

Hello,

My name is Amy Dennis and I am a resident of Mountrail County. Our county voted to end our convective weather modification program by 66% in the 2024 November election.

Thank you so much for to opportunity to submit testimony in regards to Weather Modification in our state. I am so grateful to be able to do so.

Below are just some examples as to why I would like to see warm convective modification end in our state entirely:

*Regarding precipitation:

- no county has seen an increase in precipitation in the 40 years in the program.
- 25 years or so PRIOR to entering the program, the average rainfall was higher (for June, July and August)
- Western ND is not wetter overall.
- if you attempt reducing hail by 40%, you reduce rain by 30% (1/3 on average)
- places like Kansas have hail that TOWERS ours in size, yet, they have ended their programs and haven't turned back
- there are studies showing (and can be found on the State Water Commission's website) hail suppression WEAKENS storms, causes less intense rainfall AND can cause a storm to rain out earlier than it would have if it hadn't been seeded for hail suppression.
- there is no proof rain lasts longer or seeding clouds increases updrafts
- Another problem is the excessive number of flights. There are real world (not studies or numbers based on hypotheticals) statistics showing there has been no significant increase in our rainfall in the last 50 years. Instead of just focusing on hail suppression which would mean flying ONLY when there is a severe forecast with clouds likely to bring hail, nearly every little cloud we see gets seeded. That is when the project becomes excessive and out of control. That is when Weather Modification loses its purpose as something for good. The excessive nature of the project creates an atmosphere rife with overspending, questionable benefits, cronyism and harm.

*Regarding livelihood and well-being

- In areas previously performing hail suppression, residents claim they had MORE hail storms WITH weather modification than without
- Every drop of precipitation that falls when Weather Modification is in practice contains silver iodide. Are you convinced that's safe?
- we and many other farm families oppose Weather Modification. We pay high premiums for hail insurance protection every year and every year we have hail losses. Neighboring counties who do NOT modify the weather report fewer crop hail losses than we do.
- I would argue the amount of revenue lost in at least Mountrail County from an agronomic standpoint due to the overall drought conditions in Western North Dakota in just the past 5 years FAR surpasses what appears to be 'cheap' insurance that is harming us instead.
- Government funded studies quoted by proponents of weather mod. claim over 30 to 1 economic returns from weather modification. This claim has not and cannot be proven. If real world data supported the claim, everybody would be bringing it home...but they're not, because the studies

they quote are based on hypothetical data gleaned from hypothetical scenarios. We cannot accurately measure the results of hypotheticals and scientifically apply them to real world data.

-If funding everywhere is so tight, and we know it is, why would we continue to fund a project like Weather Modification that sounds good in theory but is based on hypotheticals and has no real-world proof? It is a cold, hard fact we need the money for roads, parks, law enforcement, county extension services, social services, etc.

If this program was doing what its proponents claim, we'd all support it. Ward Count recently ended their program by a 9-1 margin as well. Why are counties leaving the program and not coming back to it?

Amy Dennis
Stanley, North Dakota