

**U.S. SENATE
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

Water Resources Issues in the Klamath Basin
June 20, 2013

**Richard Roos-Collins
Water and Power Law Group PC
On behalf of Conservation and Fishing Groups**

Chairman Wyden, Ranking Member Murkowski, and Members:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify. I am Richard Roos-Collins, appearing on behalf of American Rivers, California Trout, Trout Unlimited, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, the Institute for Fisheries Resources, Salmon River Restoration Council, and the Northern California Council of the Federation of Fly Fishers. All are signatories of the Klamath Basin and Hydropower Agreements. We respectfully request that this Committee draft and favorably report legislation to authorize full implementation of these agreements.

The water resources of the Klamath Basin have significant national value and federal interest. The Klamath Reclamation Project, authorized in 1905, is one of the oldest in the Reclamation program. Its farmers and the upstream ranchers today produce more than \$560 million annually in economic value,¹ including some of the world's best potatoes, horseradish, mint, and beef. There are six National Wildlife Refuges there, the first dedicated by President Teddy Roosevelt in 1908. These are among the most productive waterfowl habitats in the Pacific Flyway,² supporting 80% of the migratory waterfowl and the largest population of bald eagles in the lower 48.³ The Forest Service administers six National Forests which are more than half of the land in the basin, plus the Klamath National Wild and Scenic River. The salmon

*Klamath Water Resources
Roos-Collins Testimony
June 20, 2013*

fisheries of this basin are the third largest in the Lower 48⁴ and today support commercial fishing which produces \$32 million annually in economic value.⁵ There are six federally recognized tribes which occupy their time-immemorial lands and waters.

Unfortunately, in most years, there isn't enough water in the Klamath River Basin for all legal uses. Over the past century, federal and state laws have regulated individual uses in a manner that has not prevented significant shortages. These shortages have rotated between farming and fisheries. 2013 is a true crisis for Upper Basin ranchers. Litigation and political conflict are a constant for the water resources in the Klamath Basin.⁶ If we muddle through, the future of this basin will be more water shortages, more litigation, and associated hardships.

Diverse stakeholders gathered in 2004 to answer the question: "Can we agree to a better future?" We held hundreds of meetings across a six-year period, in the face of a widespread view that we would certainly fail. After hard compromises, more than forty of these participating stakeholders signed the Klamath Agreements. Some, who are here today to oppose the agreements, left the negotiation table.

Why did we sign? The Klamath Agreements are the first-ever comprehensive program for management of these water resources at a basin scale. Implementation will restore sustainable water supply for all beneficial uses. The agreements will provide a better future for the many communities in this extraordinary basin.

To achieve that goal, the signatory parties committed to unprecedented cooperation to implement fundamental changes in current management arrangements over a 50-year term. The parties making these commitments, subject to Congressional authorization, include: the United

States, both states, three of the four participating tribes, Reclamation contractors and many upstream ranchers, commercial fishermen, PacifiCorp, and other stakeholders.

The Klamath Reclamation Project will be modernized. The commitments and improvements will reduce river diversions, improve irrigation techniques, prevent groundwater overdraft, and prepare for drought and emergency. Tribes will resolve their trust claims against the Project and the United States upon performance of these and other measures. In turn, Upper Basin ranchers may voluntarily agree to increase flows for the benefit of native fishes in downstream Upper Klamath Lake. In consideration, tribes will not make calls against junior water rights. The future will be far more secure for these farms and ranches.

The National Wildlife Refuges in the basin will receive a lifeline. For the first time, these refuges will have a reliable water supply. The authorized purposes of the Klamath Reclamation Project will be expanded to permit this use. Refuges will receive an adequate supply 88% of the years under the Klamath Agreements, versus 12% today.⁷ These measures will enhance habitat in these six refuges. Wildlife viewing and hunting, now at 89,000 visits per year, will increase substantially – hunting by nearly 50%.⁸

The salmon fisheries in this basin will be restored to good condition. These have declined more than 90% over this century,⁹ resulting in periodic limitations on commercial catch from Cape Falcon, Oregon to Monterey, California under the Pacific Fishery Management Council's weak-stock management rules.¹⁰ Under the Basin Agreement, these and other native fisheries will receive enough clean water for spawning and rearing, due to reduced diversions by the Klamath Reclamation Project and Upper Basin ranchers. That agreement also establishes the first comprehensive program to address all non-flow stressors from mountains to sea.

PacifiCorp's power-only dams, which have blocked fish passage to more than 420 miles of spawning habitat¹¹ since 1918, will be removed. The economic value of commercial and ocean sport fishing will increase by \$185 million over the term of the Klamath Agreements,¹² as these fisheries recover -- salmon populations nearly doubling.¹³

What do the settling parties seek from this Committee and Congress?

We respectfully request that Congress enact statutory authorities to implement certain measures necessary for the comprehensive program. For example, National Wildlife Refuges will be authorized as a new purpose of the Klamath Reclamation Project. Another authority will permit the Interior Secretary, rather than the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, to decide whether removal of PacifiCorp's four dams is in the public interest. According to the Public Utilities Commissions of California and Oregon (PUCs), dam removal under the conditions specified in the Hydropower Agreement will be less costly and risky for power customers than relicensing under the Federal Power Act.¹⁴ The PUCs approved PacifiCorp's application for a 2% rate surcharge to generate \$200 million for dam removal, and no federal funds will be used.

Implementation of the Basin Agreement is proposed to involve just under \$40 million per year of new federal appropriation over the next 15 years.¹⁵ Is that a fiscally prudent investment? The Basin Agreement will avoid substantial federal liabilities under tribal trust doctrine, resulting from near loss of the fisheries which were essential to tribal sustenance, culture, and religion. It will also reduce the need for emergency relief resulting from water shortages. In the past decade, such relief for farmers or fishermen averaged \$17 million and reached as high as \$60 million in a single year.¹⁶

Most importantly, the future of farming and fishing communities in this basin will be much more secure. Even in the face of water shortages, these communities produce economic value each year comparable to the entire 15-year budget proposal under the Basin Agreement. That value will increase substantially through this proposed investment.

This Committee is rightly known for your pragmatic and bipartisan approach to resources management. The Klamath Agreements are an unprecedented opportunity for this Committee and Congress to help local communities resolve these water shortages and restore the sustainability of fishing, farming, and tribal uses in the Klamath Basin.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Karuk Tribe and Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, "The Klamath Settlement Agreements: Myths and Facts" (2010)
2. Ron Cole, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, "How the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) Affects the Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuges (KBNWR)" (2010)
3. Letter from Sportsmen Groups to Senator Ron Wyden (October 11, 2011)

ENDNOTES

¹ U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, *Economics and Tribal Summary Technical Report* (2012), p. 2-26.

² U.S. Department of Interior and U.S. Department of Commerce, *Klamath Dam Removal: Overview Report for the Secretary of Interior* (2012), pp. 58, 321 – 324; Dave Mauser, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, *Effects of the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement on Lower Klamath, Tule Lake, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges* (2012), p. 9.

³ *Overview Report*, p. 58.

⁴ *Overview Report*, p. 58.

⁵ *Economics and Tribal Summary Technical Report*, pp. 2-44 – 2-46.

⁶ Congressional Research Service, *Klamath River Basin: Background and Issues* (Report 7-5700) (2012), p. 1.

⁷ *Overview Report*, pp. 321 – 324.

⁸ Edward Maillett, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, *Refuge Recreation Economics: Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon* (2011), pp. 25 - 26 (comparing 50th percentile scenarios).

⁹ *Overview Report*, pp. 4, 58.

¹⁰ Cynthia Thomson, National Marine Fisheries Service, *Commercial Fishing Economics: Technical Report for the Secretarial Determination on whether to Remove Four Dams on the Klamath River in California and Oregon* (2012), pp. 7 - 9.

¹¹ *Overview Report*, p. 14.

¹² *Economics and Tribal Summary Technical Report*, p. ES-4; *Commercial Fishing Economics*, p. 30.

¹³ *Overview Report*, p. 17.

¹⁴ Oregon Public Utilities Commission, Order No. 10-364 (2010), pp. 8 - 13; California Public Utilities Commission, Decision 11-05-002 (Approving a Rate Increase for PacifiCorp Pursuant to Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement) (2011), pp. 11 - 13; *Overview Report*, p. 42.

¹⁵ CRS, *Klamath River Basin*, p. 26; *Overview Report*, p. 218.

¹⁶ CRS, *Klamath River Basin*, p. 10.

Attachment 1



THE KLAMATH SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS

Myths and Facts



Opponents of the Klamath Settlement Agreements are unfairly perpetuating many myths in the media about the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) and the Klamath Hydropower Settlement Agreement (KHSA). Here are the most common of these myths, and the facts which rebut them. The final Klamath Agreement documents are available at: www.klamathrestoration.org.

Myth: “*The KBRA is unnecessary.*”

Fact: Depressed salmon runs in the Klamath River *cannot* be restored without *both* Klamath dam removal *and* the permanent restoration of more water to the Klamath River – *a lot more water*. Opponents of the KBRA have proposed *no* alternative way to permanently restore between 130,000 and 230,000 more acre-feet of water annually (depending on rainfall) to the river, as the KBRA would do. Without those much needed water reform *as well as* dam removal, scientists tell us that the Klamath damaged salmon runs will never fully recover.

Myth: “*The KBRA provides water guarantees for Klamath Irrigation Project irrigators but no water guarantees for fish.*”

Fact: The only absolute “guarantee” Klamath Irrigation Project irrigators get under the KBRA is the *certainty* that they will receive *less water in the future*, especially in dry years. The water difference is simply left in the river, thus is “guaranteed for the fish” – it has nowhere else to go! Once that additional “environmental water” is restored to the river, several provisions of the KBRA protect it from later diversion, saving it exclusively for fish and wildlife. Also, the fish will not have to wait for the KBRA to become fully implemented – the fish will get their water *up front* through an Interim Water Bank program (KBRA Sec. 20.4) which will be phased out *only* as new lake and wetlands water storage is created, and irrigation limits actually come into place. Under the KBRA the Klamath Irrigation Project irrigators will have more *security* for the water they *do* get, but in most years they will simply get less – especially in dry years where extra water in the river counts most for fish.

Myth: “*The KBRA flow regimes are not based on science.*”

Fact: There is a huge body of science that supports the KBRA flow regimes, including a number of studies cited in KBRA Sec. 12.2.7.A. Many of these studies are available on line at: www.klamathrestoration.org/index.php/kbra-flow-science.html. See also KBRA Appendix E-5 for the various water management scenarios that the KBRA will provide for.

Myth: “*The KBRA ‘locks in’ lease land farming on the national wildlife refuges.*”

Fact: The Klamath Basin is unique in America for allowing large-scale row crop farming on approximately 23,000 acres of two of its national wildlife refuges (Tule Lake and Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuges). However, agricultural leases have been allowed on these national wildlife refuges *since the passage in 1964 of the Kuchel Act* (PL 88-567) (16 U.S.C. § 695m). Attributing this lease land program to the KBRA is *more than 45 years too late*. The already pre-existing Congressional approval for this lease lands program will simply not be affected by the KBRA in any way. Only Congress can change that law, not the KBRA.

Myth: “The KBRA is full of subsidies and pork for certain special interests.”

Fact: In every instance, what KBRA opponents call “subsidies” and “pork,” are merely benefits of the deal that constitute the exchange for what a given stakeholder has agreed to permanently give up – *valuable water and senior water rights*. The Agreements are also intended to provide investments in Upper Klamath Basin farming communities to help them make the transition to permanently living with less water. It is hardly surprising that those giving up something this valuable required something in return. That is the only way any lasting agreement can be constructed.

Myth: “The KBRA would undermine the Endangered Species Act (ESA).”

Fact: The KBRA, a mere contact, *cannot change federal law to any degree*. In addition, the KBRA itself states that nothing in it will change the ESA, the Clean Water Act or any other applicable environmental laws (Sec. 2.2.1). Also, nothing in the KBRA preempts or changes how the ESA will be applied, and nothing in the KBRA pre-judges any future ESA decisions (Sec. 2.2.6). The ESA and all other environmental laws remain alive and well. The KBRA must be implemented in accordance with all applicable laws.

Myth: “The KHSA contains so many loopholes and off-ramps that dam removal is never likely to occur.”

Fact: What opponents call “loopholes” and “off-ramps” are for the most part necessary preconditions to obtain funding, permits or environmental review. These preconditions are actually relatively few, considering that this will be the largest dam removal project in history. And if any of those preconditions cannot be met, there are backup plans for how to still move forward. Unless major environmental laws such as the ESA and NEPA are waived, any approach to dam removal would require going through nearly all of these same steps.

Myth: “2020 is too long to wait. The dams could come down by 2015.”

Fact: This is just wishful thinking. The KHSA target date to finish dam removal is 2020 – only a mere 10 years away. And again, this project involves four dams in the largest such project in history. It should not surprise anyone that it may take 10 years to completely accomplish this ambitious goal. Other smaller dam removal projects have taken longer. Fortunately, the process of working toward final dam removal actually began years ago, as part of the many studies submitted for the FERC relicensing process. Dam removal has, in a very real sense, already started – the 2020 target date is just when it will be completed.

Myth: “There are no interim measures to protect fish and wildlife until dam removal occurs.”

Fact: The KHSA commits the dams’ owner (PacifiCorp) to spend several million dollars a year to protect fish and wildlife in the river until the dams come down in 2020 (see KHSA Appendix C & D). None of these “interim measures” would be required by FERC without the Settlement Agreement. PacifiCorp must also abide by any future water quality restrictions not yet adopted (e.g., TMDLs), under the Clean Water Act (KHSA Sec. 6.3). PacifiCorp will also be bound by all state water laws. And there is an adaptive management process built in that allows additional mitigation measures if necessary.

For more information on the Klamath Settlement Agreements and why these Agreements make good sense, go to: www.klamathrestoration.org or contact:

Glen Spain, Northwest Regional Director, PCFFA fishlifr@aol.com, 541-689-2000

Craig Tucker, Natural Resources Policy Analyst, Karuk Tribe, 916-207-8294

Attachment 2



Briefing Paper

DATE:	20 January 2010	STATE: CA
PREPARED BY:	Ron Cole- Project Leader/ Klamath Basin NWRC	
PREPARED FOR:	Regional Director Ren Lohoefer	
SUBJECT:	How the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement(KBRA) Affects the Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuges (KBNWR)	
PURPOSE OF BRIEFING DOCUMENT:	Provide an analysis of the how the Refuges will function with a KBRA compared to without a KBRA (current situation)	
ISSUES:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Modification of Klamath Project Purpose: Refuge purposes will be added to current project purposes to assure that the refuge water allocation is equal in priority to the irrigator's allocation. This provision also allows the Refuge to enter into contracts with irrigation districts and/or the Bureau of Reclamation for the delivery of Refuge water through Project facilities. <i>Current Situation: The refuges, fish and wildlife are not included as a purpose of the Klamath Reclamation Project. As such, the refuges have no priority for water delivery and cannot receive water until irrigation needs are met.</i>➤ Certainty of Water Delivery: The Refuges will receive sufficient water for wildlife purposes in nine of ten years. A Drought Plan will be developed to address the rare occasion where water is in extremely short supply. Refuge managers will have the ability to call for water when it is needed which gives them the flexibility needed to manage water to create optimum habitat conditions. <i>Current Situation: In the past Refuges have suffered draught conditions in eight out of ten years. Lower Klamath NWR was essentially dry between the 1920's-40's with no legal right Project water. Planning for habitat management is difficult without knowing how much water delivery the refuge will receive.</i>➤ A Lower Klamath NWR Water Allocation (Apr-Oct): 48 taf in dry years increasing incrementally to 60 taf in wet years. Even this dry year allocation of 48 taf will provide for full refuge needs 88% of years. This dry-year wet-year approach is similar to that used by Project water users. <i>Current Situation: Refuges have no allocation of water and only receive water in excess of ESA, Tribal Trust and Project Irrigator needs. This has left the refuge short of water 80% of years since river flows and lake levels have been regulated.</i>	

- **Lower Klamath NWR allocation (Nov-Mar):** 35 taf is similar to historic use. The refuge would also have the ability to increase winter use up to 60 taf; however, the increase in use beyond 35 taf would be deducted from the subsequent spring-summer allocation. This provision allows the refuge flexibility in the future to manage wetland habitats for migratory birds. *Current Situation: The refuges have no flexibility and are unable to adapt to drought year extremes*
- **Tule Lake NWR “Allocation”:** Tule Lake NWR’s water needs are met within the Project irrigator’s allocation. This includes water to maintain elevations within the Sumps (13,000 acres of wetland habitats), consistent with current operating rules and regulations and Biological Opinions, as well as water needed to serve the agricultural lease lands. Within the On-Project Water Plan, Tule Lake NWR will be dealt with equitably and provisions within the Plan that relate to Tule Lake NWR must be approved by the Refuge Manager. This will ensure that any reductions in allocation are not imposed disproportionately to Tule Lake NWR. If water elevations within the sumps are intentionally lowered under the direction of the Service for wildlife management purposes, water to reflood those areas will be subtracted from the Lower Klamath allocation.
- **Water for “Walking Wetlands”:** “Walking Wetlands”, the practice whereby wetlands are inserted into commercial crop rotations, will receive its water from both the Lower Klamath allocation (1 af/acre) and the irrigator’s allocation (2 to 2.5 af/acre). The refuge gains additional wetland habitat for a relatively minor cost in terms of water allocation, and the Project irrigators are not penalized for using additional water to provide wetlands on private lands. This provision applies to “walking wetlands” on both private lands and lease lands on Tule Lake NWR. Any walking wetlands utilizing the Lower Klamath allocation must be approved by the Refuge Manager. *Current Situation: Walking Wetlands can be denied water if the Klamath Project deems water delivered to agricultural crops is a better use of water resources. The Refuge Manager has no authority to direct water to Walking Wetlands.*
- **Refuges and Electrical Power:** KBRA provides the refuge authority to order water delivery through Project pumping facilities including D-Plant and several pumping plants on the Straits Drain. Management of wetland habitats for wildlife on Lower Klamath NWR requires the timely delivery of water in quantities needed. Refuges and irrigators will pay for 31.25% the costs, respectively. This proportion reflects LKNWR water use. BOR pays remaining 37.5%. *Current Situation: Refuge*

- cannot order water on demand but can only receive water if Irrigation District evacuates water to maintain flood control.*
- **Leased Agricultural Lands:** Management of Refuge lease lands will remain subject to the Refuge System Improvement Act, the Kuchel Act, and all other applicable laws, regulations and policies. The parties agree to pursue collaborative conservation measures on the lease lands including walking wetlands as well as other practices beneficial to wildlife.
 - Current Situation:** The lease land farming program is subject to the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 and will be evaluated in the upcoming Comprehensive Conservation Plan as it relates to the primary purpose of waterfowl management and other applicable laws, regulations and policy.*
 - **Lease Land Administration:** The Service would maintain the ultimate administrative control over the lease lands; however, Tule Lake Irrigation District (TID) and Klamath Drainage District (KDD) would become the leasing agent for those lands. The lands would be managed consistent with the Kuchel Act. Because of the close proximity of TID and KDD, lease administration and coordination with the Service would be much improved. Under this provision, the Refuge would receive 20% of net lease revenues for implementation of conservation practices on the Refuge. In 2009, the Refuge share would have been \$640k. ***Current Situation:** The Refuge receives no funds from the current leasing program.*
 - **Agency Lake Ranch and Barnes Ranch:** Reclamation shall transfer the land to FWS upon written mutual agreement between Reclamation and FWS (transfer agreement) within one year of the Effective Date. The FWS, with technical assistance from BOR, will make best efforts to reconnect the land to Agency Lake, to provide restoration, wildlife, fisheries, and water management benefits.

MAIN DECISION OR MESSAGE:

If the KBRA is enacted, the refuges will, for the first time in over 100 years receive a certainty of water delivery. If the KBRA were in place in 2009, the summer water delivery to LKNWR would have been 48,000 AF.- about twice as much water as what the refuge actually received in 2009.

BUREAU PERSPECTIVE:
CONTACT:

The KBRA provides the certainty of water delivery and the safety net the Refuges need but have never had.
Ron Cole- Refuge Manager, KBNWRC 530-667-2231

Attachment 3

Yamsi Ranch Fly Fishing * Cal-Ore Wetlands and Waterfowl Council * California Outdoor Heritage Alliance * Deschutes Chapter-Trout Unlimited * California Waterfowl Association * Delta Waterfowl * Southern Oregon Chapter – Delta Waterfowl * McKenzie-Upper Willamette Chapter-Trout Unlimited * Bull Moose Sportsmen * Tualatin Valley Chapter-Trout Unlimited * Clackamas River Chapter-Trout Unlimited * California Trout * Wild Rivers Coast Chapter-Trout Unlimited * Oregon Council-Trout Unlimited * Sportsmen's Conservation Project-Trout Unlimited * Izaak Walton League – Oregon Division * Berkley Conservation Institute-Pure Fishing Company * Oregon Backcountry Hunters & Anglers * Backcountry Hunters & Anglers * Northwest Guides and Anglers Association * Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association * Association of Northwest Steelheaders * Birdseye Creek Anglers * Central Oregon Flyfishers * Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership * Northern California Council – Federation of Fly Fishers * California Council – Trout Unlimited

October 10, 2011

The Honorable Ron Wyden
223 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-3703

Dear Senator Wyden:

We get few opportunities in this lifetime to improve fish and wildlife habitat. In Oregon's Klamath Basin, we have the opportunity to end decades of frustration among farmers, ranchers, tribes and sportsmen by implementing The Klamath Agreements (the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement (KBRA) and Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSA)). The agreements are a locally-developed, fiscally-responsible plan that will bring balance to the Basin and restore its waters and wildlife. We write you as representatives of the hunting and fishing community to confirm that the agreements benefit our hunting and fishing values compared to the status quo of continuing conflict in this basin.

Among other benefits, this locally-developed approach will ensure a predictable supply of water for farmers and for fish and wildlife. It will ensure a steady flow of water to our precious wildlife refuges, particularly the Lower Klamath Refuge, the oldest in our nation's history, enhancing habitat for ducks and geese and ensuring our hunting heritage. And, it will dramatically improve conditions in hundreds of miles of salmon and steelhead habitat.

The Klamath Agreements and their approach – are good for agriculture, for the Basin economy and for sportsmen and women.

- The Klamath Agreements are good for family farmers and ranchers and represent a locally devised plan.
- 80% of the Pacific flyway's migratory waterfowl stop in the Klamath basin. It is one of the premier waterfowl hunting locations in North America. The Klamath Agreements will help water conditions in the refuges, improve habitat and enhance hunting opportunities.
- The Klamath Agreements will improve the salmon and steelhead fishery.

- The Klamath Agreements will help a teetering commercial fishing industry and coastal towns because they will increase salmon and steelhead runs.
- According to the Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, hunting, fishing and wildlife viewing infuses \$23 million annually into the Klamath County economy. The Klamath Agreements will enhance this while providing greater security for farmers!
- Millions of tax dollars have gone to farmers, ranchers, tribes and commercial fisherman because of drought and disaster assistance. The approach of The Klamath Agreements will save taxpayers money and improve water distribution for all.
- The agreements are good for people, fish and wildlife and are fiscally responsible compared to the costs of continued conflict in the basin.

Senator Wyden, we urge you to work with Senator Merkley and other Senators on the Klamath Agreements and the effort to end at least a decade of bitter conflict in the Klamath Basin. We look forward to working with you on this historic effort to secure legislation implementing these agreements.

Sincerely,

John Hyde
Owner
Yamsi Ranch Fly Fishing

Don Kirby
President
Cal-Ore Wetlands and Waterfowl Council

Bill Gaines
President
California Outdoor Heritage Alliance

Ted Brownrigg
President
Deschutes Chapter-Trout Unlimited

John Carlson, Jr.
President
California Waterfowl Association

Steve DeBerry
President
Southern Oregon Chapter - Delta Waterfowl

John Devney
Senior Vice-President
Delta Waterfowl

Karl Mueller
President
McKenzie-Upper Willamette Chapter-Trout Unlimited

Tim Mauck
Gaspar Perricone
Co-Directors
Bull Moose Sportsmen

Mike Gentry
President
Tualatin Valley Chapter-Trout Unlimited

Dick Hollenbeck
President
Clackamas River Chapter-Trout Unlimited

Curtis Knight
Conservation Director
California Trout

Carl Page
President
Wild Rivers Coast Chapter-Trout Unlimited

Tom Wolf
Chairman
Oregon Council-Trout Unlimited

Mike Beagle
Field Coordinator
Sportsmen's Conservation Project-Trout Unlimited

Dawn Olson
President
Izaak Walton League- Oregon Division

Jim Martin
Conservation Director
Berkley Conservation Institute-Pure Fishing Company

Ed Putnam
Fred Cliff
Co-Chairmen
Oregon Backcountry Hunters & Anglers

Jim Akenson
Executive Director
Backcountry Hunters & Anglers

Bob Rees
President
Northwest Guides and Anglers Association

Liz Hamilton
Executive Director
Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association

Russell Bassett
Executive Director
Association of Northwest Steelheaders

Tony Brauner
Owner
Birdseye Creek Anglers

Dick Olson
President
Central Oregon Flyfishers

Joel Webster
Director-Center for Western Lands
Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership

Mark Rockwell
Co-VP, Conservation
Northern California Council-Federation of Fly Fishers

Drew Irby
Chairman
California Council-Trout Unlimited

cc:

Senator Jeff Merkley

Senator Dianne Feinstein

Senator Barbara Boxer