

VII. WATER

General Water Statement **7.005**

1 The state water laws and rules must be built on a sound basis that
2 recognizes the general benefit to agriculture and encourages individual
3 enterprise. (07)

Navigable Rivers **7.010**

1 We oppose all actions by the State of Oregon to recommend
2 streams and rivers throughout the state as navigable, unless these are
3 rivers that are in fact now used for commerce between states and foreign
4 countries and which need federal government supervision and financial
5 support.

6 The State of Oregon should provide well-documented, historic data
7 that streams were in fact navigable on February 14, 1859 with respect to
8 the navigability studies now under way.

9 We oppose the expansion of the navigable waterway definition or
10 determination and seek legislation and/or signatures on an initiative
11 petition to halt such illegal activity and to restore ownership and remove
12 any cloud on the title to land that has been taken to date.

13 We oppose further designation of navigable waters in Oregon. We
14 support voluntary incentive-based programs of public recreation, such as
15 providing recreational leases, easements and cooperative agreements to
16 increase public access to private lands through financial incentives, tax
17 credits and compensation.

18 We support increased recreational development of public lands for
19 navigable access. (05)

Navigable Determination **7.015**

1 Definite determination should be made of the river bottom lands
2 claimed by the state. Ownership of contested lands should be
3 adjudicated.

Scenic Rivers **7.100**

1 We oppose the further expansion of scenic rivers to other streams or
2 tributaries.

3 Legislation regarding scenic rivers should exempt agricultural
4 management practices. Lands adjacent to scenic rivers and recreation
5 trails should be subject to local zoning ordinances. (05)

Eastside Ecosystem Plan **7.110**

1 We oppose further federal expenditures to complete or implement
2 the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP)
3 and the Upper Columbia River Basin (UCRB) project as long as the

4 plans are contrary to federally legislated public land management
5 policies. We will not support any alternative that goes contrary to our
6 national policy that sets multiple-use as the goal for management of
7 public lands.

Water Conservation

7.200

1 We will support a state water conservation program that would define
2 conservation as the “wise and beneficial use of water.” A state water
3 conservation program should address all of the state's water resources
4 and stress voluntary involvement to:

- 5 1. Improve efficiencies of delivery and application;
- 6 2. Improve efficiencies of in-stream use; and
- 7 3. Store surplus flows for future in-stream and diverted uses. (01)

8

Storage of Willamette Basin Reservoir Water 7.220

9

10
11 We support the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of
12 Reclamation and others with jurisdiction over the Willamette River Basin
13 placing the summer and seasonal water needs of agriculture,
14 municipalities and businesses in a higher priority and adopt a
15 management system to fill and store water behind the thirteen dams and
16 reservoirs in a timely manner that supports both the seasonal water
17 needs of agriculture, municipalities, and businesses and the flood control
18 and fisheries needs of the Willamette River Basin system.

Measurement of Water Use

7.225

1 We oppose statewide blanket measurement of water use. We
2 support water measurement within individual watersheds to resolve
3 water conflict between water users. (09)

Riparian Management Zones

7.250

1 We oppose non-voluntary regulatory riparian set-asides or other
2 imposed riparian restrictions on private agricultural land. If regulations
3 and improvements are proposed to protect riparian lands on private
4 agricultural property, then the following conditions should be met:

- 5 1. These regulations should be incentive-based;
- 6 2. All such regulations should be reasonable; and
- 7 3. All costs of these regulations and improvements should be paid
8 by the government agency. (05)

Water Laws

7.300

1 We support continuance of the prior appropriation doctrine as the
2 proper method to determine water law administered by the Water
3 Resources Commission.

4 We support a system of one vote per irrigated acre within an
5 irrigation district or irrigation company.

6 The Director of the Water Resources Department should be
7 appointed by the Water Resources Commission and confirmed by the
8 Governor.

9 We support the beneficial use under the constraints of irrigation
10 districts' and/or an irrigation companies' bylaws. (05)

Water Adjudication

7.305

1 We support a fair and fast state adjudication process if the following
2 provisions are met:

- 3 1. A requirement that all entities, particularly Tribal Government
4 and US Government claimants submit, and make public,
5 biological studies and the data developed in those studies, when
6 biological/environmental studies are a basis for their claim;
- 7 2. A provision allowing for sufficient time for peer review after the
8 submission of the aforementioned studies and data and prior to
9 the contested case hearing. At least one year should be allowed
10 for peer review;
- 11 3. A provision requiring the State of Oregon to fund unbiased
12 scientific studies sufficient to determine the accuracy of data,
13 and authenticity of all federal claims;
- 14 4. A requirement that Oregon Water Resources Department defend
15 existing adjudicated water rights when such water rights would
16 be jeopardized by in-stream or lake level claims filed by
17 government in an adjudication process; and
- 18 5. A requirement, if the adjudication of in-stream water rights or
19 state or federal reserved rights deprives any farm or ranch of
20 water, the government pays just compensation to the farmer or
21 rancher for all economic loss due to the loss of water.

Water Rights

7.310

1 We oppose federal preemption of state water rights. The right to use
2 water is a property right which should not be taken from the owner
3 without due process of law and just compensation.

4 We believe that water and water rights from both surface and
5 underground sources must stay with the land, particularly when lands are
6 classified for agriculture use under the state's land use planning
7 program. Water rights on EFU lands should not be used for any other
8 purpose until all agriculture needs are met and assured for the future.
9 We believe that areas where ground water is available under EFU lands
10 that no other use should be allowed unless there is an adequate supply
11 of water for all EFU lands located above the ground water source.

12 We request that the present Oregon water rights law be administered
13 in accordance with established customs and adjudicated court decisions.

14 We hold irrigation water to be property rights appurtenant to the land
15 and that irrigation water rights are owned by the landowner.

16 When water rights are applied for and developed by a landowner, the
17 ownership rights to appropriate and make beneficial-use of that water
18 right vests solely in that landowner.

19 We hold that Irrigation Districts are a critical component of Oregon's
20 agricultural infrastructure. Irrigation Districts must be managed for the
21 benefit of all patrons.

22 Irrigation Districts shall operate based on direction provided by an
23 elected board representing the district members.

24 Water rights held within a district should stay on land in that district.
25 Water that is unusable by an irrigation district for irrigation should be
26 available for other landowners or districts with access to the same water
27 source for irrigation purposes only.

28 Oregon Water Recourse Department (OWRD) basin plans for water
29 availability should be required to restrict rural, residential, municipal or
30 industrial development near or on land zoned exclusively for farm use
31 where non-farm demands will adversely impact the adjoining agricultural
32 operation or other existing uses.

33 We support the presumption that a water right application be
34 considered in the public interest, if the use is authorized in the basin
35 program and the water is available.

36 Water rights should be described in terms of recorded property
37 deeds. An affidavit showing a five year period of nonuse within any
38 preceding seven year period should accompany all petitions initiating
39 cancellation procedures.

40 We support allowing any owner of any agricultural water right to
41 receive a waiver of the five-year cancellation for nonuse if the owner has
42 a sufficient reason for requesting the waiver.

43 We support repealing that portion of the water right law which says,
44 "A water permit or water right may be canceled after five years of
45 nonuse."

46 Valid reasons for the waiver include, but are not limited to the
47 following: government programs such as the current 10 year
48 Conservation Reserve Program; improvements in Management
49 programs; changes in crop production programs; changes in ownership;
50 weather cycles; land litigation and temporary long-term economic
51 conditions.

52 A farmer should have the option to accept or reject use of sludge or
53 treated water. The use of such water should not result the in loss of
54 water rights. Water quality testing should be the responsibility of the
55 supplier, with tests done by a testing agency.

56 State law should be amended to allow representation from the
57 following nine basins:

- 58 1. Rogue, Umpqua, South Coast;
- 59 2. Klamath, Gooselake;
- 60 3. Lower Willamette, Sandy;

61 4. Mid Willamette, Mid Coast;
62 5. Upper Willamette, North Coast;
63 6. John Day, Deschutes, Hood;
64 7. Grand Ronde, Umatilla;
65 8. Powder, Malheur Lake; and
66 9. Malheur, Owyhee
67 Stock ponds and retention impoundments in use in an agriculture
68 environment should be grandfathered under Oregon water rights.
69 The water right application backlog in the OWRD should be cleared
70 within a 3 month period before the department conducts any present or
71 future rule or policy making, hires any new employees, or has their
72 budget approved by the next legislature.
73 Governmental agencies should not be exempt from water rights
74 application fees.
75 We support a fee being charged to file an appeal for granting a water
76 right application. The fee should be equivalent to all costs incurred by a
77 water right applicant. Appellants if successful should have the fee
78 returned.
79 If the appeal is lost then those filing the appeal would lose their fee
80 and be required to pay any costs incurred by the water right applicant
81 due to the appeal. (02), (03), (04)
82 It is the responsibility of OWRD's job to actively enforce the shutoff of
83 illegal water withdrawals and damming of streams on properties with no
84 water rights- (15)
85

Water Right Applications 7.320

1 We support legislation which requires the Water Resource
2 Commission to direct the Water Resource Department to process water
3 right applications according to the administrative rules in effect on the
4 date of application.

Domestic Water Well Permits 7.330

1 New exempt domestic wells should be regulated by the Water
2 Resources Department.
3 Before drilling new exempt domestic wells in a groundwater limited
4 areas, a landowner should be required to obtain a permit from the Water
5 Resources Department. (06), (08)

Hydrological Connection 7.335

1 Oregon Water Resource Department must use the most current, up
2 to date scientific techniques for determining connections of water
3 between wells and surface water.
4 Before a well can be regulated due to hydraulic connection to a
5 surface water source, the department must prove the connection and
6 that the impact is within the same irrigation season. (14)

7 Restrictions imposed on areas determined to be hydrologically
8 connected to surface water resources with no initial scientific basis
9 should sunset within five years unless scientific documentation proves a
10 hydrologic connection. (06)

Stored Water Application Process 7.350

1 We support legislation for a streamlined application process for water
2 right applications to access stored water for irrigation where the water
3 has already been earmarked for irrigation.

Irrigation District Elections 7.360

1 Irrigation District elections should fall under the authority of the
2 Secretary of State and be made to abide by the same election provisions
3 and requirements as other special districts in the State of Oregon, with
4 the exception of the weighted voting by acreage. (01)

Water Transfer 7.375

1 If an irrigator or district uses less water than their water right allows
2 for, they should be able to transfer the water rights of the water saved to
3 another parcel of land under the same ownership for agricultural use
4 within the existing water authority. If the irrigator does not transfer the
5 rights of the water saved to another parcel, he should not lose the rights
6 to that water.

7 We should broaden our policy on the transfer of water rights to
8 include the following:

- 9 1. Provide for a simplified temporary transfer of a water right from
10 the identified parcel to other parcels under the same ownership
11 or operation. The transferred water right should be limited by
12 both the acres of the original right and the volume of water
13 covered by the original right taken from and returned to the same
14 source.
- 15 2. Permit the leasing of a water right on a year to year basis to
16 other farmers having access to the same water source. This
17 transfer should be considered a "beneficial use" to the owner of
18 the water right.

Leasing of Water Rights 7.385

1 We oppose the permanent sale of water rights to in stream use
2 because junior water users cannot be protected from injury arising after
3 the sale of water rights to in stream use. Leases, as opposed to sales,
4 can be broken if injury is discovered at a later date.

5 We are not opposed to transfers in character of the use of water
6 rights by lease for five years or less. This includes transfers of irrigation
7 use to in stream use. The transfer must be conditioned to prevent injury
8 to all existing water users. Water available for transfers to in stream use
9 must be limited to actual consumptive use, and shaped to

10 mimic/resemble customary use within the stream system during the
11 irrigation season.

12 Leasing programs should allow temporary leases for other
13 agricultural uses. (03)

Water Resources Commission

7.400

1 The Water Resources Commission should be composed of ten
2 commissioners, one of which should be appointed by the Governor and
3 the remaining nine of which should be elected by the qualified voters of
4 each of the nine districts. Such districts should be composed of four
5 counties having at least one border in common with one or more other
6 county within such district. The designation of the counties which should
7 form the nine districts should be determined by the Secretary of State.
8 The elected commissioners should serve for three year terms following
9 the establishment of the initial commission whose members serve for
10 one, two and three year terms. Those elected commissioners receiving
11 the greatest percentage of votes should serve for three year terms, those
12 with the next highest percentage of votes should serve for two years, and
13 those receiving the least percentage of qualifying votes serve for one
14 year terms in the initially established commission.

Water Development

7.450

1 We support the sale of bonds by the Oregon State Treasury for
2 financing water development and land drainage projects. Funds should
3 be used to provide facilities for supplemental water, recharging wells,
4 development of semiarid lands and for domestic water supplies. Such
5 developments will stabilize and enhance the agricultural economy and
6 contribute to the wealth of Oregon and the nation.

7 We support programs for water development to reserve suitable
8 upstream storage sites and for initiation of conservation to store water for
9 flood control; recreation; domestic; industrial and agricultural uses;
10 hydroelectric power; and to stabilize stream flow.

11 We seek necessary changes in laws and rules to expedite the
12 building of small scale reservoirs of 500 acre feet or less for the purpose
13 of retaining seasonal runoff to enhance stream flows, provide sources of
14 water for fire suppression, irrigation, and for wildlife enhancement.

15 In emergency low water years, minimum stream flows should be
16 suspended in favor of domestic and agricultural uses. OWRD should
17 make provision for livestock watering during times of drought if that water
18 can be delivered simply by opening a diversion until the livestock water
19 pond has sufficient water. (14)

20 We support reasonable, cooperative and scientific studies of
21 underground water supplies and the drilling and maintenance of
22 recognized monitor wells. In classifying a "critical groundwater" or
23 declaring a moratorium on groundwater development, these studies

24 should include data gathered from properly constructed monitor wells
25 funded and maintained by the Water Resources Department.

26 The state should provide funding for the information to adequately
27 manage Oregon's water. (02), (12) Livestock watering should be an
28 exempt use and be allowed in ditches, streams, and from groundwater
29 as necessary to support livestock operations. (16)

Section 208 of the Clean Water Act 7.475

1 We favor implementation of Section 208 of the Clean Water Act by
2 the Oregon Soil and Water Conservation Commission and local Soil and
3 Water Conservation districts, acting in coordination with the Oregon
4 Department of Environmental quality and other appropriate state, local,
5 and federal agencies. The Oregon Soil and Water Conservation
6 Commission should take leadership in bringing together such agencies
7 at the state level; Soil and Water Conservation Districts should take
8 responsibility at the local level. A voluntary program with maximum local
9 control should be realized, fulfilling the strategy and guidelines outlined
10 by the State 208 Policy Advisory Group. Implementation should be
11 initially examined under a voluntary program administered through the
12 Soil and Water Conservation District. Regulatory control features should
13 proceed with reasonable caution. We support the use of best
14 management practices by owners as conclusive proof of compliance
15 under Section 208 of the Clean Water Act.

16 We urge Farm Bureau members to participate in discussions,
17 planning meetings and public hearings, and to exert their influence to
18 whatever extent possible regarding this planning process.

19 We support the right of individual counties to develop their own Best
20 Management Plan (BMP).

21 We support research and monitoring to determine the extent of
22 nonpoint source pollution. Agriculture must not be blamed as the sole
23 source of Non-point Source (NPS) pollution.

24 Oregon's 208 Plan should not be more restrictive than the federal
25 regulations.

26 The voluntary 208 program for Confined Animal Feeding Operations
27 (CAFOs) should be administered by the Division of Soil and Water
28 Conservation instead of the Department of Environmental Quality. Funds
29 should be provided for the program. If sufficient funds are not provided
30 we recommend the removal of all ordinances concerning animal wastes.

Water Quality 7.485

1 We support efforts to protect and/or improve the quality of our state's
2 surface and ground water, provided such point and non-point programs
3 are:

- 4 1. Based on sound science.
- 5 2. Management based and plan oriented.
- 6 3. Incentive based with minimal regulation.

- 7 4. Encouraged voluntary action.
- 8 5. Required to coincide with and minimize the effect on all uses.
- 9 6. Attainable, site specific standards that are based on the ability of
- 10 the water body or system, if functioning properly, to achieve
- 11 those standards.
- 12 7. Designed to protect private property and the owner's ability to
- 13 economically use their land for agricultural purposes.
- 14 8. Designed to consider natural and background characteristics of
- 15 each individual natural water system.
- 16 9. Based on the overall goal that each water body or system
- 17 function in a proper and healthy manner given the system's
- 18 potential, judged in light of natural conditions as well as current
- 19 and projected land use.
- 20 10. Required to provide monitoring to measure each water body or
- 21 system's progress or trend from an established baseline to a
- 22 predetermined desired goal or condition necessary to achieve
- 23 site specific water quality standards.

Landfill Impact on Water Quality 7.486

- 1 We oppose the expansion or the creation of landfills that will
- 2 negatively and/or quantifiably impact the ground or surface water quality
- 3 through flooding, leaching and other means. (09)

Wildlife Fecal Coli form Study 7.490

- 1 We support requiring the US Fish & Wildlife Service and the Oregon
- 2 Department of Fish & Wildlife to conduct a study to determine the extent
- 3 to which wildlife on public and private lands, including refuges, contribute
- 4 to the existence of fecal coli form in the waters of the state. (01)

Confined Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO) 7.495

- 1 We oppose expansion of CAFO regulations beyond federal levels,
- 2 whether proposed by rule or by statute. (03)

Water Use Fees 7.500

- 1 We oppose all water use fees. But if one is initiated, we recommend
- 2 that the fees be proportionately charged among all water users, including
- 3 all state and public agencies and recreational users of water for
- 4 consumptive and non-consumptive use.

Falling Water Charge 7.510

- 1 We oppose any Falling Water Rain Charge. (05)

Allocation of Water 7.525

- 1 We oppose any water allocations of any Bureau of Reclamation
- 2 projects for uses other than those for which the project was authorized.

3 We support legislation that will prevent residential or urban
4 development from restricting or reducing water available to commercial
5 agriculture holdings established by water rights.

6 We oppose the automatic granting of water rights for domestic and
7 recreational use for non-resource dwellings and other non-resource uses
8 in resource zones. The burden of proof should be with the applicant to
9 demonstrate that the additional water demands will not adversely affect
10 neighboring agricultural or forestry practices within the same watershed
11 or aquifer.

12 Municipalities should be prohibited from demanding increased in-
13 stream flows to dilute industrial and human wastes to meet minimum
14 pollution requirements. We oppose the transportation of water out of
15 water sheds for non-agricultural use if it adversely affects agriculture.

Groundwater Priority Allocation 7.550

1 The groundwater priority allocation should be the same as presently
2 established on surface water allocation.

3 The Water Resources Commission should have the authority to
4 enforce the critical groundwater statutes.

5 In groundwater matters, prior water rights are all inclusive and
6 damage to such should merit compensation furnished by the individual or
7 parties causing such damage or loss.

Notification Requirements 7.575

1 Notification to all affected users should be required whenever the
2 Water Resources Department intends to conduct a proof survey which
3 would have the effect of reallocating allotments from a water permit.
4 Water permit holders should also be given the results of the survey.

Release of Impounded Water 7.600

1 We ask that the Army Corps of Engineers be required to give prior
2 public notice of any sudden release of impounded water.

Pacific Northwest Water 7.650

1 We oppose the diversion of water out of the Pacific Northwest
2 region. (05)

Soil and Water Conservation 7.700

1 Soil and water conservation districts should be granted the
2 responsibility for reviewing and approving conservation and
3 sedimentation control plans related to nonpoint sources of pollution and
4 soil erosion.

Soil and Water Conservation Districts 7.701

1 Soil and Water Conservation Districts and the Natural Resource
2 Conservation Service should use their resources to fund farm ponds and
3 storage as a priority project. (09)

Municipal and Industrial Waste Water Reuse 7.720

1 We support the use of treated, reclaimed water for agricultural
2 purposes when the water is treated to a level that will not lower or
3 degrade the quality of the farmland on which it is applied. (06)

Fill and Removal Permit Requirements 7.750

1 No farm or farm operation should be assessed criminal penalties for
2 violation of the fill and removal laws. Civil penalties should be limited to
3 no more than \$100 per day for an alleged violation.

4 Agricultural fill or removal projects on private property that were
5 assisted by the federal government prior to 1982 should be
6 grandfathered including allowed maintenance without need for permits or
7 any other interference.

8 Farmers or ranchers, attempting to carry out normal farm or ranching
9 operations, should not have to live in fear of state government
10 enforcement of fill or removal laws.

11 Farmers should be allowed to maintain historic waterways to
12 continue water flow to irrigation sites.

13 The local Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) representing
14 the private landowners should be given the same authority as the
15 Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODF&W) regarding the waiver
16 of fill or removal permits or at least be given a mutual review process.

17 We support the retention of all exemptions for agriculture contained
18 in the 1999 Oregon fill and removal law (ORS 196.800 through 196.905).

19 If the exemptions are not fully retained, in the Oregon fill and removal
20 law, we will oppose the law as written.

21 A person engaged in activities customarily associated with
22 agriculture should not be required to obtain a permit in order to remove
23 materials from or add materials to an area defined as "essential
24 indigenous anadromous salmonid and/or other fish habitat." Activities
25 customarily associated with agriculture should be broadly defined to
26 include, but not limited to the following:

- 27 1. All agriculture activities described in 33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1);
- 28 2. Farm use activities described in ORS 215.203; and
- 29 3. Necessary repair and maintenance activities associated with

30 agricultural operations that occur on a non-annual or an infrequent basis.
31 When permits are required, the process to obtain them should be
32 simplified to reduce the time required to obtain a permit. More authority
33 for permit approvals should be granted to local jurisdictions.

34 We support repeal of statutory changes made to the Oregon fill and
35 removal law enabling the Department of State Lands, or any other state
36 agency, to obtain federal authority to administer permits under Section
37 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act. (02), (03), (04), (05)

Channel Management 7.760

1 We believe that the ban and restrictions on gravel removal and or
2 harvesting (i.e., dredging) should be revoked and the permitting process
3 should be revised or simplified. Such permits should be issued on a time
4 certain basis.

5 We urge local, state and federal agencies to conduct gravel bar
6 removal and rip-rap addition activities in Oregon's rivers to help stabilize
7 the river banks, to preserve agricultural soil, to prevent water pollution by
8 land erosion, and to make the body of the river more usable to river
9 traffic.

10 We support legislation that will allow land owners bordering a stream
11 to do what is necessary to protect the stream bank and to keep it from
12 eroding the land.

13 We support the stabilization of the rivers within their existing banks
14 and support the rights of farmers to maintain their drainage systems. We
15 oppose any state or federal projects that would weaken the river banks,
16 threatening local drainage systems and farmlands. (00), (05) (10),
17 (Referred to AFBF, 10)

18

Drainage Districts 7.765

20 Drainage districts support important functions for rural communities,
21 including maintenance of agricultural land, flood control, and public
22 safety. We support the ability of drainage districts to continue to
23 maintain drainage for their members without burdensome state and
24 federal regulation. Districts should be able to fully perform their
25 necessary drainage maintenance functions consistent with their statutory
26 obligations. In exercising these functions, the state and federal
27 government should not force drainage districts to regulate their
28 members' operations or require their members to maintain specific
29 agricultural practices in order for the district to maintain their drainage
30 systems.(16)

Fish Screens 7.770

1 We believe that the financial burden of fish screens should be borne
2 by the state rather than the producers. (05)

Peak and Ecological Flows 7.790

1 The state should not make policy on peak and ecological flows that
2 will prevent the storage of all available winter water. We recognize the
3 need for balance between uses. Protection of peak and ecological flows

4 should be based on aggregated peer reviewed science and analysis of
5 each projects unique needs and benefits. (10)

Minimum Stream Flows 7.800

1 We support the concept of minimum stream flows as provided in
2 ORS 536.310(7) and (8) which reads:

3 "The maintenance of minimum perennial stream flows sufficient to
4 support aquatic life and to minimize pollution shall be fostered and
5 encouraged if existing rights and priorities under existing laws will permit.
6 Watershed development policies shall be favored, whenever
7 possible, for the preservation of balanced multiple uses. Project
8 construction and planning with those ends in view shall be encouraged."

9 We support a change in the water resource policy which would
10 provide that support for human life, livestock, crops, etc., should have
11 priority over aquatic life and in-stream water rights.

12 We cannot stress strongly enough that existing rights should receive
13 top priority over other rights including those of aquatic life.

14 The cost of establishing upstream impoundments or any costs
15 necessary to ensure these minimum flows, must be shared by all
16 beneficiaries in proportion to the anticipated benefits or value received.

17 Any agency applying for an in-stream water right should provide
18 environmental impact and economic assessment studies and these
19 should be subject to verification by independent scientific review and
20 verification if so requested by any citizen or resident of the state. Failure
21 of verification should preclude the granting of any such right. All
22 previously issued in-stream water rights should be subject to the same
23 review and should be adjusted to comply with the standards herein set
24 forth.

Water Withdrawal from the Columbia River 7.825

1 We encourage the State of Oregon to beneficially withdraw the
2 state's allocation of water from the Columbia River for agricultural
3 purposes. (09)

Wetlands 7.850

1 The state definition for wetlands should be the same as the federal
2 definition, and the local federal farm agencies should have the final say
3 as to wetlands classification.

4 Any former wetlands that were Agricultural Stabilization
5 Conservation Service (ASCS) assisted should be exempt from
6 reconversion to wetland, as well as any area less than twenty acres. We
7 encourage tax incentives or just remuneration for all other reconversions.

8 Only one designated government agency should be allowed
9 jurisdiction over wetlands administration.

10 When the owner of private land is denied agricultural use of
11 designated wetlands, the land should be automatically assessed at the

12 lowest value as long as the nonuse designation remains. The burden of
13 proof for a wetlands designation should be on and funded by the agency
14 that is responsible for the designation.

15 Owners of private wetlands should be able to mitigate wetland
16 conversion on an acre-for-acre or value-for-value basis.

17 We support a strong policy that the status of prior converted
18 wetlands should be maintained as long as the property owner wishes to
19 do so.

20 We oppose any Wetland Reserve Program, which reduces
21 agriculture production on a permanent basis. If lands are diverted into a
22 Wetland Reserve Program, those lands must have insect, rodent, and
23 weed control as part of the program. (02), (05)

Elk Creek Dam

7.900

1 We urge the continued federal funding for the completion of the Elk
2 Creek Dam in the Rogue basin.

3 We also support funding for the Mill Town dam on Elk Creek in the
4 Umpqua Basin. (04), (07), (11)

Catherine Creek Dam

7.910

1 We urge that the Catherine Creek Dam decision be appealed.

2 We favor working with the Confederated Tribes in developing an
3 upstream impoundment or other improvements on Catherine Creek that
4 would be beneficial to both Union County and the Confederated Tribes.

Dam Removal

7.920

1 We oppose any attempt to remove or breach any existing dams in
2 the Pacific Northwest when such breach or removal would be detrimental
3 to agriculture. Specifically increase in electrical power rates where USDA
4 programs promote conversion of flood to sprinkler irrigating with
5 corresponding need for pumps. Loss of renewable hydropower would
6 have to be replaced with environmentally unfriendly coal fired or other
7 expensive generating plants.

8 We support the building of fish-friendly dams for agriculture, irrigation
9 storage, fish, recreation, flood control, hydroelectric power production,
10 and domestic water, and other beneficial uses for the local community,
11 including the completion of the Elk Creek Dam.

12 If a dam is to be removed, the public should not pay any destruction
13 tax or a fee. (01), (10), (11) (Referred to AFBF, 10)