

Feb 7, 2003

In Regard to the mainstem amendments:

My name is Paavo Carroll and I am a commercial salmon fisherman out of Charleston, Or for the last 3 years. I have fished my entire working life since 18 years old. I am 29 years old and intend to fish for the rest of my life, and I am not alone or going anywhere unless I am shut down by political forces.

For the last three years we have enjoyed returns the likes of which many thought we would never be seeing again. Salmon fishing is profitable and fun once again. When I brought my boat 3 years ago, people were practically giving them away. Boats were dilapidated and for sale. Now they are for the most part maintained and it is harder to find someone who wants to sell. More people are coming to the coast to sportfish as well. I was finally able to purchase a liferaft; that is to say if fish runs are hurt so is people's safety. Repacking a liferaft costs up to \$500 and the coast guard requires us to do it every year.

Therefore I am adamantly opposed to any changes in the status quo while evaluation of mainstem procedures proceeds. The status quo is a good thing. I urge the council to reconsider the alternative that preserves status quo operations while evaluations are pending.

I also oppose elimination of the April 10 flood control elevation target. The spring runs have been robust for a change and I seriously doubt that reducing these flows could have anything but a detrimental effect. The estuaries need water too and the fish need a place to hang out that has good temperatures and stable water levels. The good ocean conditions might mask statistically the damage to the runs but it will be there. It is only a matter of time until some reservoir fails to be anything near full by June 10 and the operators swear up and down they had no way to know it was not going to rain all may.

I urge the council to reconsider the alternative that calls for allocating more water to meeting or exceeding Biological Opinion flow targets. People ought to pay for things what they are worth, and if power is cheap to the point where fish are dying, family wage jobs on the coast are being lost and quality of life for Northwest suffers, they are not doing so. I think California should power their own air conditioners and heaters and though I feel for BPA's financial situation, it's time to stop taking it out on the fish and seek other solutions.

I don't see how it could be in question "as to whether mainstem actions could have any relation" on survival rates for Snake River fish. Don't they all have to go thru the mainstem or perhaps the idea is to truck them all. Study away on whether SARs are

the best or only tool to increase productivity, so long as the status quo is maintained meanwhile.

I'd like to conclude on a bright note and applaud and thank the council for (so far) resisting calls to include provisions for reducing or eliminating operations for fish during "power system emergencies." That would be an absolutely terrible idea. In one fell swoop untold salmon could die because people can't be bothered to conserve. The threshold for declaring an emergency should at least be set very very high as in for immediate national security where people's lives are at stake.

Thank you for the opportunity for comment and your consideration, Paavo Carroll