

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
STATE OF OREGON  
for the  
WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

In the Matter of the Determination of the Relative Rights of the Waters of the Klamath River,  
a Tributary of the Pacific Ocean

Cynthia L. Barrett, Trustee of Sydney's 1995 Irrevocable Trust, utu 12/27/95; Elaine G. Kerns, Sydney K. Giacomini and E. Martin Kerns, as Initial Trustees of the Elaine G. Kerns 1992 Trust utu 1/24/92; Mathis Family Trust; ~~WaterWatch of Oregon, Inc.~~; Roger Nicholson; Richard Nicholson; NBCC, LLC; AgriWater, LLC; Maxine Kizer; Ambrose McAuliffe; Susan McAuliffe; Kenneth L. Tuttle and Karen L. Tuttle dba Double K Ranch; ~~Dave Wood~~; ~~Kenneth Zamzow~~; Nicholson Investments, LLC; William S. Nicholson; John B. Owens; Kenneth Owens; William L. Brewer; ~~Mary Jane Danforth~~;

**PROPOSED ORDER**

Case No. 281

Claims: 668, 669, 670, and that Portion of Claim 612 pertaining to the Wood River<sup>1</sup>

Contests: 2730, 2733, 2735, 2736, 2738, 2739, 2740, 2743, 2744, 2745, ~~3016, 3067, 3068, 3069~~<sup>2</sup>, 3314<sup>3</sup>, 3370, 3371, 3372, 3929, 3930, 3931, 4002, 4058, 4059, 4060

<sup>1</sup> Claimant Klamath Tribes filed a notice withdrawing limited parts of its water rights claim. See KLAMATH TRIBES' NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF STRUCTURAL HABITAT MAINTENANCE CLAIMS dated July 5, 2005.

<sup>2</sup> WaterWatch of Oregon, Inc.'s contests 3016, 3067, 3068, and 3069 were dismissed. ORDER DISMISSING WATERWATCH OF OREGON, INC.'S CONTESTS, May 20, 2003.

<sup>3</sup> William Bryant voluntarily withdrew from Contest 3314 on October 31, 2003. Dave Wood voluntarily withdrew from Contests 3314 on October 26, 2004. Change of Title Interest for Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 from Roger Nicholson Cattle Co. to AgriWater, LLC (2/4/05). Change of Title Interest for Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 from Dorothy Nicholson Trust and Lloyd Nicholson Trust to Roger and Richard Nicholson (2/4/05). Change of Title Interest for Contest 3314 from Kenneth Hufford, Leslie Hufford, and Hart Estate Investments to Jerry and Linda Neff (2/11/05). Change of Title Interest for Contest 3314 from William and Ethel Rust to David Cowan (3/9/05). Change of Title Interest for Contest 3314 from Walter Seput to James Wayne, Jr. (5/2/05). Change of Title Interest for Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 from Jim McAuliffe, McAuliffe Ranches, and Joe McAuliffe Co. to Dwight and Helen Mebane (7/8/05). Change of Title Interest for Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 from Anita Nicholson to Nicholson Investments, LLC (7/8/05). Change of portion of Title Interest for Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 from Dwight and Helen Mebane to Sevenmile Creek Ranch, LLC (8/15/05). Kenneth Zamzow voluntarily withdrew from Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 on September 2, 2005. William Knudtsen voluntarily withdrew from Contest 3314 on September 13, 2005. Change of Ownership filed for Contest 3314 reflecting that William V. Hill is deceased and his ownership rights transferred to Lillian M. Hill (6/15/06). Sevenmile Creek Ranch, LLC voluntarily withdrew from Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 on March 1, 2007. Franklin Lockwood Barnes, Jr. and Jane M. Barnes voluntarily withdrew from Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 on April 6, 2007. Mary Jane Danforth voluntarily withdrew from Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 on June 19, 2008. Change of Title Interest for Contests 3314 from Robert Bartell to Michael LaGrande (1/9/2009). Change of Title Interest for Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 from Elmore E. Nicholson and Mary Ann Nicholson to Nicholson Loving Trust (12/8/09). Change of Title Interest for Contest 3314 from Peter M. Bourdet to Peter Bourdet & Linda Long (1/8/09). Jacob D. Wood voluntarily withdrew from Contests 3314, 3370-3372 on January 15, 2010. Change of portion of Title Interest for Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 from Roger Nicholson and Richard Nicholson to NBCC, LLC (3/17/2010). Change of Title Interest for Contests 3314 and 3370-3372 from Dwight & Helen Mebane to Farm Credit West, PCA (7/20/2011), and from Farm Credit West, PCA to PCA Acquired Properties, LLC (7/20/2011), and from PCA Acquired Properties, LLC to Robinson Best, LLC (7/20/2011).

Jane M. Barnes; Franklin Lockwood Barnes, Jr.;  
Jacob D. Wood; Elmore E. Nicholson; Mary Ann  
Nicholson; Nicholson Loving Trust; Gerald H.  
Hawkins; Hawkins Cattle Co.; Owens &  
Hawkins; Harlow Ranch; Terry M. Bengard;  
Tom Bengard; Robinson Best, LLC; Dwight T.  
Mebane; Helen Mebane; Sevenmile Creek  
Ranch, LLC; James G. Wayne, Jr.; Clifford  
Rabe; Tom Griffith; William Gallagher; Thomas  
William Mallams; River Springs Ranch; Pierre  
A. Kern Trust; William V. Hill; Lillian M. Hill;  
Carolyn Obenchain; Lon Brooks; Newman  
Enterprise; William C. Knudtsen; Wayne Jacobs;  
Margaret Jacobs; Michael LaGrande; Rodney Z.  
James; Hilda Francis for Francis Loving Trust;  
David M. Cowan; James R. Goold for Tillie  
Goold Trust; Duane F. Martin; Modoc Point  
Irrigation District; Peter M. Bourdet; Peter M.  
Bourdet & Linda Long; Vincent Briggs; J.T.  
Ranch Co.; Tom Bentley; Thomas Stephens;  
John Briggs; William Bryant; Peggy Marengo;  
Jerry L. Neff & Linda R. Neff;

Contestants

vs.

United States, Bureau of Indian Affairs, as  
Trustee on behalf of the Klamath Tribes;  
Claimant/Contestant, and

The Klamath Tribes;  
Claimant/Contestant.

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

### PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This proceeding under the provisions of ORS Chapter 539 is part of a general stream adjudication to determine the relative rights of the parties to waters of the various streams and reaches within the Klamath Basin.

Klamath Case 281 involves several claims, all involving the Wood River and its tributaries on the lands of the former Klamath Indian Reservation. Unlike the claims for individual water rights filed in this adjudication, Case 281 involves tribal claims for instream water rights. Claimants are the Klamath Tribes (Tribes) and the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) as Trustee on behalf of the Tribes.<sup>4</sup> Contestants are individually represented

---

<sup>4</sup> Claimants also hold status as contestants in this matter with regard to certain findings and determinations contained in the PEs. For clarity, the Tribes and BIA will be referred to as Claimants throughout this order.

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

landowners as well as a larger conglomeration of landowners referred to throughout this adjudication as the Upper Basin Contestants (UBC).

On or about April 30, 1997, Claimants filed several claims for instream water rights to support the Tribes hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering rights on former reservation land. On October 1, 1999, Claimants filed amendments to each of the claims at issue here. On or about October 4, 1999, OWRD issued preliminary evaluations (PE) on each claim. Thereafter, UBC and other contestants filed the Statements of Contest (Contests) at issue in this case. Claimants also contested those portions of the PEs that proposed reduction, limitation, or denial of portions of the claims filed. The Claimants' claims for instream water rights were consolidated into eight cases. Case 281 addresses those claims to water within the Wood River sub-basin.

On July 8, 2005,<sup>5</sup> the Tribes and the BIA filed a Joint Motion for Ruling on Legal Issues (Summary Determination). On that same date, UBC filed its own Motion for Ruling on Legal Issues. On February 12, 2007, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Maurice L. Russell II issued an Amended Order on Motions for Rulings on Legal Issues (Amended Order). In the Amended Order, ALJ Russell disposed of several contest grounds presented by UBC. In addition, ALJ Russell confirmed, *inter alia*, that the Tribes possessed treaty rights to hunt, fish, trap and gather on former reservation lands. Accordingly, ALJ Russell determined, as a matter of law, the Tribes possessed federally reserved water rights to whatever water is necessary to fulfill the purpose of the reservation. The priority date for the Tribes instream water rights was declared as "time immemorial." Through rulings in the Amended Order, ALJ Russell left only the quantification of Claimants' water rights for hearing.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Between 1999 and 2010, the parties engaged in extensive discovery and motions practice. From its inception, this matter has been presided over by no less than four separate Administrative Law Judges from the Office of Administrative Hearings. The rulings of each are part of the record in this matter. A detailed discussion of all prehearing matters is unnecessary for the purposes of this order.

<sup>6</sup> In the Amended Order, ALJ Russell summarized his rulings as follows:

1. The Tribes have an Article 1 right to hunt, fish, trap and gather on the former reservation lands, and an associated federal reserved water right accompanying it, with a priority of time immemorial.
2. *Adair I* and *Adair II* are controlling precedent throughout the former reservation lands in the particulars noted above.
3. The quantification process for determining the amount of water will be a modified two-step process: Claimants have the burden to show the amount of water necessary to build or preserve a viable and self-renewing population of treaty species, including the healthy and productive habitat necessary to such a population, sufficient for the exercise of the Tribes' aboriginal rights, and Contestants have the burden to show that a lesser amount of water will accomplish the same healthy, productive habitat.
4. The "as currently exercised" language in *Adair II* does not refer to a level of water based upon any specific date; rather, it refers to determining the appropriate healthy, productive habitat in the present, as opposed to trying to recreate the situation in 1864, at the time the treaty was signed.
5. There were two primary purposes to the Treaty of 1864. The Article 2 purpose was agricultural, and had a priority date of October 14, 1864. The Article 1 purpose was a reservation of the Tribes' aboriginal right to hunt, fish, trap and gather, with a priority date of time immemorial.

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

On September 28, 2009, Contestants filed Amended Statements of Contest (Amended Contest) as permitted by the scheduled of proceedings in this matter. In the Amended Contests, Contestants incorporated previously raised contests and asserted new contests to the claims.<sup>7</sup>

On December 10, 2009, the parties filed written direct testimony and exhibits. On March 25, 2010, the parties filed written rebuttal testimony and exhibits. On April 2, 2010, The Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) assigned Senior ALJ Joe L. Allen to preside over all further proceedings in the Klamath Basin Adjudication. An in-person cross-examination hearing convened on May 3, 2010, in Salem, Oregon with Senior ALJ Allen presiding.<sup>8</sup>

### EVIDENTIARY RULINGS

Prior to the in-person hearing, the parties in this matter filed more than 800 exhibits, consisting of thousands of pages, along with written direct and rebuttal testimony. Pursuant to an instruction from the ALJ, the parties filed written objections to evidence and testimony on or about April 12, 2010. The parties filed responses to objections on or about April 26, 2010. The ALJ issued a written ruling on objections at the initiation of the in-person hearing. That ruling is part of the record in this matter and therefore it is unnecessary to reiterate those evidentiary rulings in this order.

---

6. The Tribes are entitled to an instream flow through the former reservation lands which is sufficient to fulfill the purposes of the reservation, and no more.

7. The parties are not limited to the evidence provided in the 1970 ODFW report. They may offer whatever evidence they choose, subject to admissibility, including whatever methods they consider appropriate, to determine the amount of water required to satisfy the Tribe's treaty rights on the former reservation lands.

8. The recognition of Tribal water rights on the former reservation lands does not create an equal protection issue under the Constitution.

9. OWRD has a statutory responsibility to provide hydrology data on water availability in these claims on request. The parties may rely upon the OWRD data, or they may attack that data or supplement that data.

(Amended Order at 23 and 24. **Bold and strikethrough** omitted.)

<sup>7</sup> ORS 539.110 provides, in relevant part, “\* \* \*[t]he evidence in the proceedings shall be confined to the subjects enumerated in the notice of contest.” Contestants raised several new challenges to the claims through the Amended Contests. However, some issues were deemed inapplicable and irrelevant at the outset of the cross-examination hearing. Accordingly, evidence on those issues was excluded as irrelevant. Those rulings are part of the permanent record in this proceeding. A protracted discussion of those rulings is therefore unnecessary in this order. As such, only those contest grounds not disposed of through the Amended Order or through rulings on the record, during cross-examination proceedings, are discussed herein.

<sup>8</sup> The parties assigned exhibit numbers to the direct and rebuttal testimonies of each witness. For clarity, references to direct or rebuttal testimony in this order will cite to the exhibit number assigned by the party proffering such testimony. References to testimony given at the in-person cross-examination hearing will be cited as “Test. of [witness name].”

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

## EXPERT TESTIMONY

This case presents a classic “battle of experts” with regard to the hydrologic, as well as physical and riparian habitat calculations. Expert testimony at the hearing was in direct conflict regarding facts relevant to a determination in this matter. Each party’s experts opined extensively about the amount of water necessary to establish healthy and productive habitat for the exercise of the Tribes’ treaty rights. The parties’ experts have also come to significantly different conclusions about how much water is necessary to accomplish the stated goals. Despite the wealth of knowledge presented by Claimants and UBC, only one side’s calculations can be accepted as reliable. In this matter, either Claimants are correct, that the claims presented represent the minimum amount of water necessary, or UBC is correct in its assertions that a lesser amount will do.<sup>9</sup> These contradictions must therefore be resolved through a determination of which evidence is entitled to greater weight.

At the hearing, UBC presented the testimony of Graeme Aggett, an expert in fluvial geomorphology. In his testimony, Mr. Aggett opines about the inferiority of the habitat models used by Claimants and the superiority of the models and data he employed. Unfortunately, Mr. Aggett failed to provide any substantive information regarding his modeling techniques. Specifically, Mr. Aggett provided little, if any, data collected. Nor did Mr. Aggett provide the input files for his calculations. Finally, no true detailed results for the models were provided to support his testimony in this case. UBC also presented testimony of Frank Rozaklis, an environmental engineer. Mr. Rozaklis testified about the flaws inherent in OWRD’s stream flow estimates provided in Cooper 2004 and adopted by Claimants. In contrast, Mr. Rozaklis adopts the results presented in the United States Bureau of Reclamation’s (USBR) Natural Flow Study as the basis for his stream flow estimates. However, Mr. Rozaklis provides no independent basis for relying on the data presented therein, despite the fact that the National Research Council reviewed USBR’s Natural Flow Study and found it to be lacking adequate calibration and testing.

To the contrary, BIA’s experts disclosed extensive amounts of data to allow the parties to conduct independent analysis and confirmation of the IFIM/PHABSIM model results that serve as the bases for the claims presented herein. Further, BIA’s riparian habitat expert submitted his cottonwood tree ring study along with underlying data that would allow independent validation of the methodologies employed. Moreover, BIA’s hydrologist performed independent testing to confirm stream flow estimates provided by OWRD prior to adopting the results presented in the Cooper 2002 and 2004 reports. Finally, it must be noted that OWRD submitted the methodologies used in Cooper 2002 and 2004 to peer review before adopting the results.

In addition, the parties in this matter expended considerable amounts of time and energy arguing over the location of the western boundary of the former reservation as it relates to the Wood River. Claimants presented testimony from Mary Hartell, the Chief Cadastral Surveyor (Hartell) for the United States Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The BLM is the agency with

---

<sup>9</sup> A third possibility, that both sides are incorrect and some other, unstated, amount of water is sufficient, is not considered. No party has presented such evidence and the necessary calculations are beyond the abilities of this tribunal.

RECEIVED

Dec 2 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

primary responsibility and authority for determining the boundaries of federal reservations and other federal lands. Ms. Hartell has extensive experience as a cadastral surveyor and is well versed in surveying boundaries of Indian reservations. Most importantly, Ms. Hartell appears to be the only expert to rely upon the actual treaty language in drawing her conclusions regarding the Wood River's inclusion into the former reservation. The same cannot be said for UBC's experts or others providing testimony on the matter.

Testimony provided by Claimants' experts is well supported by verifiable evidence. It also appears well reasoned in its conclusions. Consequently, where testimony conflicts, greater weight is given to the testimonies of Claimants' experts including Drs. Chapin and Reiser, Mr. Ramey and Ms. Hartell.

### ISSUES

1. Whether the claimed instream flows are necessary to establish a healthy and productive habitat to allow the exercise of the Klamath Tribes' hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering rights guaranteed by the treaty of 1864.
2. Whether the waters of the Wood River lay outside the boundaries of the former reservation and, if so, whether Claimants are entitled to claim instream flows in such waters.
3. Whether Claimants are entitled to claim instream flows outside the boundaries of the former reservation for a portion of Claim 668 in order to fulfill the purposes of the reservation.
4. Whether the Tribes' treaty rights have been extinguished on lands no longer owned by the Tribes.
5. Whether the Klamath Restoration Act of 1986 limited the restoration of the Tribes' treaty rights on former reservation land.
6. Whether Claimants must subordinate their claims based upon stipulated agreements to settle other claims in this adjudication.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

*The Treaty of 1864 and applicable case law.*

1. The Klamath Tribes (including the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians) entered into a treaty with the United States on October 14, 1864. Article 1 of the Treaty involved cession of approximately 20 million acres of land to the United States in return for the establishment of the Klamath Reservation. Article 1 also reserved to the Tribes the "exclusive right of taking fish in the streams and lakes, included in said reservation, and of gathering edible roots, seeds, and berries within its limits \* \* \*." Article 2 of the Treaty provided for payment for the cession of the Tribes' lands, and announced the purpose of promoting the Tribes in civilization, particularly agriculture. (Treaty of 1864.)

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

2. Article 1 of the Treaty of 1864 identifies the boundaries of the former reservation as follows:

Beginning upon the *eastern shore of the middle Klamath Lake, at the Point of Rocks, about twelve miles below the mouth of Williamson's River; thence following up said eastern shore to the mouth of Wood River; thence up Wood River to a point one mile north of the bridge at Fort Klamath; thence due east to the summit of the ridge which divides the upper and middle Klamath Lakes; thence along said ridge to a point due east of the north end of the upper lake; thence due east, passing the said north end of the upper lake, to the summit of the mountains on the east side of the lake; thence along said mountain to the point where Sprague's River is intersected by the Ish-tish-ea-wax Creek; thence in a southerly direction to the summit of the mountain, the extremity of which forms the Point of Rocks; thence along said mountain to the place of beginning.*

(Exs. 281-US-501 (emphasis added) and 281-US-500.)

3. Surveys of water boundaries that involve Indian land vary widely based upon the specific language of the treaty or act creating such interests. (Ex. 281-US-500, quoting from the *2009 Manual of Surveying Instructions for the Survey of Public Lands*.) Where a treaty or Executive Order used language such as “up” or “along” a given body of water, the boundary is interpreted as being located at some point within the river or stream channel. Several survey maps of the former reservation depict the western boundary within the Wood River, rather than using the eastern bank of the Wood as the boundary. (Exs. 281-US-500, and 281-US-502 through 507.)

4. During treaty negotiations, the location of proposed reservation boundaries was largely determined by the Tribes. The reservation boundaries were designed to protect marshlands, hunting grounds, and fisheries that provided the majority of the Tribes' subsistence needs. (Exs. 281-US-100 and 281-US-102.)

5. In 1975, the United States, as trustee for the Tribes, filed a lawsuit in federal court against several water users in the Klamath Basin, primarily along the Wood River and its tributaries. The government sought to establish the priorities of its claimed federal reserved water rights. In 1979, the District Court issued an opinion finding that the Klamath Tribes had an aboriginal water right to accompany their right to hunt, fish, trap and gather on the former reservation lands. The court further found that the Termination Act of 1954 did not extinguish those aboriginal rights. The court considered the Tribes' exercise of its aboriginal rights to hunt, fish, trap and gather<sup>10</sup> to be one of the primary purposes of the Treaty of 1864. *U.S. v. Adair*, 478 F.Supp. 336 (1979) (*Adair I*).

6. In 1983, the Ninth Circuit affirmed *Adair I*, concluding that the District Court had been correct but adding its own ideas about the quantification process. *U.S. v. Adair*, 723 F.2d 1394 (1983) cert den (1984) (*Adair II*).

---

<sup>10</sup> The fish, animal, and plant species subject to the Tribes' aboriginal rights are referred to throughout this order as “treaty resources.”

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

*Species subject to the Tribes' treaty rights.*

7. The Tribes' culture, cosmology, and way of life are based upon hunting, fishing, gathering, and trapping in their aboriginal homeland. Treaty resources provide food, clothing and tools for tribal families. Treaty resources are also central to the Tribes' religious and cultural practices and have been so since before creation of the reservation. This is demonstrated by the Tribes' Return of C'waam and First Salmon Ceremonies. (Exs. 281-KT-75 and 281-KT-1, 281-US-100, and 281-US-124.)

8. Treaty resources include several species of fish traditionally taken from rivers and streams within the former reservation by tribal members. These species include various types of trout, as well as various species of suckers (referred to by the Tribes as c'waam). Before construction of dams downstream of the former reservation land, tribal members also fished large quantities of salmon from these rivers and streams. Tribal members gather crayfish from hiding places where riparian vegetation overhangs the river and stream banks. Tribal families also harvest freshwater mussels from beds within the rivers and streams. (Exs. 281-KT-1, 281-KT-75, 281-US-100, 281-US-124, and 281-US-400.)

9. In 1986, the Tribes voluntarily closed the sucker fishery due to declining populations of these fish. In 1988, the suckerfish was classified as an endangered or threatened species according to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. §1531 et seq.). (Ex. 281-KT-1.)

10. Prior to construction of dams downstream of the former reservation, salmon provided up to one-half of the food necessary for subsistence of tribal members each year. Construction of dams downstream of the former reservation has prevented salmon from entering the rivers and streams on the former reservation. (Exs. 281-US-100 and 281-US-124.)

11. Presently, several treaty species of fish inhabit the Wood River and its tributaries including, Redband trout, Lost River sucker, Shortnose sucker, and Klamath Largescale sucker. Historically, salmon were also present throughout the Wood River and its tributaries. (Exs. 281-US-400, 281-US-100, 281-US-107, and 281-US-121.)

12. Traditionally, the Tribes have hunted and trapped several species on former reservation land. These include but are not limited to deer, elk, antelope, bear, beaver, rabbit, ducks, and geese. Tribal members also harvest duck and goose eggs from riparian areas along the streams within the former reservation. Historically, tribal members would move to hunting camps along rivers and streams within the basin for the summer months. Some tribal families continue this practice today. (Exs. 281-KT-1, 281-KT-5 through 281-KT-8, and 281-KT-75.)

13. Tribal members traditionally gather several varieties of riparian plant species for use as food or medicine, as well as making traditional hunting and gathering tools. In addition, many riparian plant species are used in traditional tribal ceremonies. These species include apos, aspen trees, camas, cattail roots, chokecherries, currants, dock seeds, elderberries, foxtail grass and seeds, Klamath plums, Oregon grapes, and other wild berries and roots. Several species of trees found in these riparian habitats provide means of drying fish as well as wood for tool making.



These include, lodge pole pine, aspen, cottonwood, and willow. (Ex. 281-KT-1, 281-KT-4, and 281-KT-75.)

14. Of particular importance among plant species gathered by the Tribes are pond lily seed pods, referred to as "wocus." At one time, the wocus constituted a staple of the Tribes, second only to fish. Reduced water levels on former reservation land have negatively impacted wocus quantity and quality. (Exs. 281-US-124, 281-KT-75, 281-KT-83, and 281-KT-84.)

15. Species hunted and trapped by the Tribes use riparian environments within the former reservation as cover, forage, nesting, and giving birth. A healthy riparian environment is necessary to attract many species subject to the Tribes aboriginal rights. Likewise, a healthy riparian environment is necessary for the propagation of plant species harvested by the Tribes. (Exs. 281-KT-1, 281-US-300, and 281-US-600.)

#### *Claims and contests.*

16. On or about April 29, 1997,<sup>11</sup> the Klamath Tribes filed a Statement and Proof of Claim to the Use of Surface Waters of the Klamath River and its Tributaries<sup>12</sup> (Claim 612). Through Claim 612, the Tribes adopted each claim filed by the BIA as trustee on behalf of the Tribes.<sup>13</sup> On October 1, 1999, the Tribes filed an Amended Statement and Proof of Claim. This Amended Claim 612 adopted and incorporated the amended claims filed by the BIA. (OWRD Ex. 1 at 6 through 64.)

17. On April 30, 1997, the BIA filed Claims 668 through 670. On October 1, 1999, the BIA filed amendments to each of these claims. Each claim identified instream flows within the Wood River and its tributaries, which the BIA purported were necessary to fulfill the purposes of the reservation created by the Treaty of October 14, 1864 between the United States and the Klamath Tribes. Each claim filed identifies stream flow quantities, in cubic feet per second (cfs), broken down by month. The priority date for each claim was declared to be "time immemorial." Each of the claims originally claimed reserved water rights measured by three distinct components: physical habitat, riparian habitat maintenance, and structural habitat maintenance. (OWRD Exs. 46 through 48.)

18. Claim 668 claimed instream flows in a reach of the Wood River extending from Annie Creek to Agency Lake. The claimed reach is approximately nine miles in length with the northernmost mile extending beyond the boundary of the former reservation. The remainder of the claimed reach makes up an approximately eight mile segment of the western border of the former reservation. The claim asserted a water right for the three components for the period January 1 through December 31 each year. The claimed flows for physical habitat ranged from 130 cfs to 200 cfs. The claimed flows for riparian habitat maintenance ranged from 320 cfs to

<sup>11</sup> Consistent with the claim filings of the BIA, the letter from the Tribes counsel transmitting Claim 612 to OWRD is dated April 30, 1997. However, Claim 612 bears a date stamp from OWRD indicating the department received the claim on April 29, 1997.

<sup>12</sup> Statement and Proof of Claims are referred to throughout this order simply as claims.

<sup>13</sup> For the purposes of this order, Claim 612 incorporates Claims 668 through 670.

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM OREGON

426 cfs. The claimed flows for structural habitat maintenance identified a trigger flow of 290 cfs and a cap flow of 510 cfs. (OWRD Ex. 46 at 1 through 7.)

19. Claim 668 identifies the upper and lower reach boundaries longitude and latitude coordinates as well as township-range designations. The township-range description for the upper reach boundary is identified as Township 33 south, Range 7.5 east, Section 10, Southeast  $\frac{1}{4}$ , Southwest  $\frac{1}{4}$  (T 33S, R 7.5E, S 10, SE  $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW  $\frac{1}{4}$ ), distance from SW corner N  $65^{\circ} 15'37''$  E, 1,942.1 ft. The lower reach boundary is identified as T 34S, R 7.5E, S 24, SW  $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW  $\frac{1}{4}$ , distance from SW corner N  $78^{\circ} 41'24''$  E, 1,211.8 ft. (OWRD Ex. 46 at 20.)

20. In 1999, the BIA filed an Amended Statement and Proof of Claim for Claim 668. In the amended claim, the BIA adjusted the claimed flows to accurately reflect hydrologic data that became available between 1997 and 1999. The amended flows for physical habitat ranged from 130 cfs to 200 cfs. The amended flows for riparian habitat maintenance ranged from 248 cfs to 392 cfs. The amended flows for structural habitat maintenance ranged from 132 to 510 cfs. The BIA based the physical habitat and riparian habitat maintenance claims on a 20 percent exceedence flow level. (OWRD Ex. 46 at 15 through 20.)

21. In December 2009, Claimants filed their written direct testimony and exhibits. Claimants' evidence reflected downward adjustments of Claim 668. These downward adjustments resulted from basin wide stream flow estimates developed by OWRD between 2000 and 2004 as well as basin wide studies of the physical and riparian habitats, conducted by BIA's experts. The updated claim was capped at the lesser of 66-percent of the median stream flow or the 1999 claim, whichever was lower. (Exs. 281-US-200, 281-US-205, 281-US-300, 281-US-312, 281-US-400, and 281-US-432; test. of Chapin and Ramey.)

22. Claim 669 claimed instream flows in a reach of Crooked Creek extending from the source of Crooked Creek to the Wood River. The claim asserted a water right for the three components for the period January 1 through December 31 each year. The claimed flows for physical habitat were stated as 100 for each month. The claimed flows for riparian habitat maintenance ranged from 100 cfs to 107 cfs. The claimed flows for structural habitat maintenance identified a trigger flow of 92 cfs and a cap flow of 178 cfs. (OWRD Ex. 47 at 1 through 6.)

23. Claim 669 identifies the upper and lower reach boundaries longitude and latitude coordinates as well as township-range designations. The township-range description for the upper reach boundary is identified as T 33S, R 7.5E, S 26, NW  $\frac{1}{4}$ , NE  $\frac{1}{4}$ , distance from NE corner S  $59^{\circ} 38'53''$  W, 2,564.0 ft. The lower reach boundary is identified as T 34S, R 7.5E, S 25, NW  $\frac{1}{4}$ , NW  $\frac{1}{4}$ , distance from NE corner S  $89^{\circ} 13'50''$  W, 1,567.1 ft. (OWRD Ex. 47 at 19.)

24. In 1999, the BIA filed an Amended Statement and Proof of Claim for Claim 669. In the amended claim, the BIA adjusted the claimed flows to accurately reflect hydrologic data that became available between 1997 and 1999. The amended flows for physical habitat were reduced to 88 cfs for each month. The amended flows for riparian habitat maintenance ranged from 91 cfs to 123 cfs. The amended flows for structural habitat maintenance ranged from 31 to 178 cfs.

The BIA based the physical habitat and riparian habitat maintenance claims on a 20 percent exceedence flow level. (OWRD Ex. 47 at 14 through 19.)

25. In December 2009, Claimants filed their written direct testimony and exhibits. Claimants' evidence reflected downward adjustments of Claim 669. These downward adjustments resulted from basin wide stream flow estimates developed by OWRD between 2000 and 2004 as well as basin wide studies of the physical and riparian habitats, conducted by BIA's experts. The updated claim was capped at the lesser of 66-percent of the median stream flow or the 1999 claim, whichever was lower. (Exs. 281-US-200, 281-US-205, 281-US-300, 281-US-312, 281-US-400, and 281-US-432; test. of Chapin and Ramey.)

26. Claim 670 claimed instream flows in a reach of Fort Creek extending from Reservation Spring to the Wood River. The claim asserted a water right for the three components for the period January 1 through December 31 each year. The claimed flows for physical habitat were stated as 103 cfs for each month. The claimed flows for riparian habitat maintenance ranged from 103 cfs to 115 cfs. The claimed flows for structural habitat maintenance identified a trigger flow of 94 cfs and a cap flow of 126 cfs. (OWRD Ex. 48 at 1 through 4.)

27. In 1999, the BIA filed an Amended Statement and Proof of Claim for Claim 670. In the amended claim, the BIA adjusted the claimed flows to accurately reflect hydrologic data that became available between 1997 and 1999. The amended flows for physical habitat were reduced to 97 cfs for each month. The amended flows for riparian habitat maintenance were set at 107 cfs for each month. The amended flows for structural habitat ranged from 36 cfs to 126 cfs. The BIA based the physical habitat and riparian habitat maintenance claims on a 20 percent exceedence flow level. (OWRD Ex. 48 at 12 through 16.)

28. Claim 670 identifies the upper and lower reach boundaries longitude and latitude coordinates as well as township-range designations. The township-range description for the upper reach boundary is identified as T 33S, R 7.5E, S 23, NW ¼, NE ¼, distance from NE corner S 65°50'56" W, 1,759.5 ft. The lower reach boundary is identified as T 33S, R 7.5E, S 34, NE ¼, NE ¼, distance from NE corner S 41° 25'52" W, 1,578.7 ft. (OWRD Ex. 48 at 16.)

29. In December 2009, Claimants filed their written direct testimony and exhibits. Claimants' evidence reflected downward adjustments of Claim 670. These downward adjustments resulted from basin wide stream flow estimates developed by OWRD between 2000 and 2004 as well as basin wide studies of the physical and riparian habitats, conducted by BIA's experts. The updated claim was capped at the lesser of 66-percent of the median stream flow or the 1999 claim, whichever was lower. (Exs. 281-US-200, 281-US-205, 281-US-300, 281-US-312, 281-US-400, and 281-US-432; test. of Chapin and Ramey.)

30. Several treaty species utilize all or part of Claims 668, 669, and 670 to fulfill biological needs. These include Redband and Bull trout, Lost River suckers, as well as Klamath Large Scale, and Shortnose suckers. In addition, historically, Chinook salmon used all or part of the waters subject to Claims 668, 669 and 670 to fulfill important biological needs. (Exs. 279-US-400 and 279-US-300.)

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

31. The BIA based the physical habitat and riparian habitat maintenance claims, for all claims updated in 2009, on a 50-percent exceedance flow level rather than the previous 20-percent exceedance level. (Ex. 281-US-200; test. of Chapin and Ramey.)

*Stream flow estimates provided by OWRD.*

32. In the late 1980's and early 1990's, the Oregon legislature determined it was necessary to establish a water availability program in Oregon. The purpose of the program was to determine how much water was available for appropriation in any given stream. OWRD was tasked with developing a standard for determining and a methodology for calculating the availability of surface water for appropriation. (Test. of Cooper.)

33. OWRD developed a method to estimate the natural stream flow in watersheds throughout Oregon.<sup>14</sup> This method calculated the 80 percent exceedance flow using stream gauge data and a statistical methodology called regional regression analysis. The numerical model used to perform the statistical analysis consists of computer programs and various data sets available to OWRD. OWRD's method calculated the 80-percent exceedance flow based on mean daily flows. (Test. of Cooper; Ex. 281-OWRD-65.)

34. The exceedance stream flow statistic is an estimate of how often a given stream is expected to exceed a reported flow level. Therefore, an 80-percent exceedance flow indicates that a given rate of stream flow will be exceeded 80-percent of the time. Likewise, a 50-percent exceedance flow for a given stream indicates that stream flows therein will exceed the reported level at least 50-percent of the time. (Test. of Cooper; Ex. 281-OWRD-65.)

35. In 2002, Richard M. Cooper, PE,<sup>15</sup> developed a report entitled, Determining Surface Water Availability in Oregon (Open File Report SW 02-002), referred to herein as "Cooper 2002." Cooper 2002 describes the methodology employed by OWRD for determining surface water availability. (Exs. 281-OWRD-65 and 281-OWRD-69.)

36. In 2004, Mr. Cooper developed a report entitled, Natural Flow Estimates for Streams in the Klamath Basin (Open File Report SW 04-001), referred to herein as "Cooper 2004." Cooper 2004 applied the methodologies developed in Cooper 2002 to estimate natural 50-percent exceedance stream flows for watersheds in the Klamath Basin. (Test. of Cooper; Exs. 281-OWRD-65 and 281-OWRD-68.)

37. The estimates in Cooper 2004 used stream flow data from multiple sources including the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the United States Forest Service (USFS), and

---

<sup>14</sup> Natural stream flow refers to the estimated level of stream flow that would occur without consumptive or storage uses from the stream. Consumptive uses include withdrawals for irrigation, domestic, municipal, and other uses. Natural stream flow is also referred to as undepleted stream flow throughout this order.

<sup>15</sup> Richard Cooper is a Registered Professional Engineer and a Master of Agricultural Engineering. Mr. Cooper has over 20 years of experience as an agricultural engineer. OWRD employed Mr. Cooper as Natural Resource Specialist 4 (Hydrologist) from 1992 until approximately 2009. Mr. Cooper maintained primary responsibility for OWRD's Water Availability Program during his employment. (Exs. 281-OWRD-67 and 281-OWRD-65.)

OWRD's own gauge measurements. The stream flow measurements were compiled in two hydrographics databases segregating mean daily flow measurements from miscellaneous (instantaneous) measurements. Cooper 2004 also utilized consumptive use information based on data from USGS and from OWRD's Water Rights Information System (WRIS), as well as various other data pertaining to characteristics of watersheds. OWRD analyzed watershed data using a Geographic Information System (GIS) developed by Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc., called ARC/INFO 7.2.1. OWRD compiled all data available up through 1999. (Ex. 281-OWRD-65.)

38. OWRD established a base period of 1958 through 1987 for watershed measurements at index stations.<sup>16</sup> OWRD collected measurements for the base period from approximately 90 index stations. OWRD also collected measurements from numerous other gauges with shorter records than the index stations. OWRD was able to correct the short-term records to the base period so long as the two had a concurrent period of record. (Test. of Cooper; Exs. 281-OWRD-69 and 281-US-200.)

39. Use of a 30-year base period is the standard set by the World Meteorological Organization (WRO) to represent the normal range of conditions that exist at a given site. The USGS and other federal and state agencies follow the standard set by the WRO. (Exs. 281-OWRD-65 and 281-US-200; test. of Cooper.)

40. For watersheds without stream flow measurements available, OWRD utilized watershed characteristic data to develop regional regression equations used to estimate stream flows using the methodology identified in Cooper 2002. This data included nine different watershed characteristics including area, relief, slope, aspect, mean January and July precipitation, mean January maximum temperature, mean July minimum temperature, and soil permeability. This allowed OWRD to extrapolate stream flow estimates for watersheds upstream of a gauging station. (Exs. 281-OWRD-65 and 281-US-200.)

41. A regional regression equation is a standard hydrologic technique that uses statistical regression models to estimate stream flow where flow data is not available. Such an equation is based on the premise that stream flow characteristics can be estimated from various watershed characteristics and can be quantified in a mathematical form. (Ex. 281-US-200.)

42. OWRD also used several computer programs, some written by Mr. Cooper, and other data to verify and/or correct stream flow estimates generated through regional regression analysis to match stream flows at downstream gauges. (Ex. 281-OWRD-65; test. of Cooper.)

43. Claimant BIA's expert, Michael Ramey, PE, reviewed OWRD's methodologies for estimating stream flows as well as its application of those methodologies to the Klamath Basin. Mr. Ramey compared OWRD's estimates of undepleted stream flow with those of the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) and found OWRD's results to be reasonable. Finally, Mr. Ramey, and his staff, performed confirmatory analyses of undepleted flows and found a reasonable correlation between these results and those estimated by OWRD. Based on these

---

<sup>16</sup> A 30-year base period is typical for hydrologic analysis. The period selected here provided the greater amount of data regarding stream flows in the Klamath Basin. (Test. of Cooper at 54 through 56.)

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

findings, Claimants elected to adopt OWRD's stream flow estimates for the purposes of updating the claimed instream flows. (Ex. 281-US-200; test. of Ramey.)

44. Mr. Ramey, using OWRD's estimates as foundation, provided the hydrologic basis (water availability) for the updated claims and worked closely with ecologist David Chapin, Ph.D., and senior fisheries scientist Dudley Reiser, Ph.D., to develop the riparian and physical habitat claims. (Exs. 281-US-200, 281-US-300, and 281-US-400.)

45. Estimating undepleted stream flows is common in hydrology in situations where long-term gauge records are unavailable or limited or where such long-term records reflect depleted, rather than undepleted, flows. (Ex. 281-US-200.)

*Development of physical and riparian habitat claims.*

46. The physical habitat claims are intended to identify the monthly stream flows necessary for instream fish habitat in a given reach. Dr. Reiser, in conjunction with a team of fisheries biologists, aquatic ecologists, riparian ecologists, aquatic entomologists, water quality specialists, hydrologists and hydrologic engineers, developed the physical habitat claims after more than 20 years of scientific work on the project. (Exs. 281-US-200 and 281-US-400.)

47. The physical habitat claims are designed to ensure instream flows necessary to establish and maintain a healthy and productive habitat for fish species subject to the Tribes' treaty rights. In this context, habitat refers to the instream environment in which fish species exists throughout all stages of their life cycles as well as the surrounding environments (riparian) that provide material support to the instream environment. Instream environments provide living space, food, protection from predation, and spawning area. The riparian area bordering the stream contributes food, nutrients, cover, and shade protection for instream fish species. (Exs. 281-US-400, 281-US-432, and 281-US-300.)

48. Several of the treaty species are adfluvial species, meaning they spend most of their lives in the Upper Klamath Lake but migrate into streams for spawning purposes. Other treaty species, like salmon, are anadromous salmonids, meaning they live their adult lives in saltwater environments but migrate up freshwater rivers and streams for spawning. Salmon species historically present in the basin migrated from the Pacific Ocean in order to spawn in the streams of the Upper Klamath Basin. (Exs. 281-US-400, 281-US-100, and 281-US-124.)

49. A healthy and productive physical habitat must provide sufficient water to meet the needs of fish species in a manner that permits fish to exist in stable condition and reproduce in order to provide a sustainable population. To accomplish this, the physical habitat must have sufficient flows to support all lifestages of treaty species including spawning, egg incubation, fry, juvenile, and into adulthood. At present, the abundance of most treaty species has been severely diminished due, in part, to reduced streamflows in the Upper Klamath Basin. Currently, most treaty fish species are not capable or supporting any kind of harvest practice. (Exs. 281-US-400 and 281-US-432, see also, 281-US-402.)

50. Dr. Reiser developed habitat-flow relationships using the Instream Flow Incremental Methodology coupled with Physical Habitat Simulation models (IFIM/PHABSIM). This methodology allowed Dr. Reiser to ascertain the relationship between the quantity of fish habitat in the stream and the amount of water in the stream. The Physical Habitat Simulation system is an integrated collection of hydraulic and microhabitat simulation models designed to quantify the amount of microhabitat available for a target species over a wide range of stream flows. Dr. Reiser determined this methodology was appropriate for runoff-dominated as well as spring-dominated streams within the basin. (Exs. 281-US-200 and 281-US-400.)

51. IFIM/PHABSIM is a common method used by fisheries biologists to evaluate the incremental change in both quantity and quality of fish habitat with stream flow change. This method also evaluates habitat quantity and quality for the various life stages of the target species. IFIM/PHABSIM accomplishes this by combining information and data pertaining to physical and hydraulic characteristics of a stream with information that describes the habitat preferences of different fish species and lifestages. Dr. Reiser used the IFIM/PHABSIM methodology to develop both species and lifestage-specific relationships between habitat and flow (habitat-flow relationship). Dr. Reiser applied this method to all claims with the exception of Claim 649. (Exs. 281-US-200, 281-US-205, 281-US-400, and 281-US-432; test. of Ramey.)

52. Because data collection was not possible for Claim 654, Dr. Reiser used the Tennant Method to develop the physical habitat claim. The Tennant Method is a hydrologic-based approach to determining instream flow needs. This method projects fish habitat needs based on a percentage of the average annual flow for a stream reach. Dr. Reiser and Mr. Ramey utilized stream flow data provided by OWRD, in Cooper 2004, as a basis for the Tennant Method calculations. (Exs. 281-US-200 and 281-US-400; test. of Ramey.)

53. In a habitat-flow relationship, the amount of physical habitat typically increases as stream flow increases until a peak value is reached. Thereafter, higher stream flows can result in a reduction in the quantity of habitat. In this case, Dr. Reiser found the habitat-flow relationships for certain claims indicated the amount of productive physical habitat continued to increase as stream flow increased, with no apparent peak value. Dr. Reiser and Mr. Ramey observed this continuing increase at modeled stream flows higher than those typically found in the streams at issue. Dr. Reiser and Mr. Ramey, therefore, decided it was necessary to limit or cap the claims for each stream reach. Dr. Reiser determined the monthly median stream flows (50-percent exceedance value), calculated by Mr. Ramey, would be an appropriate cap for each claim for physical habitat. (Exs. 281-US-200 and 281-US-400; test. of Ramey.)

54. Use of the IFIM/PHABSIM methodology required extensive data collection. To accomplish this, Dr. Reiser followed a detailed nine-step process to ensure sufficient information necessary to support the physical habitat claims.<sup>17</sup> (Ex. 281-US-400).

<sup>17</sup> Dr. Reiser identifies the nine steps as follows:

- Step 1- Identification and Selection of Claim Reaches and Study Sites;
- Step 2- Selection of Target Fish Species;
- Step 3- Determine Species Distribution and Lifestage Periodicity;
- Step 4- Lifestage and Species Prioritization;
- Step 5- Development of Species Habitat Suitability Criteria (HSC) Curves;

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

55. Both the 1999 Amended Claims and the updated claims presented in 2009 used IFIM/PHABSIM as a basis for claimed flows. Between 1999 and 2009, Dr. Reiser and Mr. Ramey continued to collect data from existing and newly established study sites, and obtained new information on water availability in the basin, primarily from Cooper 2004. Based on this new information, Dr. Reiser and Mr. Ramey were able to update the claims to reflect lower instream flows. The updated claims are either lower than, or equal to, the 1999 Amended Claims. Dr. Reiser determined the instream flows reflected in the updated physical habitat claims are sufficient to provide healthy and productive habitats within the streams. Dr. Reiser also concluded these levels meet, but to do not exceed, the habitat needs of the target fish species. (Exs. 281-US-300, 281-US-320, 281-US-400, and 281-US-432.)

56. The updated claims present two components of the claimed flows; physical habitat flows and conditional physical habitat flows. The physical habitat flows are based upon the needs of treaty species present in the basin at this time. The conditional habitat flows are based upon the needs of anadromous species that have been extirpated from the basin. Because efforts are underway to reintroduce such species into the basin, Claimants determined it was necessary to claim flows sufficient to create a healthy and productive habitat to support anadromous fish traditionally relied upon by the Tribes. Claimants intend the conditional physical habitat claims to become effective only upon successful reintroduction of anadromous species, such as Chinook salmon, into the basin. The conditional physical habitat claims only apply during months when anadromous species are likely to utilize streams in the basin for migration to and from spawning/rearing habitats. (Ex. 281-US-400.)

57. The riparian habitat is the zone of direct interaction between terrestrial and aquatic environments, or the vegetation adjacent to a stream that depends on water from the stream. Riparian vegetation provides necessary functions to a stream's ecosystem. These include providing shade and cover for fish, stability along the stream bank, and organic matter that serves as food for various organisms within the stream. Such vegetation is also crucial in controlling stream temperatures. Healthy riparian vegetation is essential to ensure high quality fish habitat within the stream. (Exs. 281-US-300 and 281-US-400; test. of Chapin.)

58. Certain riparian habitats benefit from periodic, springtime, inundation caused by flows that exceed the streams capacity and overflow the stream channel. These high, or flood, flows scour the floodplain creating open sites for riparian plant seedlings to germinate. These flows also deposit beneficial sediments from the stream channel onto the floodplain. In addition, high flows replenish moisture in riparian soils that are important for the continued growth and maturity of riparian plants. High flows also serve to extinguish noxious weeds that may be harmful to riparian plant species. (Exs. 281-US-300 and 281-US-200; test. of Chapin.)

---

Step 6- Field Data Collection;  
Step 7- Instream Flow Hydraulic and Habitat Modeling;  
Step 8- Hydrologic Limitations- Median Flow Threshold; and  
Step 9- Other Flow Considerations- Limitation of 1999 Amended Flow Claim.

(Ex. 281-US-400 at VII-8 through VII-9.)



59. The riparian habitat claims are intended to identify the monthly stream flows necessary to establish and sustain a healthy and productive riparian habitat for fish, wildlife, and plant species subject to the Tribes' treaty rights. Healthy riparian vegetation is dependent on water from the adjacent stream or from alluvial aquifers directly associated with the stream. To determine the flows necessary to establish and sustain healthy and productive riparian habitats, David Chapin, Ph. D., performed two studies within the basin, a cottonwood tree ring study and a riparian high flow study. (Exs. 281-US-200, and 281-US-300; test. of Chapin.)

60. Dr. Chapin determined the streams within the basin fell into two categories; spring dominated and runoff dominated. Spring-dominated streams are those that rely primarily on underground springs for instream flows. In contrast, runoff-dominated streams rely primarily on precipitation and snowmelt for instream flows. Dr. Chapin further divided the runoff-dominated streams into those with floodplains and those without floodplains due to steep gradients and/or narrow channel widths. (Exs. 281-US-200 and 281-US-300; test. of Chapin.)

61. To determine the amount of water necessary to establish and maintain a healthy and productive riparian habitat, Dr. Chapin conducted a study of cottonwood tree rings at selected sites in the basin (cottonwood study). Dr. Chapin selected black cottonwood trees as an indicator of riparian habitat health and productivity. The use of indicator species as surrogates for ecological conditions is a common practice in ecology and recognized by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Dr. Chapin determined cottonwood trees to be representative of ecological conditions in the basin based upon several factors including their importance to the riparian environment in many parts of the basin and their close relationship to willows, which exist in large numbers throughout most riparian environments in the basin. (Exs. 281-US-300 and 281-US-200; test. of Chapin.)

62. Dr. Chapin determined that the relationship between growth and stream discharge should be similar for cottonwoods and willows due to similarities in vegetative and reproductive characteristics. Willows are generally more sensitive to decreases in stream discharge than are cottonwoods. As such, Dr. Chapin determined that the use of cottonwoods would be a reasonable, albeit conservative, indicator for estimating riparian habitat flow requirements. Dr. Chapin also determined it was appropriate to use cottonwood trees as a surrogate for riparian environments in the basin where cottonwoods were not present. This was based, in part, on the presence of willows throughout those riparian environments. Dr. Chapin also selected cottonwood trees because they are the only riparian species in the Upper Klamath Basin that retains a long enough record of growth that can be related to stream discharge. (Ex. 281-US-300; test. of Chapin.)

63. Between December 2000 and September 2003, Dr. Chapin extracted core samples from the trunks of several cottonwood trees at various test sites within the basin. Dr. Chapin then measured the tree ring width using the core samples and analyzed these widths in response to several variables including stream discharge, precipitation, and temperature. Dr. Chapin determined stream discharge was generally the most important environmental factor influencing the growth of cottonwoods at the test sites. From this data, Dr. Chapin was able to determine reduced stream flows between the months of April through September reduce the health of

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

riparian environments in the basin. (Exs. 281-US-300, 281-US-315 through 281-US-319; test. of Chapin.)

64. Based upon the cottonwood study, Dr. Chapin determined the stream flows needed for a healthy riparian habitat. Specifically, Dr. Chapin concluded all stream reaches in this case required a minimum flow equal to 66-percent of the monthly median flows during the months of March through November. This conclusion serves as the basis for the updated base flow claims. (Exs. 281-US-200 and 281-US-300; test. of Chapin.)

65. Because all reaches subject to claims asserted herein are spring-dominated, Dr. Chapin determined high flow claims would be inappropriate. Therefore, Claimants made only claims for base flows to support riparian habitats. (Exs. 281-US-300, and 281-US-200; test. of Chapin.)

66. The updated physical, including conditional claims, and riparian habitat base flow claims are represented in Table X-1 of the Affidavit and Direct Testimony of Dudley W. Reiser and incorporated by reference as Attachment A to this order. (281-US-400 at X-3 through X-5.)

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The claimed instream flows are necessary to establish a healthy and productive habitat to allow the exercise of the Klamath Tribes' hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering rights guaranteed by the treaty of 1864.

2. The western boundary of the former reservation, as it relates to the Wood River, incorporates the waters of the Wood River. Claims for instream flows along this border are within the former reservation for purposes of this adjudication.

3. Claimants are entitled to claim instream flows outside the boundaries of the former reservation for Claim 668 in order to fulfill the purposes of the reservation.

4. The Tribes' treaty rights have not been extinguished on lands no longer owned by the Tribes.

5. The Klamath Restoration Act of 1986 did not limit the restoration of the Tribes' treaty rights on former reservation land.

6. A determination of whether Claimants must subordinate their claims based upon stipulated agreements to settle other claims in this adjudication is inappropriate in this order.

#### OPINION

##### *I. Burden of proof.*

The parties in this matter have spent significant amounts of time arguing various interpretations and applications of the burdens of proof applicable to this and other cases

involving Claimants' instream water rights claims. Much of this argument stems from competing interpretations of the district court's opinion in *United States v. Adair*, 478 F. Supp. 336 (1979) (*Adair I*), the Ninth Circuit's opinion in *United States v. Adair*, 723 F. 2d 1394 (1983) (*Adair II*), and the Amended Order on Motions for Rulings on Legal Issues (Amended Order) issued by Administrative Law Judge Maurice "Skip" Russell on February 12, 2007.

As a starting point, in a contested case hearing, the proponent of a fact or position has the burden of proving that fact or position by a preponderance of the evidence. ORS 183.450(2) and (5); *Harris v. SAIF*, 292 Or 683, 690 (1982) (general rule regarding allocation of burden of proof is that the burden is on the proponent of the fact or position); *Cook v. Employment Div.*, 47 Or App 437 (1980) (in absence of legislation adopting a different standard, the standard in administrative hearings is preponderance of the evidence). Proof by a preponderance of the evidence means that the fact finder is convinced that the facts asserted are more likely true than false. *Riley Hill General Contractor v. Tandy Corp.*, 303 Or 390 (1987).

1. *Burden of proof under ORS Chapter 539 and the Administrative Procedures Act.*

In addition to the general standards of proof identified above, OWRD has expressly stated the allocation of the burden with regard to claims in this adjudication. The burden of establishing a claim to water in the Klamath Basin lies with the claimant whose claim is contested. ORS 539.110. A claimant of a water right must establish their claim by a preponderance of the evidence. OAR 690-0028-0040(1).

Contestants argue Claimants, in order to satisfy their burden, are required to quantify the Tribes' resource needs and show water claimed is necessary for the current exercise of the Tribes' treaty rights. I cannot agree.

Contestants' arguments advocate for the application of a burden of proof that exceeds the scope of this adjudication. As identified more fully below, the purpose of this adjudication is limited to the quantification of the Tribes' instream water rights necessary to fulfill the purposes of the reservation established by the Treaty of 1864. Limitations of that water right based on use of resources are beyond the scope of this adjudication and must be addressed, if at all, by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Likewise, to require Claimants to demonstrate the Tribes' "current exercise" of its treaty rights would exceed the scope of this adjudication and be extremely unhelpful. It is my opinion that the "as currently exercised" language found in the *Adair* line of cases and relied upon by UBC refers to the moderate living standard articulated by the court in *Adair II*. As discussed more fully below, the moderate living standard has no application to the quantification of the instream water rights at issue here; at least not at this stage.

Pursuant to the above statutes and rules, Claimants have the burden to establish their claims by a preponderance of the evidence. Failure to support the claims with reliable, probative, and substantial evidence is detrimental to such claims. See ORS 183.450(5). Having identified Claimants' burden is not, however, the end of the discussion.

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT

SALEM, OREGON

Contestants also have concurrent burdens in this matter. The evidence in these proceedings is confined to the subjects identified in the timely filed notice(s) of contest. *See*, ORS 539.110. Contestants are the proponents of each fact or position raised in the contests. As such, Contestants must present evidence to support each fact or position so raised. This burden of proof encompasses two burdens, the burden of production and the burden of persuasion. *Marvin Wood Products v. Callow*, 171 Or App 175 (2000) (Conceptually, the burden of proof encompasses two distinct burdens: the burden of producing evidence of a particular fact (*i.e.*, the burden of production), and the burden of convincing the trier of fact that the alleged fact is true (*i.e.*, the burden of persuasion)). To allow Contestants to assert contest grounds without supporting such contests with reliable, probative, and substantial evidence would be antithetical to the statutes and rules governing contested case proceedings generally and this adjudication specifically.

2. *The “moderate living” standard and its applicability to the quantification of instream water rights claimed by the Klamath Tribes and the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs.*

Throughout this adjudication, the parties have struggled with quantification standards and the application of the “moderate living” standard articulated by the court in *Adair II*. After much deliberation, I find the moderate living standard is inapplicable to this adjudication. On this point, I find myself in agreement with United States District Judge Owen Panner, as well as ALJs Barber and Russell. Judge Panner addressed the quantification standards and the moderate living standard in *United States v. Adair*, 187 F. Supp. 2d 1273 (2002) (*Adair III*), later vacated on ripeness grounds. While *Adair III* is not binding upon the parties, I find Judge Panner’s opinion provides instructive guidance on these and other issues relevant to the resolution of the claims before me.

In *Adair III*, Judge Panner declared:

[T]he assertion that the tribes are entitled only to some “minimum amount” of water is an incorrect statement of the law. In quantifying the right under *Adair I*, the Tribe is entitled to “whatever water is necessary to achieve” the result of supporting productive habitat. [Citation to *Adair I* omitted]. *Once the adjudicator has quantified the Tribes’ water rights under the principles announced in Adair I, the moderate living standard may be considered.*

\* \* \* \* \*

Under the traditional application of the moderate living standard, the initial quantification of a reserved right may be limited “if tribal needs may be satisfied by a lesser amount.” [Citation to *Fishing Vessel* omitted]. However, this case is unlike *Fishing Vessel* where the reserved right could be reduced without completely frustrating the purpose of the reservation. For example, if the tribes’ 50% allocation of the harvestable fish run at issue in *Fishing Vessel* would have been reduced to a 35% allocation, the reserved right would still survive after the reduction. In contrast, the Klamath Tribes’ reserved water right does not readily

lend itself to such a reduction. *Ultimately, the water level cannot be reduced to a level below that which is required to support productive habitat*, and the Tribes are entitled to “whatever water is necessary to achieve” the result of supporting productive habitat. \* \* \* Reducing the water below a level which would support productive habitat would have the result of abrogating the reserved rights.

*Adair III*, 187 F. Supp 2d at 1281 (emphasis added). Judge Panner correctly points out that application of the moderate living standard might be appropriate, but only *after* the adjudicator has quantified the Tribes’ water rights. As such, I believe this is an issue for resolution by the United States District Court or other court of general jurisdiction, not this tribunal.

The application of the moderate living standard would require economic and social analyses beyond the scope of this adjudication. It would likely require a year-by-year analysis of the Tribes’ harvest of treaty resources in conjunction with other, possibly innumerable economic resources available to each individual tribal member. The moderate living standard presents a question of “take” of treaty resources, not of quantity of available resources. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to apply the moderate living standard to the quantification of the Tribes water rights. It is possible the Tribes may exceed a moderate living through exploitation of treaty resources; nonetheless, I cannot envision a level of water in the Klamath Basin that would trigger such excess. Because the water rights at issue are non-consumptive, water allocated by such rights is not a resource to be directly exploited by the Tribes. Instead, it is the means by which healthy and productive instream and riparian habitats will be created and maintained to enable the Tribes to exercise their treaty rights.

A healthy and productive habitat may exist independent of the quantity of treaty resources harvested from it. The Tribes’ harvest practices, not the water right established herein, will drive their “take” of a given resource. Regardless of the take of a given treaty species necessary to provide the Tribes with a moderate living, the fact remains that the Tribes are entitled to a sufficient quantity of water to fulfill the purposes of the reservation, to wit, the exercise of the Tribes hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering rights. This requires sufficient water to maintain a healthy and productive habitat for all treaty species subject to harvest. The amount at which harvest of a given treaty species may cause the Tribes to exceed a moderate living standard is irrelevant to the quantification of water necessary to provide a healthy and productive habitat. As such, it is beyond the scope of these proceedings. The moderate living standard serves as a measure of the limits of the Tribes’ take of treaty resources. It is not, contrary to UBC’s assertions, the appropriate measure of a water right necessary for a healthy and productive habitat. Such considerations are beyond the scope of these quantification proceedings.

## *II. Sufficiency of Claimants’ proof.*

Next, Contestants argue Claimants’ proof is insufficient to establish the basis for a decree of water rights because it lacks the level of specificity demanded by UBC. I do not agree. Claimants have submitted substantial scientific data supporting each of the elements of the claimed water rights. Claimants’ evidence is the product of several years of study and modeling by a riparian habitat expert (Dr. Chapin), an expert fish biologist (Dr. Reiser). In addition,

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

Claimants' have submitted substantial evidence to support their decision to adopt stream flow estimates provided by OWRD after extensive review by an expert in hydrologic engineering with over 30 years of experience (Ramey, P.E.). As discussed below, these data are the product of more than 30 years of collection and analysis by expert hydrologists employed by OWRD and tasked with establishing accurate estimates of stream flows within the Klamath Basin.

In addition to the scientific evidence presented, Claimants have provided significant historical data to support the claimed treaty resources associated with claimed instream flows. This data focused on the historical use of identified treaty resources found both instream and in the surrounding riparian habitat. Such historical resource use data derives not only from Tribal members (Mitchell and Chocktoot) but also from an historian with numerous years of expertise in Native American tribes of the Western United States (Hart).

Contestants' arguments for a greater level of specificity in proof, than that offered by Claimants, essentially advocates for a standard of proof that exceeds a preponderance of the evidence. As discussed above, the standard applicable to this adjudication is proof by a preponderance of the evidence. Contestants provide no legal basis for deviating from this standard of proof. As such, Claimants' evidence is sufficient to prove their claims if it establishes such claims by a preponderance of the evidence. No greater level of proof will be required in this adjudication.

### *III. Updated claims.*

At the hearing, Contestants argued Claimants impermissibly amended the claims by changing the methodology used to calculate instream flow requirements. Contestants asserted this information was not raised in the Amended Contests because it was unknown to Contestants until Claimants filed their written direct testimony and exhibits in December 2010.

As an initial matter, it is important to distinguish between alterations to claims that constitute amended claims and those that simply update claims previously filed. UBC contends that, by changing the basis for and reducing the claimed flows, Claimants have presented amended claims in violation of the applicable statutes and administrative rules. Claimants assert, and OWRD agrees, that the lower claimed flows constitute nothing more than a partial withdrawal of the previous claimed flow. UBC does not contend that withdrawal of a claim, in whole or in part, is impermissible under the applicable laws and rules.

UBC relies on ORS 539.040(3)(a) and OAR 690-028-0027 to support its arguments against the claimed amounts set forth at the hearing. Unfortunately for UBC, these arguments find no support in the text of the statute or rule.

ORS 539.040(3)(a) provides, in relevant part:

For purposes of the Klamath Basin adjudication \* \* \* the claimant or owner shall present in writing all of the particulars necessary for determination of the right of the claimant or owner to contest the claims of others or to the use of the waters of a stream to which the claimant or owner lays claim.

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

OAR 690-028-0027 provides, in part:

\* \* \* \* \*

(2) A claimant shall provide supporting documentation of the methods used to estimate water quantities needed to satisfy the purpose or purposes of the reservation. Accepted methodologies for determining habitat needs include, but are not limited to:

(a) Instream Flow Incremental Methodology habitat suitability curves published in a series of technical reports by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;

(b) The Oregon Method developed by the Oregon State Game Commission \* \* \*;

(c) Forest Service Method developed by the Pacific Northwest Region USDA Forest Service, \* \* \*; and

(d) Environmental Basin Investigation Reports conducted by the Oregon State Game Commission between the mid-1960's and the mid-1970's.

ORS 539.040(3)(a) requires, *inter alia*, that a claimant provide sufficient information to allow OWRD to make a determination of the water right claimed, while the relevant portion of OAR 690-028-0027 requires a claimant provide documentation supporting the method used to calculate the claim. Neither of these provisions prohibits either a change in methodology or the submission of additional proof of claim at hearing.

UBC also relies on ORS 539.210 and OAR 690-030-0085. At first blush, UBC's arguments might find more traction under the provisions cited. A careful reading, however, coupled with OWRD's interpretation of the applicable rule, reveals UBC's arguments lack merit.

ORS 539.210 provides, in relevant part:

Whenever proceedings are instituted for determination of rights to the use of any water, *it shall be the duty of all claimants interested therein to appear and submit proof of their respective claims, at the time and in the manner required by law.*

Any claimant who fails to appear in the proceedings and submit proof of the claims of the claimant shall be barred and estopped from subsequently asserting any rights theretofore acquired upon the stream or other body of water embraced in the proceedings, and shall be held to have forfeited all rights to the use of the water theretofore claimed by the claimant.

(Emphasis added.)

While it is true the cited statute places certain requirements and limitations on claim filings, nothing in the statute prohibits complete or partial withdrawal of claims. Further, the

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALMON DIVISION

statute does not prohibit a claimant from developing and presenting additional evidence or proof of their respective claims. Rather, in the context of this adjudication, the statute requires presentation of proof sufficient to establish *prima facie* evidence of a claim. This interpretation is supported by the general scheme of the Klamath Basin Adjudication and the administrative rules governing the filing of statements and proofs of claims.

ORS Chapter 539 governs the determination of pre-1909 water rights as well as water rights of federally recognized Indian tribes. As such, it establishes a framework for determining such rights on a stream-wide, or basin-wide, approach. As applied to the current adjudication, this chapter has been interpreted to require a claimant to submit a statement of claim along with enough evidence to allow OWRD to issue a Preliminary Evaluation (PE) of claim. Once OWRD has issued the PE, a contest period is opened to allow any interested party to file a contest to the claimed water right, *or* the PE. Therefore, a claimant who disagrees with the PE can file a contest to dispute the findings of OWRD. Contests filed within the prescribed period result in a contested case hearing at which a claimant is required to present evidence to support his or her claim, and contestants are entitled to present evidence in support of their contest(s). See, ORS 539.90 through 539.110.

If UBC's interpretation of the statute were to be accepted, the only opportunity for a claimant to present evidence in support of his or her claim would be at the time of filing the initial claim. This interpretation finds no support in the statute, the rules, or prior proceedings in this adjudication. In fact, such an interpretation would make contests of the PE, by a claimant, impermissible because no new evidence would be accepted by OWRD. This has not been the practice for individual claimants, many of whom now constitute the UBC, seeking to establish water rights. Instead, all claimants seeking to prove a claimed water right have been permitted to submit any relevant evidence at hearing.

In this matter, Claimants continued to gather and analyze data after the close of the contest period in order to support their claims in a contested case hearing. In the process, Claimants were able to refine many of the claims in such a way that reduced the amount of water claimed in a particular stream. Accordingly, at the hearing, Claimants updated their claims to reflect no greater amount than they were able to prove at hearing. Nothing in ORS 539.210 prohibits such claim refinement. Interestingly, UBC argues against this approach while simultaneously arguing Claimants' obligation to prove the amount of water claimed is the minimum amount necessary.

Finally, OAR 690-030-0085 governs amendments or alterations of claims and provides, in relevant part:

(1) \* \* \* [T]he Water Resources Director (Director) may not permit any alteration or amendment of the original claim after the period for inspection has commenced; but any new matter that the claimant may wish to set forth must be set forth in the form of an affidavit, regularly verified before a proper officer and filed with the Director prior to the close of the period for public inspection.



DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
ASHEM, OREGON

UBC asserts this provision prohibits any modification of the claims after the inspection period. Claimants and OWRD disagree. OWRD acknowledges the cited rule does prohibit claim amendments after the inspection period. Nonetheless, OWRD does not interpret the cited provision as prohibiting downward adjustments to claims because it does not view such adjustments as claim amendments. Rather, OWRD views downward adjustments to a claimed water right to be a partial withdrawal of the claimed water right. (OWRD Closing Argument at 6 and 7.) In this instance, OWRD's interpretation is entitled to deference.

An agency's interpretation of its own validly promulgated administrative rule is entitled to deference unless "inconsistent with the wording of the rule itself, or with the rule's context, or with any other source of law \* \* \*." *Don't Waste Oregon Com. v. Energy Facility Siting*, 320 Or 132, 142, 881 P2d 119 (1994). Pursuant to *Don't Waste Oregon*, an agency's interpretation is erroneous and therefore not entitled to deference only if it is: 1) implausible; 2) inconsistent with the wording of the rule; 3) inconsistent with the context of the rule; or 4) inconsistent with any other source of law. *Don't Waste Oregon*, 320 Or at 142.

Here, OWRD's interpretation of OAR 690-030-0085 cannot be said to be inconsistent with the wording or context of the rule, or with any other source of law. In essence, OWRD interprets "alteration or amendment of the original claim" to apply to amendments that change a claim in such a substantial way that they essentially create a new claim (*i.e.*, alterations claiming a more senior priority date, claiming a longer season of use, or claiming a greater amount of water, *etc.*). OWRD does not interpret the quoted phrase to prohibit downward adjustments of the original claim. Read in context of ORS Chapter 539 and OAR Chapter 690, OWRD's interpretation is plausible and consistent.

Beneficial use is the basis, the measure, and the limit of all water rights in Oregon. ORS 540.610(1). Beneficial use is defined as, "[r]easonably efficient use of water *without waste* for a purpose consistent with the laws and the best interests of the people of the state." OAR 690-250-0010(3), emphasis added. The laws and rules applicable to this adjudication, and water rights generally, require a claimant prove his or her ability to beneficially use the amount of water claimed. To adopt UBC's interpretation would require Claimants to claim a water right in excess of the amount they may be able to put to beneficial use. This is inconsistent with the context of ORS Chapter 539 and Oregon water law generally.

To the extent Claimants' updated claim constitute partial withdrawal of earlier claimed flows, they are not prohibited by statute or rule in this adjudication.

*IV. OWRD's stream flow estimates are the most reliable source of data available for the Klamath Basin.*

Contestants assert stream flow estimates provided by OWRD in this matter are insufficient to establish the basis for the claimed instream flows. Instead, Contestants advocate for the use of either individual (or spot) measurements or for adoption of measurements conducted by USBR. Contestants appear to argue OWRD was required to take physical measurements of each stream and reach in the basin. As discussed herein, to do so would be neither practical nor helpful in this adjudication.

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

ORS 539.120 imposes upon OWRD, the obligation to obtain a “measurement of the discharge of a stream.” The parties in this matter are at odds over the form such measurement must take. UBC assert that such measurement must consist of actual spot measurements of each stream and reach at issue. OWRD and Claimants take the position that the term “measurement” in this case may consist of estimates of stream discharge or flow. As discussed more fully herein, I find myself in agreement with OWRD and Claimants on this issue.

The statute provides no definition of the term “measurement,” therefore one must begin with the plain, ordinary meaning of the term. *PGE v. Bureau of Labor and Industries*, 317 Or 606, 611 (1993) (“[W]ords of common usage typically should be given their plain, natural, and ordinary meaning.”). The usual source for determining the ordinary meaning of statutory terms is a dictionary of common usage. *State v. Murray*, 340 Or 599, 604, 136 P3d 10 (2006) (“Absent a special definition, we ordinarily would resort to dictionary definitions, assuming that the legislature meant to use a word of common usage in its ordinary sense.”).

In this case, the dictionary provides multiple definitions of the term “measurement” including, “**1**: the act or process of measuring something. **2 a**: a figure expressing extent that is expressed by measuring; **b**: an area, quantity, degree, or capacity obtained by measuring.” *Webster's Third New Int'l Dictionary* 1400 (unabridged ed 2002). “Measuring” is the present participle of the verb “to measure.” Therefore, one must look to the definition of the root term, “measure.” Here, the dictionary again provides multiple definitions of the verb form of “measure” including, “**4 a**: to ascertain the quantity, mass, extent, or degree of in terms of a standard unit or fixed amount usu. by means of an instrument \* \* \*; **b**: to compute the size of (an area, object) from dimensional measurements \* \* \* [.]” *Ibid.*

In the context of ORS 539.120, it appears most appropriate to adopt a definition of the term “measurement” that requires OWRD to ascertain the quantity of discharge in the subject stream. The means by which OWRD accomplishes this task must also be examined in context of the statute.

As previously discussed, ORS Chapter 539 governs the determination of pre-1909 water rights as well as water rights of federally recognized Indian tribes. Such rights are generally determined for a particular season of use, depending upon the claimed use of water. Accordingly, it is important for OWRD, as the agency responsible for managing all water in Oregon, to develop an understanding of how much water is available in a given stream throughout the year. Instantaneous, or spot, measurements, while accurate as to place and time of those particular measurements, are ill suited for the purposes of determining stream-wide, year-round discharge rates. To the contrary, exceedance flow calculations provide a greater range of information and were determined to much more useful for these purposes. (See, Test. of Cooper at 36.) In this instance, OWRD ascertained the quantity of discharge of the streams through the use of methodologies developed and/or implemented by Mr. Cooper. These included long-term and short-term gauge measurements, computer modeling, and the use of statistical analyses including regional regression. I find these methods constitute measurements within the context of ORS 539.120.

Next, UBC asserts OWRD's streamflow estimates are unreliable and, therefore, cannot serve as the basis for the claimed flows. UBC advocates for the adoption of streamflow measurements found in USBR's *Natural Flow of the Upper Klamath River* (2005). Claimants and OWRD argue the Department's measurements are reliable and entitled to substantial deference in this matter. Again, I must agree with Claimants and OWRD on this issue.

Oregon courts have an extensive history of reliance upon OWRD's technical expertise, and that of its predecessors, in matters relating to the adjudication of water rights. See, *In Re Water Rights in Silvies River*, 115 Or. 27 (1925) and *In Re Waters of Deschutes River*, 165 Or. 435 (1940) (the findings of the state engineer are entitled to a presumption of correctness.). As identified above, OWRD is tasked, by statute, with measuring the discharge of a stream subject to adjudication. In this capacity, the courts defer to state agency as "the expert on the spot." *Deschutes River*, 165 Or. at 463, citing *Moyer v. Peabody*, 212 US 78 (1909).

Cooper 2004 provides comprehensive estimates of water availability throughout the entirety of the Upper Klamath Basin. This report is the result of several years of work compiling more than three decades of streamflow data. Cooper 2004 and its underlying methodologies were subjected to peer-review prior to adoption by OWRD. In addition, Claimants' expert hydrologic engineer performed an independent analysis of the methodologies in Cooper 2004 to determine whether the results were reasonable and reliable prior to adopting these results as a basis for the updated claims. While not a party to this adjudication, OWRD has made its methods and measurements available to all parties in order to facilitate resolution of the claims and contests. Contestants have presented no evidence indicating bias on the part of OWRD or, specifically, the results in the Cooper 2002 or 2004 reports. With regard to streamflow measurements and methodologies presented by OWRD, I find no reason not to defer to the Department as "the expert on the spot."

Based on the evidence presented, I find OWRD's estimates of streamflow in the Klamath Basin, contained in Cooper 2004, satisfy the Department's obligations under ORS 539.120. Further, I find OWRD's estimates of streamflow are entitled to deference in this matter. UBC has failed to demonstrate, by a preponderance of the evidence, that such measurements are incorrect or that the alternatives presented are entitled to greater weight. Accordingly, I find Claimant's reliance upon the estimates and methodologies contained in the Cooper 2002 and Cooper 2004 reports, as a basis for the claimed flows, to be reasonable.

*V. Claimants have demonstrated certain instream flow levels are necessary to establish and maintain a healthy and productive habitat for treaty species.*

As identified throughout this order, the purpose of this adjudication is the quantification of water rights within the Klamath Basin. Specifically at issue here is the quantification of the Tribes' instream water rights on former reservation land within the basin. Such water rights are limited by the amount of water necessary to allow the Tribes to exercise their treaty protected hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering rights. This amount has been interpreted, throughout this adjudication, as the amount of water necessary to establish and maintain a "healthy and productive habitat that will enable the Tribes to exercise their aboriginal rights." (Amended Order at 16.)

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

The Tribes' aboriginal rights apply to those species of fish, fowl, wildlife, and plants traditionally or historically relied upon by the Tribes for subsistence, cultural, and religious practices. At hearing, the Tribes demonstrated the extensive nature of treaty species that live within or rely upon the riparian habitat. The Tribes also demonstrated that, without a healthy and productive riparian habitat, these species have diminished in both quantity and quality. The Tribes also established traditional or historical reliance upon several species of fish, including extirpated anadromous species such as Chinook salmon. Moreover, the Tribes established several of these species are no longer harvestable due to reduced quantities resulting from decreased stream flows.

A healthy and productive habitat is one that will support a viable and self-renewing population of all treaty species to enable the Tribes to exercise their treaty protected rights. As identified previously, Claimants' burden in this matter is to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, the level of instream flow necessary in a given stream or reach to establish and maintain a healthy and productive habitat for treaty species. As discussed below, I find Claimants have satisfied their burden.

*1. Instream flows necessary for physical fish habitat.*

Certain treaty species rely on instream flows to provide the physical habitat in which they experience all or part of their life cycle. These include several species of trout and suckers, as well as mussels and crayfish. Historically, this also included at least two varieties of salmon. Anadromous species such as salmon live in saltwater environment but require freshwater streams and rivers for spawning, egg incubation, and juvenile rearing. Prior to construction of dams downstream of the former reservation, anadromous species migrated upstream from the Pacific Ocean into the rivers and streams of the Klamath Basin. Historically, the abundance of salmon in the basin made them a main staple of the Tribes, providing up to one half of tribal members' dietary reserves. Construction of dams below Upper Klamath Lake prevented anadromous species from accessing waters within the former reservation.

Claimants' instream flow claims seek to provide a healthy and productive physical habitat for treaty species currently present, albeit in diminished numbers, within the basin (physical habitat claims) as well as securing rights to water necessary to provide healthy and productive physical habitat for anadromous species once reintroduced to the basin (conditional physical habitat claims). Equally important to fish survival and abundance is the riparian habitat that provides cover and temperature control in the form of overhanging vegetation, protection in the form of woody debris that falls into the stream, and nutrients in the form of insect and plant life that falls into a stream. Without each of these components, fish species cannot exist in a healthy and productive state.

At the hearing, Claimants provided extensive evidence on the level of water necessary, in each claim, to provide a healthy and productive instream habitat. This evidence included extensive data collection, modeling and analysis from highly experienced fish biologists, ecologists, and hydrologic engineers. Claimants provided sufficient evidence to establish the methods and criteria selected were well accepted within the various industries and scientific

communities. Claimants correlated the information derived on habitat needs with information on water availability to determine the minimum amount of water necessary to establish and maintain a healthy and productive habitat for species currently present as well as the minimum amount necessary to provide the same habitat for anadromous species currently subject to reintroduction efforts by the Tribes and various other entities. In order to avoid claiming more water than necessary, Claimants capped the physical habitat claims as the lesser of the 50-percent exceedance level or the 1999 amended claim level.

Claimants derived the physical habitat requirements (current and conditional) using accepted methodologies. Primary among these was the IFIM/PHABSIM. This method has been used by fish biologists for several decades to determine instream flow needs. This method is also recognized by OWRD as an acceptable method for determining instream flows. *See*, OAR 690-028-0027(2). Where data collection for IFIM/PHABSIM was not possible, Claimants utilized the Tennant Method. This is also a well accepted method applied by fish biologist for more than 30 years. In developing the instream flow requirements for target fish species, Claimant considered the needs of those species throughout each lifestage in order to provide a healthy and productive habitat.

The conditional physical habitat claims identify instream flows necessary to provide a healthy and productive habitat for anadromous fish species which are not currently present in the basin. At present, such treaty species are prevented from reaching the basin by multiple dams downstream of Upper Klamath Lake. Nonetheless, the Tribes and other entities are working toward the reintroduction of anadromous species into the basin. If successful, salmon may once again be available for harvest by the Tribes. If unsuccessful, the conditional claims would never go into effect. As such, the conditional physical habitat claims represent water necessary to accomplish one of the primary purposes of the reservation once anadromous species are reintroduced. Undoubtedly, these claims cannot then be denied because anadromous species find their pathways into the basin impeded by dams.

The physical habitat claims and conditional physical habitat claims identified in Attachment A reflect the minimum amount of water necessary to establish and maintain healthy and productive instream habitats within the Upper Klamath Basin.

## *2. Instream flows for riparian plant and animal habitat.*

Several plant and animal species thrive within the riparian environments surrounding the streams in this case. Many of treaty species of plants are found nowhere else basin outside the riparian environments. Many of these plants serve as food staples for tribal members. Others have pharmacological or religious uses. Further, many wildlife treaty species hunted by the Tribes rely on the riparian environments for forage, shelter, and reproduction. The Tribes have seen these plant and animal species diminish as riparian areas shrink due to decreased water in the streams.

Claimants' riparian habitat base flow claims seek to capture the water necessary to establish and maintain healthy and productive riparian habitats for those treaty species dependent upon such environments. The base flow component seeks to maintain the minimum level of

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

streamflow necessary to support the riparian habitat through direct stream contact or contact with the alluvial aquifer.

To develop the riparian habitat claims, Claimants again engaged in extensive study of the basin environments to determine the minimum amount of water necessary to fulfill the purposes of the reservation. To this end, Dr. Chapin performed a detailed study of the basin using cottonwood trees as an indicator species to represent the health of given riparian area. Dr. Chapin selected cottonwood trees because they share many genetic characteristics with willows, a species found throughout the basin's riparian floodplains. Cottonwoods, unlike willows, grow to substantial sizes. This allows for detailed analysis of tree rings present in core samples. Dr. Chapin also determined cottonwoods would provide a conservative estimate of the water needs for the riparian habitat because cottonwood trees are not as sensitive to drought conditions as are willows.

By examining the core samples taken from several test sites within the basin, and correlating this information with historic streamflow data, Dr. Chapin was able to gauge the trees' response to various levels of streamflow. This allowed Claimants to extrapolate data about the health of riparian environments at given levels of streamflow.

Dr. Chapin also examined the extent of riparian areas above the stream. Dr. Chapin concluded that certain stream reaches, specifically those dominated by runoff from precipitation and/or snowmelt and having an identifiable floodplain, required flood flows during the spring months in order to maintain a healthy riparian habitat. Dr. Chapin determined that, because the reaches at issue here are spring-dominated, flood flow, or high flow, claims were inappropriate in this case.

I find Claimants have established, by a preponderance of the evidence, that certain base flow claims are necessary to establish and maintain a healthy and productive habitat. Further, I find Claimants have identified the minimum amount of water necessary, and no more, in the updated claims.

*VI. The waters of the Wood River are within the boundaries of the former reservation.*

Claimants assert instream water rights to an approximately nine mile reach of the Wood River between Annie Creek and Agency Lake. Approximately eight miles of this reach makes up a portion of the western border of the former reservation. Contestants in this matter insist that the boundary of the former reservation stopped at the eastern bank of the Wood River, thereby making waters of the Wood River outside said reservation. Claimants argue the former reservation included the Wood River. This dispute must be resolved by a review of the Treaty language in the context how both the United States and the Tribes would have understood it at the time of drafting. *Adair II*, 723 F.2d at 1409 (“[W]here interpretation of an Indian treaty is involved, not only the intent of the Government, but also the intent of the tribe must be discerned.”).

At the hearing, Claimants presented significant evidence indicating the Tribes' reliance on several species of plant, fish, fowl, and other game found in and around the rivers and streams

within the basin. Important among these were Chinook salmon, Redband trout, and several varieties of suckers. Claimants also established that these treaty species either presently exist in the Wood River or were present in this river at the time of the creation of the reservation. Claimants also established that the United States allowed the Tribes significant input into the creation of the borders of the former reservation. Claimants further demonstrated that such borders were established with a focus on preserving, among other things, the Tribes' fishing grounds, including the Wood River. Finally, the plain language of the Treaty indicates the boundary in question runs "up the Wood River."

Contestant Mathis Family Trust (Mathis) asserts the Treaty language excludes the Wood River because the boundary must identify a route upon which a person could walk or ride a horse. However, Mathis fails to provide a legal or factual basis for this argument. Oddly, Mathis' argument appears to assume the parties to the Treaty were wholly unaware of boat travel despite the fact that Lewis and Clark navigated western waterways via boat, ending their journey here nearly 60 years before the creation of the former reservation. The remainder of Mathis' arguments are equally unavailing.

UBC takes a markedly different approach to the issue by apparently ignoring the Treaty entirely. Instead, UBC relies on "meander" lines of the eastern bank in a limited number of surveys that do not account for the intent of the Treaty drafters. In contrast, Mr. Hart presented ample evidence demonstrating the drafting parties intended to include the Wood River in order to protect important fishing grounds upon which the Tribes' relied. This is further supported by evidence presented by Ms. Hartell in the form of testimony and several surveys which indicate the boundary of the former reservation is located within the stream channel of the Wood River. In addition, Ms. Hartell's knowledge of surveying practices related to Indian reservations is significantly more persuasive when considered in the context of the Treaty language.

Neither Mathis nor UBC address why the drafters of the Treaty, if they intended to exclude the waters of the Wood River, did not specify the eastern shoreline of the river as the reservation boundary. The boundary description found in Article 1 of the Treaty begins by establishing the "eastern shore of middle Klamath Lake" as the southwestern boundary of the reservation. It is apparent that, if the drafters intended the shoreline of the Wood River to serve as a boundary, they knew how to say so. Nonetheless, they did not. Ms. Hartell testified that, where such specific language is not used, boundaries along waterways are generally interpreted as existing somewhere within the stream channel.

It is difficult to fathom how a people so dependent upon certain species of fish would reserve unto themselves sufficient land to gaze upon their historic fishing grounds while, at the same time, excluding themselves from the opportunity to take fish from them. I find a more logical interpretation is posited by Claimants in reading the Treaty to establish the boundary in question within the stream channel.

Because the boundary of the former reservation extends into the Wood River, the claim for waters of the reach between Annie Creek and Agency Lake are not off-reservation.

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

VII. *Contestants failed to rebut Claimants' evidence.*

Contestants assert Claimants have failed to prove the instream flows claimed are the minimum amount of water necessary to establish a healthy and productive habitat. I disagree. Based on the foregoing discussion, I find each of the claims presented represents the minimum amount of water necessary to fulfill the purposes of the reservation. This is supported by the stark differences present in the updated claims versus the amended claims filed in 1999.

The amended claims filed in 1999 claimed instream flows up to the 20-percent exceedance flow. The effect of this was to prevent diversions, during the claim period, except in years where streamflows were particularly high. Between 1999 and 2009, Claimants continued to collect data and perform analysis aimed at finding the minimum amount of water necessary. Based, in part, on information not available in 1999, Claimants were able to abandon large portions of the amended claims in favor of lower instream flow levels which they determined were sufficient to accomplish the purposes of the reservation. The results were updated physical habitat claims capped by the 50-percent exceedance flow and riparian base flow claims capped by 66-percent of the 50-percent exceedance flow or the 1999 claim level. This translates into significantly lower claim levels as reflected in Attachment A. I find Claimants have demonstrated, by a preponderance of the evidence, the claimed flows represent the minimum amount necessary.

In the alternative, Contestants argue Claimants water rights should be limited based on equitable considerations. This argument is unavailing in light of the well-established body of controlling case law.

Where reserved rights are properly implied, they arise without regard to equities that may favor competing water users. *Coleville Confederated Tribes v. Walton*, 752 F.2d at 405 (1984), citing *Cappaert v. United States*, 426 US 128, at 138 through 139. Accordingly, despite the urgings of UBC and other Contestants, this tribunal is not free to balance the interests of the Tribes and non-Indian water users in order to effectuate an equitable distribution of water.

Contestants rely on *City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian*, 544 U.S. 197 (2005) for the proposition that equitable considerations can and should be applied to curtail the rights of federally recognized Indian tribes. Without addressing substance of Contestants legal argument, I find *Sherrill* distinguishable from this case.

*Sherrill* involved issues surrounding land sold off by the Oneida nation and settled by residents of New York State. Approximately two hundred years later, the Oneida began reacquiring former reservation land through purchases on the open market. The Oneida then sought immunity from property taxes assessed by the City of Sherrill on the reacquired land. The court applied equitable considerations to prevent the Oneida from reviving sovereignty over the lands finding, “[t]he Oneida long ago relinquished governmental reins and cannot regain them through open-market purchases \* \* \*.” *Sherrill*, 544 U.S. at 198.



Sherrill involved the tribe's abandonment of control over former reservation land, not treaty rights never abandoned or abolished. In *Sherrill*, the Oneida Indian Nation knowingly relinquished title and control over the subject lands. Two hundred years later, the tribes sought to renew sovereign control over that same land. In this matter, the Klamath Tribes have not, knowingly or otherwise, relinquished the treaty rights they now seek to enforce. The circumstances that permitted the application of equitable principle in *Sherrill* are absent here. Accordingly, I decline the invitation to discard the principles set forth in *Walton* and *Cappaert* identified above.

1. *Contestants focus on irrelevant issues (i.e., "causal connection" between ability to exercise treaty rights and flows claimed; requirement that Tribes quantify harvest of treaty resources; etc.)*

UBC contend, for the first time in responsive briefs, Claimants are required to establish a "causal connection" between the Tribes' ability to exercise their treaty rights and the flows necessary to accomplish this purpose. At base, this argument appears to simply reiterate previous arguments in favor of UBC's interpretation the "as currently exercised" and "moderate living" phrases found in the *Adair* cases. UBC's proffered interpretation of the "as currently exercised" has been disposed of by ALJ Russell in the Amended Order. I decline any invitation to revisit that issue here. To the extent UBC's "causal connection" pertains to the quantification of tribal resource use and/or the "moderate living" phrase, those issues have been disposed of in preceding sections of this order.

2. *Contestants' insistence on unquantifiable "current flows" and "status quo" is unhelpful and unworkable. (UBC failed to demonstrate a lesser amount than that claimed will fulfill the purpose of the reservation.)*

UBC insist that Claimants' goals can be met by maintaining the status quo within the basin. UBC contends current streamflows can and should be maintained by closing the basin to further appropriations. This proposition fails for several reasons, not the least of which is that maintaining current flows suggests that current appropriators be allowed to divert water as they always have. This would defeat the Tribes' "time immemorial" priority date, declared in *Adair I and II*, in favor of junior users.

In addition, Contestants have failed to demonstrate current flows are sufficient to fulfill the purposes of the reservation. Rather, Contestants imply, through such arguments, that the current state of the physical and riparian habitats will support harvestable quantities of treaty species. Accepting Contestants' argument would require the assumption that the current habitat is healthy and productive. A preponderance of the evidence in this matter proves such assumptions cannot be accepted.

Finally, UBC's evidence is simply insufficient to serve as a basis for quantifying the Tribes' water rights. As discussed above, much of UBC's evidence is based on broad generalizations and unsupported "scientific" conclusions. Nothing in UBC's evidence indicates the current flows will allow exercise of the Tribes' treaty rights throughout the former reservation. While UBC claims a lesser amount of water will suffice, they failed to demonstrate,

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT

SALEM, OREGON

by a preponderance of the evidence, what that amount is. Inexorably, UBC's arguments in this regard are untenable.

3. *The Tribes' alleged movement away from reliance on treaty species is irrelevant to the quantification of instream water rights.*

Many of UBC's arguments seem to advocate for the abrogation of the Tribes' treaty rights due to a suggested movement away from reliance on treaty resources. Such arguments miss the mark. Only congress can abrogate Indian treaty rights and it has not done so here. The Tribes' reliance upon treaty resources is irrelevant to this quantification proceeding. While it may arguably be relevant to a congressional body in deciding whether to efface certain treaty rights, it is not information that tends to prove or disprove the amount of water necessary to establish and maintain a healthy and productive habitat for treaty species. It follows that Contestants' evidence in support of such arguments, unless also offered for another purpose, is simply irrelevant.

*VIII. Claims for instream flows outside the boundaries of the former reservation.*

Claimants filed a claim for instream water rights for a portion of the Wood River that lies outside the former reservation boundaries. Claim 668 encompasses a small portion of the Wood River outside the western boundary of the former reservation. Claimants assert these off-reservation waters are necessary to preservation of several treaty species of fish, including Redband and Bull trout and several species of suckers. In addition, Claimant presented evidence indicating these off-reservation waters were historically used by Chinook salmon and, presumably, would be used again once these species are reintroduced into the basin. OWRD and Contestants each contend Claimants are not entitled to claim water rights outside the boundaries of the former reservation.

Claims for off-reservation hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering rights are very different from off reservation water rights necessary to support the Tribes' on-reservation treaty rights. Here, OWRD and Contestants argue Claimants are not entitled to claim instream water rights outside the boundaries of the former reservation because the 1864 treaty confined the Tribes' rights to hunt fish, trap, and gather to the reservation. The question here is whether the claimed off-reservation flows are necessary to fulfill a primary purpose of the reservation. While I agree Claimants cannot claim hunting, fishing, trapping or gathering rights outside the boundaries of the former reservation, I cannot agree that instream flows claimed outside the reservation are prohibited in this case.

The parties expend considerable effort arguing over the interpretation and applicability of *Kittitas Reclamation Dist. v. Sunnyside Valley Irrigation Dist.*, 763 F2d 1032 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985). OWRD and Contestants argue *Kittitas* is inapplicable because the treaty at issue in that case granted the Yakima Nation off-reservation fishing rights. *Id.* at 1033 (“\* \* \*the right of taking fish at all usual and accustomed places[.]”). These arguments, while technically correct, miss the mark. The underlying issue addressed by the district court, and on appeal in *Kittitas*, was whether it could order the water master to maintain flows necessary to protect approximately 60 beds of salmon eggs. The case made no mention of whether the Yakima actually possessed

fishing rights in the area below Cle Elum dam where the eggs were located. Instead, the Yakima sought to protect its fishing rights by preserving the salmon eggs. The same may be said of Claimants' off-reservation claims.

One of the primary purposes of the reservation was "to secure to the Tribe a continuation of its traditional hunting and fishing lifestyle." *United States v. Adair*, 723 F.2d 1394 at 1409 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984). Claimants seek to preserve instream flow in this reach necessary to provide healthy and productive habitats for trout, suckers and eventually anadromous species. Each of these fish species have been identified as a treaty species and the portions of the Wood River within reservation boundaries are subject to the Tribes' treaty rights. Treaty species migrate through waters on the reservation, and into the off-reservation waters claimed, for spawning and other purposes. Likewise, such species migrate back onto the reservation where they, once again, become subject to the Tribes' treaty protected harvest rights. Here, like the Yakima in *Kittitas*, the Tribes claim instream flows off reservation to protect spawning and other critical habitat necessary for the exercise of their treaty rights.

For these reasons, I find Claimants are entitled to the claimed flows outside the former reservation identified in Claims 668, 669, and 670.

*IX. Treaty rights on land no longer owned by the Klamath Tribes.*

Next, UBC argues the Tribes no longer possess treaty rights on lands not owned by the Tribes. Again, UBC's argument is unavailing. Contestants seem to continually lose site of the scope of these proceedings. As declared above, the purpose of this adjudication is the quantification of Claimants instream water rights necessary to support healthy and productive instream and riparian habitats within the former reservation. Here, UBC continues to argue in favor of limitations on Claimants' water rights through abrogation, in whole or in part, of the Tribes' treaty rights to hunt, fish, gather, and trap within the boundaries of the former reservation. Such rights were confirmed by the Ninth Circuit well over two decades after termination of the reservation and the sale of much of the lands therein. (See, *Adair II*.) An analysis of property ownership within the boundaries of the former reservation is unhelpful in these proceedings. Determinations of the extent of the Tribes' treaty rights are beyond the scope of this quantification proceeding and concomitantly exceed the authority of the ALJ.

*X. The Klamath Restoration Act did not limit the restoration of the Tribes' treaty rights.*

UBC also contends the Klamath Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. § 566 et. seq.) imposed limitations on the restoration or exercise of the Tribes' treaty right. Specifically, UBC argues the express language of 25 U.S.C. § 566c excludes the Tribes treaty rights from restoration. This argument is unavailing.

25 U.S.C. § 566 restored federal recognition of the Klamath Tribes and provides, in relevant part:

\* \* \* \* \*

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT

SALEM, OREGON

(b) Restoration of rights and privileges - All rights and privileges of the tribe and the members of the tribe under any Federal treaty, Executive order, agreement, or statute, or any other Federal authority, which may have been diminished or lost under the [termination] Act \* \* \* are restored, and the provisions of such Act, to the extent that they are inconsistent with this subchapter, shall be inapplicable to the tribe and to members of the tribe after August 27, 1986.

25 U.S.C. § 566a provides:

Nothing in this subchapter shall affect in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water right of the tribe and its members.

The restoration act went in to effect seven years after the district courts recognition of the survival of the Tribes' treaty rights and three years after the Ninth Circuit's confirmation of same. Nonetheless, UBC still reads the restoration act as a limitation on the Tribes' treaty rights.

In *Adair I*, the court stated, "[t]reaty hunting and fishing rights for the Tribe, for all its members on the final tribal roll and for their descendants survived the termination of the Reservation." (Internal citations omitted.) 478 F. Supp at 345. This language unequivocally declares the Tribes' treaty rights survived termination. Nothing in the termination act, or the court's opinion cited herein, can be read to indicate Congress intended to abrogate any portion of those rights. A limitation on the Tribes' treaty rights is nothing more than partial abrogation of those rights. In this context, Congress passed the restoration act with a full understanding of the Tribes' treaty rights. Thus, by the plain language of the restoration act, nothing in that act disturbs the treaty rights that survived termination. Accordingly, any argument in favor of partial or complete abrogation of treaty rights based upon the termination or restoration acts must fail.

*XI. Stipulated agreements in other cases in the Klamath Basin Adjudication do not impact the quantification determination herein.*

In the Amended Statement of Contest, UBC contends Claimants must subordinate their claims based upon a stipulation to settle Case 177. Addressing the merits of this argument is not necessary as it does not address the issue of quantification of Claimants instream water rights. The extent to which OWRD may be compelled to enforce any such stipulations is beyond the scope of this adjudication. For that reason, I decline to address UBC's contentions in this order.

### ORDER

I propose OWRD issue the following order:

1. The claimed instream flows, reflected in 281-Attachment A, are necessary to establish a healthy and productive habitat to allow the exercise of the Klamath Tribes' hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering rights guaranteed by the treaty of 1864.
2. Claims 668, 669, 670, and those portions of Claim 612 that pertain to the Wood River and its tributaries are approved as reflected in 281-Attachment A.

3. Claimants' priority date for instream water rights is "time immemorial" for all claims listed herein.

---

Joe L. Allen, Senior Administrative Law Judge  
Office of Administrative Hearings

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2011

WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

**NOTICE TO THE PARTIES:**

If you are not satisfied with this Order you may:

**EXCEPTIONS:** Parties may file exceptions to this Order with the Adjudicator within 114 days of service of this Order. OAR 137-003-0650.

Exceptions may be made to any proposed finding of fact, conclusion of law, summary of evidence, or recommendations of the Administrative Law Judge. A copy of the exceptions shall also be delivered or mailed to all participants in this contested case.

Exceptions must be in writing and must clearly and concisely identify the portions of this Order excepted to and cite to appropriate portions of the record to which modifications are sought. Parties opposing these exceptions may file written arguments in opposition to the exceptions within 86 days after completion of the 120-day period for exceptions in case 285.

Any exceptions or arguments in opposition must be filed with the Adjudicator at the following address:

**Dwight W. French, Adjudicator  
Klamath Basin Adjudication  
Oregon Water Resources Department  
725 Summer Street NE, Suite A  
Salem OR 97301**

RECEIVED  
DEC 02 2011  
WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on **December 1, 2011**, I mailed a true copy of the following, **PROPOSED ORDER**, by depositing the same in the U.S. Post Office, Salem, Oregon 97309, with first class, postage prepaid thereon, and addressed to:

Dwight W. French  
Oregon Water Resources Department  
725 NE Summer St., Suite A  
Salem, OR 97301  
[klamadj@wrđ.state.or.us](mailto:klamadj@wrđ.state.or.us)  
[dwright.w.french@wrđ.state.or.us](mailto:dwright.w.french@wrđ.state.or.us)

Jesse D. Ratcliffe  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Oregon Department of Justice  
1162 Court St NE  
Salem, OR 97301  
[Jesse.d.ratcliffe@doj.state.or.us](mailto:Jesse.d.ratcliffe@doj.state.or.us)

Carl Ullman  
Water Adjudication Project  
The Klamath Tribes  
PO Box 957  
Chiloquin, OR 97624  
[Bullman3@earthlink.net](mailto:Bullman3@earthlink.net)

David L. Gover/Sue Y Noe  
Native American Rights Fund  
1506 Broadway  
Boulder, CO 80302  
[dgover@narf.org](mailto:dgover@narf.org)

Douglas W. MacDougal  
Adam D. Orford  
Marten Law PLLC  
1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1500  
Portland, OR 97204  
[dmacdoug@martlaw.com](mailto:dmacdoug@martlaw.com)  
[aorford@martlaw.com](mailto:aorford@martlaw.com)

David W. Harder / "Guss" Guarino  
US Department of Justice  
Environment and Natural Resources Division  
South Terrace, Suite 370  
999 18<sup>th</sup> Street  
Denver, CO 80202  
[david.harder@usdoj.gov](mailto:david.harder@usdoj.gov)  
[guss.guarino@usdoj.gov](mailto:guss.guarino@usdoj.gov)

Barbara Scott-Brier  
Special Attorney  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of the Regional Solicitor, Pacific  
Northwest Region  
805 SW Broadway, Suite 600  
Portland, OR 97205  
Phone: 503.231.2139  
Fax: 503.231.2166

Tom & Althia Stephens  
P. O. Box 1251  
Chiloquin, OR 97624

Melinda Cauvin  
Modoc Point Irrigation District  
P.O. Box 278  
Chiloquin, OR 97624  
[Mc1852@aol.com](mailto:Mc1852@aol.com)

Jeff L. Neff  
PO Box 640  
Redmond, OR 97756


RECEIVED  
DEC 02 2011  
WATER RESOURCES DEPT  
SALEM, OREGON

Loren Little  
Modoc Point Irrigation District  
28888 HWY 97 N  
Chiloquin, OR 97625  
[llbuild@gmail.com](mailto:llbuild@gmail.com)

**Courtesy Copy**

Andrea Rabe  
421 Commercial Street  
Klamath Falls OR 97601  
[andrea@rabeconsulting.com](mailto:andrea@rabeconsulting.com)

Elizabeth E. Howard / Anne D. Foster /  
Dominic A. Carollo / Kate L. Moore  
Dunn Carney Allen Higgins & Tongue, LLP  
851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 1500  
Portland, OR 97204  
[eeh@dunn-carney.com](mailto:eeh@dunn-carney.com)  
[afoster@dunn-carney.com](mailto:afoster@dunn-carney.com)  
[dcarollo@dunn-carney.com](mailto:dcarollo@dunn-carney.com)



---

Misty Fragua  
Administrative Assistant



**KBA Case No. 281 - Attachment A- Monthly Flow Values**

(The table below is taken from page 41 of KBA Case No. 281, Claimant United States Bureau of Indian Affairs' and Claimant Klamath Tribes' Joint Opening Post-Hearing Brief)

**Table 1. Monthly Physical Habitat flow values for Wood River Physical Habitat Claims, KBA Case #281.**

All values included in this table are presented in cubic feet per second (cfs). Dr. Reiser Direct Testimony at question 300 and Table X-1.

<b>Claim Type</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>	<b>April</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>June</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>	<b>October</b>	<b>November</b>	<b>December</b>
<b>Claim Reach 668</b>												
Physical Habitat Claim flow value	125	125	125	125	125	134	125	125	125	125	125	125
Conditional Physical Habitat flow value	125	125	125	125	125	134	130	130	130	130	130	125
<b>Claim Reach 669</b>												
Physical Habitat Claim flow value	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Conditional Physical Habitat flow value	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
<b>Claim Reach 670</b>												
Physical Habitat Claim flow value	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Conditional Physical Habitat flow value	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75

(The table below is taken from page 51 of KBA Case No. 281, Claimant United States Bureau of Indian Affairs' and Claimant Klamath Tribes' Joint Opening Post-Hearing Brief)

**Table 2. Monthly Riparian Habitat flow values for Wood River Riparian Habitat Claims, KBA Case #281**

(all values included in this table are presented in cubic feet per second (cfs)) (Dr. Chapin Direct Testimony at question 63 and Tables 2 and 3).

<b>Claim Type</b>	<b>January</b>	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>	<b>April</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>June</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>August</b>	<b>September</b>	<b>October</b>	<b>November</b>	<b>December</b>
<b>Claim Reach 668</b>												
Riparian Habitat Claim base flow value	0	0	270	286	323	352	312	277	254	255	263	0
<b>Claim Reach 669</b>												
Riparian Habitat Claim base flow value	0	0	62	62	56	56	53	55	54	61	60	0
<b>Claim Reach 670</b>												
Riparian Habitat Claim base flow value	0	0	55	56	56	56	56	55	55	55	55	0