A case study of the Eugene Water and Electric Board's planning for the Minto Hydroelectric is examined in terms of social movement theory. It is hypothesized that public works projects have a significant likeness to a social movement and they conform in their essential ingredients to social movement explanations. The Minto Project data were scrutinized in terms of the elements of social movement theory developed by C. W. King, a natural history or "careers" theory.

Analysis revealed the Minto Project to possess the basis elements of a social movement: goals and means (ideology, group cohesion and tactics). It also possessed the characteristics of a social movement's internal and external dimensions in a highly vulnerable incipient phase of development, with general and vague goals, a nebulous ideology, unclear tactics, strong internal cohesion of some internal groups but little agency-wide cohesion. The Minto Project was overwhelmed and rejected by external factors prior to its
internal development into a full and less vulnerable organizational phase. Clear goal formulation and articulation was never achieved, creating a negative external image and the local public's rejection of the project's proposal. A lack of agency-wide cohesion and commitment to the project contributed to its downfall. Tactical blunders in the provision of information and in public meetings also contributed. The plan did not anticipate external consequences of its presentation.

It is concluded that the planning of the Minto Hydroelectric Project conformed very closely to a social movement and that its key ingredients are effectively explained by C. W. King's social movement theory. Basic elements were identical. Internal development stages correspond to planning, construction, and post construction phases of public works projects. External development stages also showed close correspondence, although King's innovation phase did not place sufficient emphasis on first impression factors. Motives, internal and external factors in growth and purposes and consequences also show very close correspondence and explanatory value.

It is recommended that planners be very familiar with all laws effecting public works development and devote considerable pre-planning effort to the determination of sound, clear, attainable goals through earliest possible public involvement.
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The planning and implementation of public works projects involves a very wide range of factors including the technical features of the project, environmental problems that require mitigation, legal requirements which must be met before approvals are given, and the values and behaviors of people to be affected. The success or failure of projects relies to an enormous extent in the image of development agencies and their personal abilities to be a convincing advocate. In a large number of ways the essential elements of public works projects are similar to social movements. The end product may be very different but the way to the end appears to have at least surface similarities.

This thesis presents an historic case study of the Minto Hydroelectric Project proposed by the Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB) of Eugene, Oregon. The case study was designed to reconstruct as closely as possible the sequence of events in and surrounding the project. These events then are examined to determine the extent to which they fit social movement theory advanced by C. W. King in his work, Social Movements in the United States (1956).
Kings Thesis on Social Movements

King notes that social movements are not confined to mass society but that mass society has an abundance of them. Movements are spawned by cultural confusion, social heterogeneity and disorganization, and individual discontent. Some movements purpose is change and they employ different means of organization to effect this change. Movements generally have broad geographical scope or are involved in issues of a broad nature. Successful movements, King notes, have persistence through time (pp. 11-27).

Social movements have a number of key elements. They are goals, ideology, group cohesion, an organization and status system, definite sets of tactics, means of recruiting membership and support.

Historic analysis of social movements reveals what King calls their "natural history or careers"... "a series of steps in a progression of phases." These pertain both to the internal development of the movement and to its external development. In discussing these aspects of development, King viewed internal development as pertaining to the successive internal alterations, in other words the events within the movement itself. He viewed the external development of the movement as involving the trends in the relations of the movement with the external society, especially reactions of outsiders to the movement and its impact on various groups and cultures. King qualifies these by noting that while these two aspects of development are interrelated in actual cases. They never the less may be treated separately for purpose of analysis (39-40).
King divided the internal development of a movement into three phases, the incipient phase, an organizational phase and a stable phase. The incipient phase is one which can only be recognized and defined in retrospect. King explains that it begins when the individual or individuals chiefly responsible for the inception of the movement become conscious of this possibility (p. 42). Some characteristics of this stage are simple organization, no differentiation of statuses, general goals, nebulous ideological elements, crude tactics, intense loyalty and strong group cohesion. Some limiting factors of this stage are: limited size, resources and experience, which make for vulnerability to opposing or competing groups. King notes "these and other hazards are especially formidable during incipience; hence a high mortality rate for young movements" (p. 41).

According to King, following the incipient phase is the organizational phase which is reached when the plans and ideas that existed only on paper or in the minds of the founders or followers develop into systematic activities and a more definite organization (43-44). The transition from one stage to the next takes place gradually with one phase blending into the next. Some characteristics of this stage are: the organization becomes more complex and specialized, ideological elements as well as structure undergo modification, original goals are reappraised, tactics are developed and become more effective, aims and values become well defined. This phase is organizational and reorganizational through keeping what works and eliminating what doesn't. The limiting factors are primarily internal,
relating to rapid growth, over enthusiasm and problems with status system (45-46).

Following the organizational phase is the stable phase. According to King, stability here refers to an internal development which consists of the clarification and stabilization of component elements. Goals are stable, as are values, organization and ideology; tactics are clearcut and orderly. At this stage the movement becomes more like a bureaucracy. (49)

King divided the external development into three phases as well, which consist of the innovation phase, the selection phase and the integration phase. King notes that each term is descriptive of a phase in the graduated career of any movement and a process which the movement is undergoing at that time. (p. 49)

The purposes of these stages are to reveal the gradualness with which new elements achieve acceptance in society. King states that some series must be adopted in order to discuss changing relationships between the movement and greater society in which it occurs. They are essential to appraising its success or even determining what "success" implies. King adds that these stages pertain only to what happens to the movement (p. 44).

By innovation, King means the act or process of introducing a new element into society. King adds that the concern is not how the innovation gets started as to what happens after it appears. It is important to add that there is an extremely wide range of innovations that occur, and only a very small portion are adopted. In order to
get past the stage, the movement must be approved by some group or organization. If not the movement ends (p. 49).

After the innovation phase comes the selection phase. Once the innovation occurs, its ultimate fate depends less on the originator of the innovation than on those to whom it is displayed. King used the word "selection" to broadly cover the processes of selection and reselection of innovations. The process of selection is often a long and drawn out process, with some members of society accepting the movement as others being apathetic or rejecting it totally.

It is important to remember that the success of the movement must be made with the distinction in mind between the movement as an organization and the goals it is directed towards. King states that acceptance is a matter of degree in two respects, a movement and all its goals may not be acceptable as a complete package since some items are separable and fare differently in the selective process (p. 54).

After the movement passes the selection phase it moves into the integration phase. King describes the stage as occurring "when an innovation has found continuing social acceptance, and has thus passed the test of selection. The last phase of its career is its integration. King described an integrated item as one which is closely tied in with other cultural elements and contributes to the existence or operation of the society (p. 55).

With these aspects of development in mind, King examines social movements with regards to the factors which lead an individual to
accept or reject the movement as a whole. He has termed these factors as motives. King notes, "The nature and strength of motives are not always clear to the individual and they are certainly not self-evident to the observer, for real motives may be literally or unconsciously concealed" (pp. 60-61).

King examined the individuals' motives for accepting or rejection according to two primary points. The first are biographical determinants. With regards to this King says that there is more to accepting or rejecting a movement than just making the decision on the movement or who started it. A portion of that decision making comes from the individuals making that decisions' life history, and experiences. The second motivational factor is the role of crisis. King explains that crisis exists when an individual's life experiences have produced in him a state of chronic discontent. When the discontent is intensified by a convergence of events and forces a single situation can represent to him a culmination of his chronic dissatisfaction. Crisis provokes concrete action.

The role of motives in general, within the selection process, is that of a consultant, because motives represent and are involved in the acceptance of any movement regardless of its inherent characteristics or the values and structures of the external society (p. 66).

After the discussion of motives, King examined the internal elements of growth. King notes that internal elements, including both goals and the various means employed in their pursuit can be shown to influence the growth of social movements independently of
external conditions. According to King, the internal factors of growth are goals, ideology, organization and status system, group cohesion and tactics (pp. 67-68).

After examining the internal factors in growth, King examines the external influences on growth. King explains that external influences operate by amplifying or limiting the functions of the internal elements. According to King the external influences on growth are cultural consistency, cultural drift, and form and meaning (p. 69-70).

King concludes his analysis of social movements with a general discussion of purposes and consequences. He examines social movements according to what they set out to do and what actually occurred. He views each aspect of the movement according to its manifest and latent consequences. He further explains the value of viewing social movements in this way by stating: "The distinction between purposes and consequences is especially vital in the study of social movements. Here men formulate objectives; they organize and plan in order to attain these goals. But their best made plans can go astray" (p. 107). What King attempts to do in this discussion is to separate and shed new light on the reasons why movements sometimes reach different objectives than the ones that they set out to reach.

Background to Study

This study has made use of some of the empirical data that have been obtained through the study of social movements. These empirical
data are very relevant to public works planning, because the activities are marked by group activity (the organization planning the project), social relationships (the relationships between those doing the planning and those who will be effected by the plan), and some sort of objective (reason behind the plan). King supports this idea by saying that social movements and the planning process are similar because both alter social order and both are attempting to predetermine events and situations in the future (p. V). King also supports the value of using the empirical findings from the study of social movements in the study of the planning process by stating:

To the extent that social planning operates on the basis of principles more efficient than trial and error, to the degree that it is guided by something more effective than sheer idealism - to that extent it must draw upon scientifically established finding, some of which can be derived from the study of social movements (p. V).

Statement of Problem and Hypothesis

The problem posed for this thesis is that public works plans and developments are part of a social process as well as a technological one, and yet we know precious little about their social elements, their social nature, their careers, internal social factors, external social influence and their social purposes and consequences. The hypothesis advanced is that public works projects have a significant likeness to a social movement and that they conform in their essential ingredients to social movement explanations.
The objective of the study is to reconstruct and review the Minto case in a unique way: to test how well King's method of analysis explains the planning process as it occurred within the case study of the Minto Project.

The case study approach is designed to obtain a data base and a knowledge of the relationships between otherwise unknown and unrelated events. Sjobery and Nett's *A Methodology for Social Research* (1968), states:

> Case materials are relevant for social scientists who employ not only the logico-deductive method, discovery, and induction but also certain logical systems that do not fit into traditional categories of scientific inquiry as formulated by philosophers of science. One of these logical systems involves relating parts to parts and parts to wholes. This process enables us to grasp the context within which social action occurs and thereby to understand that action (p. 262).

**Method of Obtaining Data**

In testing the hypothesis, this study will make use of an historic case study of the Minto Hydroelectric Project proposed by Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB) of Eugene, Oregon. The data contained in this case history were obtained through three primary methods. The first method was an extensive review of project documents. The documents reviewed include:

- various government documents covering assorted phases of the proposed project.
- official documents of Eugene Water and Electric Board and
those of the engineering firm of Hanner, Ross and Sporseeen.

- A wide range of newspaper and magazine articles from local, state and regional sources

The second means of acquiring data was through key informant interviews. This study relied principally on six key informants. Three of the informants represented the developing agency (EWB) and three were individuals who opposed the proposed development. The key informants were selected because of their unique knowledge of and involvement with the project, as well as the fact that they represent opposing views.

The third means of acquiring data for this study was through open ended interviews with a purposive sample of the effected population. The purposive sampling technique was chosen because a random sample would not meet the goals of the study, since involvement with the project, either supporting or opposing is not a random process. Sjoberg and Nett defend the purposive sampling technique in their book, A Methodology for Social Research (1968), by stating "Certain types of social inquiry are most affectively advanced when the researcher relies on strategic informants who would not be located through any random procedure (1968, pp. 134-137).

The purposive sample interviews were drawn through the use of extensive literature review and key informant interviews. The purposive sample interviews were with people who were actively involved with the proposed project; i.e. project engineers, contractors, private consultants, public relations personnel, agency staff members,
club members, government officials, environmentalists, landowners and local businessmen.

Method of Analysis of Data

In order to recognize and analyze the critical phases and key ingredients of a public works project and at the same time make use of the vast amount of empirical data on social movements, this paper will make use of C. W. King's Method of Analysis. By employing King's social movement thesis, and the criteria King employs in his analysis of social movements for the analysis of a public works project, a comparison thus can be made between the two which will allow for the testing of the stated hypothesis.

In using King's method, the case history of the proposed Minto Hydroelectric project is to be viewed as a series of steps, or in King's words, "a natural history or career." This consists of distinguishing and dealing separately with two dimensions of the career of a public works project. The first dimension pertains to events within the EWEB organization. The second relates to the trends in the relations of the development of the project with external society.

By following this procedure, explaining aspects of each critical phase, it is then possible to provide an explanation of how the case history of the Minto project corresponded to each stage and to the natural history or career model of King.
Following this analysis, conclusions are drawn, concentrating on reasons for the project's acceptance or rejection, and identifying the critical phases of the Minto case and how it corresponds to King's social movement thesis.

Following the conclusions will be a brief discussion of the legal requirements that impact the planning for hydroelectric projects within the state of Oregon. Then, a set of recommendations is offered. These recommendations incorporate the conclusion chapter and related research into a model of the early planning process of public works projects.
CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF SITE

The Niagara area has long been considered a viable site for hydroelectric development. The main reason for the area's development popularity is the Niagara gorge, which is where the North Santiam River surges down a narrow canyon through basalt clefts.

The first recorded development in the area was by the O'Neil brothers, Edward and Frank, who later were joined by L. W. Callaghan. The O'Neil brothers owned 1,000 acres of timber land in Linn and Marion counties and they owned an operating paper mill in Lebanon. In 1896 or 1897 they planned construction of a paper mill in the town of Niagara. The mill was to take straw and turn it into paper. The mill was to be powered by a hydroelectric dam which would produce electricity to be sold as a by-product.

The site the O'Neils chose to build their dam was where the North Santiam flows through a four foot, three inch basalt cleft, which was adjacent to the town of Niagara, and consisted of a railroad depot, hotel, store and a number of dwellings. In 1898 the O'Neils decided that it would take too long to build a mill at the Niagara site, so they made an addition to their Lebanon mill.

---

1 The sources for this section on the history of the Niagara site include interviews and undated news clippings from area newspapers.
paper mill, when in operation, required straw from 8,000 acres for a year of continuous operation; production amounted to 400 reams of straw paper daily.

The O'Neils were still very interested in building a hydroelectric project on the Niagara site, so they continued to hold on to the water rights. Around 1900 the O'Neils and Callaghan began building their dam. The project used local rock and Chinese labor with horse and oxen being the only power source other than manual labor. The project was to be composed of two major sections. Work started on the Marion county side. The dam was constructed using a stone masonry technique. The O'Neils are said to have spent $37,500 in completing a portion of the first wing of the dam.

In 1908 the O'Neils decided to allow a development company, Byliesby & Co., to take over construction with an option to purchase. Byliesby & Co. worked on the dam from 1909 to 1912. They constructed the wing dam and work halted with only a small section left to be completed. It is not known whether financial or engineering problems prevented the dam's completion. There are and probably were some serious doubts about the stone masonry dam's ability to withstand the force of the North Santiam River at high water stages. When work stopped in 1912, Byliesby & Co. had spent close to $65,000 on the project.

In 1913 the Oregon Electric Railroad looked the site over and was interested in taking the project over. But, a financial arrangement could not be made. O'Neil and Callaghan kept maintenance men on
the site for several months, doing minor work and retaining their water power rights. But no major work was attempted, and eventually the men were sent elsewhere. Over time the masonry began to lose its mortar and it was not pointed up again. In later years large floods destroyed portions of the dam and the remains of the dam today are a local tourist attraction.

The local population supported the project and the town of Niagara boomed construction. After the project was abandoned, the town went into a state of decline until it was disbanded in 1951.

The site was ignored until the Willamette Basin Project got underway in 1935. The goal of the project was to more fully develop the Willamette valley's natural resources. In 1938, the Flood Control Act was passed which allowed federal funding to go into the construction of multipurpose dams and reservoirs. In 1945, the Army Corps of Engineers began planning construction of a Detroit dam and reservoir was to be located approximately five miles above the Niagara site.

In 1947, the project engineers of the Detroit dam determined that the most effective way to produce power at Detroit dam would be to operate the powerhouse as a peaking plant. To do this, additional stream regulation would be needed so that Detroit powerplant discharges would not cause hazardous flow conditions in the downstream reaches. The project engineer of Detroit Dam asked Stan Sporseen, a planning engineer for the project, to find a location for the re-regulation dam. In order to meet hydrological, environmental, and cost
concerns, a site was chosen approximately two and eight-tenths miles south of the Detroit Dam site. Sporseen was chosen as project engineer for the dam, which had been named Big Cliff.

Sporseen made the recommendation that the power house for Big Cliff dam be placed at Niagara, connected to the dam with a 14 - 15 foot in diameter pipe which would run along the Southern Pacific Railroad rightaway for approximately two miles to Niagara. By placing the power house at Niagara, ninety feet of head could be gained, making the pipe and the plant pay for itself. The plan was submitted, but, a Washington D.C. consultant for the Corps said that the Army Corp of Engineers were not in the power business and decided the power house should be built at the Big Cliff dam site. Construction of Detroit Dam began in March of 1949 and operation commenced in January of 1953. Construction of Big Cliff Dam began in August of 1951 and concluded in November of 1953.

In the late 1950's, John Cotton, a hydroelectric engineer representing Consumer's Power of Corvallis (a cooperative corporation founded in 1939 and which serves approximately 6,000 square miles spread over six counties: Lane, Benton, Polk, Marion, Lincoln, Linn; serving over 5,000 customers), contacted Sporseen, who was working as a consulting engineer, about developable hydroelectric sites in Oregon. Sporseen said that the Niagara site is in his opinion one of the most developable dam sites in Oregon. Consumers Power & Sporseen worked together in drawing a number of plans for the project and submitted them to the Consumers Power Engineers, who chose a plan
that called for a power canal in addition to the pipe, at which time Sporseen asked to be disassociated with the project. Consumers Power completed their initial planning and applied for a preliminary permit with the State Water Resources Board to build a concrete diversion dam. It was to be sixty-five feet in height with a length on top of six hundred and fifty feet that would be constructed about two and half miles below the existing Big Cliff dam and power house. The water from the dam would be carried through a 1.6 mile pressure tunnel and then a 8.5 mile concrete lined flume along the north bank of the North Santiam to a point approximately two miles west of Mill City. There it would be used to operate two generators each of a 37,500 kilowatt capacity, which would produce 388 kilowatts per year on the average. The construction cost of the project was estimated at 25 million dollars and would take approximately four years to build.

Consumers Power of Corvallis was required to testify before the State Water Resource Board on March 4, 1960. The public hearing was held in order to determine if they could receive a preliminary permit to construct their proposed North Santiam power project. Consumers Power's attorney, Tom Mix, testified that Consumers Power's reason for developing the project was that a severe power shortage looms in the future. In support of that statement he said, "the Bonneville Power Administration predicts a severe power shortage in the Pacific Northwest within its system in 1964 or 1965."
Alan Hunnicut, the assistant engineer for Consumers Power, went on to testify that "according to various estimates, Consumers Power will have 12,000 customers by 1988, and that by 1985 Consumers Power customers would be using all of the energy generated by the project."

Consumers Power had the support of the North Santiam Chamber of Commerce who testified as being "in favor of the project because it would be beneficial to the area."

The Marion County Farmers Union, which represents approximately 500 members, testified that they were in favor of the project because:

- a power shortage will exist in the Northwest in the mid sixties and Consumers Power, as a cooperative electric utility, is responsible to provide a lasting source of power for its members; there is an undeveloped hydropotential in the North Santiam River, and Consumers Power desires to develop that hydropotential which would be of lasting benefit to the North Santiam community by furnishing jobs and taxable wealth.

The project also had the support of many homeowners, local residents and business men.

The project was opposed by a number of public and private agencies as well as by some citizen groups. The State Fish and Game Commission testified, "the North Santiam Power Project would be detrimental to the fish and game resources of the North Santiam River; the trailrace flows at the powerhouse would create an objectionable artificial attraction for adult steelhead and salmon. The project would adversely effect the Marion Fork's Fish Hatchery and the Minto Wier which is operated by the Fish Commission." They also
pointed out that the proposed reservoir would inundate 2.5 miles of excellent stream fishing and an additional 10 miles of fishing downstream from the dam would be reduced in value or destroyed as a result of flow depletion.

The Oregon and Salem division of the Izaak Walton League testified that they opposed the project for the same reason as the Fish and Games Commissions. The Silverton Chapter of the Izaak Walton League testified their concern for protecting Niagara Park, which is maintained by the chapter, from the reduction of the river flow and its affect on river recreation. Marion County Park Officials testified that they strongly opposed the diversion of water from the North Santiam River, which they felt would adversely affect Marion County Parks and destroy the scenic and aesthetic beauty of the area.

A number of local towns also expressed concern over the possibility of the diversion from the river increasing the water temperature which would in turn adversely affect the river as a source of public water.

On August 17, 1960 the Oregon Water Resource Board denied the application of a preliminary construction permit for the North Santiam Power project. The board based its denial on several factors including that: the dam would result in a single purpose use of water to the detriment of other beneficial uses; it would reduce the recreational values of the area and would destroy the scenic beauty; it would do further damage to the anadromous fish runs; and a minimum
flow of escapement water would not be adequate for the protection of water supplies.

In the 1960's and 70's there were no hydroelectric projects planned for the Niagara Site. The site, however, was listed in a number of studies considering possible hydropower project sites.

In 1976, Congress passed the Water Resources Development Act, which authorized the National Hydroelectric Power study. The Army Corps of Engineers was given authority to conduct the study through their Institute for Water Resources which is located in Virginia. This study is divided into two major elements. The first element consists of a comprehensive inventory of hydropower resources across the nation and a projection of regional demands for hydropower through the year 2000. The second element consists of the identification of socio-economic, environmental, institutional and other policy issues effecting hydropower developments. The study was scheduled for completion in late 1981.
CHAPTER III

CASE HISTORY - EARLY PLANNING AND PERMIT

EWEB Begin Involvement

In 1979, Al Spar, an engineer for Pacific Power and Light, in a conversation with Stan Sporseen, then a consulting engineer for the firm Hanner, Ross and Sporseen, asked Sporseen, "why don't you try to find someone interested in building a hydroelectric project in the Niagara area, since you have always been interested in developing a project there and since the time for hydroelectric development seems right?" Sporseen responded that it sounded like a good idea, and that while in Eugene talking to Kieth Parks, the general manager of Eugene Water and Electric Board, about the proposed Sunnyside Project on the South Santiam, he might as well talk to Parks about the prospects of developing the Niagara site. Sporseen traveled to Eugene the next day to talk to Parks, the General Manager of Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB).

EWEB presently owns and operates four hydroelectric projects located on the McKenzie River. EWEB also has the rights to the energy outputs of the EWEB and Weyerhauser industrial energy center for use in its own system. These sources provide approximately 25% of EWEB's electrical energy requirements. EWEB retains the balance of its energy requirements through contractual agreements with Bonneville Power Administration.
Kieth Parks listened to Sporseen explain his ideas for hydroelectric development at the Niagara site. When Sporseen finished his presentation, Parks told him to go ahead and complete a preliminary engineering feasibility study and then with the study EWEB would apply to the Federal Energy Regulating Commission for a preliminary permit.

Parks was able to authorize the study by Hanner Ross and Sporseen because the five member board of directors had approved funds for the investigation of further hydroelectric projects in their yearly budget; which was supported by a 1970 referendum that was passed by Eugene voters to put a ban on EWEB's involvement in nuclear power. As a result of this referendum, EWEB's board of directors voted to disassociate itself forever from nuclear power by selling its share of Trojan Nuclear Power Plant and by stressing the importance of developing renewable energy resources such as hydroelectric power.

**EWEB Begin FERC Application Process**

EWEB was formed in 1911 and is organized pursuant to the city of Eugene charter. EWEB provides water, electric and central steam services within the city limits of Eugene and certain areas outside the city limits.

The utility is directed by five Eugene citizens who are elected to four year terms and serve without pay. EWEB operates without tax support, and has paid over 46 million dollars in "lieu of taxes" to
various communities since they are not required to pay property taxes being a public utility.

In late 1979 early 1980, the engineering consulting firm of Hanner, Ross and Sporseen of Gladstone, Oregon, began compiling the necessary information for EWEB's application for preliminary permit to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

EWEB is required to apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), because according to the Federal Power Act, FERC regulates every hydroelectric project that:

- would be located in part or whole on federal land
- would be located on a navigable stream. "The term navigable waters' appears to include all waters regardless of navigability." (58 FPC 2702)
- would feed electricity into a utility's grid, thus affecting interstate commerce.
- would use surplus water at federal dam to generate electricity.

Since EWEB's plans called for feeding electricity into the Bonneville Power Administration power grid, and since it would use water released from a Federal water project, it was determined that EWEB must apply to FERC for a license.

EWEB officials determined that it was in the utility's best interest to pursue the preliminary FERC permit, which is the first step in the FERC licensing process. If granted, the preliminary permit would protect EWEB's right to the Niagara site and no other
developer could apply for a license to build a dam on the site during the term of the permit, which is usually three years. The purpose of the preliminary permit was in effect an insurance policy for the permittee (EWEB), which allowed them to conduct detailed engineering, environmental and financial studies for the proposed project without the worry of competition from other developers.

EWEB did not have to apply for the preliminary permit. The license could be applied for directly rather than applying for the preliminary permit. But EWEB's interests would not be protected until or if a license is granted. So EWEB, as nearly all developers do, applied for the preliminary permit first.

The application for preliminary permit, according to FERC guidelines, must describe the proposed project, explain the studies that will be taking place, including location and type of test pits and other field work which would be conducted in order to assess the projects' engineering feasibility. The application procedures also require the permittee to estimate the cost of the various studies. The application procedures make it clear that the preliminary FERC permit only authorizes the field tests needed for engineering assessment. It does not authorize the construction of the actual dam.

It should be noted that "FERC normally approves development." That bias reflects its mission, as spelled out by Congress: 'To adopt... a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway (12 U.S.C. B803)'. Still, some projects have been rejected, strictly on environmental grounds; and FERC allows most to be built only under
conditions which are intended to minimize environmental damage." (Roos-Collins, 1982 p2)

In late February 1980, Hanner, Ross and Sporseen had obtained the necessary information for EWEB to apply to FERC for a preliminary permit. On May 30, 1980, EWEB filed an application for the preliminary permit for a project that had been named the Minto Diversion Dam and Power Plant.

EWEB's application began with the following statement:

Eugene Water and Electric Board, Municipal Corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, applies to the Federal Energy Regulating Commission for a preliminary permit for the proposed Minto Water Power Project, as described in the attached exhibits. This application is made in order that the applicant may secure and maintain priority of application for a license.

EWEB's application consisted of four exhibits: the proposed project description; a description of proposed studies, costs, and financing of studies and maps. The application was 15 pages in length; each exhibit will be briefly summarized.

The project description portion of the application described the project as consisting of a new diversion dam, 80 feet high and 200 feet long that would be constructed approximately two and one-half miles downstream of the existing Big Cliff Dam and power plant. The diversion dam will direct the stream flow through a pipeline to the powerhouse. The pipeline will be approximately 21 feet in diameter and will follow the right of way of a former Southern Pacific Railroad Branch line located on the North Bank of the North Santiam River.
The pipeline will be buried at the points where it passes through the State of Oregon, Niagara State Park. The outlet of the powerhouse will return the flow to the North Santiam River.

The proposed project will not include a storage reservoir. However, the diversion dam pondage will cover approximately 74.3 acres and contain 2,660 acre feet at a normal maximum surface elevation of 1109 feet mean sea level. The project will use water released from the reservoirs at Detroit Dam and Big Cliff Dam. Flow in this portion of the North Santiam River is controlled by Detroit Dam and reservoir and releases of water for power generation are reregulated by Big Cliff Dam.

Three 230/20 transmission lines owned by the Bonneville Power Administration pass within one-quarter of a mile of the proposed powerhouse site. The feasibility study will investigate tapping one of these lines. The proposed powerhouse would contain two generating units, each rated a 16,125 kw, which would produce an estimate average annual energy production of 150 GWH. The capacity and energy production of the project are directly related to and entirely dependent upon the releases from Big Cliff Reservoir.

There are no public lands of the United States included within this project. Most of the land that is required for the project is owned by the State of Oregon Department of Transportation. The land required for the penstock and power plant and that part of the South Bank of the North Santiam River to be covered by the diversion pool is privately owned.
There are no areas within or in the vicinity of the proposed project boundary that have been included in or have been designated for study for inclusion in national wild and scenic river system. There are no areas within the proposed project boundary that have been designated as a wilderness area or wilderness study area, or recommended for designation as a wilderness area under the Wilderness Act.

Exhibit two contained a description of the proposed studies that would be completed under the preliminary permit. EWEB explained that they were seeking an issuance of a preliminary permit for a period of 36 months, during which time they would conduct geotechnical studies and surveys, perform preliminary designs, quantity computations, cost estimates, conduct environmental studies and assessments and prepare for a FERC license application.

EWEB further explained that the feasibility studies would consider alternative sites for the proposed project facilities that would avoid or minimize the impacts on environmental values, including those located in flood plains or wetlands. EWEB continued this line of thought by stating that the studies will also consider measures to enhance and protect environmental resources and mitigate adverse impacts on environmental resources.

EWEB explained that the studies worked on under the preliminary permit would not involve the preparation of an environmental impact statement and that no new roads will be required to conduct the studies mentioned. Exhibit two concluded with a workplan and
timetable for the various studies and the following statement by EWEB: "The field studies, tests and other activities to be conducted under the permit are not expected to adversely affect cultural resources, flood plains or wetlands or any endangered species."

Exhibit three contained an explanation of the costs of the studies and an explanation of how the studies would be financed. EWEB estimated the cost of the work to be completed under the preliminary permit to be $120,000.00, and explained that the studies would be financed from monies generated from internal operations.

Exhibit three also contained an explanation of why EWEB needed to build the project. They explained that the power generated by the project would be used to serve the loads of EWEB; stating that arrangements would be made to wheel the power to the EWEB service area. EWEB, in order to show the need for increase power production, pointed out that they had substantial load growth in the past two decades, with annual peak loads of 109.9 MW in 1959, 315.5 MW in 1969, and 533.0 MW in 1979.

Exhibit three concluded the EWEB arguments for the need of further power production by stating:

Historically, EWEB has been able to purchase additional power from the Bonneville Power Administration. However, BPA has given a notice of insufficiency, limiting our additional power purchases starting in 1983. The BPA purchase contracts will expire on December 3, 1984 and EWEB does not know whether the contracts will be renewed. If the contracts are renewed, the amount of energy available for purchase and the terms and conditions of purchase are currently unknown.
The final section, Exhibit four, contained a map showing the project's location and a map of the proposed Minto hydro project. It also included the project boundary and typical profiles of the proposed new facilities developed by Hanner, Ross and Sporseen. (See Figures 1, and 2).

On June 25, 1980 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission announced that Eugene Water and Electric Board had filed an application for preliminary permit on May 30, 1980 for proposed project No. 3112 to be known as the Minto Dam and Power Plant Project located on the North Santiam River. In the Notice of Application, FERC included the name and addresses of EWEB's general manager Kieth Parks and of Stan Sporseen, consulting engineer, in case interested parties wanted more information. The notice included a simplified copy of EWEB's application, as well as an explanation of what the issuance of a preliminary permit means.

The notice also included a section entitled, "Comments, Protests and Petitions to Intervene." This section outlined procedures for all such actions. It also pointed out that the FERC takes all comments and protests under consideration in determining the appropriate action to be taken on the application. August 6th, 1980 was listed as the date by which all such actions must be received by.

The Notice of Application was published in accordance to the Federal Power Act (Sec. 4f) which requires the FERC to announce the application to the news media and to all federal, state, and local agencies.
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Figure 1. Project location map.
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Government Agency Responses

A number of government agencies commented on the Notice of Application for Preliminary Permit. The U.S. Department of Interior stated that they have no objection to the granting of the preliminary permit to EWEB provided that the studies under the permit give adequate consideration to a number of concerns.

The concerns expressed by the Department of Interior were: water rights; a gauging station located upstream from the dam site; extensive sand and gravel deposits in reservoir area; the fact that the North Santiam River has been listed on the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Services National River Inventory; and the diverse fish and wildlife species in the area. The Department of Interior said, "Because of these and other concerns EWEB should maintain close coordination with the appropriate Federal and State agencies throughout the project planning and during preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement."

The Department of Interior concluded their comments by recommending that the preliminary permit contain the following items, if issued.

1. The Permittee shall consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service (F.W.S.), National Marines Fisheries Service (N.M.F.S.), Oregon Division of Fisheries and Wildlife (O.D.F.W.) and Corps for Guidance in Conducting Project Investigations to preserve and protect the
environmental integrity of the area and to explore all alternatives to avoid damage to, or destruction of fish and wildlife resources and their habitat.

2. The Permittee shall at its expense, arrange for, initiate, conduct such studies as may be necessary to:
   (a) determine the impact of project construction and operation on fish and wildlife resources, including threatened (rare) and endangered species and their habitat; and
   (b) develop appropriate measures to protect, maintain and, if possible, enhance these resources and their habitat.

3. The findings and recommendations from studies described in items 1 and 2 above shall be appended to exhibits of any subsequent application for a license to construct this project.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) commented that the notice did not contain sufficient information on the proposed project for them to provide the FERC with detailed comments on the scope of needed environmental studies. Using as an example the fact that the project plan did not indicate the location of the existing Minto egg-taking facility, EPA pointing out that this facility was built and is operated as mitigation for the upstream Corps of Engineers' dams, and must continue to be maintained as part of this proposal. The EPA concluded their comments by saying that they were
willing to work with EWEB during the environmental study and license application preparation stage and that they hoped that this opportunity would be used to resolve any potential issues as early as possible.

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), the Oregon Water Polity Review Board (WPRB), and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) filed late petitions to intervene and were granted intervention on September 16, 1980.

DFW and NMFS contended that construction of the proposed project would affect the fishery resources of the North Santiam River and requested that the applicant be required to file a workplan before conducting any land or water disturbing studies. DFW further requested that the permit contain conditions that would require EWEB to undertake detailed studies to minimize the impact of the project on fish and wildlife resources and to provide mitigation for any destruction of these resources. NMFS also requested that it become a party to future planning and to the studies that would determine project impacts on fishery resources.

The Water Policy Review Board contacted the Attorney General of Oregon through an inter office memo and requested that office to prepare a petition of intervention into the FERC process. The Attorney General's office prepared the following Notice of Intervention.

The state of Oregon has a comprehensive water code governing the use and development of water resources of that state, including hydroelectric power projects which is administered by the Water Policy Review Board and the Director of the Water Resources Department. The Water Policy Review Board has adopted a program for
the use of the water in the middle Willamette Basin where Project No. 3112 is proposed to be located. Based upon its statutory duties, the Water Policy Review Board hereby files Notice of Intervention under CRF 1.8 and requests an evidentiary hearing in connection with the captivized matters.

The Permit

On September 30, 1980 the FERC released a Notice of the Issuance of an Order granting a Preliminary Permit to EWEB for 36 months. FERC explained that they issued the permit without an evidentiary hearing even though WPRB requested such a hearing to be held, because Water Policy Review Board did not explain why a hearing was necessary and that WPRB did not indicate that it was opposed to the issuance of the permit. Taking the before mentioned factors into account the FERC stated:

Since there appears to be no material issues of fact in dispute with respect to the issuance of a permit for this project, it is concluded that an evidentiary hearing would serve no useful purpose.

The FERC replied to some of the other comments and interventions on the Notice of Application for the preliminary permit by stating:

Some of the concerns raised in the comments and interventions address the potential effects of constructing and operating the proposed project itself, not the effects of issuing a preliminary permit. The effects of constructing and operating the project will be the subject of studies performed under the permit and of any license application that may follow. Should the permittee find the project feasible and file an application for license, all interested persons and agencies will be given notice and have an opportunity to review the application, present their comments concerning the project and the effects of its
construction and operation, and seek to participate in the licensing proceedings.

The order issuing the preliminary permit contained a one paragraph description of the project as well as the following explanation of the purpose of the permit.

The purpose of any preliminary permit is to maintain priority of application for a license during the term of the permit. While the permittee conducts investigations and secures data necessary to determine the feasibility of the proposed project and to prepare an acceptance application for license. A preliminary permit does not authorize construction of any projects works. This permit does require the permittee to conduct certain studies, but under conditions which will assure that those studies caused significant adverse environmental impacts.

The notice also contained a number of requirements that EWEB must follow to maintain its preliminary permit. The FERC required EWEB to comply with all regulations in the Federal Power Act as well as the terms and conditions of the preliminary permit which is made up of statutes and articles.

Article One stated that EWEB shall make such engineering and other investigations, secure such data and perform such acts as are necessary to determine the feasibility of the proposed project and, if said project is found to be feasible, to prepare an application for license for the project that will be in conformance with current rules and regulations of the Commission. Article One went on to list the various engineering studies that must be completed, as well as a time schedule for their completion.
Article two explained the requirements for the issuance of a license by stating that a project will be granted a license only if; the project will be best adapted to a comprehensive plan for the improvement or development of a waterway for the use or benefit of interstate commerce, for the utilization of water power development, and for other beneficial public uses, including recreational purposes in the judgment of the Commission.

Article Two gave the following list of items that the Commission will consider in reaching its decision:

A. Whether the maps placing and specifications are such:

1. That full, practicable utilization will be made of the water, storage possibilities, and head at the site to be developed;

2. That the structures will be safe and constructed in accordance with good engineering practice; and

3. That all unnecessary energy losses, whether in hydraulic works, mechanical or electrical equipment, will be avoided.

B. Whether in relation to existing or probable future projects upon the same or adjacent streams, the potential for the fullest practicable utilization of available water, storage possibilities, and heat will be maintained.

C. Whether said project will be in general accord with the most beneficial utilization of the water for navigation, water power, irrigation, or other public uses, and for aiding flood control reclamation, and similar developments.

D. Whether proper provision is made for present or future electrical interconnection with other projects or systems in order to take advantage of diversity of streamflow and of power demands.
E. Whether the use to which the power will be devoted is, in general, in accord with the public interest.

F. Whether the applicant is financially able to carry out the development.

G. Whether the construction, maintenance, and operation of the proposed project works will interface or be inconsistent with the purpose for which any reservative, as defined in the Federal Power Act, was created or acquired.

Article Three stated that the priority granted under the permit will be lost if the permittee fails to fulfill the requirements of the permit. It continued by listing the various ways that such an event could occur.

Article Four required the permittee to keep accurate records of all expenditures made for the purposes authorized by the permit.

Article Five stated that the permit gives no authority to the permittee to begin construction of the proposed project.

The final standard article, number 6, explained that the permit was not transferrable and could be cancelled by order of the Commission upon failure of the permittee to begin in good faith, or prosecute diligently the investigations, examinations, and surveys contemplated under the permit, or to comply with any other conditions therein, or for any good cause showed after notice and opportunity for hearing.

In addition to the standard conditions and articles of the preliminary permit, FERC added a number of special conditions set forth in six additional articles that relate directly to the proposed Minto power project.
FERC stated that they determined the additional articles 7-12 were needed because of the various comments and interventions that were received in response of the Notice for Application. Articles 7-12 expressed the concerns of the various Federal, state and local agencies that were explained earlier. Each concern was made a requirement for the permittee. FERC required that the agencies mentioned in the Department of Interior comments become a part of the study process.

Numerous state and area newspapers announced that EWEB was granted a preliminary permit for a hydropower project on the North Santiam. The November 17, 1980 edition of Salem's Statesman Journal explained the project according to EWEB's application to FERC in a 5 inch column in an inside section. The article also reported that EWEB had plans for the study of the possibility of damming the middle fork of the Santiam between Foster and Green Peter dams.

For the next few months the engineering firm of Hanner Ross and Sporseen began working on the various studies required by FERC.

During this time Dale Hagey, the state ecologist for EWEB, began working on a study of the fish and wildlife to be impacted by the project as required by special article #10 which stated:

Within six months from the effective date of this permit, the permittee shall (1) prepare a preliminary outline of the content and scope of a study of the effects that the proposed project might have on the fish and wildlife resources and of the facilities or measures needed to conserve or develop these resources.
Article 10 also required that EWEB consult with the various appropriate agencies in developing this plan.

EWEB planned a study with the help of ODFW, NMFS and DFW, that met all of the various agencies concerns. There was a high degree of cooperation between all involved parties. According to EWEB's staff ecologist, "It was just a matter of listening to their interests and concerns and then developing those interests and concerns into a plan for study." EWEB hired VTMI Enterprise, a consulting firm from Eugene, to complete the study.

In mid-October of 1980 the Corps of Engineers released the results of a portion of their National Hydroelectric Power Study. The study listed as feasible, 144 new dams in Oregon. Thirteen new dam sites are listed for the North Santiam, including the Niagara site. Representatives for the Corps' point out that the study is only an inventory not a recommendation that the dams be constructed.

Another portion of the study stated that the demand for electrical energy will increase 151% in the Northwest in the next 20 years, the 151% figure was close to the most recent forecasted by the Bonneville Power Administration.

The Corps' study received a great deal of press in state papers. Most covered the controversial aspects of the study, i.e. how the sites were determined feasible, effects of having sites listed as feasible, cost of the study and how they arrived at the need for power figures.
The Tollisen Involvement and Response

Early in 1981 Pat Tollisen, a Linn County Commissioner, received a number of phone calls from her constituents in eastern Linn County. The callers expressed concern about the proposed hydroelectric project, and wished to know if she knew any more about it. Tollisen explained to the callers that she did not know any more about the project than they did, but she would try to find out more and get back to them.

Tollisen made a number of phone calls with little success until she contacted EWEB who provided her with a copy of their application to FERC for a preliminary permit. She studied the application and made copies of it. Tollisen then set up informal meetings with the local residents who had expressed interest in knowing more about the project.

The meetings were held at various locations. The meetings began with Tollisen's passing out copies of EWEB's FERC application. After the local concerned residents read the application there was a discussion of the project. The general concern of the group was why EWEB had not publicized the project more, there was a feeling of mistrust, some thought that EWEB was trying to pull something over on the community. Tollisen expressed her concern that EWEB had not contacted the Linn or Marion County Board of Commissioners, and thought that EWEB might be trying to sidestep the local county's comprehensive plans.
After discussing the project with some of the citizens that would be impacted by the project and after doing some additional research, she decided to be actively opposed to the project. She said her reasons for opposing the project were: the project would be destructive to the area by hurting the recreation industry, it would destroy valuable fish habitat; EWEB had no business trying to build a project in Linn and Marion counties; and most importantly she said that she opposed the project because local people didn't want it and asked her to help them actively oppose it.

Tollisen felt that the best way to stop the project was to oppose EWEB at a grassroots level. She felt that the local people should have the final say whether or not EWEB should build the project, and felt it her duty as an elected commissioner to help them any way she could.

The next week Tollisen tried to get fellow commissioners to openly oppose the project, but no formal decisions were made. Over the next months Tollisen had a number of meetings with small groups of canyon residents, discussing the project, and advising them to write letters and to be more active in their opposition. No formal action was taken and some thought the situation was out of their control—that if EWEB wanted to build, they would build. Tollisen continued to advise them that the project could be stopped if they would do something to stop it, such as forming a group against the project. She told them she would do all she could as an elected commissioner to stop the project.
Oregon Water Policy

On January 29, 1981 James Sexson, the Director of Oregon Water Policy Review Board, wrote a letter to Kenneth Plumb, the Secretary of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, concerning its granting of preliminary permits for proposed hydroelectric developments in Oregon.

Sexson states that "The use of water for power generation cannot be allowed under Oregon law unless the applicant has secured the appropriate state permit or license."

Sexson continued by pointing out that there are a number of legislative requirements and adopted water use policies which might limit or prohibit the use of water for power generation in a particular area or on certain stream systems within the state. Sexson stated that all power projects in excess of 100 theoretical horsepower are subject to review by public hearing before Oregon's Water Policy Review Board prior to the issuance of state permit or license.

Sexson concluded his letter by stating that:

It appears that many applicants are proceeding directly to secure the required federal authorization without inquiring as to the possible requirements or restrictions at the state level. I am concerned about the possibility of issuance of a Federal permit for a particular project where the applicant has not been advised regarding state requirements. To avoid this situation I am asking that you advise all Oregon applicants, by a copy of this letter, that it would be prudent for them to contact this department prior to making any substantial investment in a proposed project.
EWEB's First Presentation

EWEB held its first presentation on the proposed Minto Power Project on Thursday May 28, 1981 to the Marion County Park Commission. The presentation was made by EWEB engineer Dean Axtell. Axtell said "the presentation's purpose is to provide local park officials with all available preliminary feasibility study information." He said that any design work planning on the project is "very early preliminary" and that through meeting with various local, state and federal agencies, EWEB hopes "to determine whether or not to pursue the project and to see if there is significant opposition to it."

Axtell began the presentation by explaining that the study is being done under a preliminary permit for hydroelectric development granted to EWEB by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. He continued by explaining that the general plans for the site consists of a diversion dam east of Niagara Park that would impound about 72 acres of water behind its 100 ft. high wall which would flood portions of existing Highway 22 and would require its realignment north of its present location. He added that he was unsure of the extent of change that would be required.

He said, "the project would include two power houses. The first would be at the site of the diversion dam, which would generate electricity from the estimated 750 cubic feet per second of water as it is released into the river bed." This amount of water he said "would surpass the requirements of the state law, which requires a minimum
of 500 cubic feet per second of water to remain in the channel of the North Santiam at all times."

Axtell explained that the remainder of the river's flow will be stored behind the dam and would be sent through a two mile long 21 foot wide pipeline to the site of the second powerhouse which is planned to be located near Pack Saddle Park.

Axtell further said that the current plans call for the use of the old railroad rightaway, that is owned by the state for the pipeline, and a couple acres of parkland owned by the county for the diversion dam, and some amount of privately owned property for the highway realignment project. In total he said the project would comprise about 100 acres.

Axtell concluded his presentation to the Parks Commission by saying, "This is a base plan, a place to start and although I expect it to be the one recommended to us by the engineers, I am sure that it will be modified."

The Marion County Parks Commission responded to the presentation with mixed reactions. County Parks Director Bob Maxey said that at this point the project and the Commission's position on it is, "tenuous and not firmed up at all." Maxey said, "at this point there are some plusses and minuses." Among the plusses he said, "is that the current plan suggests moving Highway 22 north, a move which would join two county parks that are now separated by the highway, Niagara and Rogers Wayside, into one park."
Maxey speculated that the 72 acre lake could provide more water recreation in the area. But Water Superintendent Arnold said, "the city would probably object to most recreational use that could contaminate the water in the reservoir," and added that "the steep banks that were present would probably preclude most water activities." The minuses, Maxey said, "include the dam itself, it certainly won't be as beautiful to look up the canyon and see a 100 ft. high wall of concrete as it is to look up the canyon as it is now." Maxey said, "another minus would be the disturbance of the parks caused by the construction of the pipeline and dam which would remove a lot of old trees and would tear up the area royally."

Maxey went on to say that he had been assured by EWEB that a 750 cubic foot per second flow would be maintained through the Niagara area, which wouldn't cause a problem, but he added that he is not sure if the parks department would be able to enforce the 750 cubic feet flow if EWEB doesn't cooperate. He added, "It would be a real different area if they change the flows through there too much, and it could cause real problems."

Maxey concluded his informal statement by saying "the field work on the project probably won't begin until fall" and he said "an Environmental Impact Assessment won't be completed by EWEB for at least a year."

The information presented by EWEB to the members of the Park Commission was reviewed by several members of Marion County Board of Commissioners (Gary Heer, Harry Carson and Randy Franke). Commis-
Commissioner Heer made a public statement saying that "the project called Minto Dam by EWEB is of no direct benefit to Marion County. Its big benefit is to Eugene, and I don't see why they don't build this on the McKenzie River." Heer also said, "the proposed plan would destroy several acres of large pine trees and most of the picnic sites in Niagara Park, and construction would require the popular park to be closed for an undetermined length of time."

In response to some of the criticisms of the project, an EWEB official said that EWEB chose the North Santiam River site because environmental concerns over any new dams on the McKenzie would prevent them from building a project in Lane County." This remark did not sit too well with many Mid-Willamette Valley public officials. Public officials of Mill City, Marion and Linn counties voiced words of opposition about the environmental concerns of the Minto site, i.e. fish and aesthetics.

Pat Tollisen, Linn County Commissioner, after reviewing the information presented at the hearing, told EWEB managers "you've got rivers in Lane County, build your dam on one of them." Tollisen also presented EWEB with a petition signed by 36 canyon residents who opposed any study of a dam project in the canyon. The petition had been given to her by a concerned canyon resident who had attended a couple of her informal meetings. Tollisen ended her public statement by questioning EWEB as to what made environmental concerns on the McKenzie more important than the environmental concerns on the North Santiam.
In response to the petitions and the various questions and statements made by Mid-Valley residents and Commissioners, EWEB General Manager Keith Parks said that the utility is willing to compromise on some of the environmental issues but they are not going to waver in their attempt to sell the project to Mid-Valley residents. Parks urged that geographical rivalaries be set aside in the interests of meeting energy shortages.

Parks continued his defense of the proposed project by saying "A lot of people complaining about this project have not had all the information. Some of them think we're ready to start construction. All we're talking about is a study. We've got a hell of a public process to go through before we can build anything."

Parks said that future energy demands must be met by increased use of renewable energy resources, such as water power and any suitable hydroelectric sites will be in heavy demand for development, if not by us then by other utilities in the region.

Parks, in referring to the opposition to the proposed project, said, "I don't mind pressures as long as they're knowledgeable, but when the lights go out there will be only one guy that is blamed - the utility that wasn't doing its job. We're doing our best to plan for the future." He said that some of the opposition to the Santiam project may be the result of the political rivalry between Mid-Valley and Eugene officials. He concluded "People have to ask themselves whether they oppose the project because it's a bad project or if it's
because we're doing it. If it's feasible, then it should be built. It's far too important, to have neighborhood squabbles stop it."

The political rivalries and neighborhood squabbles that Parks referred to were for the most part the result of the controversy over field burning in the Mid-Willamette Valley that is associated with the grass seed industry.

The field burning controversy arose with the environmental movement in the late 1960's. Eugene residents strongly opposed field burning because of the associated air pollution that was a yearly problem in Eugene, due to the burning of fields in the North. Eugene residents strongly lobbied for field burning restrictions or a complete ban on burning. Mid-Valley residents opposed such restrictions or bans because the grass seed industry is an important part of the Mid-Valley economy. The issue became a yearly legislative battle, with Eugene succeeding in getting a ban passed in legislature in 1971 and Marion County succeeding in getting the ban rescinded in 1975. The issue went back and forth for the next few years until the E.P.A. became involved in 1979 by enforcing the Clear Air Act. The issue hasn't been completely resolved and there are still hard feelings on both sides of the issue.

Auxiliary Actions by Public Agencies

In May of 1981, Governor Vic Atiyeh endorsed the findings of a review of potential Oregon Dam projects by a state task force composed of nine state agencies.
The task force formed in 1980 by the governor, reviewed over 80 dam projects proposed by the Corps of Engineers. The Governor's task force divided 84 of the Corps dam proposals into three categories, 29 were found suitable, 14 were found less suitable, and 41 unsuitable. The Governor urged the Corps to include 43 proposals in its nationwide inventory which would be completed later in the year, and urged them to drop 48 proposals that would cause significant environmental damage. EWEB's Minto project was not considered, rather a diversion project from Big Cliff to below Mill City was listed and determined suitable - to less suitable due to concerns over salmon and steelhead.

On June 9th, 1981, Major General Richard Wells, Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers told the Northwest Power Planning Council that the Pacific Northwest is in a worsening and potentially crippling water shortage that can only be solved by building more dams. "The statement related directly to the upper Columbia Basin. Although it could have effects in smaller hydro projects, though a change in water policy by the regions power planning council.

On June 11th, 1981 it was reported in a number of newspapers that the City of Portland was applying to the Oregon Water Policy Review Board for a state permit to acquire water rights for a proposed North Santiam Diversion project. The proposed project would divert water from the existing Big Cliff Dam into a 12 foot wide, 13 foot deep canal that would run 11 miles, through federal and private lands to a point two miles west of Mill City, where the water would
be channeled through a powerhouse which would produce an estimated 272 million k.w. annually.

James Doane, the manager of Portland's Bureau of Hydroelectric Power, said, "Portland has developed a great deal of experience working on projects involving community watersheds like the North Santiam River." He explained that the city has already developed two similar projects.

Doane, who worked under Portland Mayor Frank Invancie, said he expected hearings on the project to begin in the fall (fall of 1981) before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the State Water Policy Review Board, which controls water right allocations on the state's rivers. Doane said the city had three years to complete a feasibility study on the project if it gets the go-ahead from Federal and State agencies. He said that under the city's "very preliminary" timetable, construction would not begin until 1984 and the project would not be completed until 1987 or 1988.

Doane said "unlike the Eugene Power Project, Portland is not proposing construction of a dam, nor is it asking, like Eugene, for rights to the entire flow of the North Santiam. He said, "the decision to look at the North Santiam for power generation came after the site was listed by the Army Corps of Engineers and was confirmed by the Governor's task force, as being one of the best sites in the state." He said that the major problems to be faced with the Big Cliff to Mill City power canal are the maintenance of existing fish-
eries, and developing wildlife crossings along the length of the canal.

One week later, on June 25, 1981, Doane made a public statement that, "It appears to us that we and Eugene are asking for the same water and apparently EWEB beat us to the punch. As far as I can tell now, this puts our project on the back burner or possibly off the stove."

Tom Kline of the Oregon State Water Resources Department confirmed Doane's view by saying, "EWEB does have a preliminary permit for studying the site and I believe that gives them priority for use of the water."

**EWEB Attempts for Positive Image**

Early in June EWEB contracted the services of Max Wales of the public relations consulting firm of Wharf, Foote and Rose. According to Wales he was hired by EWEB to do some communicating with the local community, and to work with Tom Santee, EWEB's public information person, in developing and implementing a plan for providing canyon residents with information on the proposed Minto project.

Wales said that EWEB wanted to play the role of a responsible utility. He said that EWEB officials wanted all the information available on the project given to the canyon residents, not just the information that made the project look good. He said that EWEB officials stressed their desire that people opposed to the project be given the same information that they have.
EWEB felt that this was the most appropriate tactic, as Max Wales explained it. "There is magic in an honest person. EWEB management is fundamentally honest and fundamentally responsible. They are making an honest effort to serve their rate payers and the community. If it is clear that a company, person or utility is making an effort to be honest, responsible and farsighted there is magic to it. I think that's also true with politicians. Magic doesn't seem like something a public relations person should be talking about, but, I think that most people are basically honest themselves and are looking for it. EWEB wants to try to get people to sense that in them." He said that EWEB management decided that they would not make any broad statements or promises to canyon residents until they are sure that the project is feasible, that there is a need for power and that the elected board will approve the project and make the decision with respect to the promises, i.e. in lieu of tax payments, and improvements to sanitary systems, water treatment, and local parks.

About this time Kieth Parks, General Manager of EWEB, talked to Stan Sporseen, Consulting Engineer, doing the feasibility study for EWEB, and told him not to say anything to local people about the things that EWEB will do for the communities. Sporseen said that they should tell them, because some people would come out in support of the project if they knew they would get something from it. Parks told him that the Board makes those decisions and the matter would be left to them.
Later in the month Santee and Wales made a number of trips to the Santiam Canyon area to talk to local residents about the project. From these talks, Wales and Santee thought there would be a platform on which to build a local support base on if it was needed. According to Wales, most of the people interviewed were interested in hearing what EWEB had to offer the community, with respect to in lieu of tax payments. Wales said they explained that EWEB could not make any offers until it was determined that the project was feasible.

In July of 1981 Linn County Commissioner Pat Tollisen put a resolution condemning EWEB's proposed Minto project before the Linn County Board of Commissioners. Commissioner Joel Fosdick spoke out in support of Tollisen's resolution and said that he was concerned about EWEB fouling up Linn and Marion counties to send a lot of power down to a bunch of environmentalists in Lane County. He continued by saying that he would have to be convinced that the project would benefit Linn County before he would change his mind on the project.

Not all of the Board was in agreement with Tollisen's resolution and there was some debate over the matter. Commissioner Dave Cooper said, "I have reservations about adopting a resolution based on one side of the information." Tollisen responded by saying that her resolution would force EWEB officials to come up to Linn County to present their side of the story. Cooper said the public utility shouldn't be forced when the county hadn't even asked them to come. Tollisen replied, "I'm not willing to be that courteous." The matter of the resolution was put off to the Commission's July 14th meeting.
Fosdick directed an administrative assistant to tell EWEB officials that the dam would be discussed at the next meeting. Tollisen didn't want to. "If they're fooling around in our county they ought to come to us first, we shouldn't have to go begging them."

The debate over the resolution received some press coverage. Marilyn Montgomery, a reporter for the *Statesman Journal* wrote an article entitled, "Linn Board Debate Stance on Santiam Plans." She explained the project and the conversation between the various commissioners. Montgomery quoted Tollisen as saying the reason why she opposed the project, was because she was concerned about the project causing the banks of the river to wear away, about condemnation of private property belonging to Linn County residents and about the creation of a dry river. Montgomery also quoted Tollisen as saying that she would oppose EWEB's Sunnyside project that is under study near Sweet Home in Linn County.

The article also announced that EWEB officials were scheduled to discuss the project with the Salem City Council in a public meeting on July 20th. The article concluded with Montgomery quoting EWEB officials as saying last fall that construction on some of the dams could begin in mid-1983 at the end of the study period, and power generation could be expected to begin about three years later.

The next week, EWEB responded to Cooper's (Linn County Commissioner) invitation to address the Linn County Board of Commissioners. They presented the same program as given to the Park Commission. Afterwards Tollisen asked EWEB representative Dean Axtell why they
didn't come up to talk to the Board earlier. Axtell said they planned to begin presentation after they got the results of the feasibility study. Tollisen and Fosdick were very opposed to the project, Commissioner Cooper had a more open mind toward it, and supported EWEB's Sunnyside project strongly. No decision was made by the Board whether or not to condemn the project.

EWEB officials presented their plans for the proposed project to the Salem City Council in a public session July 20, 1981. Ron Merry, Director of Salem City Works; said that EWEB was invited to address the council. Because of all the controversy about this, the many concerns that have been expressed, and that the city council wanted to hear exactly what they are proposing. Merry went on to say, "My main concern is the long-range effect that the project may have on Salem's water supply."

Salem draws its municipal water from the Santiam River near Stayton and they expect to enlarge its water works in the next few years to meet the community's growing water demands. Merry said that both the construction of the dam and its subsequent operation could affect the quality of Salem drinking water.

With these concerns in mind, EWEB engineer Dean Axtell and Public Information Director Tom Santee began their presentation on the proposed project to the Salem City Council and concerned citizens. EWEB explained the project in the same terms as they did in their presentation to Park Commissioners. After Axtell explained the proposed project, he stated that Federal and state energy policies
stress the development of renewable resources, such as favoring hydro over thermal plants, which puts dam sites like this one in great demand. Axtell said that this site may be one of the best potential hydro sites in Oregon. He said if, "EWEB doesn't build the site, somebody else is likely to try," pointing out that the Corps of Engineers has already expressed interest in the site.

For the most part, city council members listened quietly as the EWEB spokesman described their study. But, councilman Connell Dyer, by far the most vocal on the issue, drove repeatedly at one question: "You've got the McKenzie and you've got other rivers, why did you pick the North Santiam?"

Tom Santee answered the question by explaining that EWEB already has three dams on the McKenzie, and appears to have exhausted feasible and environmentally acceptable sites there.

Dyer also expressed the Council's fear that construction of a new dam on the North Santiam could increase the silt content of streams' drinking water. Saying that high silt contents already cause occasional trouble at Salem's Water Works during heavy rains, without a dam. Dyer asked, "If the possible silt problems turn out to be reality, would you go ahead and build the dam knowing that it would affect the water supply for the city of Salem?"

Santee answered the question by saying that he could not speak for EWEB's elected board on the policy issue, of whether drinking water quality or power generation is of a higher priority. But he
added, "I would say the quality of community drinking water comes first."

The City Council members expressed concern that the power produced by the project would flow into EWEB's power grid for consumption by Eugene residents with neither power nor revenues from the project going to Mid-Valley residents.

In response to this expressed concern Santee said, "The Northwest faces serious electricity shortages, and those shortages would be shared by all utilities." He explained that the proposed power project would be capable of peak power generation of about 40 megawatts, which would be fed into the Northwest's interwoven power grid for use by Eugene residents. This would free up an equivalent amount of electricity for use by others.

The meeting received press coverage before and after the session. An article entitled "Eugene Utility Aids, to Try Soft Sell on Salem; Dam is Focus of Session", which appeared in the July 20, 1981 edition of the Statesman Journal and was written by John Hayes explained the project, and expressed EWEB's reasons for wanting to built it, as well as the concerns of those opposed to the project.

Another article appeared in the Statesman Journal on July 21, 1981 entitled "North Santiam 'Best Dam Site in Oregon'", written by Dan Postrell, covered the meeting as a straight newstory. Explaining what happened at the meeting and who said what about what. Neither article editorialized the issue.
Shortly after EWEB's presentation to the Salem City Council, Salem Mayor Kent Aldrich said that the City of Salem should explore the possible benefits of joining with the Eugene public utility in its quest to build a dam on the North Santiam. Aldrich relayed the proposal to the City Council via Assistant City Manager Russ Abolt. Abolt said the note handed to him by Aldrich on the subject emphasized the word "explanatory."

The City Council approved the proposal by a 5-2 margin, and it was decided that they would ask the City Energy Committee to study the prospects of a joint venture with EWEB. EWEB made no formal statement in reaction to the city's vote, City Council member Ken Bonnem stated that he opposed the study because it sounded like sharing power generation, and that he wanted to avoid any appearance that they wanted to share anything at this point.

Dyer, who cast the other "no" vote, said that he has "major, major" concerns about the project. He had previously expressed his concerns about the possibilities of the construction of the project increasing the silt content of Salem's drinking water.

Exact details of what the approved proposal involved were not made public, but the possibility of Salem receiving revenue dollars from the sale of power was mentioned as being the motivating factor.

In mid-September of 1981, the Stayton Chamber of Commerce invited EWEB to give a presentation of their proposed project to the chamber's October meeting. EWEB accepted and Tom Santee and Dean Axtell gave the presentation.
The presentation provided the same information as was presented to the Marion County Parks Commission and the Salem City Council with exception of one addition. The addition was a description of a Pacific Power and Light study, that showed hydroelectric energy development to be the most preferred method of producing new energy, the study received its data from a sampling of PP&L rate payers.

The presentation was heard by the Chamber and a number of guests, as well as a reporter for the local newspaper. The Chamber expressed a number of concerns about the project and its effect on the city's water supply. David Lentz, an attorney and property owner, who's land would be effected by the project asked, why EWEB was planning on developing the site rather than a local utility?

Santee responded for EWEB by saying that they were interested in the site because it is one of the best hydro sites in the state, and that they received the FERC permit because they filed before the other utilities, neither of which were from the area.

There were no major debates at the meeting, it's purpose was for EWEB to explain the project to the Chamber of Commerce which would enable them to be informed and in a position to make an informed decision whether to support or oppose the proposed project at a later date.

At the end of the meeting a Justice of the Peace from Mill City, a guest at the meeting, asked EWEB if they would make a similar presentation to the North Santiam Chamber of Commerce, and to the
general public at the Mill City Eagles Hall. EWEB accepted and the presentation was scheduled for late October.

EWEB Presentations to Local Groups

EWEB's presentation to the Stayton Chamber of Commerce was reported in the Stayton mail by Chuck Bennett. The article outlined EWEB's proposed plans for the project and explained the studies that would be completed. The article covered the various concerns that the chamber expressed at the meeting which included, concern over the impact of the dam on Niagara Park, the impact on fish and wildlife, and whether local people would be hired to build the dam. Bennett reported that EWEB made no formal reply to the questions, saying that they said they didn't have the information available to answer the question at that time, and that the information would be released as soon as they got the results of their feasibility study.

EWEB's presentation to the North Santiam Chamber of Commerce was announced in a number of local papers. The Mill City Enterprise carried three stories on the meeting, one each week, explaining the project and advising all interested persons to attend.

EWEB's presentation to the North Santiam Chamber of Commerce on October 21, 1981, began with an informal dinner with the Chamber where EWEB staff and the Commerce had a chance to get to know one another before the meeting. Tom Santee, Dean Axtell and Tom Hagee, EWEB's staff ecologist, represented EWEB at the meeting.
The EWEB representatives were seated up on the stage behind a table facing the 100+ people in attendance. Prior to the meeting EWEB had received a rough draft of the preliminary feasibility study from the consulting engineer firm of Hanner, Ross and Sporseen, and EWEB presented that information to those in attendance.

EWEB had slides of the three different proposals for the development of the project. The slides showed the various proposals and their locations. EWEB explained each of the proposals briefly and stated that they had not made a decision which one was best, because all the information was not yet available. But, they said that Plan 1A was still considered most feasible.

In EWEB's concluding statements Axtell said, that EWEB had not made a decision whether to build or not, that they are still considering the feasibility of each of the various projects and that all they ask is for the community to keep an open mind until all the information is in.

After the presentation EWEB representatives opened the floor for questions. Pat Tollisen, Linn County Commissioner, asked if local labor would be employed in the construction of the project. Santee replied that they had not made a decision whether or not the project is feasible, let alone deciding who would do the construction.

Bennett, the Editor fo the Stayton Mail, asked if EWEB would make in lieu of tax payments to the local community, since EWEB as a public utility is not required to pay property taxes. Santee said, that EWEB makes in-lieu of tax payments to communities that their
projects are located in, but a decision with respect to this project and the amount of payments to be made would be made by EWEB's elected board, if and when the project is determined feasible.

A number of fishermen expressed concern on the fate of the salmon and steelhead runs. Dale Hagey told them that there were, to his knowledge, no migratory fish above the Minto egg-taking station so no migratory fish would be impacted.

Before Hagey could finish his statement a number of fishermen told him that there were indeed steelhead and salmon above the egg-taking station. They explained that the station releases a number of salmon and steelhead over the weir each year to spawn in the area between the weir and Big Cliff Dam. Hagey responded to this by saying that he was unaware of this situation and to answer their question, there would be no spawning area between Big Cliff and the proposed dam, and that the loss of spawning area would have to be mitigated in someway.

Another concern expressed by area residents, was that they were worried that there would be less water in the river after the dam is built. Axtell said that the river will have no less water in it than it does now. The only water the Corp of Engineers will allow them to use is the excess amount over that needed to maintain an efficient flow in the river.

A former well driller in the area, asked if EWEB knew about the active slide area and faults located in the area of the proposed dam. Santee explained that there would be extensive studies completed on
rock formations, and that those are the kinds of things that will be looked at in the feasibility tests.

Other questions asked were: where will the power go; what type of mitigation will be done for the steelhead runs; how much money for in-lieu of taxes; what will happen to China Dam and the other parks; etc. EWEB replied to the various questions: that the power will go into the BPA system; and that they were unable to answer the remainder of the questions because all the studies are not completed, and the decisions on those type of questions must be made after they determine the project feasible. Santee said, "Before any decisions would be made there will be many more public meetings and hearings held in the local area because EWE wants to be a good neighbor to the area's residents."

Santee concluded the question and answer period which lasted about an hour, by telling the audience that there would be a sign-up list available for people who wanted to receive information on the project and EWEB's monthly newsletter. Approximately 40 to 50 canyon residents signed up.

After the meeting, EWEB asked the Chamber of Commerce if they would choose someone to be the local information person for the project. The person chosen would serve as a direct line of communication between EWEB and the community. The Chamber asked George Long, the Editor of the Mill City Enterprise, if he would serve in that position, and he agreed.
The Chamber asked Long because he had an open mind on the project. George Long felt that if the power was really needed, and if EWEB could convince the community that they would build the best project for all concerned, then it was alright by him. The Chamber also chose Long because he had a direct way to distribute information provided to him by EWEB, in the local weekly paper he owns and edits.

On December 24, 1981 it was announced in the Mill City Enterprise that the drilling of two earth core samples about two miles below Big Cliff would begin soon. The drilling will be done by Medford Diamond Drillers, who have been contracted to drill two, two-inch diameter core samples at a possible dam site near the east end of Niagara Park. The article said the core samples will help determine the geologic suitability for support of a dam foundation at that location.

The article went on to say that other surveying and tests had been and were being performed by Hanner, Ross and Sporseen, as authorized by EWEB and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Organizing Opposition

Early in January of 1982 Pat Tollisen received a number of calls expressing concern over the surveying and tests being done in the area. The consulting engineers had placed survey flags around the area of the proposed highway relocation which was visible from the road and made local residents aware that the project study was
reality, and many believed the flags to be a sign that construction would be beginning soon.

Tollisen agreed to meet with the concerned citizens at a number of locations. The first meeting in January was held at a local restaurant. The meeting was attended by approximately 10 people who were concerned that the project was going to be built whether they wanted it or not. The meeting lasted for a little over an hour and it consisted of those in attendance talking about why the project was a bad idea, going over the problems that were mentioned at Santiam Chamber of Commerce meeting. Pat Tollisen advised those in attendance to begin writing letters to local, state and Federal politicians, expressing their opposition to the project.

A second information meeting was held in mid January at a local school. The meeting was attended by a few of those who attended the first, and a number of new people. Chuck Bennett and Pat Tollisen served as informal chair people of the meeting. The same concerns were expressed, and Tollisen made the statement, that if they didn't get together and stop EWEB the project would be built. Letter writing was again emphasized and there was talk of forming some type of organization to oppose the project.

Both Bennett and Tollisen had worked together on opposing navigability of the North Santiam. An issue that if passed would have allowed state takeover of river bank property. Bennett was elected as chairman of the North Santiam River Basin Protective Society, which was comprised of homeowners, landowners, conservationists and
representatives of local and state governments, opposed to navigability. The organization successfully defeated the proposed navigability issue.

Both Bennett and Tollisen thought the formation of a similar organization to oppose the EWEB project was necessary, as did the local residents in attendance. No formal plan was adopted, however. At the close of the meeting, Tollisen and Bennett again stressed the importance of writing letters to EWEB, and local politicians, stressing their opposition to the project, and listing their reasons for their opposition.

On February 5th of 1982 the feasibility study on the proposed Minto Hydroelectric Project was completed by EWEB's engineering consulting firm. The publication was long and primarily composed of very technical information as was required by FERC.

The most read section of the report was the Summary, Conclusions and Recommendation section see appendix A.
CHAPTER IV

CASE HISTORY - OPPOSITION ORGANIZES

Outside Leaders

In early February of 1982 it was announced in local and area newspapers that Chuck Bennett filed as a candidate for State Representative in the newly formed District 38. Bennett had been involved with the Minto project from the beginning as a newspaper reporter, and later as more people began to fear the proposed project's construction, he took an active opposition to the project, writing letters and advising others to do the same, as well as assisting Tollisen in a petition drive.

This was Bennett's second run for the Legislature. In 1978 he was the Democratic nominee in District 55 which included portions of the same western Oregon counties, as well as five counties in central and eastern Oregon. General election returns from that election showed Bennett the winner in the counties west of the Cascades.

Bennett has a B.S. degree in Journalism from Willamette University. He has worked as the editor of the Woodburn Independent Newspaper and was North Marion County correspondent for the Capital Journal. He then spent several years as a government reporter for the Capital Journal, including stints as a city and county editorial written for the former Salem Afternoon Daily. He is currently the managing editor of the Stayton Mail Newspaper.
In addition to work in newspapering, Bennett has been involved in a variety of community affairs. During Marion County's massive financial crisis he and his family maintained four Marion County parks. For their work keeping Minto, Pack Saddle, Niagara and Rogers Wayside parks open for nearly nine months as county leaders worked to solve their financial problems, each member of the family received a Marion County Distinguished Service Award.

As mentioned earlier, Bennett chaired and organized the 100-plus member group, the North Santiam River Protective Association. Bennett also has served on Marion County Democratic Central Committee, Gates Planning Commission and he organized the Santiam Canyon Art Association.

The Mill City Enterprise February 18, 1982 edition quoted Bennett as saying:

District 38 with its diverse and unique lifestyle needs a rural spokesman familiar with issues ranging from hydro power development to airports to timber supply to regulation of small volunteer local governments. Without active, committed representation the people of this new district face increasingly organized urban challenges to local control and locally determined resolutions that affect our very livelihoods.

About this time, Pat Tollisen met with Chuck Bennett and David Lentz and advised them that she was organizing a public meeting to be held on March 19th, 1982, which would serve as a forum to voice opposition to the proposed project. She said that she had advised EWEB of the meeting, and would publicize the event in local and state newspapers, radio stations, and she was trying to get television news
She asked Bennett to prepare a presentation on the project, and said all interested people would have a chance to voice their concerns in a public forum.

She explained to Bennett and Lentz that her motivations for organizing the meeting were to make the people in the area aware of what it is that EWEB wanted to do there; and that so many people had contacted her to voice their opposition to the project that she thought a public meeting was necessary to make EWEB and the state and Federal government aware that they did not want the project. Both Bennett and Lentz agreed it was a good idea and would participate.

The February 28, 1982 edition of the Statesmen Journal printed a story entitled "Consultants For Utility Say Dam Plan is Feasible." The article said, "The Minto project is technically and economically feasible, according to the Gladstone Engineering Consulting Firm." The article also said that the Minto project would receive licenses from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the State Water Resources Board and the Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council.

During this time an intensive letter writing campaign was going on by Bennett, Tollisen, Lentz, and a number of concerned local residents. The letters were sent to a wide range of local, state and Federal agency representatives. A majority of the letters were expressing outright opposition to the project. But, there were a number of letters sent by Bennett to local school districts that served as recommendation for the institutions to review the proposed project for use in considering a position on the project.
The following letter from Bennett to the School Board is a good example of this type of letter.

March 15, 1982

Mill City-Gates School Board
Wendell Fultz, Chairman
Mill City, OR

Dear Wendell and board memebers;

I'm writing to suggest that the school board consider its role and needs during impending discussions of a proposed Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB) hydroelectric project just east of Niagara County Park.

Although several options are open for the board to react to this project, ranging from outright opposition to full approval; this letter is to encourage the district to begin work now on what impact this project will have on us.

"Socio-Cultural Impacts of Water Resource Development in the Santiam River Basin," by Thomas C. Hogg and Courtland L. Smith of Oregon State University, is a study of hydro-power development in the Sweet Home area during the mid-1960's (see attachment). As you can see from the attached pages from the study, there are serious impacts from this type of project which must be considered. In Sweet Home, hydroelectric projects meant bulging enrollment, plummetting enrollment (in the postconstruction phase) and tremendous impact on local costs and taxes. Very little fiscal assistance came from county, state or federal sources. There was no appreciable benefit to the local tax base.

In all, I think you will agree that our district needs to review now how it will respond to such a project. We could easily wake up within the next year and find this project is moving off the drawing boards and into the North Santiam River.

Given the clear evidence that our district will be affected by such a project, I recommend you instruct the district staff to:

1) Determine and write an impact statement based on available studies and data regarding such projects.

2) Review the laws and precedents governing "payments in lieu of taxes." EWEB currently makes such payments to the Rainier-area school district where the Trojan nuclear plant is located. If we fail to discuss this with EWEB, we will have missed a valuable addition to our tax base if the project proceeds.
3) Prepare a plan for accommodating anticipated student population increases if the project goes into construction.
4) Contact EWEB to establish a dialogue with them on the project and its relation to district needs.
5) Designate a board, staff or community member to serve as district spokesman at EWEB, state agency and federal government hearings on the project.

I have been in regular contact with EWEB about this project. I think you will find them very cooperative and generally helpful. Again, this is not a suggestion to either endorse or oppose the project but rather a patron's request that you address its potential impact on our schools and taxes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Chuck Bennett
Star Rt. Box 23
Gates, OR

attachment

The School Board made no formal response, other than saying that they were glad to be made aware of the project and its possible impacts and that they would monitor EWEB's activities.

The other type of letter written was that calling for immediate action by a county, state or federal agency. A good example of this type is from David Lentz, property owner, and attorney, which was written to William Lindsay, Director of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
March 10, 1982

William W. Lindsay, Director
Office of Electric Power Regulation
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
825 N. Capitol Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: FERC No. 3112

Dear Mr. Lindsay:

I respectfully request that you take appropriate proceedings to cancel preliminary permit #3112 issued September 30, 1980, to Eugene Water & Electric Board for the proposed Minto Dam Power Plant Project for the following reasons:

* The applicant is not financially able to carry out the development and will not be able to do so without the authorization, issue and sale of bonds which would most likely not be approved by the voters.

* FERC has no jurisdiction to issue a permit. Jurisdiction is obtained from one of four sources, none of which applies. The land involved is primarily state, county and private, not federal. The power would not come from a federal dam, at least not by the most favored plan. The waters involved do not meet the necessary navigability/interstate commerce test. Finally, and most crucial to this application is the fact that the applicant has not demonstrated and probably cannot demonstrate that the power will be placed in the federal power grid at an acceptable, economical price.

* Riparian land owners are experiencing what amounts to an inverse condemnation of their property without compensation. Our damage will go without compensation if the application is denied years from now. It is only fair that the public and property owners not be put through the turmoil of an unjustified application which you have in you
March 10, 1982

William W. Lindsay, Director
Office of Electric Power Regulation
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
825 N. Capitol Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: FERC No. 3112

Dear Mr. Lindsay:

I respectfully request that you take appropriate proceedings to cancel preliminary permit #3112 issued September 30, 1980, to Eugene Water & Electric Board for the proposed Minto Dam Power Plant Project for the following reasons:

* The applicant is not financially able to carry out the development and will not be able to do so without the authorization, issue and sale of bonds which would most likely not be approved by the voters.

* FERC has no jurisdiction to issue a permit. Jurisdiction is obtained from one of four sources, none of which applies. The land involved is primarily state, county and private, not federal. The power would not come from a federal dam, at least not by the most favored plan. The waters involved do not meet the necessary navigability/interstate commerce test. Finally, and most crucial to this application is the fact that the applicant has not demonstrated and probably cannot demonstrate that the power will be placed in the federal power grid at an acceptable, economical price.

* Riparian land owners are experiencing what amounts to an inverse condemnation of their property without compensation. Our damage will go without compensation if the application is denied years from now. It is only fair that the public and property owners not be put through the turmoil of an unjustified application which you have in your power to squash at this time.

* The applicant has not pursued the permit study in good faith. Details will be furnished investigators appointed by you.

* Construction of Plan 1A would pose a hazard. The surge tank and power plant would be built directly below a massive inactive slide area. It is doubtful that Marion County would issue necessary building permits.

* The vast majority of the public does not want this project.
* The February 5, 1982, Feasibility Study contains self-serving declarations not founded in fact on the major issues of an environmental nature. River gaging, etc. was probably not done pursuant to the permit; and the accuracy is questionable.

Permits of this type just should not be issued without a public hearing. I trust that you will send a representative to a public meeting scheduled at Eagles Hall, Mill City, Oregon, 8:00 p.m., Friday, March 19, 1982, if you can.

Very truly yours, cc: Linn and Marion County

David F. Lentz
Star Route, Box 57
Gates, Oregon 97346

Bob Packwood
Mark Hatfield
Vic Atiyeh

Copies of this letter were also sent by Lentz to Linn and Marion County Board of Commissioners, Denny Smith, Bob Packwood, Mark Hatfield and Vic Atiyeh.

Lentz received a letter from Lindsey saying that he had advised a representative from FERC's San Francisco office to contact him with respect to his letter, but the contact never came.

Linn County Commissioner Pat Tollisen's meeting was announced in all area newspapers and some state newspapers. The March 11, 1982 edition of the Mill City Enterprise said, that the public meeting will be an opportunity to review the project and its impact on local residents and communities. It went on to say that the meeting would review the feasibility study that shows that the project can be built, and would be an opportunity for local residents to comment on the project.

The article also said that copies of the feasibility study done by EWEB were available at the Mill City Enterprise or from Chuck
Bennett at the Stayton Mail. The article concluded by announcing formally that George Long was designated by EWEB as local information person.

The meeting was announced on the community events portion of area radio broadcasts. Many area politicians were notified, both those in office and seeking office, and most were expected to attend. A large turnout was expected.

The meeting started according to schedule on March 19th, 1982 at the Mill City Eagles Hall with over one hundred concerned citizens in attendance. Pat Tollisen began the meeting by saying that her purpose for organizing the meeting was to inform the public on EWEB's proposed project and its possible impacts on local residents and communities. She then introduced Chuck Bennett who briefly explained the project as it was described in the most recent feasibility study. Next, Bennett outlined what he saw as the potential problems that could result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

In this discussion of possible problems, Bennett said that the relocation of Highway 22 would cause financial hardships to the canyon during the construction phase. Stating that the prime problem would be the state imposed log limits that would be in effect, which would severely handicap local timber companies in transporting logs for at least two seasons. He also repeated the concerns of the Mayor of Detroit in saying "the interruption of traffic on Highway 22 would bring a halt to the tourist industry in Detroit and the upper canyon
reaches for at least two crucial seasons." Bennett described the tourist industry as representing a crucial portion of the canyon's economy.

In discussing the dam's construction effects on Niagara County Park, Bennett said, "the blasting that would be required to lay 2000 feet of forty foot pipe would destroy Niagara Park and China Dam as well." He then spoke out against EWEB's feasibility study, which he said did not give adequate assurance of protection of the extremely delicate fisheries resource.

Bennett said that five local property owners are facing the possibility of condemnation of their property because it is included in the proposed construction plan. He said that this decreases the value of their property, as well as the value of all other property along the river, until the issue is ultimately resolved.

He illustrated the problems that canyon communities could face during the two year construction period by reading a list of statistics taken for the Smith and Hogg study of the Sweet Home area during the construction of the Foster and Green Peter dam projects. He said that while Sweet Home merchants did a land office business during the time that construction workers and their families were in town, the city's property taxes went up 200%. He said that this was partially due to increased school enrollment which required hiring more staff and providing more room for more students enrolled in the schools. Bennett went on to say, "according to Sweet Home statistics for the construction period, there was a general crime increase of 240% and
an increase in burgularly and petty larcency of 575%.

Bennett continued his outline of the possible problems of the proposed project by saying, "The proposed Minto Project does not conform with local comprehensive plans and there will be no increase to the local tax base since it would be constructed by a public utility." He also said that there will be no local power or rate benefits from the proposed project.

Bennett then suggested the formation of a group to represent canyon interests during federal, state and county hearings on the project. He also proposed: a local employment quota of the project was approved; an agreement on phasing of Highway 22 realignment project to protect the tourist and logging industries in the canyon; payments to local taxing districts in lieu of taxes that would be owed if the project were under private ownership; grants to the cities of Mill City and Gates to offset the impact of increased population during the construction phase; appointment of a local project advisory committee to work with EWEB and its contractors; and full compliance with local planning rules.

Bennett concluded his presentation by suggesting that canyon residents make their objections and proposals known to EWEB officials concerning the proposed dam construction. He said "If they won't listen to us we should go down to Eugene and convince the voters not to spend $80 million on this dam project."

After Bennett's presentation, Pat Tollisen took over the podium, she said it was not clear to her what Linn County's role was in the
consideration of the project. She expressed her concern over the possibility of a lot of Linn County tax dollars being spent to investigate a project that she felt Linn County would have no final say in anyway. She then asked those in attendance if they wanted the Minto Dam built on their rivers, the majority of the audience responded by saying, "no".

Tollisen then reminded the audience that someone once said that Pebble Springs Nuclear Power Plant could never be stopped, and that organized citizens had accomplished it. She said if the audience would organize they could bring EWEB and the Minto Dam to a halt.

Scram

Tollisen concluded by suggesting a name for the organization. She said the group could be called SCRAM, Santiam Canyon Residents Against Minto. When she said the name SCRAM she was looking directly at Dean Axtell, EWEB's project engineer. The audience showed their approval of the name by giving it a good round of applause.

Linn County Planner Marv Gloege actually came up with the name as he was doodling on a piece of paper during Bennett's presentation. Gloege showed the name to Tollisen who then suggested it. Gloege attended the meeting at the request of Tollisen, who wanted the planner there in case the comprehensive plan issue came up.

Tollisen then called on David Lentz to outline the effort he has made over the past year to put a stop to the project. Lentz, a lawyer and property owner facing possible condemnation of his land,
said he had learned a lot about bureaucracy in the past year. Explaining the various channels of letter writing he went through and said that he didn't receive any satisfying responses to his questions. He then asked the audience why more money wasn't spent on the proven efficiency of solar power instead of spending $80 million for a power source that will soon be outdated.

Lentz turned the meeting over to Carmen Barnhart, a long time local resident, who said that when Big Cliff Dam was completed, residents were told that it would generate enough power to last to the year 2000. She said it was her understanding that more generating units could be added to Big Cliff. She asked, "so why do we have to build another dam?"

Next, a representative from the Gates Water Board said he had concerns about turbidity and how it would affect Gate's water supply. He said that the feasibility study did not cover that.

Tollisen directed his question to Axtell, project engineer for EWEB in attendance at the meeting. Axtell said he wasn't prepared to answer the question at that time, that he was only there to hear public opinion. He said that EWEB's next step is to reconsider other options in the feasibility study, and he further pointed out that the study only represents very preliminary designs.

Tollisen responded to Axtell saying "that is not the report I got." She said, "I have been informed that you have only three more steps to go in the FERC licensing process and construction could begin this year."
Axtell responded again that the feasibility report was not even finished yet, and that they were only two years into a three year preliminary permit. He said that EWEB had not been given the go ahead to build, only to research the feasibility of the project.

Pat Tollisen concluded the meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m. by informing those in attendance that there was a sign-up sheet available for those interested in forming an organization to oppose the project. She added that there would be an organizational meeting on April 16th.

A number of canyon residents prepared signs that were posted on the inside, and outside of the Eagles Hall. Some of the signs said, "Did anyone ask the fish?", "Turn off a light and save a river", and "Damn the dam." The meeting received some coverage on local radio and television, but no camera crews were present.

The meeting received extensive press coverage in local newspapers, and minimal coverage in state newspapers, all of which reported the event as a straight news story, by explaining the project and the views expressed by participants of the meeting.

The Mill City Enterprise reported that it was stated at the meeting that local residents should write their elected officials and to the editor of various state and local newspapers, expressing their feelings on the project. The article listed the addresses of various local, state and federal officials, as well as the addresses of both Eugene papers.
About 50 canyon residents expressed interest in forming an organization by signing their names to a list. Many others wrote letters to Chuck Bennett, George Long and Pat Tollisen offering support and suggestions for the organization. One such letter was written by Bryan Johnston, a candidate for the Marion County Board of Commissioners, which follows in.

April 3, 1982

Pat Tollisen
Chuck Bennett
George Long

Re: SCRAM's April Meeting

Gentlepersons,

I have been thinking about the meeting set for April 16th. I'd like to offer the following agenda suggestions for your consideration.

I. Organization

A. Incorporation - SCRAM should consider the benefits of incorporating as a nonprofit corporation. The group would gain standing to sue, and if sued itself, the liability would be limited to the assets of the corporation.

B. Money - No matter what course of action SCRAM takes, money will be required to coordinate and implement the plan. Some combination of membership fees, planned fund raisers, and/or just passing the hat at the general meetings should be started.

II. Substance

A. Research Committees - A small enough group to be manageable should be formed to investigate each component part of the opposition to the dam, i.e. economic impact, salmon, etc.
B. Other Dangers - Peter Packett, an Oregon state engineer, advised me that the Army Engineers have a project of their own planned for the same area. We should also prepare on this front.

III. Strategy

A. Eugene - The goal is to learn what tactics would be most helpful in preventing EWEB from approving the plan.

B. Legal Representation - At what stage should SCRAM seek legal counsel?

C. Government Action - What do we want each local jurisdiction to do, and how can we get them to do it?

These are merely suggestions, I hope you find them helpful. I would like to work with you on this.

Sincerely,

Bryan Johnston

Relationships

During the next few months, Bennett made a number of trips and numerous phone calls to Eugene to discuss the Minto project with EWEB officials. The meetings and calls would consist of an open discussion of various Santiam canyon residents' concerns as expressed by Bennett. EWEB would listen and communicate their views and plans. Both sides communicated well together, and thought each other honest and willing to compromise.

On April 5, John Bartels, a member of Eugene Water and Electric Board, spoke out against a proposed refuse-fueled power plant at a public hearing in Salem. Bartels said Oregon would be taking a giant
step backward if Willamette Valley communities succeed in erecting huge electric generating plants fueled by garbage. One of the proposed plants would be located in Salem's Kaiser area, and has been endorsed by Salem's City Council and the Marion County Board of Commissioners.

On April 14th the Linn County Board of Commissioners sent a letter to FERC stating that they were firmly opposed to the Minto Dam and power plant project. The board sited the following reasons for their opposition:

1) The applicant is not financially able to carry out the development of the project and will not be able to do so without authorization, issuance and sale of bonds which would most likely not be approved by the voters.

2) Riparian landowners are experiencing what amounts to an inverse condemnation of their property without compensation. Our damage will go without compensation if the application is denied years from now. It is only fair that the public and property owners not be put through the turmoil of an unjustified application which you have the power to quash at this time.

3) Construction of Plan 1A would pose a hazard. The surge tank would be built directly below a massive inactive slide area. It is doubtful that Marion County would issue necessary building permits.

4) The vast majority of the public does not want this project.

In their letter, the Linn County Board of Commissioners also expressed some concerns about how the FERC licensening process relates to the local planning processes. They expressed these concerns by stating:

We are quoting you Oregon Revised Statute 215.130 (3) which states 'county ordinances designed to implement a county comprehensive plan shall apply to
publicly-owned property.' To the best of our knowledge, the majority of land that will be impacted is in private ownership, including a parcel owned by Linn County. Under Oregon Land Use Law, local zoning ordinances often classify hydro-electric facilities as conditional uses which are subject to special approval processes involving considerable staff analysis, public hearings and finding of fact based on detailed criteria.

The letter also stated that changing land use designation is a complicated process, and if they are forced to take action they want their decision to mean something. The Board concluded their letter by asking FERC to take the appropriate actions to cancel the preliminary permit #3112 issued September 30, 1980, to Eugene Water and Electric Board for the proposed Minto Dam and Power Plant project. The Linn County Board of Commissioners did not receive a reply from FERC.

On April 15, an announcement appeared in the local press, stating that an organizational meeting would be held on April 16 at the Eagle Hall. It explained that the purpose of the meeting would be to form an organized group of canyon residents to oppose the proposed dam. It said that committees would be formed at the meeting to take on various projects, such as a close evaluation of the independent feasibility study and the preparation of a slide show, to be used to gather support for the organization.

The organizational meeting for canyon residents opposed to the Minto project began as scheduled on April 16, with 64 people in attendance. The meeting began with a general discussion of the project with various persons explaining why they oppose the project.
Pat Tollisen brought forward the first item on the agenda for the meeting by asking those in attendance if they wanted to formally become a group? A show of hands was requested with a unanimous response in favor of such a move. Tollisen then said that if there was going to be a group, there must be an election of officers.

In order to simplify the election and other organizational functions, it was recommended by Tollisen and Bennett that an organizational committee be formed. Tollisen called for volunteers to serve on the committee, those volunteers were Dan Cox, Tom Hirons, Joe Poteet, Olive Barnhardt, Mike Gleason and Arnie White. Dan Cox was nominated and elected as chairman of this committee. It was decided that the newly formed committees would determine a name for the group, form a set of by-laws and nominate officers.

The meeting continued with the establishment of a number of committees to review the feasibility study. Each committee was given a section to study and were to prepare a summary of the contents of each section.

The next item on the agenda was to establish a testimony committee which would use the information provided by the other committees to develop a presentation for various governmental agencies to show the possible harmful effects the project could have on the area. It was also decided that color slides depicting the beauty of the region would be needed for use in this presentation. Chuck Bennett volunteered to write the testimony and to present it and the slide show to the agencies if needed. Tollisen also brought up the need for a
press contact person; Chuck Bennett volunteered for this position as well since he is familiar with the issue and is the editor of The Stayton Mail.

The next item discussed was the need for some fund raising, it was stated that fighting EWEB would take money, for possible legal fees and publications. Some ideas suggested were the collection of dues, bake sales, and walkathons.

The final item discussed was the organization's participation in the annual 4th of July activities in Mill City. The 4th of July is a big celebration in the canyon with many activities, such as bake sales, craft fairs, information booths, political booths and games. It was decided that the organization would participate in the activities, but how was not decided.

The meeting received local press coverage in the April 22nd edition of the local newspapers. The articles included a brief description of the meeting and named the individuals in the organization committee. It also requested that anyone possessing slides of the Niagara and Minto area that would like to help should give Chuck Bennett a call. The article concluded with:

Anyone interested in channeling their efforts towards preserving the natural beauty of the Niagara area are invited to attend another meeting, May 7th, 9 p.m. at the Eagles Lodge in Mill City.

The next week the Mayor of Detroit and the town council held a meeting to discuss the proposed project, as a result of this meeting the following letter was sent to EWEB.
April 16, 1982

EWEB

Gentlemen:

This letter is to be construed as our objections to your putting a hydro plant for power on the Santiam River.

1. This would affect the existing Detroit dam greatly.

2. We would have to assure you of so much water, which we are not willing to do. This affects our business in our area, as we are strictly a recreation area.

3. You are a municipality whom would not be subject to any taxation.

4. We would lose one of the most beautiful spots on the river. There is no other place like this on the Santiam River. Yet you seek to destroy same with this hydro dam.

5. We would lose our steelhead fishing in our area, which makes it rather convenient for our people to go fishing after work. This also is true for the Mill City and lower canyon area residents.

6. The upper canyon area including Mill City would not be compensated for this loss. No money in the world could bring back the area that you intend to destroy.

We find it very strange that your own River namely (McKenzie) could not be tapped for this resource. Why come into another county and file a claim on their resources. Not very neighborly of you. We have not come into your county making a claim on any of your resources.

We are sending a copy of this letter to the Governor, our State Representative and our State Senator. This we feel must be stopped. We will fight this cause to make sure that our rights are protected.

Sincerely,

CITY OF DETROIT

_________________________  Bob Smith, Mayor
After EWEB received the letter, Tom Santee, public information person for EWEB, and consultant Max Wales went to Detroit to talk to the Mayor of Detroit and the town council. Detroit city officials told EWEB representatives that their major concern over the EWEB project was the possible harmful effects the project would have on the recreational use of the Detroit Lake, which would effect the City of Detroit directly through decreased tourist dollars.

Detroit officials felt that if EWEB built Minto, the Army Corp of Engineers would draw down the water level in Detroit Lake more than they had in the past. EWEB officials explained that they had no control whatsoever over what the Corps does, but it was not in EWEB's plans to have the Corps draw down Detroit Lake any more than they already do.

The meeting continued with a healthy discussion of the project, with Detroit expressing their concerns, and EWEB answering those concerns honestly. Detroit officials did not change their stance on the project, but there was a feeling of cooperation felt by both sides.

After the Detroit meeting, Wales and Santee stopped at a number of local restaurants and taverns to try to get an idea of how the
local residents felt about the project. In their opinion a portion of canyon residents didn't care one way or another about the project; and many still wondered what EWEB was going to do for them before they would decide to support or oppose the project.

The general feeling they received from their talks with residents was that a majority of residents would have to be convinced by EWEB to support the project. Without any offers of benefits many said they had no choice but to oppose the project, although they said they didn't actively oppose it. Santee and Wales both felt from their informal interviews with canyon residents that there was not as much opposition to the project as those opposed to the project had lead them to believe. They concluded that many canyon residents would support the project if the right incentives were present.

The organizational committee of the Santiam canyon residents opposed to the Minto project was held in late April of 1982. It consisted of a discussion of possible names for the organization and the nomination of officers.

In the discussion of names for the group, there were some mixed feelings over the name that Marv Gloege, a Linn County planner, had given the group, which was SCRAM (Santiam Canyon Residents Against Minto.) Some members of the committee thought that the name took too hard of a line, that it produced a very negative feeling, that didn't leave any room for compromise. A majority of the committee, however, felt that SCRAM was a very appropriate name and it summed up the community's view of the Minto project perfectly by pointing out that
EWEB had no business coming up to the Canyon to build a dam. So it was decided that the name SCRAM would be put to a vote before the general membership.

The next item the committee had to discuss was who to nominate as officers. David Lentz was nominated for president, because he was a lawyer and since his property would be part of the project he had been active in the project from its beginning.

Chuck Bennett was also nominated for president. Bennett had met with the committee earlier and said he was very interested in being president, but, that they should consider that he is a candidate for political office and the organization would probably become connected to him politically, which could have some good and bad effects on the group. The committee took this into consideration but nominated the long-time canyon resident and newspaper editor anyway.

There were no nominations for the positions of vice-president and secretary because the committee was not sure who would accept the position if nominated. So it was determined that these positions would be filled from the floor.

The committee also discussed the general feeling that there had been too many meetings with nothing coming out of them. It was pointed out that the number of people in attendance had been steadily dropping. There was a good turn out at meetings in November and December, and the meeting in March had a strong turn out due to large amounts of advance publicity, but the turnout was a lot less at the April meeting and would probably drop further at the May meeting.
The committee felt that the reason for this was the meetings all covered the same material; a discussion of the project, and complaining and griping about it with no real suggestions, ideas, or actions on stopping it. No real fight was developing since EWEB would not make a formal stand. The committee decided that after the election the group should begin its active opposition. All members of the committee believed that the project would be built unless they successfully organized and put a stop to it.

Issues Editorialized

On April 25th the Oregon Territory featured a six page article titled "Daming the North Santiam" written by Bill Dixon with photos by Don Black.

The article concentrated on describing the natural beauty of the North Santiam, and the effects the Minto project would have on that beauty. The article also covered the trend away from nuclear and fossil fuels and towards hydropower.

It went on to discuss some specifics of the project and the region's need for power. Dixon quoted Dean Axtell, Project Engineer for EWEB as saying: "EWEB has determined the project can be built and is studying whether it will be economically and environmentally feasible." Dixon continued by saying, "But neither Axtell nor Parks nor Herbert Hunt, EWEB's Director of Power Resources will say if there is proven need for power from Minto."
Dixon continued his article by interviewing Chuck Bennett, who outlined the reasons for the community's opposition to the project (as has been pointed out earlier).

Next Dixon explained Bennett's plan for opposition to the EWEB proposal.

First he is asking that undeveloped hydro potential at Detroit and Big Cliff Dams, upriver from Minto, be exploited before further consideration is given to the Minto project.

Next he sees the maze of local state and federal agencies with a voice in planning Minto as a powerful ally. Bennett says that few of the agencies work well together, much less know what they're doing. He says that the influence of the regional power council and the Bonneville Power Administration (which has a plan that might make EWEB pay Bonneville extra for acquiring Minto's power) might work against the project.

"It might die of its own weight in the confused power politics of the region," Bennett says. "That may be our best chance."

If not, there is always the method EWEB has chosen to pay for the dam - a bond measure. The multi-billion dollar difficulties that have hit the Washington Public Power System because of its reliance on bonds are well known in Eugene.

Bennett says anti-Minto forces are ready to play in that knowledge if the project even reaches the financing stage.

Barring that, Bennett says the anti-Minto forces want two things out of EWEB: direct payments to help pay for extra social services required by the influx of construction workers and a guarantee that 20 to 30 percent of the workers hired for the project would come from the local area.

Dixon concluded his article by saying:

Bennett's concern isn't confined to the Santiam canyon. He is a candidate for state legislature
from District 38, a resource-rich, job-poor area of the western Cascades that stretches from Clackamas County in the North to Linn County in the South.

This is prime hydro country, Bennett knows it. As far as he is concerned, if power companies are going to take something out of this district, they are going to start putting something in as well.

Otherwise he says, "I'd prefer they turn a few lights out in Eugene as build a new dam."

**Gleason Walks**

In late April Mike Gleason, a Gates' farmer and substitute school teacher, went to Chuck Bennett (Press contact person) with an idea. Gleason told Bennett he would walk to Eugene in protest of the proposed Minto project if Bennett could get their resistance organization and their cause some publicity. Bennett said he could, and Gleason made plans for his 80 mile walk.

On April 29th Mike Gleason set out on his walk, carrying a sign that read, "Don't Dam the North Santiam!"

Gleason said his reasons for making the walk was to stop the defacing of nature for the sake of hydroelectric power. He went on say that he didn't know the answer to cure energy problems, but he just knew that there must be a better way to get electricity than by destroying a river that it took thousands of years to make.

Despite his protest march he said he is not an environmentalist, nor is he concerned that the dam will affect his property - it won't. Rather he said his devotion to the river began in 1955, when he moved to Gates as a child.
Gleason said his objectives for the hike are to get some attention from the people on his route, in order to let people know that a lot of us up there are concerned.

He said he won't attempt to talk to EWEB officials when he reaches his destination on Saturday or Sunday. Rather he said he hopes to influence Eugene voters who would have to approve the sale of 88 million dollars in bonds before EWEB could build the dam. Gleason said he wants to invite Eugene people up to our river and convince them not to vote for the proposed bond.

Gleason completed the walk on Sunday, and received extensive press coverage on, during, and after the walk, in various Willamette Valley newspapers. The newspapers carried it as a straight newstory, covering his motivations for the hike and an explanation of the project.

SCRAM Meets

On May 7th the Organization of Santiam Residents Opposed to the Minto Hydroelectric Power Project held their second meeting at the Mill City Eagles Lodge. The meeting was called to order by organizational committee chairman Dan Cox. The first item on the meeting agenda was voting to accept the name SCRAM (Santiam Canyon Residents Against Minto) as the name for the newly formed organization. The vote was by a show of hands, and SCRAM was accepted as the name, by a near unanimous vote in favor of the name.
The next item on the agenda was the election of officers. The two nominees, Bennett and Lentz, were asked to leave the room so those in attendance could vote. Bennett won the election by a substantial majority, and was named president, Lentz was named vice-president and Anita Williams accepted the office of secretary.

Chuck Bennett then took over the meeting and asked those present if they wanted to become a non-profit corporation, Bennett explained the advantages and called for a vote, the vote was unanimous in favor of incorporation and Bennett said he would take care of it. The meeting continued with a report from the various committees which studied each section of the feasibility study, none of whom had anything new to report.

Bennett reported that he was still preparing the testimony and slide presentation and he stressed the need for more slides depicting the natural beauty and beautiful wildlife resources of the area. He concluded the meeting by urging all those in attendance to continue writing letters and to get all of their neighbors to join their cause.

After the meeting adjourned, Pat Tollisen told Bennett that she was going to end her active involvement with the project. She said that she was sure that he could handle from here out. Her reason for ending her active involvement was that she felt she had accomplished her primary goal, which was to help local residents form a grassroots organization to oppose the project.
The next week, SCRAM had an informal meeting of its officers and organizational committees. The meeting's purpose was to develop a strategy for the SCRAM's organization attack on EWEB's Minto project.

Some of the ideas discussed at that meeting were:

- The importance of keeping the proposed project and the SCRAM group in the public eye, through newspaper articles and editorials.
- The value of having a SCRAM representative in Eugene to monitor the EWEB board meetings, to see if and when the Minto project would be a topic of discussion.
- The value and means of keeping the canyon residents concerned about the realities of EWEB's proposed project. Ideas suggested where monthly meetings with new facts and events that would keep members enthused, and starting a major petition drive.
- Making use of red herring issues, such as introducing the idea that the project would destroy the historic China Dam, which no one, including EWEB, wanted to see destroyed.
- The advantages of bringing in outside groups into the battle with EWEB, such as the Sierra Club, 1000 Friends of Oregon, Northwest Steelheaders, flycasting clubs and various chapters of the Izaak Walton League.
- The idea that the SCRAM organization should attempt to pressure EWEB into making a decision to build or not to
build. It was suggested that public statements about the unfair stress put on canyon residents should be made. It was also suggested the EWEB's well used public statements, "We haven't made a decision and we don't have the information available yet, and the elected board has to make that decision," could be put to use against them.

- Letter writing was again stressed and the importance of making the EWEB project a land use issue. Bennett said that if SCRAM succeeds in getting EWEB to file a land use application he feels sure the project can be defeated because the Marion County Board has already expressed opposition to the project.

- The importance of SCRAM and canyon residents being well prepared to give testimony at the various hearings that would be required.

After discussing these ideas the SCRAM members felt more confident that they would be able to stop EWEB's project. It was also mentioned that the SCRAM group as a whole would support just about anything put before them by SCRAM officers, that looked like it could stop EWEB.

In mid May the papers for the incorporation of the SCRAM organization were completed and signed by the SCRAM officers. The purpose of the SCRAM organization as listed on the official documents was "preventing further daming or diversion of the North Santiam River."
**Debate**

Towards the end of May, the North Santiam River Guides Association asked Chuck Bennett, as the president of SCRAM, and representatives of EWEB, to debate the proposed Minto hydroelectric project before their monthly meeting in Salem.

Bennett and EWEB accepted the invitation. Dean Axtell, Project Engineer and Herbert Hunt, Director of Power Resources, represented EWEB in the debate. Approximately 60 people were in attendance. The debate began with each side presenting an introductory argument. The arguments were the same as before, with EWEB describing the project and saying that the Minto site looked like one of the most developable dam sites in the state, and concluding by saying that a decision on the project has not been made. Bennett pointed out the potential problems the dam would cause to the community and environment.

The audience's reaction to the debate was mixed. A portion of the audience felt that the dam and the associated slack water reservoir would be the best thing for that stretch of river because the water that would be destroyed by the dam, is not safe for river recreation. Some of the guides pointed out that each year they were called on to go and look for, and remove, drowned raftmen who used that stretch of the river, and they stated they were tired of doing that.

Other guides were opposed to all dam construction, believing that the Northwest already had too many dams. Others were concerned
about fish runs and scenic beauty, arguing that "just because we can't raft it, doesn't mean it has to be destroyed."

The River Guides Association didn't make a formal announcement of its position on the dam, leaving it up to the individual members to express their views.

**News Coverage**

On May 24, 1982, the *Oregon Journal* printed an editorial entitled "EWEB Prepares for Dam on Santiam River", written by Cameron La Follette, a Eugene writer (see Appendix B).

On June 6th *The Sunday Oregonian* printed a news story entitled "Canyon Residents Irate Over New North Santiam Dam Plans" written by John Hayes, an Oregonian staffwriter. Hayes began the story by explaining EWEB's proposed project, and the local residents' reasons for opposing it. Hayes continued by saying that EWEB has already paid for engineering feasibility study for the project, which Hayes quoted EWEB power resources director Herbert Hunt as saying, "The results of the study are favorable."

Hayes then questioned EWEB's reason for pursuing the project to which Hunt replied:

> Our opinion is that the Northwest will have more people over the next 20 to 40 years, and those people will require power. Utilities have an obligation to bring on line more resources to meet that load, and people here have shown a great deal of interest in renewable resources like hydroelectricity.
As the story continued, a section heading printed in bold black type read "1987 completion seen," under that heading Hayes quoted EWEB project engineer Dean Axtell as saying that the project could be completed by 1987 at a cost of 87 million. Axtell went on to say that the board had not made a decision to build Minto Dam and he predicted it could be as long as five years before such a decision is made. Hayes quoted Hunt as saying, "The board members will not be asked to give the go-ahead for the project until after I have the federal construction permit in hand."

Hayes asked Hunt what was preventing EWEB from making a decision on the dam. Hunt replied: "The uncertainties surrounding the energy requirements of the region and the fact that the Bonneville Power Administration has severely cut back its schedule on new plant construction in partial response to recent forecasts showing a diminished need for new power plants over the next 20 years, has prevented us from making a decision." "In addition to this, the Northwest Power Planning Council is only mid-way through its task of preparing an energy blueprint for the region and any decision by EWEB must come after that plan is published." Hunt concluded his statement by saying, "we anticipate a lot of things will become cleared in four or five years, things like the need for power, cost of money, and inflation. A lot of things like these you can't really anticipate until you get there."

"Uncertainty Irks Opponents," was the next subheading, which has followed with:
It is just this wait and see attitude that raises the IRK of Santiam canyon residents who oppose the dam plan. They argue that the uncertainty surrounding the utility's plan is almost as bad as having the dam under construction.

Hayes quoted SCRAM president Chuck Bennett as saying that "five years of having the area in question is absolutely irresponsible. They're throwing the community into a state of chaos, and we want them to decide and decide this summer."

The story continued by explaining the reasons why canyon residents are opposed to the project, and explaining SCRAM's tactics for resisting the project. Hayes quoted Bennett as saying that SCRAM will target their campaign on the City of Eugene as a whole since the decision is likely to be a city-wide one. "We don't think the City of Eugene really wants to do this to us. Our responsibility is to help them make a reasonable decision."

Hayes asked utility officials to respond to some of SCRAM's concerns. Hunt replied that EWEB will go to some lengths to design the project to satisfy as many local demands as possible, but, the Santiam canyon will not necessarily have the last word. "It is our objective to try to satisfy as many of the concerns as possible, we want to be good neighbors. But if we haven't resolved all the disputes, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is the final arbitrator."

Hayes concluded his article by saying, "If that commission gives the go-ahead for construction, the matter promises to become a statewide environmental battle."
More SCRAM Meeting

On June 11 the SCRAM organization had a meeting in the Eagles Lodge in Mill City, with approximately 50 concerned citizens in attendance. The meeting consisted of a preview of the presentation that Chuck Bennett had developed. The presentation consisted of showing slides that depicted the national scenic beauty of the area, and explaining the harmful effects that the proposed project would have on it and the community. The slide show and presentation lasted 30 minutes.

After the slide show Bennett started a discussion of possible fund raising activities for the SCRAM organization that could take place at the 4th of July celebration. A number of ideas were brought up: bake sales, sale of handicraft items, sale of T-shirts with the SCRAM logo on them, raffles and soliciting donations. The ideas that got the most support were to sell homemade ice cream and fresh strawberries at a booth, selling T-shirts with SCRAM logo, and donations. The proposals were voted on and all in attendance were in favor of them.

The next item on the agenda was the matter of membership dues, a number of ideas were suggested and it was finally decided that dues would be set at $5.00 per year or $20.00 for sustaining members. The money raised through dues and fund raising activities would be used for retaining lawyers (if needed), paying for pamphlets, newsletters and other miscellaneous costs.
Minto as a Political Issue

Steve Starkovich, a candidate for state senator from District 14 then addressed the group. He began by stating that he is a senate candidate ready to attack Minto. Starkovich said he is suspicious of the energy projection put forward by EWEB and likened EWEB's attitude to that of the Washington Public Power Supply System toward the construction of nuclear power plants. He said, "Yes, we will need more energy, but the costs to the North Santiam area are too great for this project to go forward." Starkovich stated that he had long been an advocate of renewable energy resource development, including solar, geothermal and more innovative projects, but called the Minto project "Badly Misplaced."

Starkovich said his specific concerns on the project are the effects it would have on sport fishing done on the river and its possible effects on the tourist industry in the region. He continued this line of thought by saying, "In a time when the state is looking to diversify its economy and when that diversification will include the expansion of Oregon's tourist industry, it makes no sense to damage one of the most beautiful areas of the state with a marginally useful water project."

Starkovich then briefly explained the FERC licensing and hearing process, and mentioned the probable state (WPRB) Water Policy Review Board hearings that EWEB would have to go through to have the project approved, and pointed out the important hearings where canyon resi-
dents "with me at your side can have the most impact towards defeating the project."

He told the audience that earlier in the day he had spoken with an official of the State Energy Department's Siting and Regulation program, and that from that talk he believes that with adequate factual and political preparation EWEB's Minto project is beatable.

Starkovich concluded his presentation to the SCRAM members by saying that he is well acquainted with one member of the EWEB Board in Eugene and that, "If I have to call him up and spell out the concerns of canyon residents regarding this project, I'll do it." He also said that he would give Chuck Bennett the name of a public power attorney who could be contacted to serve as legal council should SCRAM find the need for such council.

Bennett then took control of the meeting and said he had contacted the Marion County Board of Commissioners and that they had agreed to see SCRAM's slide presentation and hear testimony concerning SCRAM's positions on the project. He then announced the next general meeting of SCRAM would be held July 9th, and said that all those interested in working and organizing the 4th of July activities should sign the sign-up sheet. The meeting was closed.

In mid-June SCRAM published an information leaflet (see Figure 3) copies were posted in most public areas in the canyon and in surrounding areas. Copies were also posted at various locations in Eugene.
The Eugene Water and Electric Board plans to build a 100-foot high dam in the North Santiam River at Niagara Park.

The so-called "MINTO DAM" PROJECT would include:

- A 100-foot high dam in Niagara Park.
- Diversion of the river through a 2-mile long, 20-foot diameter buried pipeline through Niagara Park down to Packsaddle Park.
- Flooding 72 acres from Niagara Park to Big Cliff Dam.
- An 85-foot high surge tank just east of Packsaddle Park.
- A powerhouse at the state-operated fish trap at the river’s edge just east of Packsaddle.
- Cutting the river flow to as little as 250 cubic feet per second (average summer flow is now 1,000 cfs).
- Rerouting 2 miles of Highway 22.

THE PROBLEMS:

- Destruction of Niagara Park and China Dam (blasting).
- Destruction of the last native steelhead and salmon spawning grounds at Little Sweden.
- Hurting logging and tourist travel while Highway 22 is rebuilt.
- Increased taxes to pay for schools and local services during 3 years of construction.
- Reduced flows in the North Santiam, hurting fish and recreational uses.
- The lack of demonstrated need for the power to be generated.
- A possible draw-down of Detroit Lake.
- Loss of water quality for communities from Gates to Salem that rely on the North Santiam for drinking water.

THE SOLUTION:

- "Santiam Canyon Residents Against Minto," a group of people from Idanha to Salem who are concerned about all these issues.

JOIN US —— DON’T DAM(N) THE SANTIAM!

For more information on the dam or SCRAM, contact Chuck Bennett at 769-6338 or 897-2211 or write Star Rt. Box 23, Gates, OR 97346.
Marion County's Board Decision and the Background

June 21, 1982 EWEB filed an application with the Marion County Board of Commissioners to change the land use of designation of the Minto site in the Marion County Comprehensive Plan. The application requested the site be changed from the designation of forest land to public land and to change the zoning applicable from timber conservation designation to a public zone. Approximately 49 acres of forestland would be removed by the project. EWEB's application stated that the "loss of 49 acres of forest land, to gain a supply of renewable electric power, is a reasonable tradeoff in a county that has over 320,000 acres of forests."

EWEB also requested the necessary conditional use permit and variance. EWEB's Director of Power Resources, Herbert Hunt, said that the change in land use designation would be one of the major steps toward getting the project build.

In the application EWEB announced that they would change their project from Plan 1A to what they call 1B. 1B calls for the dam to be moved 400 feet upstream, and calls for the placement of turbines onsite rather than 2 miles downstream which eliminates the need for a pipeline. "The dam will still be called the Minto Project and will create enough power for about 6000 households at a cost of 56 million."

Marion County Planning Director, Russ Nebon, made a public statement on June 22nd announcing that his staff was reviewing the application to see if it was valid. "If it is," Nebon said, "the
County Commissioners will call a public hearing on the matter, probably some time in August." Nebon went on to say that the dam case presents the first test of Marion County's comprehensive plan which was approved last month.

On June 23rd, the Statesman Journal printed an article entitled, "EWEB Alters Plans for Dam, Wins Praise", written by staff writer Bill Dixon. Dixon began his article by stating:

A Eugene utility has taken another step toward building a hydroelectric dam in the Cascade foothills east of Salem. The move brought tentative praise from an allowed opponent of the project.

After explaining the new plans for the dam, Dixon wrote that these plans and the fact that EWEB has applied to Marion County for land use designation change, "Appears to have softened the outcry from SCRAM." Dixon stated that in asking Bennett how he felt about the new plan Bennett replied that the plan sounds like "a pretty good deal although it will have some of the same impacts as the other project, they have gotten rid of the more onerous aspects of the thing. The main thing is that they have agreed to come to the local level and hold a public hearing."

Dixon went on to quote both Bennett and EWEB's Hunt as saying local pressure had effected EWEB's stand on the project, and encouraged the utility to downshift to a smaller project.

Herbert Hunt was quoted by John Hayes, a staff writer for The Oregonian, on June 24, 1983 in an article entitled, "Power Plant Plans Cutback" as saying that EWEB's new plan is the "least costly
and has the least environmental impact, it seems to meet the concerns of the people in the canyon the best." Hayes also quoted EWEB public information person Tom Santee as saying, "The new plan will eliminate the majority of the concerns expressed by local residents in opposition to the project."

Hayes then quoted Bennett, in the same article, as saying that SCRAM was not mollified by the changes. "All that has happened at this point is that we've seen the whites of their eyes." Hayes further quoted Bennett as saying that "The county planning meetings are likely to result in the cancellation of the project since the Marion County Commissioners voted last year to oppose the project."

A number of letters and editorials were printed in response to EWEB's announcement to local and statewide newspapers in support of the SCRAM organization's effort, (written by SCRAM members for the most part). These letters continued to attack EWEB's proposed plan for the same basic concerns as listed earlier.

Later in the week, Terry Hauck, a Portland attorney and legal representative of EWEB, claimed that hearing testimony by SCRAM on June 24 might be prejudicial to the utility's plan to build the proposed Minto project. Hauck went on to say to the Marion Board that hearing from SCRAM now would take it out of sequence.

Marion County Legal Representative Bob Cannon and Planning Director Rus Nebon, argued that the hearing testimony from SCRAM could hardly be prejudicial. Cannon said, "It is the public policy of the Board of Commissioners to listen to any public input that
citizens wish to give during their Wednesday morning meeting." Cannon continued by saying that SCRAM was just giving an informational presentation that was scheduled long before the utility applied to the county.

Nebon added that the utility's application had not been formally accepted because it lacked a certified notification list of affected property owners within 250 feet of the project. The application also did not include a signed consent from owners of property at the proposed dam location, as required by county ordinance. He said that that application would go back to EWEB with a request for the missing documents.

Cannon explained that without a formal application the issue is out of the quasi-judicial range and that the SCRAM presentation could not be made part of any record regarding the proposed dam.

Nebon concluded by saying when the completed application is received he would recommend that the commissioners hear the case themselves, bypassing the Planning Commission and hearings officer, that hearing could come in late August or September.

June 23, 1982 Chuck Bennett and other members of SCRAM presented a slide presentation they developed to the Marion County Board of Commissioners. The presentation pointed out some of the concerns canyon residents had about the project, including the need for power, its impact on water quality, Highway 22, tourist industry, fish and wildlife and the destruction of an area known as Little Sweden.
Bennett concluded the presentation by saying he was glad the issue would go before the Board for consideration and thanked the Board for allowing SCRAM to present the slide show to the Board. The Commissioners thanked SCRAM for the presentation saying that it was well developed and informative.

Later in June SCRAM made a number of similar presentations to various groups. Some of the groups that saw the slide show were: Northwest Steelheaders' Albany and Salem chapters, Flycasters, Izaak Walton League, and a number of church groups. The various groups responded well to the presentation, often donating money and time to the cause, many members of the group went on to join SCRAM as individuals.

The July 1st edition of the Mill City Enterprise printed an article entitled, "SCRAM Claims a Small Victory." In reply to EWEB's scaled-down version of the project, the story quoted Bennett as saying, "Contrary to EWEB's belief, this scaled-down version does not satisfy the concerns of local residents. SCRAM is more prepared than ever to prevent any new dam construction on the North Santiam. We've won the first battle and we're in an excellent position to win the next one."

Bennett explained that the next battle would take place before the Marion County Board of Commissioners where EWEB would try to persuade officials that the Minto project is compatible with the county's land use plan.
The Enterprise went on to quote Bennett as saying, "although the latest EWEB proposal eliminates the destruction of the park and other privately owned property, many other issues besides land use remain unresolved."

Bennett then listed the concerns that are considered paramount by the SCRAM organization.

1. The diminished quality of downstream drinking water during construction.
2. The destruction of natural fish habitat.
3. The re-routing of Highway 22 and its subsequent effect on the livelihoods of local people involved in the logging and recreation industries.
4. The potential damage to the aesthetics of the local environment.

The Enterprise article concluded with the following statement by Bennett, "What it comes down to is that we have no reason to surrender our river to EWEB - not now, not ever."

4th of July Activities

On July 4th, 1982, the SCRAM organization took part in the annual 4th of July celebrations in Mill City. SCRAM staffed a booth that provided information and passed out newsletters written and designed by SCRAM president Chuck Bennet, with the help of various SCRAM members. (See Figure 4).
NEWSLETTER
July 4, 1982

SCRAM wins first round as EWEB drops plan

MILL CITY — The group known as Santiam Canyon Residents Against -Minto (SCRAM) announced an initial victory in its fight to prevent the Eugene Water and Electric Board from building an $80 million hydroelectric dam on the North Santiam River. Local opposition to the project reportedly has forced the Eugene-based utility to pull back from its original plan for what is called the Minto Project.

EWEB now is suggesting that a smaller facility be constructed just upstream from Santiam County’s Niagara Park. “But contrary to EWEB’S belief, said opposition leader Chuck Bennett, ‘this scaled-down version does not satisfy the concerns of canyon residents.”

Santiam Canyon Residents Against Minto (SCRAM) are more prepared than ever to prevent any new dam construction on the North Santiam, said Bennett. “We’ve won the battle, he said, referring to the groups recent victory before the Marion County Board of Commissioners, where EWEB must try to persuade officials that the Minto project is compatible with the county’s comprehensive land use plan.

“Although the latest EWEB proposal eliminates the destruction of the park and other privately-owned property,” said Bennett, “many issues besides land use remain unresolved. Paramount among SCRAM’S concerns are: (1) the diminished quality of downstream drinking water during construction, (2) the destruction of a natural fish habitat, (3) the rerouting of Highway 22 and its subsequent effect on the livelihoods of local businesses involved in the logging and recreation industries, and (4) the potential danger to the aesthetics of the local environment. “What it comes down to,” said Bennett, “is that we have no reason to surrender our river to EWEB. Not now. Not ever.”

SCRAM will sponsor fund-raising activities at Mill City’s 4th of July celebration. T-shirt transfers of the group’s official logo will be sold, along with a variety of baked goods. SCRAM members also will be recruiting even more supporters to help save the North Santiam River. SCRAM’S next public meeting will be on Friday, July 9 at 7 p.m. at the Mill City Eagle’s Hall. New information concerning the Minto Project will be discussed during the meeting.

EWEB proposes plan ‘B’ but problems remain

Thanks in part to SCRAM’S outcry against the plan to dam the North Santiam, the Eugene Water and Electric Board has fallen back to plan “B.” Actualiy, the Eugene utility calls it plan “1b.”

The main difference between this new EWEB plan and the original one is simplicity. Rather than put the proposed powerhouse two miles downstream from the dam, the power-generating turbines would be built right on top of the dam. This eliminates the need for a breached 21-foot diameter pipeline through Niagara Park.

The other difference is that it is being moved about 400 feet upstream from its original location at the east end of the park. As a result, the pipeline will be heavily used fishing and picnic area. It will still be in the park, however.

What remains, however, is a 117-foot-high dam just upstream and within eyeshot of park users: a 72-acre reservoir backing the river’s water up to Big Cliff Dam. Highway 22 will still have to be rerouted under this plan.

It appears that EWEB switched to this plan because it believes this plan has the best chance of winning local approval.

Too many problems still remain for this proposal to ever be built. It will be the job of SCRAM to maintain strong pressure on EWEB until the Eugene utility finally and completely withdraws its plan to disrupt the river, the local communities and our own quality of life. For purposes we deem inappropriate.

Perhaps the greatest misconception about EWEB’S designs on our river is that the people of the canyon will benefit somehow from construction of their dam. Nothing could be further from the truth. True, there could well be a temporary boom for some local service businesses but the long-term effects could seriously damage the quality of life we all have come to enjoy.

How to help stop the dam

Becoming a member of Santiam Canyon Residents Against Minto is easy. Just pay your dues and then pitch in.

Your membership dues cost just $5 per year. If you want to become a sustaining member, the fee is $25 per year. The choice is yours.

Whenever membership you choose, you’ll be helping a unique cause: the protection of the North Santiam River. With your help, SCRAM will continue to fight to keep EWEB out of the canyon and back to Eugene, where it belongs.

For more information, call Chuck Bennett at 897-2211 or 769-6335.

Or send a check to SCRAM, Star Rt. Box 23, Gates, OR 97826
Approximately 500 of these newsletters were handed out from the SCRAM booth to interested fairgoers. Another 500 were mailed to individuals and groups on SCRAM's mailing list. Another 500 were given out at SCRAM meetings for members to disperse.

The SCRAM booth, was decorated with pictures that depicted the natural beauty of the Minto area. The booth's principle attraction was homemade ice cream topped with fresh strawberries. The ice cream attracted many hungry fairgoers who were supplied with information on the SCRAM cause as they received and paid for their strawberries and ice cream. The booth also sold T-shirts with the SCRAM logo stencil on them.

Many of the fairgoers expressed support of the SCRAM cause by signing petitions, mailing lists and donating funds. Many also volunteered to help SCRAM any way they could.

EWEB had a booth at the 4th of July festival as well. It was staffed by Public Information Person Tom Santee and Public Relations Consultant Max Wales. Their booth consisted of a table and large map that showed the new project boundaries. The booth was not very popular, and only attracted a few fairgoers. Tom Santee said EWEB thought it was important to have the new project's details available for the residents, but added EWEB could not compete with homemade ice cream and fresh strawberries. Max Wales added that those who asked questions were genuinely interested, and that they were treated well by all fairgoers, including SCRAM members.
In early July Chuck Bennett won the Democratic primary for Representative from the 55th District. On July 9th Chuck Bennett called the SCRAM meeting being held at the Mill City Eagles Hall to order. Bennett began the meeting by explaining EWEB's newest plans for the project. He then explained EWEB's application to Marion County for land use changes by describing what they wanted to change and why. Bennett then stressed the importance of SCRAM's testimony at the upcoming land use hearings.

Bennett told SCRAM members that he would be monitoring the activities of the Marion County Board of Commissioners and EWEB with respect to these hearings and that he would call a special meeting of SCRAM when a date for the hearing was set, so they as a group and as individuals could prepare testimony. He said that no date had been set, because EWEB's application was not completed, once they completed it, a hearing date would be set.

The next item on the agenda was a report on the 4th of July activities at the Mill City fair. The involved membership was very pleased with the community response to the booth, and the support offered. It was pointed out that many people outside of the canyon were very supportive of the group, and many offered assistance if needed. The staff of the booth said that they stressed the importance of letter writing to those who offered assistance, and most replied that they would definitely write their political representatives. It was reported that the ice cream and bake sale went well,
but T-shirt sales were much lower than expected. Many people signed petitions, and took copies to have friends sign.

Bennett then brought up that the Stayton parade and fair would be held July 31 in Stayton, saying that SCRAM could be a part of the fair and that SCRAM had been offered free both space if the organization wanted it.

The membership voted in favor of participating and it was decided that they would sell T-shirts and provide information and pass out newsletters at the fair; it was also decided to try to prepare a float for the parade.

Bennett then read the following resolution and said that after discussing it it would be put before the group for a vote.

Resolution

Whereas, Eugene Water and Electric Board has proposed construction of a 117 foot high, 700 foot wide dam and power house in Niagara Park in the North Santiam Canyon; and

Whereas, the so-called "Minto Project" requires a change in the Marion County Comprehensive Plan from its current zoning designation as a forest area; and

Whereas, the change would be to a designation of "Public Use," which is a plan designation requiring a zone change, as well as a variance in order to make the site available for hydroelectric development; and

Whereas, the project contemplated would detrimentally affect water quality in the North Santiam River, the major drinking source in the area; and
Whereas, the North Santiam River is a major local resource which should be maintained for the future needs of Marion County; and

Whereas, there is no proven need for the power that would be generated by this facility; and

Whereas, the project would change the land and water use pattern in this area from multiple use to a single use to the detriment of all other uses now and in the future; and,

Whereas, there is strong and broad based opposition to the project in local incorporated and unincorporated communities that would be detrimentally affected by the dam during and after construction due to the rerouting of State Highway 22, loss of private property, impact of housing and serving out-of-area construction workers, increased local taxes to provide short term services, disruption of the rural character of the area, loss of a major local recreation area, and lessened water quality,

Be it Resolved that S.C.R.A.M. President Chuck Bennett is authorized to appear in behalf of this affected citizen's group, which is duly organized as a non profit corporation under Oregon Law, and present evidence to the Marion County Board of Commissioners and any other appropriate land use agency considering the E.W.E.B. proposal.

And further, that as an affected citizen's group we request that all notices of public hearings on this project as well as pertinent filings or information on the project be made available to Chuck Bennett, Star Route Box 23, Gates, OR 97346.

There was little discussion over the resolution, and it was put up to a vote and passed unanimously. Bennett said copies would be presented to various newspapers, EWEB, local, county and Federal agencies.

A SCRAM member asked Bennett where the aggregate for the project would be coming from. Bennett responded that he didn't know, but he would try to find out.
As the meeting was closing Bennett advised members to try to sell more T-shirt transfers because they had a large number of them on hand.

Bennett said that the next meeting of SCRAM would be announced in the local newspapers because he was unsure of when another meeting would be needed. He said that it would more than likely be just before the Marion County Land Use Hearings, whenever that would be. He concluded by saying that SCRAM's Stayton fair activities would be organized through telephone communications and special committee meetings; those interested should sign up.

On July 28th, Carmen Barnhart organized a meeting at a local restaurant (which was announced in local newspapers) for the purpose of forming a group to work towards making Niagara Park a historic site. About six concerned citizens attended the meeting, all SCRAM members, it was decided to write letters and to do further research into the project.

**EWEB Justifies**

On July 29th, the following article was written by EWEB's Director of Power Resources, Herbert Hunt, "EWEB explains Minto Project Status" appeared in local newspapers.

Making choices about future energy development requires careful study, investigating facts and options as best we can. That is why EWEB has shared with canyon residents the complete feasibility study prepared for EWEB by the consulting engineers, so concerned citizens have the most complete information available.
We're pleased that people are hungry for facts. There is some emotional talk about "winning" or "losing" in respect to Minto. The only "winning" which can occur is when all parties involved can reach a wise decision which best serves the long-range interests of Oregon's citizens.

That sort of "winning" takes hard facts and hard thinking.

To help in obtaining the facts about Minto, I am going to summarize some of the material contained in the application filed in Marion County. I ask that you keep two things in mind. First, the EWEB Commissioners have not made a decision on Minto. Second, in condensing a long application to a few paragraphs, I have to use some generalities instead of lengthy details.

Among some of the positive impacts which could result from the project are the enlargement and improvement of the recreational area of Niagara Park, employment of local labor and increase business for local firms during construction, addition of a 72-acre lake for boating in an area which is considered by many to be dangerous for boating, and, of course, an increased regional electricity supply which all of us share.

The manner in which problems arising from construction would be mitigated is set forth in the application. Only 2.3 miles of the riverbed would be changed to a lake. The potential impact on the environment was, in part, mitigated by the project option chosen by EWEB engineers. It affects the least land and the fewest people.

The proposal is for a concrete dam about two-thirds the height of Big Cliff Dam. It would be built upriver from the recreational part of Niagara Park. The dam location would be about 400 feet east of the rock point where the river can be seen from the highway (near the east exit of the park). The powerhouse would be located at the dam and would generate an estimated 103 million kilowatt-hours annually. The transmission power line would reach north only 560 feet to intertie with the existing Bonneville Power Administration line.
Because the dam would be higher than the existing highway at Niagara Park, about one mile of highway would be relocated to higher ground. This would be done before any construction work began on the dam. The highway would not be closed, although some short construction delays would occur. Relocation of the highway would allow for 14.2 acres of land to be added to the major area of the park. EWEB would donate the land to Marion County to offset a narrow strip of land which is in the project area. Construction would be limited to a five-day work week so that weekend recreationalists could use the park and highway undisturbed by construction activity. EWEB would also install tap water and waste water facilities for construction and donate them for park use.

The project would have no affect on existing river flows at Niagara Park and downstream. Flows would be dependent upon the Corps of Engineers' releases of water at Big Cliff Dam, over which EWEB has no control. When completed, the dam would have essentially no impact on water quality, as the lake would tend to reduce rather than increase turbidity. EWEB would require that construction be planned to minimize bank disturbance by using buffer zones and by quickly replanting vegetation to minimize turbidity. Special settling pools would be used to remove sediment.

The impact on fish would be far less than most hydroelectric projects. The Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife currently traps all spring Chinook and most winter steelhead migrating upstream at the Minto Weir located down-river of Niagara Park. Only the summer steelhead which exceed the egg collection needs, are placed above the weir. This can be mitigated by stocking fish in numbers and species acceptable to ODFW in the river area above the weir.

A total of nearly 158 acres of land would need to be acquired for the project of which just 34 acres is privately owned. Private property owners are Oscar & Richard Nystrom, Publishers Paper Co. and Boise Cascade Corp. No homes or buildings would be affected. Public property includes U.S.A., State of Oregon, Marion County, and Linn County.
Some people have asked why this area has been selected as a possible place to increase the region's electricity supply. The answer is simple. First, the narrow canyon means that a reservoir would be small compared with the power production potential. Second, Big Cliff and Detroit dams provide storage and regulated river flows allowing for efficient operation of a downstream project. Third, the Minto Weir (fish trap) further downstream already restricts fish population in this river stretch. And fourth, only a limited amount of private property, and no homes, would be in the project area.

As I said earlier, EWEB has not made a decision to build a dam. Recent load forecasts, which seem to be changing constantly, indicate that there is no need to make hasty decisions to build, or not to build, new resources. Meanwhile, it is wise to keep options open regarding any renewable resources which may be needed to serve Oregon's future.

We hope that the good people of the Canyon will work with us to reach a thoughtful decision which will prove to be right ten or twenty years from now.

EWEB also sent out copies of the article to those individuals that signed up on their information lists.

The Stayton Fair and parade took place on July 31, and SCRAM had a float in the parade which consisted of a pickup truck, drift boat and trailer that had been donated and was decorated with SCRAM's logos and signs stating opposition to the project.

SCRAM members also staffed a booth at the fairgrounds where members sold T-shirts and passed out information pamphlets. The response to the booth was supportive and many people showed interest and volunteered to write. And many signed petitions and took copies to have friends and neighbors sign. The Stayton Fair was the last formal SCRAM activity of the year.
Bennett and SCRAM had obtained 5000 signatures on petitions signed by a wide range of voters from various areas in the state. The petitions stated that the signees were opposed to EWEB's Minto Hydroelectric Project.

The most active members of SCRAM continued to communicate with Bennett regularly. Bennett continued to monitor EWEB's activities, by making frequent phone calls to EWEB's Dean Axtell and Tom Santee, who would inform Bennett as to what EWEB's activities in the Santiam Canyon were.

As a campaign promise, Bennett said if elected he would submit legislation to prevent EWEB's Minto Dam from being built. A number of SCRAM members wrote letters to the editor of various papers, and some members helped make signs in support of Bennett, but SCRAM as an organization did not campaign for Bennett, and EWEB was not involved in the election process at all.
CHAPTER V

CASE HISTORY - LEGISLATIVE CONCLUSION

Legislative Power

On November 11 Bennett was elected to the Oregon House of Representatives. His opponent did not make a stand on the Minto project. Bennett claimed his Canyon Area by a vast majority, and held even in other areas of the 55th District. Steve Starkovich, Democratic candidate for senate and opposer of Minto, was also elected.

From the election to mid January there was little activity with regards to the Minto project. EWEB had not submitted a new application to Marion County Board of Commissioners, and the community had felt reasonably assured that the project was defeated with Bennett and Starkovich serving in the House and Senate.

In early January the City of Salem continued to debate their stance on the project. There was, however, a general feeling of opposition, because Frank Mauldin, a city planning engineer, had expressed his concern that construction of the project could damage the city's water supply.

City of Salem officials told the city council on January 17, that they didn't know enough about the project to decide where they stood, and council members agreed not to take a formal position on the project until more information was provided by EWEB.
As the 1983 legislature went into session, Bennett drafted a Bill that would outlaw the Minto Dam. Bennett discussed the Bill with a veteran legislator, and the legislator advised Bennett to get in touch with EWEB's lobbyist, Libby Henry. Bennett contacted Henry and provided her with a draft of the Bill. This is a common practice for new legislators when the element of surprise is not important.

Upon reviewing the Bill, EWEB's lobbyist called EWEB's General Manager Keith Parks and explained the Bill to him. Parks said he would be coming to Salem later in the week, and he wanted to talk the proposed Bill over with Representative Bennett.

Later in the week Parks and Henry visited Bennett in his office to discuss the Bill. Bennett explained that his goal and the goal of the community was that no dam would be built on the site. Parks and Henry pointed out that there are other ways to prevent the dam than introducing a high precedent Bill. (A high precedent Bill that sets a standard, that other Bills can be copied from.) Parks told Bennett that they would prefer him to pursue other means, such as a wild and scenic river designation or a historical landmark, something else so that it would appear less in direct opposition to EWEB's activity. Parks said it would be better to pursue these ideas than to have a legislative battle over the issue.

Bennett was in agreement with this idea, and he said he would look into these options. Bennett investigated the possibilities of designating the North Santiam River a wild and scenic river, but he found out that it did not qualify because there were already two dams
on the river in the vicinity of the site. He then investigated the possibilities of the China Dam being put on the Historic Registrar, but he found it would take too long and authorities were uncertain as to whether or not it would qualify for the State or National Registrars. The local community was putting some degree of pressure on Bennett to fulfill his campaign promises, so Bennett called EWEB Lobbyist and explained that the other options she and Parks suggested were not going to meet his needs and the needs of the community.

The next week Bennett heard rumors around the capital that the Corps of Engineers were considering the North Santiam Area as a possible site for a hydroelectric project of their own, which called for the diversion of water from Big Cliff into a two mile long concrete canal which would feed the water into a powerhouse.

In the February 24, 1983 edition of The Oregonian there appeared an article written by Linda Killian entitled, "Dam Proposal Called Danger to City Water." Killian quoted Salem City Planning Engineer Frank Mandlin as saying that the project proposed by EWEB and by the Corps could have a serious impact on Salem's drinking water. Killian wrote that Mandlin told the City Council that during construction of the project, increased turbidity in the North Santiam could make it impossible for the equipment at Green Island to treat the river water. Water from the North Santiam is treated at the Green Island plant, which then pipes the treated water to Salem.

Killian then quoted Mandlin as saying, "If Salem's water supply is affected, it would be EWEB's responsibility, to either come up
with an alternative water source for Salem, or pay for improvement of the treatment equipment at Green Island." Maudlin added that the cities of Gates, Mill City and Stayton would also be seriously impacted because they also get their water from the North Santiam and their water treatment facilities are even less sophisticated than Salem's.

Parks Meets with Bennett

Late in February EWEB General Manager Keith Parks and Libbey Henry made another visit to Representative Bennett's office. Parks said, "In confidence with us, I don't think we can complete this project," to which Bennett replied, "I don't think you can either."

Parks asked Bennett if he would hold off on dropping the Bill until EWEB completed their feasibility studies, after which they would completely pull out of the area. Bennett agreed, but later in the week, SCRAM members and other concerned citizens notified Bennett that they were upset because it appeared that EWEB was still going ahead with the project.

Bennett then called EWEB Lobbyist Libbey Henry and told her that he would have to break his agreement and drop the Bill soon, due to concerns expressed to him by Santiam Canyon residents and because of his own political reasons.

The next week Parks, Henry and Bennett had another meeting, at which time they made an agreement that EWEB would not oppose the Bill, if Bennett did not make it a case of the people against EWEB
and if Bennett would not oppose EWEB's Sunnyside project, which is also in Bennett's area of representation. They also agreed not to make any public statement against one another, and to keep the press coverage on the Bill at a minimum. Both sides agreed that it was best not to have an adversarial relationship develop in the press.

Facing the Enemy

The next day Bennett told Libbey Henry that he had agreed to be a guest speaker at the Lane County Demo Forum, which is a Eugene based community meeting which discusses important democratic issues of the day. Henry advised Bennett that it might not be a good idea for him to go down there because the Forum could become a debate over the Minto Project, that would be one sided in favor of the project. She pointed out that Jack Graig, a member of EWEB's elected board, is a member of the Demo Forum.

The next Saturday Bennett addressed the forum; the issue of the day was natural resource development. Representative Bennett was chosen because he is a member of the House's Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee and becaue he is the Chairman of the Freshmen Caucus, as well as the fact that he is president of the SCRAM organization.

The meeting began with a general discussion of the House's view on natural resources, but, the topic eventually changed to the Minto Project. This led to a heated discussion between EWEB board member, Graig, and Bennett. Graig accused Bennett of misleading the Canyon
residents with respect to EWEB's plans for the project. Graig stated that a dam would be an improvement to the area, because "it's basically a swamp now." Bennett responded, defending himself and SCRAM's intentions, and that EWEB should have never come up to the Canyon in the first place. The meeting soon came to a close with both Bennett and Graig angry at one another.

As Bennett drove home, he became more upset about the forum, and at EWEB. He felt EWEB had broken their agreement not to speak out against one another by allowing Graig to confront him on the Minto issue.

On February 28, 1983, Bennett introduced legislation that would prohibit the construction of a hydroelectric generating facilities of the North Santiam. Thirty-four representatives and sixteen senators, a majority of each house of legislature, co-sponsored the Bill.

Bennett made the following public statement: "Construction of the proposed Minto Dam would destroy a historic park and steelhead spawning area and is universally opposed by residents of the area. The Eugene Water and Electric Board wants to build the dam far away from their ratepayers because they know of their tremendous opposition to further damming of Oregon's rivers, particularly the McKenzie River where they have traditionally built. "EWEB privately assured me they would not continue their plans for a dam. Despite these assurances, they have continued their surveying and study activities and it is evident they still want to build the dam in spite of protests by citizens in my district. The project still looks
alive... I have introduced this Bill along with a final resolution to this problem and to prohibit anyone from constructing more dams on the North Santiam, thereby preserving this beautiful area for recreation and future generations of Oregonians.

The next day EWEB General Manager Keith Parks made a public statement saying he wouldn't fight the Bill because there was little likelihood that the utility would be able to obtain the necessary land use permits from Marion and Linn counties, and the approval of the State Land Conservation and Development Commission to build the dam. Parks continued by saying, "I'm fed up to my ears with the whole regulatory process," and he challenged the legislature to "fish or cut the bait" on the issue of developing hydroelectric facilities. Parks said, "a few years ago the Legislature told us to go out and get renewables. Hydro was the number one priority after conservation. If we can't develop on the Santiam, I don't know how we can develop anywhere." Parks said that land use and environmental regulations were especially difficult hurdles for the project and added that the state had done nothing to ease the process in exchange for allowing development of the renewable source of power.

Parks concluded his public statement by stating that Bennett's Bill could have a chilling effect on future hydro investments. If utilities perceive that the legislature is likely to rule out specific dam projects after development money has been spent, they will soon realize that it's not a good idea to go out and spend money on studies of hydro projects.
Parks said that there are currently three bills pending before legislature that could restrict dams on stretches of the Illinois, Owyhee, and Grande Rhonde rivers, and others may be introduced. He added, "I think these bills will set the real policy of the state toward renewables."

**Bill Receives Press**

The introduction of Bennett's Bill received extensive press coverage; *The Oregonian* printed two news articles entitled "New Legislation Seeks Dam Free Santiam River," and "Utility Chief Raps Dam Ban Bill;" *The Stateman Journal* covered the bill with an article entitled, "Bennett's Bill Would Rule Out Minto," and the *Eugene Registrar Guard* carried a study entitled, "Legislature Acts to Kill Dam Plan." All the articles covered the same material, a brief explanation of the project, Bennett's statement with respect to the Bill and his reason for opposing the Minto project and a statement by Parks that explained EWEB's position on the Bill.

The editorial pages of the *Oregonian, Statesman Journal* and *Registrar Guard* carried the following articles which expressed the editorial staffs' view on the project. The *Oregonian's* editorial was printed March 3, 1983 and was entitled, "Save Santiam."

Santiam Canyon, with its aesthetic and historic Niagara County Park and nearby China Dam, is one of the most appealing tourist areas in Oregon. It should not be obliterated by a hydroelectric project being considered by the Eugene Water and Electric Board and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
Despite protests from citizens and local government officials in the area, and environmentalists, EWEB has not withdrawn its interest in building a new hydroelectric dam approximately 2.3 miles downstream from the existing Big Cliff Dam.

If built, this $40 million project - 700 feet long, with a dam wall 117 feet high to create a reservoir of approximately 76 acres - would severely affect North Santiam River stream flows, drastically changing the shape and appearance of Niagara County Park. Furthermore, highway and dam construction would affect fish spawning in a large stretch of the river, destroy the spawning area at the dam site and possibly tax the city of Salem's ability to treat the increased turbidity of the North Santiam River water used as Salem's water supply.

Concerned citizens interested in saving the Santiam from hydroelectric development might ask, "Why is EWEB proposing to build a hydro project so distant from its Lane County ratepayers?" Clearly, the utility would be more sensitive to the Santiam protests if it first tried to construct a new dam on home turf - say, the McKenzie River.

Had 1981 legislative reapportionment not given residents of the Santiam Canyon a voice and vote in Salem in the person of Representative Chuck Bennett, D-Gates, the North Santiam might have been fertile ground for a new hydroelectric project. Fortunately, Bennett, new chairman of the Democratic Freshman Caucus, also happens to be chairman of the Santiam Canyon Residents Against Minto (the name of EWEB's proposed project).

To head off EWEB, Bennett, an effective politician who recognized early in this process that the magic legislative numbers are 31 House votes and 16 Senate votes, has lined up 33 House sponsors and 16 Senate sponsors for House Bill 2913, which would prohibit construction of a third dam on the North Santiam River.

Other lawmakers should join them in supporting this bill, thereby sending a message to all hydroelectric developers that Oregon's natural resource blessings - places like Niagara County Park, for
example - should be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

The Salem Statesman Journal printed an editorial entitled "Vain Attack on 'Straw Dam'" on March 9, 1983.

It is simple enough to raise a straw man editorially for purposes of batting it down, but it's more of a chore to raise a straw dam.

Nevertheless, the Portland Oregonian accomplishes that task in attacking the proposed Minto hydroelectric project on the North Santiam River.

The newspaper declares Niagara County Park and nearby China Dam would be "obliterated" by the proposed dam and reservoir below Big Cliff Dam. A preliminary study permit for the project was granted to the Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB).

In declaring that "places like Niagara County Park... should be preserved for future generations to enjoy," the Oregonian asserts the project "would severely affect North Santiam River stream flows, drastically changing the shape and appearance of Niagara County Park."

We have serious questions about the need for such a project and some of its other environmental impacts. But at no time has EWEB intended to "obliterate" Niagara Park or the historic China Dam.

An earlier version of the proposal would have created a diversion tunnel from above the park to a generator below it, cutting the flow of water through the park and creating a problem of where to run the tunnel.

Objections by this newspaper and others caused EWEB to modify its plan. An EWEB spokesman tells us the version for which it has a study permit eliminates the diversion tunnel, placing the generator at the dam site. The full flow of the river would continue through the narrow channel at Niagara Park.
In addition, the proposed site of the dam was withdrawn upriver to where it would not be visible from the recreational area of the park.

The energy surplus in the region has dramatically reduced the need for a Minto hydro-electric project.

Rep. Chuck Bennett, D-Gates, whose vigilant opposition to the dam helped propel him into the Legislature, has mustered legislative support for his House Bill 2913, which would prohibit the dam's construction.

If the issue is to occupy the time of the Legislature, it should be debated on its merits. Inflammatory comments indicating that the proposal would "obliterate" a park and a dam does not contribute to the proper atmosphere for that debate.

The Eugene Register Guard printed the following editorial entitled, "Oregon's Future is at Stake." on March 11, 1983.

If the Legislature arbitrarily forbids the Eugene Water & Electric Board to continue plans for a hydroelectric dam on the North Santiam River, the State of Oregon will - morally, at least - owe the people of Eugene half a million dollars.

That's what EWEB has invested in engineering studies that it undertook several years ago when the Legislature and the governor called on Oregon utilities to develop such projects.

Now Rep. Chuck Bennett, D-Gates, has introduced a bill that would block hydro projects on the North Santiam - without compensating EWEB. And EWEB general manager Keith Parks is as much as throwing in the towel, saying that he's "fed up with the whole regulatory process."

Parks explains that Marion and Linn counties are unlikely to grant permits that would be needed - in addition to approval by the State Lane Conservation and Development Commission - before EWEB could build its proposed Minto Dam. Approval by the Bonneville Power Administration would also be required under a pending master plan for Northwest regional power developments.
Bennett lists a number of objections to the construction of Minto Dam that merit analysis. These include boom-and-bust effects that might disrupt small towns nearby, possible damage to water supplies and fish life and the fact that 103 million dillowatts of electricity the dam would produce is not immediately needed.

However, members of the Legislature who buy his contention that all the electricity from Minto would automatically go to Eugene had better bone up on the regional power plan. It would effectively restrict new projects to those adding to the overall Northwest supply.

Parks notes that the regional power plan puts only energy conservation ahead of new hydro projects as a means of meeting the Northwest's power supply needs over the next 20 years, adding, "If we can't develop there (on the Santiam), I don't know how we can develop hydro anywhere."

That observation deserves a lot more attention by the Legislature than does Bennett's parochially motivated pitch. Parks has challenged the legislature to "fish or cut bait" on the issue of how hydro projects are to be handled in this state in the future.

The Legislature owes at least that much to the people of Eugene who, through EWEB, set about using their money to develop energy supplies for which Oregon's need has been postponed, but by no means canceled.

Power not Needed

The Bonneville Power Administration announced on March 30, 1983 that the Pacific Northwest would have a power surplus for the next ten years. Steve Hickok, the Assistant B.P.A. Manager for Conservation, said that "the surplus is much larger than we anticipated and we don't show a need for new resources until 1993." The B.P.A., a
federal power marketing agency, said, "the Northwest will have a surplus of 1800 megawatts next year even if the snow pack is low. This figure is twice as much as the City of Seattle uses."

This prediction is the reverse of a prediction made two years ago which stated that there would be a regionwide electricity shortage in the mid-80's. A B.P.A. official said that the power demand dropped because of the recession and the impact of rising prices.

Ed Sienkiewkz, Power Management Chief, said "the B.P.A. will have problems disposing of surplus electricity for at least five to eight years." He said that efforts to sell unneeded power to California have not been worked out yet. Recently the B.P.A. offered surplus power to the Northwest depressed aluminum industry at a rock bottom rate of 1.1 cents per kilowatt hour.

The Northwest Power Planning Council decided on March 30, to scale down part of its 20 year draft plan for regional energy needs. The council decided to reduce downward its prediction that the regional power demand would increase by at least .9% annually over a twenty year period.

Annette Frahm, the council's public information officer, said that the exact percentage of the decrease had not been calculated. But explained the reason for the decrease as being that the Northwest is expected to recover more slowly than expected from the recession.

The B.P.A. surplus announcement, and the Northwest's Power Planning Council redrafting of its plan, received extensive regional press coverage, as well as regional (and to some extent national)
radio and television coverage. The media covered the announcements as a straight news story stressing the effects of the recession on the announcement. EWEB did not make a formal response to the B.P.A. announcement.

A local newspaper announced in its April 7th edition that a SCRAM meeting would be held at the Mill City High School to discuss SCRAM testimony before the House Natural Resource Committee. The article also explained Bennett's proposed Bill and the need for testimony at the hearing.

On April 13th Representative Bennett called the SCRAM meeting to order. Approximately 30 SCRAM members were in attendance. SCRAM President Bennett passed out the following copies of the House Bill 2913 and a sheet explaining how to testify before the House Agricultural Committee. (See Figure's 5 and 6).

Upon receiving a copy of the Bill, a SCRAM member questioned Bennett as to the effect of his Bill on the Corps planned project. Bennett explained that he was in the process of making a slight change in the Bill that would prohibit any hydroelectric project on the North Santiam, rather than just dams as it currently reads, which would prohibit any plans for diversion of water for the North Santiam.

Bennett also stressed the importance of taking on one project at a time, by saying that they must first end EWEB's project and then they can take on the Corps. He further explained that it wasn't clear if his Bill could stop a federal project, but he added that if
House Bill 2913

Sponsored by Representatives BENNETT, ANDERSON, BAUMAN, CEASE, COURTNEY, FAWBUSH, GILMOUR, HANLON, HARPER, J. HILL, L. HILL, HUGO, JOLIN, LEEK, LINDQUIST, MARKHAM, MASON, McCRACKEN, MILLER, PARKINSON, RUKEN, B. ROBERTS, L. ROBERTS, ScAVERA, SchoON, ShipRack, SPRINGER, ThROOp, TRAHERN, yOUNG, ZAJONC, Senators BROWN, DAY, HENDRIKSEN, STARKOVICH, TIMMS, Representatives AGRONS, DeBOER, D. JONES, Van VLIET, Senators COHEN, FRYE, GARDNER, HAMby, HANNON, HOUCK, JERNSTEDT, McFARLAND, RYLES, TROW, WYERS (at the request of Santiam Residents Against Minto Dam)

SUMMARY

The following summary is not prepared by the sponsors of the measure and is not a part of the body thereof subject to consideration by the Legislative Assembly. It is an editor's brief statement of the essential features of the measure as introduced.

Prohibits construction or maintenance of dams on North Santiam River. Exempts any dam constructed on North Santiam River prior to effective date of Act. Declares emergency, effective on passage.

A BILL FOR AN ACT

Relating to water; and declaring an emergency.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. No person shall construct or maintain, and no officer or agency of the state shall issue any permit for the construction or maintenance of any dam on the North Santiam River.

SECTION 2. Nothing in this section applies to any dam constructed on the North Santiam River prior to effective date of Act, to the historic uses of such a dam or to the repair or reconstruction of such a dam at the present site.

SECTION 3. This Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this Act takes effect on its passage.

NOTE: Matter in bold face in an amended section is new; matter [italic and bracketed] is existing law to be omitted.

Figure 5. House Bill 2913.
A public hearing on House Bill 2913, which prevents construction of dams on the North Santiam, will probably be held in Hearing Room "D" in the Capitol the evening of May 3.

If you wish to address the committee, please sign up on the witness sheet with the committee clerk.

Written comments should be prepared and copies submitted for the record and the committee members (10 copies if possible). These should be given to the committee clerk.

When you are called by Chairman Bradbury to testify, approach the witness stand and address the committee. The members should be addressed "Mister Chairman, members of the Agriculture Committee, I am ________, I live in ________.

Testimony should be brief and should summarize written comments.

Personal reasons for support of the bill are influential to members of the committee but should specifically address the bill and the Santiam.

Large groups should choose someone to talk to the committee who can say "I represent _____ people in support of this bill."

When you have finished speaking, the Chairman will ask the members if there are any questions for the witness. You are not expected to be an expert in all details, so relax and answer to the best of your ability.

For your convenience, restrooms are located near the circular wood Guide Office in the Capitol.

If you have any questions, you can call me toll-free at 800-452-7613. My office is located on the second floor in room H-297. Take the elevator to the second floor and turn right.

Figure 6. Testifying to the House Agriculture Committee.
his Bill was approved it would be the State of Oregon against the Army Corps of Engineers, rather than a small community against the Corps.

Bennett then asked those in attendance if they would support his Bill, and those in attendance said they would. Next Bennett briefly explained how a Bill is made into a law. He said the first step is a public hearing before the appropriate committee, which in this case is the House Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee. From there it would go to the House for a vote, then to a Senate hearing; furthermore, it would go before the Senate for a vote, and finally the Bill would go to the Governor for his signature which would make it a law.

Bennett then explained the process of testimony before the hearing, by asking SCRAM members to refer back to the handout he had given them earlier. He stressed that testimony should be brief and that all those who testify should summarize their testimony in a written form before the hearing, and to give it to him so he could present it to the committee to go into the record.

Bennett concluded the meeting by stressing the importance of a good turnout at the hearing by SCRAM members and other groups opposed to the project. He requested each person in attendance to bring three people with them to the hearings, and he said he hoped that 100 people would be in attendance, saying that "it really makes an impression on the committee when the hearing room is full." He said that he would be in contact with other groups - such as the Steel-
headers and Flycasters, asking them to prepare testimony for the hearing, as well.

In a notice issued April 24, 1983 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers formally announced that it was investigating a plan to divert water from the North Santiam via canal to a powerhouse downstream from Mill City.

According to the plan, the Corp would divert all North Santiam water in excess to the instream requirements. The water would be taken from the Big Cliff Reservoir and carried eleven miles along the adjacent north hillside roughly parallel to Highway 22 to a head pond north of Fishermen's Bend. From there the water would be dropped 400 feet to a powerhouse near Fishermen's Bend State Park. The powerhouse would be in the 70 mega-watt range using diversion flows of 1200 to 2400 cubic feet per second.

Ted Oldenburger, the Corps Public Information person, said the study is not being prepared at the request of any power company or power administration. At this point it is strictly a Corp's project, in partial response to a U.S. Senate Resolution issued in 1961 calling for the development of water resources.

Oldenburger said that the B.P.A. had been contacted and they said it was worth going ahead with the study because they were looking for power in the 1990's or so.

Oldenburger, when asked about the possible effects of the Legislations introduced by Bennett on the Corp's project, said that he was
unaware of the proposed Legislation and that he didn't know how it might affect the Corp's proposal.

According to Jerry Johnson, a Corp's study manager, the Corp's decision is far in the future, a typical G.I. study takes a minimum of a couple years. "This one is funded over several years, depending on appropriations."

Johnson defended the study by saying that there is a continuing need to identify feasible hydro power development opportunities in the Pacific Northwest in order to minimize reliance on non-renewable thermal generation. He concluded by saying the identification of these opportunities helps assure that additions to the region's generation system will be made at the lowest possible costs.

In response to the Corp's formal announcement, Bob Jensen, a Legislative Assistant to Representative Bennett, said that Bennett would amend the draft of the Bill to prohibit any hydroelectric projects on the river, rather than just hydroelectric dams on the river. Jenson said that Bennett had also requested a cost analysis survey to see what the Corps was up to. Jenson said that Bennett had contacted Denny Smith and another Federal Representative to ask them to try to get the Corps' research funds dropped.

The Corps' announcement was issued in local and state newspapers which reported on the proposed project as a straight news story. Several area newspapers carried Bennett's response to the Corps' plans. Local area, and state newspapers carried announcements of the hearing, the announcements told the date, May 3rd, and time, 7 p.m.
room, etc. and explained the Bill's purpose, as being to block construction of the Minto Dam and the newly proposed project by the Corps and all other hydroelectric projects on the North Santiam. It also stated that the hearing was open to the public.

**Hearing**

The public hearing before the House Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources began on schedule at 7 p.m. May 3rd, 1983, with over 100 people in attendance.

The hearing began with a brief explanation of the Bill by its sponsor, Representative Chuck Bennett, who said he introduced the Bill in response to the granting of a preliminary permit to EWEB by FERC over two years ago. He continued his introduction by giving a brief slide show of the area, and a brief description of EWEB's project. Bennett then turned the meeting over to the Committee's chairman.

The first person called to testify was Salem City Councilperson, Jane Cummins. She said that Salem supported the Bill, providing some amendments were added. The amendments suggested would clarify the fact that only the main stream of the North Santiam would be affected, that the area restriction would be reduced and that the Bill would be reworded to allow for the maintenance and improvements on existing dams.

Bennett was then called to take the stand as the President of SCRAM. He began his testimony informally by saying, "I'm not here to
spend a great deal of time harassing EWEB over its proposal; because EWEB has been eminently cooperative in working with SCRAM and they have been very sensitive to the needs of the community." He said, "The current question between SCRAM and EWEB is a matter of siting only."

Bennett began his formal testimony by outlining and supporting the major reasons why the dam should not be located at the Minto site. A brief description of those reasons follow:

- The proposed dam would adversely affect the historic China Dam. He said that Marion County had spent tens of thousands of dollars protecting the dam from erosion and man made vibrations from the old railroad and Highway 22. He also quoted a 1978 study that said the dam could not withstand nearby blasting. He also said the dam is a popular historic and recreation site.

- The Minto Dam construction would destroy spawning grounds for native Chinook and steelhead. He said that that area of the Santiam has some of the best steelhead fishing around, and that it was just beginning to recover from earlier dam projects.

- The dam could adversely effect water quality. He said that major questions remain as to the project's impact on the river's water temperature and turbidity. He said that many communities rely on the North Santiam River as a source of water and that they can't stand to have that water supply changed or interrupted.
The project would have an impact on canyon residents and the local economy. He said relocation of Highway 22 would harmfully impact the timber and tourist industry, the two mainstays of their economy.

The project would effect local tax rates and public services. He cited examples from a study done by Hogg and Smith, in the Sweet Home area during construction of Green Peter Dam. He said that a socio-cultural chaos could occur if the Minto project was constructed.

Bennett concluded his testimony by saying that Santiam Canyon residents are not against energy development or progress, but they already have two major dams and don't want or need a third.

Many local residents were called to testify in support of the Bill. Most expressed their concern over the protection of the natural beauty of the river and others echoed some of the concerns presented by Bennett.

Libbey Henry was then called to testify on behalf of her employer, EWEB. She said, "EWEB's elected board has not taken action to direct the utility to construct a dam on the Santiam River," She said that the power is not needed now, but will be in the future to meet Oregon's energy requirements. "For those reasons EWEB does not oppose the Bill." She then added that "if the state is going to get in the business of telling us site by site where we cannot develop these resources, then the state should tell us where we can."
The Committee then heard testimony from students of Detroit Elementary School who testified that most of the kids in the school told them to testify in favor of the Bill. Detroit High School students also testified in favor of the Bill.

Stan Sporseen was then called to testify, he introduced himself and said that he was only speaking for himself not his former employer EWEB. He said, "I appear to be in a lion's den, but I must speak out in opposition to this Bill," he asked the audience to let him speak his piece, and then he would "go home and watch basketball." He began his formal presentation by saying that he was the person who started all this trouble in the first place when he suggested the project to EWEB's General Manager. He said that he had been interested in the site since the 1940's when he saw water pouring through the narrow gorge and all that water going to waste.

Sporseen then addressed each part of Bennett's testimony as follows:

- Who the hell's going to destroy Niagara Park?
He said that he suggested EWEB fix it up and maintain it for year round use.

- "Where's the fish spawning area?"
He said his impression was that they threw some fish eggs in from the weir to keep the fish population up. "My impression is that no self respecting salmon would swim in the Willamette River in 1935." He said that when he came to Oregon as an engineer for Bonneville Dam, they called the river the Willamette sewer and that the only reason
they had salmon and steelhead now was because of the dam projects which keep up the Willamette flows during the summer.

- "Its stretching the imagination to think that another dam on this river will increase turbidity."

He said that the only reason why the water is so clear now for municipal use is that the sediment settles out behind the dams.

- "Who the devil's going to close the road?"

He said that roads are relocated all the time, and roads are not closed to do so, because detours are provided.

- "A little bit of a project like this won't put a strain on community services."

He said a maximum of 125 workers would be needed to build the dam. Most of those he said would be unemployed loggers and others out of work in the community, and that only 25-30 supervisory personnel would come in from out of the area. He concluded by thanking the committee for hearing his views and said that he felt someone had to speak out in favor of the project since EWEB would not.

While Sporseen was giving his testimony, various people openly expressed their disagreement with him on a number of issues, and the committee had to ask for order a couple of times.

The next person to testify following Sporseen was a long time canyon resident who said, "An engineer may see running water and see a waste, but others see it differently."

Altogether the committee heard testimony from over twenty citizens with Sporseen's testimony the only one that opposed the Bill.
The hearing before the House Agriculture and Natural Resource Committee received extensive press coverage in local and area newspapers. The papers reported on the hearings in general giving background on the project and the proposed Bill, and then they focused on key testimonies in the hearing, namely, Bennett's, Henry's and Sporseen's. The articles also pointed out that all but one of the testimonies given (+20) were in favor of the new legislation.

Later in the same week, the House Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources announced that they had unanimously approved the Bill. Prior to the vote, the Committee agreed to limit the restriction to that part of the river between Mehama and Big Cliff Dam. Also the Committee removed an emergency clause from the Bill, thereby putting the effective date of the Bill at January of 1984.

After the Committee's announcement, Bennett said he did not foresee more hearings in the House, but he said the Senate would hold a hearing after the House approved the Bill.


I am an independent consulting engineer and feel free to express my own opinions as I see fit. My former company, Hanner, Ross & Sporseen Inc., has been retained by the Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) to prepare the Feasibility Analysis of the North Santiam Project, and Erling Soli is project engineer. They and EWEB ask for my advise occasionally and follow my advice if they wish, but in this matter I speak only for myself.

I started this whole thing when I was project planning engineer for the ARMY Corps of Engineers on Big Cliff Dam in 1947-48. At that time my assistant and I worked up an alternative plan for
Big Cliff power plant which consisted of a 20-foot pipeline along the abandoned railroad grade to a powerhouse about 2,000 feet downstream from Niagara Falls. This plan was, however, vetoed by the brass of the Army Engineers.

About four years ago I tried to interest various groups in sponsoring this plan. I finally turned to EWEB and they ordered my company to proceed with preliminary plans. Since that time I have been retired from active participation and serve only as a consultant on this and other projects.

At the hearing on May 3 regarding HB 2913, which would prohibit any new dams on the North Santiam, state Rep. Chuck Bennett, D-Gates, spoke of adverse effects on the quality of life due to the large number of construction workers and the effect on school enrollment, taxes, crime, drinking water supplies, fish life and recreation areas. He cites the results at Sweet Home for comparison.

Construction of the plan referred to above would require about 125 to 130 workers, hardly comparable to Green Peter & Foster dams, which probably required a total of 600 to 1,000 workers.

Further, the economy now is not the same as in the 1960s, when most people in the area were quite fully employed. At present, in view of the high rate of unemployment in the timber industry, at least 90 percent of the required working force could be hired within 20 miles of the site. I'm not well acquainted in the area, but I have talked with a few heavy equipment operators who would welcome the project so that they could get off the unemployment rolls.

Others cited pollution of water supplies. I suppose these people are all too young to remember what the river was like before the upstream dams were built in the era of 1935-65, or else they don't understand the situation.

For example, one man cited slime in the river water. He must have had dreams or hallucinations.

I remember very well the situation of Portland and Salem in 1933-35 when no fish moved up the river
from June to October. Now these runs have been re-established. The improved water conditions are a matter of record.

Of course it can be argued that sewage treatment and other controls of waste water are in part responsible for this change. However, increased and cooler water flows from reservoirs augmenting low summer flows are also a big factor. A small reservoir like Minto would hardly be noticed.

I'd like to make a suggestion for Rep. Bennett: Forget about the "cause" which got him elected and get together with EWEB and develop a project for the good of his community. They can all gain something.

Further, don't let anybody tell you hydro power is an anathema. The only thing keeping our rates in the 26-32 mill range now is the 2-4 mill power from the Columbia River dams some of us helped build in the period 1935-1955.

On May 19, 1983 the Oregon House of Representative passed Legislation to preserve the North Santiam River from further hydroelectric projects by a 49-3 vote.

After the House vote Bennett said,

This Bill will preserve the unique beauty of the North Santiam River for current residents and future generations of rafters, fishermen, and others. The people of the North Santiam don't want a hydro project in their backyard, with the resulting two or three year disruption of business and Highway 22, and irreversible destruction of the pure water we now enjoy. This assembly has overwhelmingly endorsed our desire to preserve the quality of life along the North Santiam.

Passage of this Bill 49-3 proves that when local people become involved they can get action. The testimony from those in support of the Bill convinced the committee and assembly that this is the proper action to preserve our river.
Other representatives that strongly supported the Bill were Rep. John Schoon and Rep. Jeff Gilmour. Schoon said, "the Eugene utility has resources in its own backyard without coveting the North Santiam." Gilmour said, "there are a lot better ways to produce electricity then to ruin this river."

After the Oregon House of Representatives passed House Bill 2913, Chuck Bennett called SCRAM Secretary Anita Williams and they discussed whether or not to call another meeting of SCRAM to prepare testimony of the Senate Committee Hearings. After discussing it, they decided another meeting wasn't necessary and opted for a call tree. Bennett and Williams began calling SCRAM members telling them the date of the Senate Hearings and asking them to attend and to call three or four other SCRAM members, whose numbers they provided. Altogether approximately 60 members and concerned citizens were contacted; of those 30 said they would try to attend. The Senate Hearing was scheduled in the afternoon rather than the evening so many members could not attend because of work and other responsibilities. The Detroit High School sent a bus of Political Science students to the hearing so the hearing room was filled to capacity again.

The Senate Hearing followed the same format as the House Hearing with Bennett and Canyon residents providing similar testimony as well. At the end of the hearing members of the Senate Committee assured those in attendance that they would present the Bill on the floor of the Senate and pass it.
On July 1st, 1983 the Oregon Senate passed House Bill 2913 unanimously. Since the bill had already passed the House, it now went to the Governor for his signature. The governor must sign the bill within 15 days for it to become a law.

After the Senate passage of the bill, Bennett said, "Passage of this bill virtually without opposition in both chambers, proves that local involvement is crucial to legislative process."

On July 26, several SCRAM members joined Representative Bennett in Salem for the ceremonial signing of House Bill 2913 by Oregon Governor Vic Atiyeh. After the signing of the bill Representative Bennett made the following public statement:

> Through the hard work of hundreds of Santiam Canyon residents, this was passed overwhelmingly in the House and Senate, and I am very pleased that Governor Atiyeh has signed it.

> The bill was the result of strong cooperation among the four representatives of the Santiam Canyon. Without the assistance and support of Representative Jeff Gilmour, Senator L. B. Day and Senator Steve Starkovich, this bill would have had tougher sledding I'm sure.

**Aftermath**

A letter to the editor and editorial appeared in a local paper the week following the governor's endorsement on the bill banning further hydroelectric projects on the North Santiam, which marked the official termination of EWEB's proposed Minto project.

The letter to the editors was written by A. A. White and was entitled "SCRAM Member Happy With Legislature."
Members of Santiam Canyon Residents Against Minto, (SCRAM) and all residents of the upper Santiam Canyon have reason to rejoice.

In a recent senate hearing on the passage of House Bill 2913, representatives from Lyons, Mill City, Gates, Idanha and Detroit were assured by members of the senate committee that they would rush the bill to the floor and pass it. The bill, which would prohibit the construction of a third dam on the Santiam River, still has to go through some final channels before it is signed into law by the governor, but it is receiving no opposition. Even the Eugene Water and Electric Board, the company that planned to build the dam, has refrained from opposing it.

It has been a long and sometimes hard battle. Many people from the area fought long and hard to stop this dam. They circulated petitions, worked on many projects to raise funds and argued eloquently before both the House and Senate committees. They told of the love each had for the river, how they would hate to see it ravished any more. They told of their love for the way of life we have in our small communities and how the influx of construction workers would overburden our schools and tax our economy.

I am proud to be a member of a community with such fine and concerned citizens. I am also proud of our state representative, Chuck Bennett. As author of the bill and president of SCRAM. Chuck showed an untiring effort in this mission to get this bill passed.

Listening to Chuck present his testimony before the house committee would have made us all not only proud but also keenly aware of the unique and unmatched beauty of our canyon home. Rafters, fishermen, campers, canyon residents and people who like the Santiam River just the way it is, rejoice. It will soon be against the law to defile our river any more for the benefit of the power companies.

Thank you to all that helped in this effort and thank you Chuck.
The editorial was written by Bill Woodel and was entitled, "SCRAM, Bennett a Winning Team", and appeared as follows:

Governor Vic Atiyeh signed a bill Tuesday which will keep the North Santiam River free of dams. The new law is a textbook-perfect example of cooperation between a state representative and his constituency.

Rep. Chuck Bennett, Gates, teamed up with a neighborhood group called Santiam Canyon Residents Against Minto (SCRAM) to shepherd the bill through the legislative process.

SCRAM was formed almost two years ago when Eugene Water and Electric Board announced its intention to construct a hydropower project, Minto Dam, near Niagara Park. Bennett was elected chairman of that group and held his position during the legislative session.

To see the bill through the state Senate, Bennett enlisted the aid of Sen. Steve Starkovich.

Whether the removal of fast-flowing streams from the list of potential hydropower sites will, in the long run, prove a benefit or a detriment remains to be seen.

For the moment, though, the legislation reflects the spirit of participation our republic was designed to engender. And our river, west of Big Cliff Dam, runs free.

Corps Still Interested

In early August an official from the Army Corps of Engineers said that the Corps was going to continue their study to divert water from Big Cliff Dam and one pit dam 14 miles in a concrete lined canal to a point downstream from Mill City where it would be channeled through a powerhouse; despite the new state law prohibiting further hydropower development on the North Santiam.
Upon hearing this news Oregon Governor Vic Atiyeh contacted U.S. Representative Denny Smith and asked for his help in stopping the Corps' plans.

U.S. Representative Denny Smith wrote a letter to the Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger on September 7th, 1983. Smith informed Weinberger on the current status of the project and wrote that "A way to cut waste in the defense budget is to trim wasteful spending by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers in my district."

Smith continued by asking Weinberger, "If the people don't want it and the State Legislature won't allow it, why is the federal government continuing to spend money on an EIS for the project?" Smith noted in his letter that ten Corps staffpeople were working on an EIS for the project with a budget through December 1986. He wrote, "I realize that you probably do not receive many letters from members of Congress asking you not to spend money in that Congressmen's District, but this one is." He concluded his letter by saying, "I respectfully request that you examine the circumstances in this case and then I think you will agree that not another dime should be spent on this project."

Case Closed

About a week after that letter was received the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers announced that they had decided to end their study of a diversion canal on the North Santiam.
The following editorial was in the next edition of *The Stayton Mail Paper*, which was written by Bill Woodel, and was entitled "Citizens Can Make a Difference".

A decision last week by the Army Corps of Engineers is a textbook example of what can be accomplished when private citizens get involved in their government.

The Corps agreed to stop its study of a plan to build a 13-mile power canal parallel to the North Santiam. The decision climaxed some three years of work by private citizens and their elected officials.

A handful of residents initially organized Santiam Canyon Residents Against Minto to block construction of a hydroelectric project proposed by Eugene Water and Electric Board. When SCRAM chairman Chuck Bennett was elected to the legislature, he took the fight there in the form of a bill to protect the river. He enlisted the help of Senator Steve Starkovich to get the bill through that house.


So the North Santiam is, apparently, safe from further hydroelectric development. Because private citizens refused to sit back and watch and because elected officials took their constituency seriously.

With the signing of the House Bill 2913 and the Corp announcement to terminate its study, the case study of the public and individual activities involved with the early planning of a proposed hydroelectric project comes to a close.

**Summary of Case History**

EWEB's involvement began with a discussion between an
engineering consultant, and EWEB's general manager. As a result of this meeting EWEB decided to pursue a preliminary FERC permit, which would authorize the engineering studies necessary to determine the site's feasibility.

The preliminary permit raised a great deal of concern about the proposed project within the various local, state and federal agencies, as well as within the local communities. The residents of the local communities formed a grassroots organization to oppose EWEB's proposed project. EWEB was not prepared for this organized opposition at this early stage in their planning process, and the opposition group was successful in stopping EWEB's feasibility study. This was accomplished through the successful introduction of a Bill that banned hydro development on the N. Santiam.
CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS

In analyzing the case history of the proposed Minto Hydroelectric project with the vast amount of data contained therein, it is necessary to first break the project down into manageable units. This will be done by following the same format as King did in his thesis on social movements. This will be accomplished by providing a description of what King described as occurring followed by what occurred in the case history of Minto.

Basic Elements

King's first step was a general description of the elements of a social movement. The first element discussed by King is goals. He explains that the goal of any movement is the objective towards which the movement's activities is directed (King 1956, p. 30).

In the case of the Minto project, EWEB's goal was to determine first if the proposed site and project was feasible with respect to engineering a cost benefit concern. The organization's second goal was to successfully apply for a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, at which time, the fate of the project would be up to the elected board of governors and the voters of Eugene.

The next elements of a social movement to be discussed by King are the means the movement utilizes to accomplish its goals. The first mean described by King is ideology. According to King the
ideology of a movement encompasses most of what is essentially its culture, it's the source from which the movement derives its rationale, its doctrine and its course (p. 32).

EWEB's basic ideology is in the form of a mandate from their ratepayers and elected board; that being that they divest in nuclear power and passive alternate sources of electricity, and that EWEB as an organization was formed as a public utility to supply the people within the City of Eugene with a continuous supply of electricity as effectively and efficiently as possible.

The next element of a social movement to be described is group cohesion, which according to King, group cohesion is an essential ingredient to holding a movement together, it is a dedication to common aims and values (p. 33). Cohesion was present to some extent; as can be seen in the case study.

The next element necessary for a movement to be present is the organization and status system. King described this mean as the patterns and relationships between groups and statuses within the movement (p. 34).

This element was present in the Minto case. Since it was a formal organization, it had an intricate organizational and status system composed of three primary groups, EWEB staff, elected board members and the ratepayers.

The final essential element of a social movement described by King were tactics: Tactics are those activities and policies of a movement which are directed at the outside world (p.36).
In the Minto case, EWEB had a definite set of tactics aimed at the outside world that would help them achieve their goals. They had an engineering consultant firm working on a feasibility study, and they had a public information campaign planned to keep the "outside world" informed.

After listing the key elements necessary to have a social movement, King explained that in order to gain a more complete understanding of social movements it is necessary to view them in a time dimension. He then scrutinized social movements in terms of a natural history model; in doing this he broke the movements down into a series of steps or a progression of phases. He then analyzed the contents of each step in a time sequence.

This study will follow this same procedure in the analysis of the Minto case. To accomplish this in a coherent manner it is necessary to briefly review what King said occurs in each phase of a social movement, and then compare that to what occurred in the Minto case, discussing and analyzing the key elements of each stage.

As described in the introduction, King's analysis deals separately with two dimensions of every movement. His first dimension pertains to successive internal alterations, that is, events within the movement itself. King's second dimension involves trends in the relations of the movement with external society.

King explains and qualifies his two dimensions by saying: "While these two dimensions are interrelated in actual cases, they may be treated separately for the purposes of analysis, moreover, a
given stage of one dimension need not coincide with a particular stage in the other" (p. 48).

King broke up his first dimension into three phases; the incipient phase, an organizational phase and a stable phase.

Internal Development

King described the incipient phase as being one which can only be recognized in retrospect, and that it begins when the individual or individuals responsible for the movement. Become conscious of the movement.

In the proposed Minto case, the beginning of the project occurred with Stan Sporseen's talk with the General Manager of EWEB. As a result of this meeting the General Manager decided that the project was worth looking into and gave Sporseen's engineering consulting firm the go-ahead to do a preliminary feasibility study.

King continues his description of the incipient phase by stating "The incipient period extends through the time when a small nucleus of followers come to share the leader's ideas and enthusiasm. Throughout this period the organization of the movement is similar" (p. 41).

The Minto case goes along with the incipient phase as well. The General Manager of EWEB (Parks) shared his plans with other staff members, who all supported the idea. But in this early time frame Parks and Sporseen dealt directly with one another, with Sporseen telling Parks how the feasibility study was coming along. Parks was
able to approve the preliminary feasibility study because EWEB's elected board of governors had approved money to be spent on research of possible renewable resource power projects to be spent at Park's discretion.

King stated that, "during this first phase goals are likely to be general..."

EWEB's goals at this point were very general, they wanted to investigate possible hydroelectric sites to determine whether or not the site would be feasible for a project, with respect to engineering and cost/benefit concerns. The other goal present was an immediate goal of applying for and receiving a preliminary permit from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which would allow them to conduct the necessary studies.

"... and rewarded by some as immediately attainable."

Stan Sporseen, head of private consulting firm, believed the Minto site to be feasible, and thought that the preliminary permit would be granted and that the project should and would be completed. (Sporseen had an ultimate goal of building a project on the Minto site and producing electricity. But EWEB as an organization did not announce that as a goal).

"Other ideological elements remain nebulous..."

EWEB had two ideological components that related to the project, the first was in the form of a mandate from the elected board and the rate payers that they devest in nuclear power and pursue alternate sources of electricity, i.e. renewables. This provided no real
guidelines to the organization. The second ideology was that EWEB is a public utility whose purpose is to provide the ratepayer with electricity as effectively and efficiently as possible. Neither of the ideological components provide too much structure with regards to how they pursue the goal of providing electrical power, or to develop the sources of such power.

"... and tactics crude and unformulated" (p. 46).

At this point EWEB was without any formal tactics, with respect to external society. They were only interested in looking into the prospects of developing a site, and apparently felt that there was no need to develop tactics. This goes along well with their lack of specific and ultimate goals. They had no need for tactics when their goal was only to investigate possible hydroelectric sites.

"Loyalty is usually intense and group cohesion strong" (p. 47).

Loyalty to the general goal was strong in the sense that all staff supported it and that the engineering firm was pursuing the immediate goal of preparing a preliminary feasibility study for a preliminary permit. With respect to group cohesion; there was a strong sense of group cohesion amongst and between EWEB staff and the engineering consulting firm. But, there was no cohesiveness between the staff, the Board, and the ratepayers with respect to the Minto Project. Neither the Board nor the ratepayers were consulted on the goals, because it was decided by Parks, and Board policy, that neither would be asked to support a project or goal until the federal license for construction was obtained.
King explains "limited size, experience and resources make for vulnerability to opposing and competing groups. These and other hazards are especially formidable during incipiance; hence a high mortality rate for young movements" (p. 43).

EWEB's goals were very vulnerable right after EWEB submitted their preliminary permit to FERC. This was mostly due to the FERC licensing process as well as the fact that EWEB had no formal tactics.

If the general public and the various county, state and federal agencies would have had more knowledge of the FERC processes, the project could have been stopped at this point. FERC wanted to know reasons why they shouldn't grant the preliminary permit, not reasons why they shouldn't approve the project itself. Most of the agencies who protested the permit expressed concerns over the impacts of the project, rather than pointing out the harmful effects of the permit, such as the permit's effect on land values.

King states:

As the plan and ideas which originally existed only on paper or in the minds of the founder and followers develop into systematic activities and a more definite organization, the movement enters into its second phase. The transition takes place gradually, with one phase leading into the next (p. 44).

In the Minto case the transition aspects continued for the remainder of the career of the project. Some aspects advanced into the organizational phase while others stayed in the incipient phase. The following aspects of the project advanced into the organizational phase.
EWEB began more systematic activities with the granting of the preliminary permit. For the most part EWEB was required by FERC to begin a series of studies and activities with regards to determining the overall feasibility of the project.

King stated, "In the second phase, organizations becomes more and more complex as the division of labor is made more specific" (p. 44).

EWEB's organization began to become much more complex. EWEB's general manager named a project engineer to be responsible for all aspects of the project, and a public information person to develop a process for informing the public on the proposed Minto Project. EWEB also hired a number of consulting firms such as U.T.M.I. Enterprises, who were hired to complete an environmental assessment of the proposed project area, and the public relations firm of Hanner, Foote and Rose, who were hired to work with EWEB's staff public relations person in developing a public information plan.

"The informality of the incipient stage is cost" (p. 45).

EWEB now has a definite chain of command. The various consulting firms, and staff, report to the project engineer, who reports to the Director of Power Resources, who then reports to the General Manager of EWEB.

Other aspects of the Minto processes do not make the complete transition from the incipient phase to the organizational phase.

King states that "during the organizational phase, original goals are reappraised: some are now defined as ultimate rather than
According to the Minto Case History, EWEB never had the ultimate goal of completing the hydroelectric project, or at least they never admitted that was their ultimate goal. EWEB kept the same general goals of wanting to determine whether the site was feasible. EWEB had many reasons why they didn't change their goals, such as the need for power, cost of money, etc. But the bottom line remains that they never altered the goal - from determining whether or not the site was feasible for them to build.

"Ideological elements undergo modification and rearrangement during the organizational phase" (p. 46).

EWEB's ideology remained unchanged. EWEB's basic ideology was that new sources of electricity are needed now and will be in the future and it's their responsibility as a public utility to serve their rate payers with electricity.

"In the organizational phase, tactics begin to be developed, and frequently change as trial and error proves some more effective than others, gradually they become more systematic and less a matter of improvisation or whim" (p. 46).

EWEB, with the granting of the preliminary permit, was actually led into developing tactics by various public and agency requests for information, the various groups wanted information about what EWEB was up to. EWEB's tactics corresponded well to their aims and values. Their tactics were quite simply to provide all of the
information available on the project to whomever wanted to receive it. They believed honesty to be the best policy, and they decided early on that they would make no formal decision on the project until they determined the site feasible.

When the engineering aspects of the project were determined feasible, EWEB slightly altered their plans. EWEB's new plan was to get the project licensed. If licensed, however, EWEB stated the elected board and the rate payers would make the decision to build or not to build. So at this point EWEB still had not made a formally stated goal that they wanted to build the project. At this point it's important to add that even though EWEB never formally stated they wanted to build the project, the people who opposed the project perceived them as having made a formal commitment to attempt to build the project.

The tactics for successful licensing of the project warranted little change. EWEB continued to provide all the information and gave many presentations in front of various agencies and groups, not so much in the spirit of gaining support as trying to play the role of a responsible party.

"By altering goals and tactics with an eye to combating opponents or competitors, external hazards may be overcome" (p. 46).

EWEB altered another aspect of their plan. EWEB had been seeking to license a project called 1A which included a 20 ft. diameter pipe through a park. This project was very unpopular with many external publics. EWEB, in an attempt to accomplish their goal of
licensing the project, altered the project to a smaller project, that they believed would be easier to license. But with the change in the project, those in opposition to the project felt that they had a partial victory and sought to get EWEB to drop the idea of the project altogether. A partial reason for this lack of acceptance and renewed vulnerability was the fact that EWEB had never made the transition over to the organization phase, and remained in the more vulnerable incipient phase, with its less developed goals and tactics.

After the organizational phase comes the stable phase; King introduces the third and final stage by saying:

That it occurs as the unsettled organizational phase gives way to clarification and stabilization of component elements. Goals are no longer shifting or values transitory; tactics and other activities no longer hit or miss and are now prescribed (p. 47).

EWEB's proposed Minto Project never fully reached the organizational phase; which is necessary to pass through in order to reach the stable phase. A necessary ingredient of the stable phase is goals that are no longer shifting; EWEB never developed anything beyond general and immediate goals. Without the key ingredient of an ultimate goal - to build an electricity producing hydroelectric dam. Without this key ingredient none of the other elements can stabilize because the ideology and tactics depend on the ultimate goal.

With reference to the importance of the internal development of a project reaching the stable phase, King states, "If a movement (project) reaches the stable phase it does not guarantee success, but
success without reaching the stable phase is extremely unlikely" (p.49).

External Development

The second dimension of a social movement - public works project - to be analyzed is the external dimension. King divided this dimension into three phases, the innovation phase, the selection phase, and the integration phase. King explains the purpose of these stages by saying that some series must be adopted in order to discuss changing relationships between the movement and the greater society (p. 50).

According to King:

- The act or process of introducing a new element into society is termed an innovation. The chief concern here is the general career of innovations rather than their 'causes'. The question is not so much how they got started as what happens after they appear (p. 50).

The basic innovation in this case is the proposed hydroelectric project at the Minto site. The key innovation then is the possibility of a hydroelectric site being built.

In further discussing the innovation process King states, "without some spread in popularity, its life span must be short and its ultimate fate oblivian" (p. 51).

What King is saying here is that if the innovation (Minto Project) was not supported by someone the idea would have been dropped. In this case the Minto Project was supported. Stan Sporseen's origi-
nal innovation was supported by EWEB, and was supported again by FERC in the form of the granting of the preliminary permit.

King's second phase is the selection phase, he explains that selection is used here to broadly cover the processes of both social acceptance and the rejection of innovations. The period in which selection occurs is thus a testing period. Having once been introduced, the innovation is on trial and its ultimate fate is determined by the reactions of people other than the innovators (p. 52).

King brings up an important point with respect to the selection process which relates directly to the proposed Minto Project in stating:

One additional complication which must be noted is that social acceptance is a problem involving two elements: the movement itself and the changes which it strives to bring about. From the observer's point of view, the movement as such in an agency or means, distinguishable from the goals towards which it is oriented. Hence both movements and the goals they underwrite are subject to similar processes and similar degrees of acceptance with reference to the society in which they occur (p. 52).

This relates directly to the Minto Project, because EWEB as a means is subject to acceptance or rejection, just as much as the objective is.

With this in mind EWEB and the Minto Project entered the selection process when it was announced in local and regional newspapers that EWEB had applied for a preliminary permit. EWEB never made it out of the selection phase. The Minto Project was formally rejected when the Governor of Oregon signed the bill banning further dam construction on the North Santiam. Although in reality, EWEB's Minto
Project ended when EWEB's Parks told Bennet they were stopping the feasibility study.

Since the Minto Project was rejected, it never made it to King's final stage of external development which according to King occurs when an innovation finds continued social acceptance and passes the test of selection, and becomes closely tied in with other cultural elements and contributes to the existence and operation of the society.

Since EWEB's Minto Project was rejected, it is important to gain an understanding why the project did not pass the "test of selection". King views the selection process in a number of different ways, each focuses on various aspects of the selection process. King explains the scope of his analysis by stating:

While it would be technically correct to assume that some part is played in the selection by every element of a movement and by each of its individual members and that virtually every item of the external setting also constitutes a determinant, appraising the relative influence of all related factors and persons would be an obviously impossible task (p. 58).

The scope of the analysis is therefore limited to making explicit the relevance of the component parts of the movements to acceptance or rejection. In addition, some of the more evident aspects of the social setting will be searched out for the same purpose (p. 66).

Motives of the Individual for Acceptance or Rejection

The first component part of the movement King discusses is motives of acceptance or rejection of the individuals. King views
motives in the context of sociological factors of selection. The first to be discussed is biographical determinates. King explains...

"In addition to the nature of particular proposals and the conditions under which they are made, an individual's general receptiveness or lack of it to the innovation is a product of biographical factors; experiences, events and relationships of his life history." (p. 61)

Biographical determinants played a noticeable role in the case history of the proposed Minto Project. Many of those who rejected the project, had previous negative experiences with dam projects that left them with the feeling that another dam project, no matter what it's goals or who wanted to build it, would be unacceptable.

And their relevant example of this is that Linn and Marion County officials were almost predestined to oppose the Minto Project. Many Linn and Marion County officials had a very negative image of Lane County government in general, partially due to the controversy over field burning which pitted Linn and Marion counties against Lane County. As a result of these controversies, Linn and Marion County officials felt a general distrust and dislike for anything related to or supported by Lane county government, let alone, a Eugene-based public utility attempting to come up to "their" counties to develop "their" natural resources.

There were a number of other biographical determinates present, such as local fishermen, who fished certain fishing holes all of their life, they were predistined to reject any development project that would affect their favorite fishing spots.
The next aspect of the motives for individuals accepting or rejecting a project, according to King, was "the role of crisis." King explains: "A crisis exists when an individual's life experiences have produced in him a state of chronic discontent, and when his discontent is intensified by a convergence of events representing to him accumulation of his chronic dissatisfactions, crisis provokes action" (p. 63).

The role of crisis was a factor in the rejection of the Minto Project. Many of the local residents felt a general dissatisfaction with the Corps of Engineer's Big Cliff and Detroit Dam projects. This dissatisfaction was intensified with various plans for building a third dam in the area, and reached the culmination when EWEB began doing their engineering feasibility study. The actual crisis then was the idea of a dam being constructed, and the actions it provoked was rejection of the project, and active involvement in the opposition.

The next component parts that King analyzed are the internal and external factors of acceptance or rejection. King explains the distinction between the two by saying:

The distinction between internal and external factors of acceptance or rejection should not obscure the inevitable interconnections between them, which are to be found in the life histories of all concrete social movements. But, this distinction is useful for analysis. Moreover, internal elements including both goals and various means employed in their pursuit can be shown to influence the growth of social movements independently of external conditions in some measure (p. 67).
Internal Factors in Growth

King begins his analysis of the internal factor in growth with a discussion of goals. He does this by asking the question, "What intrinsic qualities of the goals may influence its acceptance or rejection?" (p. 68).

The first quality to be discussed was realism with respect to basic human needs. A goal that offers relief from pain, hunger, freezing cold has a better chance of being accepted than a goal that offers something people already have, or don't need.

EWEB's goal did not have realism with respect to human needs. The local community did not need to know if the site was feasible or not to fulfill their human needs. Even if EWEB's goal was to increase the electricity supply it still would not have allowed them to live a better life with regards to the fulfillment of basic needs, because they had all the electricity they needed, and an increase in supply would not lower their cost.

The second aspect of goals that leads to acceptance or rejection, is as viewed by the individuals; whether or not the goal has an apparent or demonstratable utility. That is if the objective is reached will it produce the satisfactions claimed by the proponents? (p. 69).

The EWEB's goals had no apparent or demonstratable utility to the local community. Because EWEB offered no real "satisfactions" in the first place, even if you viewed their objective as increasing the supply of electricity in the region, this goal has no apparent
utility to the community. It might have had if the local communities were experiencing electrical power shortages. With the current situation as it was with W.P.P.S. closures and power being sold to California, the project had no apparent utility.

The third aspect of goals that leads to acceptance or rejection is flexibility. If the goals are inflexible, changing external conditions may strip inflexible goals of their relevance and appeal, which would make rejection probable.

EWEB's goals can be viewed as being flexible, their goals were very general and nebulous, which lent itself to varying interpretations. EWEB's stated goal was that they wanted to determine if their hydroelectric project was feasible, they didn't have a rigid goal. When one particular project met with a great deal of opposition they changed the project to one they thought would receive some support.

The fourth and final aspect of goals is whether or not the goal is apparently attainable, that is, attainability in the eyes of potential supporters or opposers (p. 68).

EWEB goals can be viewed as both attainable and unattainable. The goals are viewed as attainable in the sense that all EWEB wanted to do was to determine feasibility. However, if the goal was to get the project constructed then the goal was viewed as unattainable (p. 68).

The apparent attainability component was a major factor in organizing people to oppose the project. Those actively opposing the
project felt that EWEB would build the project unless they formally organized and stopped them.

There was another portion of the public who viewed the goal of a completed project as unattainable. This segment of the local community might have supported the project if they thought there was a chance that it could have been completed, because they would have benefited monetarily from the completed project. These people didn't speak out for it however, because they didn't think the project had a chance, and they didn't want to risk losing customers or friends by voicing support for a doomed project.

With respect to these attributes of the goals King states:

The intrinsic attributes of goals represent the barest requirements for the growth of a movement. Goals possessing favorable attributes - those that are realistic, flexible, attainable and possess utility - do not guarantee that a movement will be greeted with enthusiasm. But a movement whose goals lack these attributes does not have the minimum assets for success (p. 69).

In introducing the next set of internal ingredients King states:

While all elements of a movement classified as "a mean" ideology, organization and status system, group cohesion and tactics, exist so that some social change will be brought about, these elements also have a very real bearing on the fate of the movement itself as a social system (p. 69).

King then defined the first "mean" to be discussed according to its function:

The minimum function of an ideology in a movement is to provide rationale, not only for the objectives, but for the tactical and organizational means to those objectives - it must make a good case for what the movement is trying to do and how it is trying to do it (p. 70).
EWEB's ideology as explained earlier was to act as a responsible utility and to serve their ratepayers by providing them with a continuous supply of electricity, and to pursue and develop renewable sources of energy. This is the part of their ideology that got them involved with the Minto site. They were seeking new sources of electricity and they believed Minto to be one of the "most developable" sites in the state. They also felt that it was important to develop these renewable sites because they believed there to be a "genuine need for power if not now, ten years from now."

This ideology made a case for their attempting to find feasible sites, and for seeking a FERC license for the Minto Project. It made a case, but not necessarily the "good case" King had in mind. There could have been a stronger case made, by showing apparent utility (actual need for power), by making a commitment whether to build or not, just saying there is a need to investigate, without backing that up with, "we want to develop", is lacking direction. The tactics corresponded to the ideology well, not because the public information process is that good of a tactic, but having any better tactic would outpace the ideology and objectives.

Organization and Status System

The second "means" to be discussed by King is the organization and status system. This mean represents the patterns and relationships between groups and statuses within the project (p. 71).
In King's analysis of the organization and status system he breaks the status system and organization into two categories: personnel and functionaries. He describes personnel as being ordinary members whose participation is sporadic and whose roles are unspecialized. He describes functionaries as the persistently active members whose roles are likely to be more specifically defined. He divides the functionaries into these categories:

1) Leader - the individual in the role of the leader frequently appearing to outsiders and the personnel as being responsible for the policies and objectives distinctive to the movement.

2) Bureaucrat - Activities are predominantly administrative, high bureaucrat is responsible for policy making.

3) Agitator - serves as a liaison between the movement and the outside world, his chief function is promotion (pp. 72-75)

King explains that specialization of labor is essential if a movement is to grow. Internal chaos would result if each functionary were a jack-of-all trades, and under such circumstances no movement could evolve beyond the incipient stage (pp. 72-75).

In the Minto Case there was a degree of specialization. But for the most part, EWEB functionaries did serve as Jack-of-all-trades, with various functionaries, serving various roles. An example of this would be the number of EWEB staff members that participated in the role of the agitator, at least five different staff members gave
public presentations on the project, each with different official titles, and various areas of expertise, only one of which had the designated title of public information person.

Within the organization of EWEB it seemed that the leader, Parks, had supreme power with respect to decision and policy making responsibility concerning the Minto Project with each person in the organization following his procedures and policies.

The third internal factor that effects acceptance or rejection is group cohesion. King explained the importance of group cohesion as being the element that holds the movement together and gives it durability. It is also the dedication to common aims and values (p. 77).

Within the EWEB organization there were three primary groups. They all must have had common aims and values for the project not to fail.

EWEB's staff as a whole was pretty cohesive. As shown in the case history. They all had like aims, and felt like they were pursuing the right goals in the right way. But the interrelationships between EWEB staff and the engineering consulting firm, and the EWEB staff and the Elected Board was not all that cohesive.

EWEB staff and the engineering firm never had an external falling out. But the firm was disappointed in EWEB for a number of reasons. They felt EWEB should have went "all out" for the project. By "all out" they meant that EWEB should have made firm offers to local publics, with respect to benefits of the project (such as
enlargement of parks, in lieu of tax payments, improvement of local water system, new jobs) rather than saying that they could not make any promises because those decisions were left up to the Elected Board. Another issue of contention that led to a lack of internal cohesiveness occurred when EWEB staff altered the plans for the proposed project, changing from a larger more cost effective project to a smaller less cost effective project (that was less environmentally damaging.) The engineering firm felt that this was a form of selling out to the opposition.

Another example of lack of cohesion, that was external as well as internal occurred between an elected board member and staff. EWEB staff was seeking to elicit support for the project from the Marion County Commissioners, when an EWEB board member went up to Marion County and spoke out against a project endorsed by the Marion County Board. The EWEB board member spoke as a private citizen, but he was still viewed by the Marion County Commissioners as an EWEB Representative, and the Marion County Commissioners grew firmer in their opposition to the project as a result of that action. If there was a high degree of cohesiveness between the two sub groups, the EWEB staff would have advised the board member that his testimony at the Marion County hearing could be damaging to EWEB's proposed project, and the EWEB board member could have chosen other avenues to voice his disapproval for Marion County's proposed project.

Another example of this lack of cohesiveness and probably the most damaging aspect was the fact that the Board was not asked to
endorse the project before EWEB obtained the preliminary permit. Throughout the entire public information process EWEB staff members kept saying that they couldn't answer certain question that were up to the Elected Board, or saying, the Board has the final say on whether we try to construct the project or not. This showed a definite lack of cohesiveness. The general feeling of some of the opposing citizens, was why are they bothering us when they haven't even approved the project themselves?

The final "means" to be discussed is tactics. According to King: "The tactics employed in a given situation affect in a very direct way the reactions of outsiders to the movement as a whole" (p. 79).

EWEB's tactics consisted of mounting a public information campaign that provided all the information available to the concerned public, and to view the various public reaction to that information. A policy that directly effected the tactics was that EWEB staff, or consulting staff member, could not make any promises or statements regarding potential benefits of the project with respect to providing new water systems, in lieu of tax payments, enlarged parks, jobs, etc.

What this tactic did was to provide all information on the project, to those opposing the project, turning them against EWEB, while at the same time not answering or making any statements concerning potential benefits of the project, which also allowed those opposing the project to gain momentum.
Individual tactics or tactical blunders also had influence on the project as a whole. This tactical error occurred when an EWEB representative attended an organizational meeting of those who opposed the project. During the course of the meeting, the EWEB staff member was recognized by the chair of the meeting and called on to answer a question with respect to the project. The staff member replied that he was not prepared to answer any questions, explaining that he was only in attendance to observe. This statement was misunderstood by a portion of 100+ in attendance, who felt that "observe" meant that he was there to spy on them, which was not the intent; he was in attendance to get a feeling for some of the public concerns. But this one little tactical error, made a segment of those in attendance believe that EWEB was underhanded, and couldn't be trusted, and this tactical error mobilized more citizens to oppose the project.

A lot of the tactical problems EWEB experienced could be traced back to their goals, which were described as being "wait and see".

**External Influences on Growth**

In the study of social movements, the influence of external variables is seldom treated as expediently or as fully as internal influences. But, the flourishing social movement is a result of a congenial marriage between elements within the movement and the external social condition (p. 85). King provides an analogy by comparing the growth of a movement to the growth of an embryo by saying:

The conditions effecting its growth and the growth of any embryo, are basically the same. If
its own generative mechanism is seriously defective, the most favorable milieu can produce nothing; yet the most vigorous organism or organization remains dormant or dies in milieu that provides not nourishment (p. 86).

King has divided the social setting of a social movement into two basic interrelated dimensions. The first is the general cultural context which consists of the norms and values of society. The second is the structure of society itself, which concentrates on statues, strata, subgroups and association that occur within it.

In analization, King divided the general cultural context into three parts, cultural consistency, cultural drift and form, and meaning. King states that cultural consistency is one of the major dimensions of the social milieu. He explains that in order to pass the test of selection some aspect of the movement must be consistent with some value or norm of the culture.

EWEB's Minto Project was more or less consistent with the cultural norms and values. Their objective was to determine feasibility of the site, and their ideology and tactics went along with that well and did not violate any norms or values.

King's next aspect of the cultural context is cultural drift. By cultural drift King means that the movement should be consistent with drifts or tendencies already underway in some areas of the culture (p. 88).

At the time EWEB proposed the Minto Project there was a general societal trend away from hydroelectric development. This can be seen in various newspaper articles in the case history. A number of large
dam projects were stopped due to environmental and social concerns. EWEB applied for their preliminary permit right before the general drift began. The opposition to dam projects began with the Army Corps of Engineers' National Hydroelectric Power Study, which listed a large number of possible dam sites in Oregon. This put a general fear in the society, that a large portion of these dams would be constructed, and was the beginning of the drift away from large hydro projects. EWEB's Minto Project got caught in this ebb flow because the project did not correspond to the new norms and values of the culture which put an added value on free-flowing rivers.

The final aspect of the general cultural context to be discussed by King is form and meaning. He explains that the reception of an innovation depends upon the meaning ascribed to it as well as its formal attributes (p. 90). Ultimate goals which are superficially acceptable by the culture may lend themselves to meaning's which make them seem repugnant.

This was very clearly the case in the Minto Project. EWEB's objective was to determine whether or not the site was feasible for them to build. The meaning that was ascribed to this objective was that EWEB wanted to build the project. This meaning was ascribed because of a general lack of knowledge on the part of the community of the FERC process. When FERC granted EWEB the preliminary permit many people considered this permit a permit for construction. This fact and others added to the change in meaning of EWEB's objective, which in turn assisted those opposing the study to mobilize. This change
in meaning, changed the goal from a relatively consistent goal of investigating a possible hydro site, to an inconsistent goal of developing a project, irregardless of the communities' needs, wants and desires.

Another good example of this change in meaning occurred within and as a result of EWEB's ideology and tactics. EWEB's ideology called for them to be an honest and responsible utility. As a result of this ideology, EWEB staff determined that it would be in the utilities' best interest not to make any "promises" or statements concerning what the project could do for the community until EWEB was certain they could keep those promises. This is consistent with their formal ideology, however the meaning ascribed to this act was inconsistent. The local community felt that they are not making promises to us because they are not planning to give us anything. Also, it's easier for them to tell us they can't make promises until all the facts are in, than it is to tell us the truth that we're not getting anything from them, which is inconsistent with societal norms, of give and take, most cultures feel that if they have to give something up, they should get something in return.

The second dimension King discusses is the structure of society itself. He explains that social structure is one of the most important dimensions of the social setting having an influence on the career of a movement. Of the many ways the structural element is related to selection, only a few can be touched on here. King ex-
plained the items that would be discussed, social rank, compatibility of norms and apparent utility (p. 96).

King's first factor in the structure of society is social rank. He explains that social rank comes into operation in the selection rejection process if and when a social movement is identified with some particular prestige level or social class.

Social rank was not a factor in the Minto case. No one social rank supported the project and a wide range of social ranks rejected it, within the formally organized opposition there were lawyers, teachers, doctors, loggers, businessmen, unemployed and housewives to name but a few.

The second factor King discusses with regard to the social structure dimension is the compatibility between a movement's goals and the normative structure of particular subgroups (p. 99).

The various subgroups involved with the Minto Project, had for the most part very different value orientations than EWEB.

A majority of the groups (fishing and hunting clubs, Izaak Walton Leagues, 1000 Friends of Oregon, etc.) put a very high value on the free-flowing river, the scenic beauty of the area, the fishing and hunting. These value orientations did not correspond with EWEB's at all; these subgroups put a much higher value on "natural items" than on a completed feasibility study and the production of electricity.

Other subgroups such as various county and city officials felt that EWEB as an organization was not compatible with their norms and
value system. The primary reason for this lack of compatibility was due to the fact that EWEB was from out of the area, and the fact that EWEB didn't value the various officials' inputs enough to consult with them before beginning the feasibility study.

Some subgroups who had value orientations similar to EWEB, was the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. FERC showed that they viewed the project as being compatible by granting EWEB the permit. Other utility companies and resource development agencies also had a compatibility of norms with EWEB as can be seen from the case study.

The final factor of social structure discussed by King is apparent utility. He states that apparent utility has a direct influence on the receptiveness of subgroups to innovations. Utility has several implications for the selection of proposals sponsored by social movements. Since the attainment of movement's goals involves changing certain phases of the existing social order, among the various subgroups confronted with this possibility some will be inclined to react favorably, others unfavorably. The subgroups that feel they have the most to lose by the achievement of the goals, will have the largest vested interest in stopping them from achieving the goal. To them, the movement's goals seem not only without utility, but positively detrimental. Other subgroups may be quite indifferent to the movement because of its belief that its efforts will be neither disadvantageous nor beneficial. Still, other groups may feel that they not only have nothing to lose by the change, but may actually benefit by it. These groups believe the movement to have
utility and are a likely source of supporters and converts (pp. 101-102).

In the Minto case all three groups were present. The most vocal group was the group that felt they had the most to lose. This group believed EWEB was going to destroy the river, ruin the fishing, tear up the parks and contaminate the water supply. These subgroups felt so strongly about their opposition to the project that they started their own social movement (SCRAM) to stop EWEB.

Public apathy probably had the largest majority; these people for the most part didn't know about the project, and if they knew they didn't care enough about the issue to raise their voice in support of or opposition to the project.

The project had no real supporters because there was not much apparent utility in their goals. There may have been a support base if EWEB had announced that they planned on building a project to produce electricity, but EWEB never got that far, so we'll never know.

Purposes and Consequences

King states that the distinction between purposes and consequences is especially vital in the study of social movements. A social movement employs established means for the purpose of producing certain consequences, but quite different ones occur. The results thus brought about may be not only unanticipated but unwanted, as well. Various internal elements of the movement may, by producing unintended effects, not only impede the attainment of explicit goals
but endanger the very existence of the movements themselves (p. 112). King has termed these unintended events, consequences, and distinguished two types: manifest consequences - those which are foreseen and are explicitly intended, and latent consequences - those which are not explicitly intended and are presumably unforeseen.

Manifest consequences were not prevalent in the Minto case history, with respect to EWEB. Although a few did occur, the most obvious one is that it was EWEB's primary objective to determine if the Minto site was feasible for them to build a hydro electric project. They found out that it wasn't.

Another manifest consequence that occurred was when EWEB agreed not to formally oppose Bennett's "No dams on the North Santiam Bill". EWEB agreed for a number of reasons, all of which were manifest consequences. The first consequence was that Bennet said he would not oppose EWEB's other project in his district; the second was, that they were able to get the message to the state legislature that "if the state was going to get in the business of telling utilities where they couldn't build then they should also tell them where they can." The third consequence, was that the bill prohibited all projects, not just EWEB's, but anyone else from developing the site. The fourth was that EWEB could say that they fulfilled the Regional Power Act Mandate that local utilities seek out developable hydro-sites.

There was a large number of latent consequences that could be identified within the case history of the Minto Project, most of which were a result of the internal elements of EWEB's planning
process, and many of the consequences bear a direct relationship to the Minto Project rejection.

EWEB's initial goal was to determine if the Minto Project was feasible; in order to realize that goal EWEB applied for and got a preliminary permit. The purpose of the permit was to protect EWEB's rights to the site, (they expected some public questioning, but nothing like they got.) The consequence was that it mobilized people to oppose the project, and it enacted the role of crisis in numbers of people who were truly concerned that EWEB was going to construct this project.

Another internal element that had latent consequences to it was EWEB's tactics, which consisted of beginning a public information campaign. Their tactic's purpose was to get the public informed and to promote a "good guy image for EWEB". EWEB expected some opposition to develop, but not to the extent that it did. With the public information campaign, key individuals with the opposition began a very successful campaign to stop EWEB. This was the start of the SCRAM organization, which was, in fact, a true social movement. SCRAM had all of the key elements: goals - to stop EWEB's Minto Project; ideology - to preserve the natural beauty of the North Santiam; organization - over 100 members (with a strong leader); group cohesion - they were very tight knit and had common aims and values - to stop EWEB by making them make commitments, use of red herrings, editorial campaigns, etc.
The SCRAM movement was very successful, they succeeded in making EWEB the "bad guys", and the movement exceeded its goals when legislation was passed that prohibited any hydroelectric projects on that section of the river. With the passing of the legislation the movement reached the integrative stage.

There were a large number of latent consequences that allowed SCRAM to form and succeed, which led to the rejection of Minto. Many are self evident in the case history, and these have already been discussed in other aspects. A good example of this is the situation of an EWEB staff member attending an organizational meeting of SCRAM. His purpose was to get a feeling for the reasons behind the group's opposition to EWEB. The consequence that occurred was that he was viewed by those in attendance as sorely out of place, and his attendance served as a rallying point for the organization, and further reenforced their "bad guy" impression the group was trying to develop.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study's purpose was to review and compare the Minto Hydro-electric project to King's study of social movements in order to test how well King's method explains the social process aspects of public works planning.

On the basis of the foregoing analysis, King's study of social movements is of great value to the study of planning for public works developments. It is of value because it allows for a better understanding of the social processes involved in public works planning. King's study provides a structure for the examination of social processes involved, internally and externally, in the planning process of public works development. This structure allowed for the Minto Project to be broken down and analyzed according to each aspect of its development. A conclusion has been drawn with respect to how well each of these parts related to and met the needs of this study.

Basic Elements

The basic elements of a social movement and the basic elements of the Minto Project were identical. This was very useful in the analysis because it allowed a description to be given of the inner makeup of a project.
Internal Development

King's stages or "career" of internal development, was of great use in the study of the Minto Project. King's stages allowed for an increased understanding of what changes must take place within the inner dimensions of the project, and when. The Minto Project corresponded quite well to King's first stage, but the Minto case did not make the necessary developmental changes in order to advance out of that first stage.

The internal developmental aspects have a direct relevance to public works planners, because it allows the planner to see and understand what changes must take place within the planning organization in order to pass into the third stage, which a project must reach in order to have a chance of reaching its goals.

From viewing these stages, it would seem that King's stages correspond to the pre-planning, post-planning construction, and post construction phases of a public works development project.

External Development

King's "career" of external development was of value as well, it described and outlined the changes in processes that take place with respect to the outside world.

The first stage of King's model was a little weak in explaining the Minto Project because it did not put enough emphasis on the importance of the first impression, of the external world to the
innovation, and the point that selection begins as soon as the first person hears about it.

King's next stage was very relevant and had direct implications. One of the most important aspects of this study was that both the organization and the organization's objective are subject to the selection rejection process. This was critical to the analysis of the Minto case because EWEB as an organization was subject to that process almost completely, because they really didn't have an objective in the sense that they never formally announced that they were to build a dam.

The Minto Project did not pass the selection-rejection test, so it never reached King's integration stage. But, other public works projects have passed the selection-rejection test and have been integrated into society, so all three of King's stages can be viewed as relevant.

King's work was very valuable with respect to his internal and external dimensions of development which became clear after the Minto Project was rejected. King made the point that the two stages did not have to occur congruently, that one stage could be ahead or behind. This point was quite prevalent in the Minto case and had a direct bearing on the organization rejection. EWEB as an organization stayed in the incipient phase, whereas their external development was in the selection phase, and the outside public expected more, they thought EWEB should be able to provide organization facts, but they couldn't because they had not advanced that far. This had a
very negative impact on EWEB, because it confused their image, and caused questions to be raised with regards to their honesty.

Motives of the Individual for Acceptance or Rejection

This component was very relevant to the Minto case and to public works planning in general. Most of King's points about motives of individuals could be seen in the Case History of Minto. Biographical determinants are a necessary part of public works planning and have been dealt with extensively in planning journals. King's study, brought up an added dimension, that is, the role of crisis. The role of crisis played an important role in the Minto Project and would have been overlooked in a more traditional analysis of public works project.

Internal Factors in Growth

This component had direct and significant relevance to the Minto Project and to planning in general. It showed the importance of internal elements on the acceptance or rejection of a project. King's discussion on goals is particularly relevant to the study of public works planning. The objectives of many projects do not have the four essential qualities that King said they must have, and that is probably the reason or a cause of rejection more often than not. King stated that the four qualities must be present in order for success, although having them present doesn't guarantee success. The Minto Project was a case in point, three of the four were not present
and the project was rejected. If planners would include these ingredients into their project objectives they would probably have a better success rate, and they would definitely have more public support. The other three internal elements also played a part in the Minto Project's rejection and all three have direct relevance to public works planning.

External Influences Growth

These components were present and of value to the Minto case. Cultural drift was a very important factor and is very relevant to planners because it shows the importance of looking ahead and trying to see underlying currents in society. If EWEB would have attempted the project five years earlier, they would have had a much greater chance of passing the test of selection. But they attempted to build a project when social norms were changing away from such developments, hence, its rejection.

Form and meaning were very present in the Minto Project; it impacted the project by changing the meaning attached to EWEB's objective, and was an element in EWEB's rejection.

Social rank was not a factor in the Minto case. It could however be perceived as a factor in other public works projects. The other aspects of social structure were very present in, and relevant to the Minto case. Social structure is a common element in the study of the planning process, planners usually identify the various pub-
lics involved, and sometimes attempt to incorporate their values into the plan.

**Purposes and Consequences**

This section was an important part of the analysis of the Minto case, it allowed for a discussing of the project's plans, intents, and the eventual outcome of that action. This is relavent to the planning processes because it shows the importance of considering other possible outcomes than the expected outcome, and planning for or around them.

When this study was planned it was expected that social movements and public works planning would be shown to be quite similar, but, what this study has shown is the public works planning is in fact a social process. Each of King's components of social movements corresponded directly or at least indirectly to aspects of the Minto case. This study clearly shows the social change characteristics of public works projects and their vulnerability to social phenomena. A failure to acknowledge this social dimension is an assurance of future project failure.

The hypothesis advanced in the introduction (public works projects have a significant likeness to a social movement and they conform in their essential ingredients to social movement explanations), was definitely strengthened by the case history of the Minto Project. But the study did not fully validate it. It was not fully validated because the project did not proceed through all of the
stages or through the complete "career" due to the project's rejection.

It would be of value to apply King’s method to a fully documented success case to see if the hypothesis could be fully validated.
CHAPTER VIII

RECOMMENDATION

This section will incorporate the analysis and conclusion chapters of this study into a model for the early planning of a public works project in general, and a hydroelectric project, specifically. This model will not guarantee success, but it will have the necessary qualities that makes success possible. First, a brief description of various county, state and federal laws that related to hydroelectric development in Oregon. This description will not go into great detail, but it will provide an idea of the type of laws that must be met at the various levels.

The Laws

The first step a developer must take before beginning planning for a project is to have a complete understanding of how the various county, state and federal laws relate to hydroelectric developments.

In Oregon, the developing organization must make a change in the appropriate county's comprehensive plan. Many Oregon counties classify hydroelectric facilities as a conditional use. Conditional uses are subject to special approval processes involving staff analysis, public hearings and findings of fact based on detailed criteria. According to ORS 215.130 - a county comprehensive plan applies to all publicly-owned property.
The State of Oregon has a number of statues that apply to water resource development. Oregon has a comprehensive code that governs the proper use and development of water resources of the state. This code is administered by the Water Resource Department which is comprised of the Water Policy Review Board and the director of the Water Resources Department.

Some of the relevant chapters of the Water Code are:

Chapter 537 - Water Appropriations - all water within the state from all sources of water supply belongs to the public.

Chapter 543 - Hydropower project - all water projects that are developed must conform to the laws of Oregon. ORS 543.010-543.620.

- Water Policy Review Board - The Board has primary responsibility for setting water policy in the State of Oregon, to insure coordinated, integrated use in accordance with programs adopted pursuant to ORS 536.300-536.310.

Various river basins within the State of Oregon also fall under the jurisdiction of the Water Policy Review Board (WPRB). For instance, the WPRB has adopted a program for the use of water in the Middle Willamette Basin. According to State Statue - All project constructed within this basin must conform to the adopted policy,
within the Basin, hydro power is permitted use, but the Board must conduct investigations, hold hearings, and review the proposed project to insure its conformance to the public interest and the highest and best use of water. See Figure (7) for a copy of the Guidelines for Hearings on Hydroelectric Projects.

At the Federal level, every hydroelectric project must be licensed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) before the start of construction. Each stage of the FERC licensing process includes a myriad of requirements.

The application for preliminary permit must describe the proposed project, including maps and an explanation of studies to be conducted such as test pits and other types of field work, which would be conducted to assess the projects' engineering, feasibility, and estimate the cost of the project. If granted, the preliminary permit authorizes engineering tests, but does not authorize construction.

If the developing organization receives the preliminary permit, its next step is to begin an application for a license. The application for a license is far more detailed and conclusive than the earlier application for the permit. The developer must establish the durability and feasibility of the development. To do this, the developer must include in his license application a complete construction history of the project, a concise explanation of the operation of the project, proof of mean of financing construction and operation, and an environment impact assessment.
GUIDELINES FOR HEARINGS ON HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS

In considering applications for hydroelectric projects, the Oregon Water Policy Review Board is charged by statute with determining whether or not the proposed project would impair or be detrimental to the public interest.

The Board is guided in its determination by ORS 543.225. The following is an excerpt from the statute.

(3) In determining whether the proposed project would impair or be detrimental to such public interest, the board shall have due regard for:

(a) Conserving the highest use of the water for all purposes, including irrigation, domestic use, municipal water supply, power development, public recreation, protection of commercial and game fishing and wildlife, fire protection, mining, industrial purposes, navigation, scenic attraction or any other beneficial use to which the water may be applied for which it may have a special value to the public.

(b) The maximum economic development of the waters involved.

(c) The control of the waters of this state for all beneficial purposes, including drainage, sanitation and flood control.

(d) The amount of waters available for appropriation for beneficial use.

(e) The prevention of wasteful, uneconomic, impracticable or unreasonable use of the waters involved.

(f) All vested and inchoate rights to the waters of this state or to the use thereof, and the means necessary to protect such rights.

(g) The state water resources policy formulated under ORS 536.300 to 536.350 and 537.505 to 537.525.

In addressing these requirements, questions may be asked regarding the following areas:

- **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
  - Dams
  - Transmission System
  - Generation Facilities

- **WATER RELATED CONCERNS**
  - Fish Life
  - Wildlife
  - Aesthetics
  - Recreation
  - Water Quality

- **POTENTIAL HAZARDS**
  - Soil Stability
  - Geological Stability
  - Flood Flows

- **ECONOMICS**
  - Market for Power
  - Project Funding
  - Project Feasibility

- **LAND ISSUES**
  - Ownership
  - Easements Needed
  - Conditional Use Permits Required
  - Compliance with Local-State-Federal Policies, Plans, etc.

- **HYDROLOGY**
  - Availability of water
  - Effect on Streamflow

All of these concerns may not apply to all projects. The speed and ease of the decision making process, however, will be greatly facilitated if the applicant is prepared to address the applicable concerns at the hearing.

Figure 7. Guidelines for Hearings on Hydroelectric Projects.
Various federal and state agencies are expected to review every application for permit of license. To receive approval from FERC the applicant must show that he has "consulted with" those agencies managing natural resources which may be affected. Resource managing agencies can only advise the applicant and FERC.

FERC may hold a hearing before the permit and before the license, at their discretion. The hearing would review the issues of fact and law. More commonly, FERC's staff review the application and the comments by resource agencies and interviewers. FERC then makes a recommendation to the commissioner, who then makes a decision on the permit or license.

Short of review by a federal court, FERC's decision is binding on the developer, and on the state and municipality where the project would be located. "State laws cannot prevent the Commission from issuing a license or ban the licensee from acting under the licensee to build a dam on a navigable stream (the term navigable waters appears to include all water regardless of navigability) under the dominion of the United States" (397 U.S. 936) See Figure (8) for a schematic outline of FERC's review of application for development.

If the license is granted, the license authorizes the developer to build, and then to operate the project. Its term is usually 25-40 years, a maximum of 50 years. It has the effect of a property deed. It also establishes the conditions for operation of the project. For instance, the minimum release needed to protect downstream fisheries and water quality.
Figure B. Schematic outline of FERC's review for development.
The Model

This model was developed through an extensive review of related literature relying heavily on Peggy Ross' *Education of Publics for Participation in Water Resource Policy and Decision Making*. It will provide a method of determining a sound goal. The entire analysis section explained the importance of the goal with respect to all aspects of the planning process. King provided four necessary qualities of goals as being: realism with respect to basic human needs; apparent and demonstratable utility, flexibility, and apparent attainability. King and this study gave a description and showed the importance of these qualities, but neither gave any real idea how these qualities might be achieved.

This model will do just that. All the before-mentioned qualities are interrelated. The first phase of developing a sound goal relates to apparent attainability. In order to have apparent attainability a goal must have some measure of support from influential people. To do this, informal contacts must be made with various governmental agencies at all levels of government. This will allow the developer and the agencies to develop a coordinative relationship and will enable the developer to incorporate the various agencies' views regarding their problems, needs and goals. This will also cut down on the changes of an additional relationship developing early on in the planning process between the developers and agencies.

At the same time the developing agency, should identify key groups, organizations and individuals, such as fishing clubs, gun
clubs, environmental groups, and local politicians and newspaper people. It is important to identify these groups early on in a project, in order to plan education programs for them to be given by the developer after the media announcement.

Following this identification, the developer should announce to the public that they are preparing to do a study on the possibilities of developing a project. They should be sure to ask for the public's help in determining the organization's goals.

The next step relates directly to the qualities of goals of realism and apparent utility. In order to make sure the goal has these qualities the public should be called on to help the developer to be aware of their basic needs as well as how the project can be developed to be useful to them.

This can be accomplished in a number of ways. First, the public should be informed of the planning process. The developer should explain what they are trying to do, what they must do and how they are trying to do it. This can be done through a number of means, such as: small group conferences; workshops; small meetings with the various groups identified as allies; the mailing out of an information pamphlet that contains information regarding water resource planning (this can also include a questionnaire directed towards eliciting descriptions of the public's various needs, problems and goals.)

After all the information from the various conferences, panels and questionnaires is processed and organized, a public meeting
should be held in order to discuss this information. The public meeting's purpose is to give out all of the information obtained from the earlier discussed sources to the general public. The meeting should also be a forum to obtain additional feedback from those in attendance with respect to the information presented and new problems, needs and goals. These meetings should receive extensive media coverage to make more people aware.

The next step is for the developer to use the information to develop plans for a project if a need is shown from the earlier sources. The plan should outline a number of alternative solutions which will satisfy the quality of flexibility. With these alternative solutions, the developer should hold another set of meetings and workshops with all the groups contacted earlier. These groups should rate and help determine these alternative solutions, along with their ideas of the probably impacts and how to deal with them.

Once these alternatives are discussed, the most desirable alternatives should be printed in detail with summaries of the alternatives and the various impacts of each. A pamphlet should be mailed out containing this information, as well as an announcement of another large public meeting. This meeting will be held in order to discuss and evaluate the alternatives and the rationale for the tentative decision regarding the solution.

Once all these meetings are held a goal should be chosen. This goal will have all the necessary qualities, or at least it should,
because of the wide range of input and the incorporation of the various groups and public's problems, needs and goals.

It is important to remember, that if all these qualities are present and incorporated into the goal it, as stated earlier, does not guarantee success, but it does provide the minimum assets for success. The other problems relate to external factors, these were described earlier and are important for the developer to recognize and to account for them in the development of the plans.

In conclusion, there is no easy way to develop a project, there are many factors that must be planned for and around. It is hoped that this paper will be of help through: the case study, which allowed for a proposed project to be viewed from start to rejection; the analysis and conclusions, which discuss why this rejection occurred; and the recommendation which pointed out the associated laws and a model for developing sound goals.
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APPENDIX A

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

The installation of a hydroelectric project on the North Santiam River as herein described is technically feasible, environmentally non-detrimental and economically viable, if considered in comparison to development of alternative energy resources.

The recommended development plan is the alternative Plan 1A. It includes:

A concrete gravity dam at River Mile 43.4. The structure to be gated with a pool level about #1, 1115.

A powerhouse located at the damsite to produce power from the required instream flow in the river.

A pipeline 20 feet in diameter to carry the remaining river flow up to 3550 cfs to a second powerhouse located at the Minto weir.

A fish ladder installed at the powerhouse to bring fish to the egg gathering station operated at the Minto Weir by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

5000 l.f. of Oregon State Highway 22 to be re-routed around the damsite and reservoir.

Power from the project to be brought to the Detroit-Santiam 230 kv transmission line approximately 0.5 miles south of the project.

The project will operate continuously, the installed capacity being about 35.8 mw. The annual average power production is estimated to be 168,700 mwh.

The estimated project financing requirement with a debt service rate of 10% for 25 years and a schedule to bring power on line in 1987 will be $88,330,000. Using avoided costs of 75 mils/kwh for 1987, the project will show a benefit/cost ratio of 1.16/1.

No technical or environmental concerns have been identified that would severely affect the project development. Some of the technical
concerns that will require special attention during design and construction include:

The 20-foot diameter pipeline. Any inordinate cost increases in steel or wages of the affected trades could alter the costs of the selected alternative enough to warrant consideration of the alternative with no pipeline.

Drilling for foundation analysis of the damsite to date indicates that the rock is competent at the site. Geotechnical information in the stream bed and left abutments must be analyzed before completion of the design.

The project operation must be established - either independent run-of-rive operation or three-dam-plan agreement.

Alternative selection - the instream flow requirement if found to be 1000 cfs may affect the economical size of the long pipeline in some alternatives, and an instream required flow of 200-300 cfs will affect the selection toward the long pipeline. As it now stands, any alternative considered produces about the same rate of return. The only variation is in the amount of power produced.

Because of previous alteration of the environment of the area through construction and operation of a railroad, the highway, the previous developments and the upstream projects of Detroit Dam and Big Cliff Dam, few environmental impacts directly attributable to the proposed project will occur; Section VI, ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS, and the Exhibit E required for the FERC License will address this aspect of the project.

Environmental concerns that need to be addressed early in the licensing phase are:

Instream flow requirements for the reach of the river between the Minto weir and the damsite.

Operation of the egg gathering station during and after construction.
B. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the computations and conclusions established in this report, the recommendations of Haner, Ross & Sporseen, Inc., are that:

The work on the project progress according to Figure 40 - Project Work Plans.

Design work be commenced upon receiving preliminary indications of approval from FERC in the licensing period.

The alternative that will produce the most power be selected. This would be Plan 1A with studies continued to establish whether gates be favored over the uncontrolled spillway and possibly a future use as a three-dam-plan.

The report evaluates the Minto Project solely on the value of the energy produced. There is a capacity credit for the project which will possibly change the benefit/cost ratio to approximately 1.32/1.

Copies of the feasibility study were made available, to local, county, state and Federal offices; local libraries and newspapers, as well as to some concerned citizens. Copies could also be viewed at EWEB's office in Eugene. Many local citizens read the feasibility report and became more concerned. Both Bennett and Tellisen received many calls, wanting more information, or wanting to know what the study really meant.

EWEB officials contacted George Long and gave him a number of copies of the study to loan out to concerned citizens, and explained the project's current standing, pointing out that they had not made a decision on the project, saying even if they are successful in their licensing attempt, the elected board of EWEB and the citizens of Eugene would make the final decision whether or not to build the project.
APPENDIX B

The Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB) is stubbornly shepherding its proposed Minto Dam on the North Santiam River through the regulatory obstacle course despite local opposition and likely high cost.

EWEB proposed a 32-megawatt dam on the North Santiam above Mill City and Gates on the Marion-Linn County border. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) gave EWEB a preliminary permit. A recently finished study found the dam economically and environmentally feasible.

On its lengthy trip through the bureaucracy, EWEB must get a FERC construction license. EWEB must also acquire a license from the state's Energy Facility Siting Council, and another license from the state Department of Water Resources. After running this hazard course, EWEB must also fend off local opposition.

Five or more years from now, EWEB may be able to look towards construction. Then it has to decide on financing methods. The recent Regional Power Act offers utilities several tantalizing alternatives for spreading the costs of new generating facilities. But Bonneville Power Administration hasn't yet written the rules for the act, and most of the particulars are still in the air.

If the dam were built today, high interest rates in the bond market - 12 percent and over - would push the cost up to $100 million or more. Power forecasts are uncertain about future needs. Local opposition is strong. So why does EWEB persist? For several reasons. The licensing process is so long and tedious that EWEB must start now, and spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, just to maintain the option of building a dam five years from now. Said Herbert Hunt, EWEB's director of power resources, "Shouldn't we have a license ready in case it's needed? If we wait until economic conditions are stable, we'd have a five-year waiting period before we could build, and then we would have no way of knowing about the future.
Federal laws also created a rush on hydropower. Utilities are out front in this race, because they remain responsible for their own generating facilities under the Regional Power Act. But hydro sites are few and far between and all are costly. Thanks to the Regional Power Act, utilities have several financing choices.

EWEB could finance the dam itself, through revenue bonds. The power from the dam would belong solely to EWEB. But it might be fairly expensive for Eugene's ratepayers, especially if interest rates drove construction costs up.

EWEB could use BPA's new billing credit system. BPA would reimburse EWEB for part of the dam's cost, if the power from it were more expensive than BPA's average power rate. EWEB could schedule the power for its own use. But BPA's rate may rise above EWEB's, because of financially troubled projects BPA is underwriting, such as the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS) nuclear plants.

Lastly, EWEB could just sell the dam to BPA. BPA would reimburse EWEB for all its costs. However, the Regional Power Planning Council would have to determine that the power is needed and that power from the dam is cheaper than any available alternative. EWEB would no longer be able to schedule the power for its own use. BPA would meld the power into the regional power grid. Since costs would be spread among the region's ratepayers, they would presumably be lower. But again, BPA's rate may rise above EWEB's as expensive fiascos like WPPSS are spread to regional ratepayers.

EWEB can't make these calculations ahead of time. It doesn't know how much the dam will cost, since interest rates will change for the bonds. Nobody knows how much more BPA's rate will rise, so EWEB does not know whether it would be cheaper to build it alone or share costs with BPA. Power forecasts are not always reliable. EWEB doesn't know what the forecast will be either, but it operates on utilities' traditional philosophy. Said Hunt, "We assume the Northwest will have more people, and so will Eugene. How many more, we're not sure, but we see there will be some increase in the need for power."
There is also opposition to the dam. People in Mill City and Gates worry about the social effects of temporary construction workers crowding into tiny hamlets; about destruction of much-loved Niagara County Park; about effects on the tourist and lumber traffic, the mainstays of the economy; and especially, about EWEB's temerity. What, they ask, is EWEB doing building a dam outside its service area? It serves Eugene, not Linn and Marion counties. Why doesn't it build dams on the McKenzie River, closer to home?

EWEB's position is soothing. Said Hunt, "We are looking at projects in our own backyard - on the Blue River, a tributary to the McKenzie, at Dorena, and Fall Creek. There was a 1919 proposal to dam the McKenzie at Vida. But EWEB realized it wouldn't be popular, and abandoned it after World War II." That, of course, is just the point made by the opponents. They don't want another dam on the Santiam - it isn't popular, either.

This tiff does point out a larger problem. Oregon has no policy on dams. Each proposal is bitterly fought on local grounds. The Department of Water Resources (DWR), entrusted with the state's water policy, has no policy on water storage. DWR just follows the law's vague outline, which gives preference to multipurpose impoundments rather than single-purpose ones, and to upstream impoundments over downstream ones. DWR wrote a series of river basin studies to deal with water commitments. But the Middle Willamette River Basin study is 18 years old, and doesn't address the question of reservoir sites. There are no plans to update it.

EWEB is paying hundred of thousands of dollars just to make a choice. But after all the effort, the plethora of licenses and studies only adds up to an annoying obstacle course. If EWEB successfully gets to the construction phase on Minto Dam, we will know a great deal about the utility's perseverance, but not much about its fiscal wisdom, its need for power, the ratepayers' cost or the desirability of damming another river.