

Editorials are written by or approved by members of the Capital Press Editorial Board.

All other commentary pieces are the opinions of the authors but not necessarily this newspaper.

# Opinion

Editor & Publisher  
Joe Beach  
Managing Editor  
Carl Sampson  
opinions@capitalpress.com | CapitalPress.com/opinion

## Our View

# Got milk? An oldie but goodie is back

We were happy to hear that the dairy industry has revived the iconic “Got Milk?” advertising campaign.

The original campaign was started by the California Milk Processor Board. The national campaign was operated by the Milk Processor Education Program. After a six-year hiatus, MilkPEP is bringing the campaign back in light of increased sales during the COVID-19 pandemic.

“Not to return to the past,” MilkPEP said, “but to bring forward this iconic tagline and product in a refreshed world where milk is undoubtedly essential and top of mind among consumers....”

Color us nostalgic for what now seems like a simpler time.

In 1993, according to the California Milk Processor Board, a television ad depicted a history buff who couldn’t enunciate the answer to a trivia question because he had just eaten a peanut butter sandwich and had no milk to wash it down. It was the first “Got Milk?” advertisement.

In 1994, print ads started: glossy images of celebrities sporting milk mustaches. Through the original campaign’s end in 2014 there were 350 print ads and 70 television commercials. They featured a who’s who of celebrities from Hollywood, music, sports and popular

culture, including Jennifer Aniston, Harrison Ford, Brett Favre, Kermit the Frog, Serena and Venus Williams, Kristi Yamaguchi, Rihanna and Martha Stewart.



The ads and slogan were so popular they were widely copied and parodied throughout the popular culture.

Why did it work?

“There was something so perfectly hip about it,” Edward Wasserman, the dean of UC-Berkeley’s Graduate School of Journalism, told Fast Company on the campaign’s 25th anniversary in 2018. “They start with a

product with no personality, which, if anything, was forced upon generations of children, which very few adults drank or would admit to drinking, whose health benefits are questionable, whose environmental impact is dubious, and they turned it into something that had a kind of panache. They had a concession of unlikely subjects and had them pose in a way that most people would have deemed a self-parody or ludicrous. And yet, it worked.”

It still works. When ag talks directly to consumers with a clever, compelling message, consumers listen. That work never ends.

We can only hope that we’ll again see dancing raisins.

## Our View

# We can’t afford to shortchange students

As legislators across the nation grapple with revenue shortfalls caused by the shutdown and curtailment of businesses in their states, we would like to issue a plea.

Please, do not balance state budgets on the back of education. Other programs can be trimmed or cut entirely and wouldn’t be missed, but education is the key to our future.

A strong state economy is the product of a strong K-12, community college, technical school and university system.

While legislators may shrug and say they can’t afford to fully fund education, we will argue that they can’t afford not to.

During this pandemic, governors and other political leaders have urged people to stay home and to shut down the businesses that pay local, state and federal taxes. What they apparently forgot or ignored was the damage their actions would inflict on their states.

Nationwide, 33 million people were thrown out of work — more than half of the adult population. That is temporary. The number of unemployed will shrink as COVID-19 continues to subside.

Congress has also promised to help the states get back on more solid fiscal footing.

In the meantime, we urge all of our elected representatives not to do permanent damage by shortchanging education to solve a temporary problem.

Whether kindergarten or graduate level research, education is an economic driver. Education produces entre-

preneurs, business owners, farmers, ranchers ... the list goes on.

And it produces good citizens, who know more than the bare minimums about physics, chemistry, biology, history, language and the many facets of our great civilization.

If we relegate the current generation to online classes and rob them of the richness of a full slate of in-person classes, our economy will suffer. Some students may well thrive with some online classes, but others will tune out and eventually drop out.

Some classes may lend them selves to an online format. Others, not so much. Try learning to weld, raise livestock or repair a tractor online. Try to discuss the mysteries of ancient worlds or the inner workings of DNA on Zoom.

Good luck. We appreciate that online classes have offered a last-minute substitute for real school and college work.

But now that many parts of the nation have curbed the spread of

COVID, the time has come to consider allowing students to return — and to make sure the high schools, community colleges and universities are adequately funded to carry out the classwork and research that are essential to a 21st century economy.

All students in all schools deserve the best possible education, not just for their sake but for the sake of the economy. And it will require more than Zoom.



University of Idaho  
A student performs research.

## The Columbia-Snake River EIS meets Judgment Day

Columbia-Snake River Irrigators Association representatives are quick to affirm the central point of your Aug. 14 editorial, “Breaching Snake Dams Still Not a Good Option:” the court-ordered, Columbia River System Operations (CRSO) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not cease litigation on the dam breaching question.

Across the page from your editorial, our media release ad stated the same, but CSRIA representatives acknowledged that key legal/technical issues imbibed by the EIS will springboard the dam breaching question back before U.S. District (OR) Judge Michael Simon.

We give the EIS high marks in dealing with the hydro power impacts and fish analyses, as the Bonneville Power Administration staff and the NOAA Fisheries’ Ph.D.s do this type of technical evaluations practically on a daily basis. The same cannot be said for how the irrigation and nav-

igation sectors were prepared, and how the overall EIS study structure led to both technical and legal problems, soon to be flogged in Judge Simon’s Court.

Your OpEd unintentionally carried forward inaccurate irrigation impact numbers from the EIS, where the USBR Denver Technical Center refused to account for the total irrigated acres affected by dam breaching — most notably ignoring the changed river shoreline and silt/debris impacts below the Ice Harbor Dam tailrace, along the shallow-water Upper McNary Pool area (the total impact would affect about 91,000 acres, not 47,000 acres). They also used the wrong economic metric for market value — tax assess-

ments are not market value transactions. The navigation analysis retains a fundamental flaw, purposefully excluding the main rail route alternative between Lewiston-Lyons Ferry and the Columbia River (grain) ports. This analysis will have to be redone by others.

Even as an ESA litigation defendant-intervenor, CSRIA had to prod the EIS technical managers to make some much needed pre-draft changes; but this effort did not override the EIS managers’ zealotry for a “Joe Biden, hide-in-the-base-ment” approach to presenting the EIS alternatives and avoiding technical review committees (that had been successfully employed in the past).

Technical issues aside, the CRSO agencies did the EIS process no favors by limiting the Lower Snake River hydro system alternatives or by making no effort to include within the EIS a “regional alternative,” now nonchalantly referred to as being a task for “the next step.”

The above EIS omissions and idiosyncrasies mean that scrutiny before Judge Simon’s Court is rapidly approaching — and the region is emotionally and rationally ill-prepared for Judgment Day. Alas, if only the agency staff, scientists, planners, fish advocates, and elected representatives had more time to go through another regional process, we could find redemption.

Right? It will take a more deliberate action plan to avoid being cast into the legal infernal. A small, but thoughtful, stakeholder coalition could address the EIS frailties and compose a plan adopting a near-term implementation protocol. There has been enough time, enough technical information, and enough legal review, and enough debate dancing. Purgatory need not be followed by Hell.

Darryll Olsen, Ph.D., is a board representative of the Columbia-Snake River Irrigators Association.

## OSU deserves support to produce next generation of farmers

As an Oregon dairy farmer, I’ve seen struggles from the pandemic and stress on food supply firsthand. When the pandemic hit, consumers and farmers were anxious about food security, especially when supply chains were interrupted, but people also became more aware of where their food was coming from and how vital local farms are. As we all know, you cannot remove food from the household budget.

It is more evident than ever that agriculture in Oregon is essential. However, policy-makers face dire pressure to rectify a state budget in the wake of COVID-19. Some proposals suggest reducing Oregon Department of Agriculture funding by as much as 8.5% and a loss in funding for Oregon State University (OSU) efforts that support agriculture research, extension and education.

Like dozens of Organic Valley dairy farmers in our state, I continue doing what I always do during the pandemic. I spend a lot of time on the farm managing pasture and caring for calves that will be milk cows in a couple of years. There is a science to organic dairy farming and efficient pasturing of livestock to get optimal production.

Our state produces a diverse bounty of crops and livestock products. Much of it is processed and purchased right here in Oregon, and some is destined for other markets, generating income for families and rural communities. Oregon agriculture is an economic engine, and as we look to what strategic investments our state will make, agriculture must be part of that answer.

According to the Organic Trade Association, organic agriculture provided \$350 million to farmers last year, and 92% of Oregon households purchased organic products. The state is home to nearly 900 businesses that contribute to the organic sector.

It was encouraging the Oregon Legislature and governor dedicated dollars to establish two faculty positions at OSU to accelerate organic research and education in 2019. These positions will arm farmers with knowledge so they can be more productive and better at managing farms. It is an investment that will help leverage federal research funding and set Oregon on a path to further our national leadership in organic farming.

As a young farmer, just two years out of college, I want to see our dairy industry grow, create jobs, offer consumers choices, and help feed the nation. Investments in public research in agriculture can make for more productive farms and are essential to our state’s future. It ensures food security and lays the foundation for economic vitality.

State leaders should avoid pausing or stepping back on agricultural research and education. This would not be the case of one step forward and two steps back but more like a fumble that might cost the game.

Our land-grant university taught me so much, and I brought that knowledge home to become a fifth-generation family farmer. To recruit and teach the next generation of Oregon farmers, we must continue investing in agricultural research and education.

Sara Coleman farms with her family in St. Paul, Ore. Their farm, Sar-Ben Farms, belongs to the Organic Valley cooperative, which includes over 1,800 farmers nationwide. In 2016, she was the Oregon Dairy Princess Ambassador, and in 2018 graduated from Oregon State University with a degree in agriculture business management.

GUEST VIEW  
Sara Coleman

