

## David Fenn

I am not going to take the time to comment on each point of the EIS, but some comments that apply to many of the individual points of the EIS. Many of the supposed consequences of building the flow through dam would occur without a dam. A larger flow of water would move more gravel and disturb more spawning beds than the dam would cause. Potentially more bank erosion and debris and sediment deposits in fields and home sites. We had up to 6 feet of water in a barn, affecting several pieces of equipment. Up to to feet of silt in fields, somewhere around 500 loads of logs and pulp chips hauled away.

The spawning area of the entire basin affected by the dam is somewhere around 1%! Spawning by Chinook salmon occurs from Sept to Oct., silvers slightly longer, so their actual spawning activity is rarely affected by high water. Steelhead spawn over a wider range, including into late spring and early summer. The operation of the dam would have little to no effect on actual spawning.

Your report ignored the effects of non-native fish, bass, the explosion of other predators and the effect of fishing. They are not related to the dam, but absolutely need to be part of the conversation if the problem with the dam is fish and other water creatures.

Two specific issues that were actually silly to include were PeEll water and noise. PeEll water has had a problem since 07, if not before. Some money, but simple to solve the water system problem, with the benefit of a long term solution. Concern about noise from a construction site 2 miles from any homes strikes me as really stretching to find potential effects. Plus the noise would be relatively temporary.

There would be benefits to those of us that live in the basin, but are not on streams where the dam would not reduce flow. Loss of access to services would be reduced and for a shorter period of time.