt and we don't change and we don't get with the program, we're going to lose our customer base and we're going to be toast, right?" and it was kind of a neat and I think that certainly there's a million different topics, but the idea of adaptation and evolution and listening and thinking was something I really appreciated. So thank you for that and a great job. I mean incredible event. I learned something from every single speaker today. I'm not going to spend a whole bunch of time synthesizing everything. So I think you all were here witness to the great program, but I also want to just to comment. I do think it was pretty cool and a very neat moment to have Congressman Simpson here today in a lot of ways and I'm sure that his comments were probably viewed through a whole bunch of different lenses.

Elliot Mainzer: You can certainly imagine that and although maybe there wasn't hair on fire, I know he did light a little bit of fire in the room and got a lot of people out of their seat and it's very thought provoking and for me as a person running a big organization with a lot of people, I admire leadership when I see it and no matter what you think for Mike to sort of step out and to try to at least find his

space and his voice on this really important topic, that's admirable and I commend him for that and I certainly appreciate he is right. I get back to DC fairly regularly with a regular stop through his office and I've seen the Lindsay Wall and I know all the thought process that's going on back there and he's always been a big supporter of Bonneville and certainly does a great job of looking out for the interests of his constituents here.

Elliot Mainzer: So I just want to commend him and also, you know for me, I want to just to maybe share a little bit with you personally of my own kind of prism on these issues. It is a little bit interesting and to maybe tell you how I approach these issues and how I'm going to be thinking about things over the course of the next few months as we continue to grapple with the issues at play in the Columbia River System Operations Review, which is a responsibility that I'm personally taking very seriously and also as we engage in other processes that may emerge and other conversations. I know Idaho's going to be kicking off some conversations, which you know I think are going to be important. Not to bore you with too much biographical detail, but I actually was first really exposed to the big issues of dams and their consequences when I was in college.

Elliot Mainzer: I spent a college semester in India actually and at the time they were building the big Narmada dams in India. I don't know if any of you guys ever followed those there on Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh and at the time it wasn't a salmon issue at all, but it was big dams and it was huge impacts on the tribal Adivasi people that lived in the basin and I just remember I was like 21 years old and I was struck by two things. First of all, I couldn't believe that you could spend that much money on infrastructure and not really take care of the people that were actually impacted by it and displaced from their land and I also kind of walked away from the experience thinking, "Boy, we're going to need to make sure we have other sources of electricity over the time that aren't necessarily quite as impactful as this," and so honestly, I came away with an abiding interest in some of the socioeconomic impacts of infrastructure development.

Ed Bowles: I can't tell you that I became sort of an anti-damn person. I just was struck by the magnitude of the infrastructure and the impacts and I also kind of became a pro-renewables person in smaller scale, wind, solar. I got real interested in the solar energy and real interested in wind energy and what it was going to take to get those resources onto the grid because I thought we really needed to figure that out and so back in 2002 when I went over to Iowa, I won't bore you with all the details, you've seen my resume, I was a product of a big private sector blow up and I decided to get the heck out of the private sector and run back to public power and back to big infrastructure. I went to Bonneville in 2002 with honestly the big interest in the grid and the design of balancing authorities and how we were going to use that fast flexible characteristics of the hydroelectric system to

get a wind energy up to scale because at the time, I think there was like 200 megawatts of wind on the system.

Elliot Mainzer: Over the course of 2005 and '06 and '07, there's friends in this room who I worked with hard and we all collectively figured out how to compliment the renewable, build on that sort of backbone of clean energy that the hydro system provided here and get a lot more of additional resources and I'll be honest, I got kind of attached to the hydro system through that process because I said, "Boy, this is kind of amazing. We're integrating thousands of megawatts of renewables that you can't do that with every resource and that's pretty cool," and there was a lot of success. I will also say just by way of background before I get to the administrator part is my Mom is actually from Pocatello. My mom grew up in Poky, Class of '56 and so I came out to Idaho every summer as a kid and I grew up in the Snake Basin and I actually got to really experience and appreciate rural living and some of the positive ways of life and changes of all the infrastructure had been developed on the Columbia River.

Elliot Mainzer: I have family and been around fishing. We used to up to Palisades and get up into the Tetons. This is area of the world that's very dear to me and so not only is the environment of this area very important to me, but I also connected with the people of this area and so I can really see the different perspectives. When I listened to folks up and down the river talking about whether they're from Lewiston or from working in the [Lenmire 00:14:14] ,working in different parts of the Basin, I can understand that and I can relate to that and I can feel in my heart the complexity and the importance of the issues.

Elliot Mainzer: So when I became administrator back in 2013, '14, I had not worked very heavily, honestly on the salmon issues, but suddenly I'm thrown into that job. It was inescapable, right? And not too long after I became administrator back in 2016 we had the big ruling from Judge Simon, obviously a very adverse ruling and from that point on it was like, "Boy, I'm in a neck deep on this topic and we've got to figure this out," and and I will tell you that it was interesting to watch all of the conversations and somebody said it earlier before, "What's the definition of insanity?" We all know that. Doing the same thing and expecting a different result and I honestly was seeing that we were kind of reloading potentially for another similar output, outcome and I knew very clearly where Oregon was.

Ed Bowles: I knew very clearly where the tribes were. I will say based off some of my early experience, I've really valued the working relationships with the tribes here in the region. It was a very easy decision for me to roll over the fisher courts. I think they were important agreements. Jamie Pinkham has become an incredible partner and somebody I really admire. Working with the Nez Perce has been really important across the Basin and so for me, I saw where we were

headed for another just Kind of blow up with Oregon, another blow up with the Nez and I said, "You know what? We've got to find a different way to do this. This is not working," and I think I felt, I feel very strongly having worked with my public power customers who I've also really grown much closer to. I'll be honest, when I became administrator, I think a lot of these public power customers were like, "Oh boy, means are out. I don't know. We're not sure this is our guy," because I'd been working primarily on renewables and grids and markets.

Elliot Mainzer: I think what over time, I've really profoundly appreciate what BPA has been able to do for this customer base. The importance of public power. I value local control, local decision making. I think those are important things and I think clean carbon free energy supporting the backbone of this economy are very important things and so I felt that the importance of maintaining a competitive hydro system and flexible capacity, but I also realized we got to try to lean in a bit more for the fish. We've got to try to find something different and Ed and his team in Oregon, I think we're very clear about their perspective of wanting to see more spill on the river. I think that sentiment was also articulated in the tribal community.

Elliot Mainzer: [Critfic 00:16:59] I think was really getting in the middle of this and saying, "Hey, are there some different ways we can think about?" So we started sitting down and having a conversation saying, "Hey look, I get where you guys are coming from. I know you want to see more and more spill. Boy oh boy, it's tough to swallow. We're still a little skeptical on the science on that, but I get it and the judge has spoken. We need to keep evolving, but can you work with us to think about is there a way that maybe we can get some of this done that actually doesn't have additional rate impacts and also can be done in a way that preserves some of that vital flexibility of the system, especially as Washington state and Oregon are aggressively decarbonizing as California has thousands of megawatts of solar and we need that flexibility to be part of the equation."

Elliot Mainzer: When we first started these conversations, I mean it was very, very, very difficult and I think a lot of skepticism and quite frankly, very little trust, but slowly but surely and people started listening to each other and they started thinking about the other person's perspective and they started saying, "Hmm, okay, I get that. What about if we tried this?" and we iterated back and forth and thought about it from each other's perspective. I think almost miraculously late last year and again I got a real kick out of this, Ed and the team, I wasn't in every single negotiating session. I tried to be there for big pivotal parts with my federal partners, but I'd come in, I'd see this group of people who had historically been fighting with each other incessantly, starting to trust each other and starting to think about each other's perspective and back in December we came to an agreement.

Elliot Mainzer: The agreement was, as Ed and others have described, it's not a totally revolutionary concept, but basically said, "Listen, when the river, when power demand is relatively modest, let's really lean in. Let's spill even more than we have. Let's go change the gas standards and raise them back up to get them up to one 120 and let's lean in on that and we'll conduct that experiment, but when the demand for power and flexibility is higher, let's back off and let's flex into that. Let's produce some revenue, provide some flexibility and load service to the market and see if we bring some revenues in, keep the rates stable and meantime give the Army Corps of Engineers who at the end of the day runs this system, an operation that they could actually implement that was consistent with all their multiple power and non power objectives.

Elliot Mainzer: Working with the agreement, was signed by Governor Brown and by Shannon Wheeler, the chair of the Nez Perce, Governor Inslee signed that agreement and we're very pleased to have explicit statements of support from Governor Otter before he left and also from Governor Bullock in Montana and I think that was just the first and I give credit to National Wildlife Federation and others. All the attorneys who basically agreed, "Let's stay out of court for a couple of years and let's see how this works. Let's give it a shot and let's give Bonneville and the other federal agencies a chance to do a really comprehensive CRSO process, get that done and let's work together," and I've just been profoundly appreciative of the willingness of people to think a little bit differently and lean in and carry water for each other.

Elliot Mainzer: To add, he was really an incredibly important part of this, Critfic, Jamie Nez Perce, others and so far we're a few weeks into spill season and early returns are it seems to be generally working pretty well and the power traders at Bonneville are sitting there trying to figure out how do I optimize it in the market and they've got their creativity caps on, the cores managing it and we're watching gas Michael Garrity and the guys have done a good job working with us and we're going to see how it works. So to me, irrespective of what happens over the longterm with respect to flex bill and I'm very conscious of the fact that not everybody thinks that that's the be all end all solution for river operations and we heard that today, but there's a kernel of collaboration and trust and coordination and willingness to work with each other to explore different solutions and to explore different approaches where we're trying to co optimize for these various important environmental, economic and operational objectives that I think is something that I really hope carries for it.

Elliot Mainzer: I can just tell you certainly from Bonneville's perspective, we're very, very committed to that. Now the next few months are going to be really intense and I'll wrap this up in just a couple minutes here. We are in the midst of the federal process. We've been doing this for a couple of years. It was mentioned earlier today that we were asked to expedite this process and we are going to do that.

The draft environmental impact statement is due next February and actually we ended up, that particular milestone wasn't moved but the backend has been shrunk down a little bit, down about September '21, September 2020. So we have a lot of work to do to get this right and I am trying to let you know, I am really, I'm doing significant due diligence to really try to understand what the best path forward is.

Elliot Mainzer: I am still processing information and I would say obviously the dam breaching issue is being evaluated as one of the main alternatives or one of the four alternatives in this process and I am just trying and others in the federal family really try to make sure we can really avail ourselves of the best information. Today was very interesting to me. Just coming here and being able to listen to all these different perspectives, to be able to synthesize them and to be able to make sure that I can carry those perspectives back into the deliberations and into the conversations is very important. I tend to agree with a couple things. This is obviously incredibly complicated. I really appreciated the comments from the last panel, from the chair of the work task force because I think there's a recognition there of just how multifaceted all the different impacts on the fish are and I do think as Chairman Simpson said today, this problem, this set of issues is really big.

Elliot Mainzer: You're going to have to think about it from a system perspective to make sure you're dealing with all the different areas, but I think that what's positive is that I think we really are trying to do that hard work I'm encouraged that particularly within Idaho, which has historically been a place where some of these issues have been most controversial that we're seeing this dynamic of folks wanting to really sit down and talk amongst themselves a little bit more and certainly we're going to want to support that and we're hoping that the Columbia River system operations review process can be a constructive piece of the broad conversation about where we need to go as a region.

Elliot Mainzer: As Ed said, certainly the world is changing. We know that. My primary responsibility in this job, in addition to the basic reliability and our stewardship responsibilities, we want to help our customers and our broader constituencies successfully adapt to the changes that are sweeping the industry. I feel, I mean there are a lot of people that are dependent upon this infrastructure and it's a lot of change. So we have to really understand the best way to get after these issues, what the pros and cons are, what the solutions are and I will say sort of in closing, somebody mentioned earlier, be careful how fast you go.

Elliot Mainzer: I guess I would say since it kind of came back to the quote earlier. I think there's a difference between haste and urgency. If you do something hastily you can kind of make a mess out of it, but there is a sense of urgency on these issues and I think we have to be very thoughtful about them and, but we need to get

after them sooner rather than later. I think certainly the biology for the fish is very important and I think, I can't imagine there's a single person in this room who doesn't care about the future of salmon in the Pacific Northwest. It is really important and I feel that energy about "I want my grandkids to know that we were leaning in and trying to do the right thing." I think that's really important.

Elliot Mainzer: At the same time, I want to make sure that for our power customers, that we're able to provide them with some certainty as well. We need to make some decisions. We need to know what we're dealing with. We didn't know what that the infrastructure requirements. We need to know what the power structure is. I think it's encouraging the cost structure that Congressman Simpson acknowledges that there will be impacts and so we're going to try to do our very best of providing the best information we possibly can into the public policy and talk about what the consequences will be to the power system and to our customers and others who are dependent on the grid from any changes that we may see in the future so that we can successfully address them and adapt to them, especially because infrastructure changes tend to be disruptive and take a long time to deal with.

Elliot Mainzer: So we don't want to be met sloppy. We want to be very thoughtful and very thorough. but we do need to keep things moving because we have another round of contract negotiations coming up here in the next few years and we want to try to provide. I am committed to serving public power and their needs, particularly here in Idaho and in other parts of the regions for many, many years to come and we want to make sure that whatever the power system and BPA looks like coming out of these discussions, that it is lean and efficient and competitive and set for that dynamic, a future in the future.

Elliot Mainzer: So I'm going to stop there. I'm imagining that you guys are probably all ready for the reception. One thing I think is really cool. I probably have some great, I'm certainly going to go. I'd love to meet a few people I've never met before and just build on the kind of nice vibration here today. I think it's been great. I really commend the organizers again for a very nice program. It's been a pleasure to be a part of it and I look forward to working with many of you and thanks very much and let's go, let's go make some things happen. Cheers. If people want to I'm happy to [inaudible 00:27:42].

Ed Bowles: [inaudible 00:27:44], Elliot said he's glad to take questions, a few questions. We're very cognizant now. We have a reception. We do not run over into the reception time.

Elliot Mainzer: I think so, so reception time?

Ed Bowles: Anytime they want it and you want it, I guess we can go to that.

Elliot Mainzer: I'm happy to take a question too, but my feeling is that folks are probably ready for the reception. If you want to catch me at the reception, I'd love to catch up a little bit more too, yeah.

Ed Bowles: So I'll pause for a minute, see if there's a question or two that's urgent enough to ask. Otherwise I have a-

Elliot Mainzer: There's one.

Ed Bowles: ... quick announcement.

Elliot Mainzer: I think you do have a-

Ed Bowles: Two quick and we'll go, but we do have a question. Here, let me get the mic to you.

John Freemuth: Thank you. Mr Mainzer, you mentioned that the [Sierraso 00:28:33] process will look at the option of dam removal. The question I have is in what or will the alternatives that are looked at to the dams include a clean energy option?

Elliot Mainzer: Undoubtedly, and certainly as we are looking at the implications of removing the dams and what it would take it to to effectively maintain reliability, serve load, restore capacity. We'll be looking at a variety of different alternatives and we'll also, looking at some of the information that's been put into the public domain here in the last couple of years to make sure it's part of the input. So yes, it will.

Ed Bowles: Okay, so two quick things and then we'll break for the reception and thank Elliot again. One is do it now if you want. It's fine. There's going to be an Andrews conference in about a year and a few months where the Society of Environmental Journalists are coming to Boise. They really wanted to come here. We will help sponsor-