

CUTTING OFF THE HEADWATERS

An Analysis of H.R. 1837, the San Joaquin Valley Water Uncertainty Act



**NATURAL
RESOURCES**
COMMITTEE • DEMOCRATS

This report has not been officially adopted
by the Committee on Natural Resources and may
not necessarily reflect the views of its Members

CUTTING OFF THE HEADWATERS:

ANALYSIS OF H.R. 1837, THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY WATER UNCERTAINTY ACT

INTRODUCTION

H.R. 1837 was introduced by Congressmen Nunes, McCarthy, and Denham (R-CA) on May 11, 2011, and on February 14, 2012, Republicans offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute. This revised version contained extreme provisions, which would upset state water rights, placing the priorities of a few agricultural interests over the water needs of other farmers, fishermen, municipalities, industries, and the environment.

If enacted, H.R. 1837 would have far reaching impacts, not just for California but for the Bureau of Reclamation and the seventeen western states.

WHAT ENACTMENT OF H.R. 1837 WOULD MEAN FOR CALIFORNIA:

- Fundamentally alter the allocation of water rights within California, in essence allowing more junior agricultural users in the Central Valley to cut straight to the headwaters, to the detriment of more senior water users, whose priority rights are established under current law because they utilized the water first.

“It is almost breathtaking in its total disregard for equity and its willful subjugation of the State of California to the whims of federal action.” — *May 27, 2011 letter from the California State Legislature*¹

¹ Letter was signed by Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg, Speaker of the California Assembly John Perez, and Assembly Chairs Huffman and Chesbro, and Senate Chair of Natural Resources and Water Fran Pavley

JUNE 13, 2011 SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER PART II LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON H.R. 1837

(Rep. Garamendi) Mr. Herrick, you were talking about the area of origin. Are these counties the area of origin counties? Nevada, Placer, El Dorado, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa, Merced, are those areas of origin counties?

(Mr. Herrick) Absolutely. That is where much of the water originates that flows down into the main rivers that goes into the delta.

(Rep. Garamendi) and this bill, in its present form, would remove their rights and substitute federal law, is that correct?

(Mr. Herrick) That is correct.

(Rep. Garamendi) Why would anybody representing those counties support this piece of legislation?

(Mr. Herrick) I can't explain why, but the water battles in California make people line up in different - on different sides at different times.

- Preempt existing state water law by preventing the implementation of scientifically-based protections for salmon and other protected species, ignoring the recent collapse of the West Coast salmon fishery and preventing the jobs that could be created by recovery of salmon.

“California’s complex water problems require thoughtful, science-based solutions developed with the support of the Federal and state governments and all stakeholders. H.R. 1837 flies in the face of this principle by undermining State water laws, dismantling bipartisan and broad-based planning processes, and discarding a productive settlement in favor of continued contentiousness and litigation. We believe this legislation would not help move California toward the collaborative and science-based solutions we need to address California’s water supply and ecosystem challenges.” —*June 2, 2011 letter from Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar*

- Repeal the court-approved San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement and the San Joaquin River Settlement Act, which has been litigated and negotiated for over two decades, creating more legal uncertainty for all affected parties.

“Title II of the H.R. 1837 would repeal the San Joaquin Restoration Settlement Act and prohibit further federal participation in the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement. The Friant Water Authority is a party to the Settlement as approved by the Federal Courts in 2006 and thus has a contractual obligation to comply with the Settlement and therefore opposes amendments to the Settlement Act that are not agreed to by the settling Parties.” *May 25, 2011 Letter from the Friant Water Authority*

WHAT ENACTMENT OF H.R. 1837 WOULD MEAN FOR THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION:

- Erode long-standing western water principles by setting aside a century of Reclamation Law, which preserves the state’s legal ability to control, appropriate, use, or distribute irrigation water.

“This type of broad and complete preemption of state law represents a complete paradigm shift from over 100 years of Reclamation law and purposeful direction from Congress of deference to state water law.” — *Testimony from Commissioner Mike Connor, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation*

“As Wyoming’s State Engineer, I am deeply troubled by the precedent that could be established should H.R. 1837, the San Joaquin Valley Water Reliability Act, pass and become law. Specifically, I am most concerned with section 202 which would set aside Section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 and effectively preempt California state law. This direct weakening of the deference to state water law is unacceptable. It poses a threat to water rights and water administration across the Western U.S.” —*August 9, 2011 letter from Pat Tyrell, Wyoming State Engineer*

“From the very beginning, the federal projects and operations have been specifically mandated to be under state regulation so that federal participation in programs addressing water issues does not frustrate or preclude each state from controlling its own policies. This principle has been the subject of over 100 years of negotiation, litigation and federal action. Virtually every relevant law passed by Congress in the last 100 years has contained a provision that explicitly stated that the federal action/law would not otherwise alter or supersede state water law. Since the waters that flow in the streams and rivers of California are owned by the people of California, California should decide what rules apply to the use of those waters, and under what conditions such uses will be allowed. State water laws should not exist at the whim of Congressional debate.” — *Testimony from John Herrick, Esq., Counsel and Manager, South Delta Water Agency*

WHAT ENACTMENT OF H.R. 1837 WOULD MEAN FOR THE SEVENTEEN WESTERN STATES:

Create precedent setting legislation impacting the management of water rights in the entire west:

“The bill’s explicit preemption of California law runs contrary to the long established tradition of Congressional and court deference to states on water resource decisions. Consequently, this bill sets a very dangerous precedent of Congressional intervention into state water rights, which could have far reaching consequences not only for California, but for other states as well.” —*June 7, 2011 letter from U.S. Senator Feinstein and U.S. Senator Boxer*

“The Council opposes any weakening of the deference to state water law as now expressed in Section 8 [of H.R. 1837] as inconsistent with the policy of cooperative federalism that has guided Reclamation Law for over a century. This is a threat to water right and water right administration in all the Western States.”—*August 1, 2011 letter from Weir Labatt III, Chairman, Western States Water Council*

“States are responsible for allocating and administering rights for all types of water uses, and are best positioned, working cooperatively with local and federal partners, to evaluate and prioritize state needs. H.R. 1837 would erode the longstanding deference to state authorities as articulated in Section 8 of the Reclamation Act, and would inhibit the ability of states to develop balanced and cooperative solutions to the complex issues facing water resources today. For these reasons, H.R. 1837 should not be enacted as law.” — *August 16, 2011 Letter from Mr. Phillip Ward, Director of the Oregon Water Resources Department*

“H.R. 1837 would also overturn a century old precedent in water law: Congress ought not to preempt the right of states to manage their own water under state water rights law. If this bill passes, no state will be safe from congressional interference in their water rights laws.” —*Testimony from California Natural Resources Secretary John Laird*

IF ENACTED, H.R. 1837 WOULD NOT:

- Support the coequal goals, as stated in the bipartisan Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009, of first providing a more reliable water supply for California, and second protecting, restoring, and enhancing the overall quality of the California Bay-Delta.
- Solve California’s water problems through a thoughtful, science-based stakeholder process.
- Resolve the long standing issues on the San Joaquin River and provide flood protection and water supply projects for farmers that were approved as a part of the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act².
- Maintain environmental protections necessary to sustain rebuild and salmon populations, which are the backbone of the west coast salmon fishery and support fishermen, their livelihoods, and local coastal communities.

A solution to California’s complex water issues must be found through a local, state, and federal stakeholder process, using the best available science and respecting all applicable state laws. H.R. 1837, the San Joaquin Valley Water Act, has nothing to do with job creation and water reliability and everything to do with water supply uncertainty.

BACKGROUND

The Bureau of Reclamation's (Reclamation) Central Valley Project (CVP) intersects the Sacramento River, the San Joaquin River, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, spanning over 400 miles. The multipurpose project primarily serves to deliver water contracts of approximately seven million acre-feet annually for agricultural, urban, and wildlife use. (One acre-foot is approximately 325,800 gallons, or enough water for a family of four annually). The project also serves to regulate rivers, control flooding, and generate 5.6 billion kilowatt hours of electricity annually.

About 90 percent of the CVP water (five million acre-feet) is used for agricultural purposes, irrigating 3 million acres of farmland³. According to a recent census, nine of the nation's top ten producing counties are in California⁴. Six of those counties are served by the CVP, producing crops and livestock worth almost \$20 billion.

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta agriculture supports 13,700 jobs, \$1.1 billion in value added, and nearly \$2.8 billion in economic output in the five Delta counties. In addition, Delta agriculture supports nearly 23,000 jobs, over \$1.9 billion in value added, and over \$4.6 billion in economic output in the state of California⁵.

The remaining ten percent of the CVP water is delivered to two million municipal and industrial (M&I) users.

The project also dedicates 800,000 acre-feet per year to fish and wildlife and their habitat and 410,000 acre-feet to State and Federal wildlife refuges and wetlands, pursuant to the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA).

Delta recreation and tourism supports 2,700 jobs, \$152 million in value-added, and nearly \$284 million in economic output in the five Delta counties. In addition, Delta recreation and tourism generates over 4,900 jobs, \$324 million in value-added, and \$600 million in economic output in the state of California. Even though the value of Delta recreation and tourism has flattened, improved water quality and new investment in recreation facilities and hospitality enterprises are frequently cited as being essential to growing recreation and tourism in the Delta⁶.

Supporters of H.R. 1837 argue that water shortages and job losses were not primarily a result of the drought, but instead because of environmental and regulatory restrictions. Yet the California Department of Water Resources reported that three-quarters of the reductions in delta water exports (1.6 MAF) were due to drought conditions and less than a quarter (0.5 MAF) was due to environmental protections, such as maintaining delta salinity standards⁷. Several studies estimated the loss of jobs from the drought were much higher than from environmental protections.

3 http://www.usbr.gov/projects/Project.jsp?proj_Name=Central+Valley+Project

4 <http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/Statistics/>

5 <http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/Admin%20Draft%20ESP.pdf>

6 <http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/Admin%20Draft%20ESP.pdf>

7 http://www.usbr.gov/main/docs/CA_Water_Reality_Check.pdf

WATER / AGRICULTURAL & FISHING JOBS

Water is needed by both farmers and fishermen. Taking away water from the environment, as H.R. 1837 would do, means killing fishing jobs and ways of life by preventing recovery of salmon:

“H.R. 1837 would negate more than 17 years of research and science by reverting to 1994 water operations. These operations would ignore the universally accepted scientific understanding that the Bay-Delta ecosystem is in a state of collapse and in addition, the significant strides toward adaptively managing implementation with science. If implemented, these operations would hasten the decline of numerous species, including fall-run Chinook salmon, which are key to the economic stability of fishing communities along the west coast. – *Testimony of Will Stelle, National Marine Fisheries Service*”

“H.R. 1837 would eliminate many of the protections now in place for Central Valley salmon – in the San Joaquin River and the Bay-Delta Estuary. It undermines efforts at protecting and recovering the Central Valley’s listed salmon species. It jeopardizes the restoration and productivity of fall-run Chinook populations. It likely will destroy California’s salmon fishery and the jobs of thousands up and down the coast who depend on this resource and the fishing communities this fish supports. – *Testimony of David Bitts, Commercial Fisherman*”

“For over one hundred years the salmon industry has been a mainstay of the California economy and a major food producer for California and the nation. As recently as 2002, 720,600 Central Valley salmon were harvested sending over 8.6 million pounds of fresh salmon to the market. Since that time the policies of the state and federal water agencies have devastated most of this production. It can be recovered, but it cannot be recovered without policies that balance the water needs of the salmon with the other water needs of the state. A water grab by a few agricultural interests at the expense of the salmon industry and the other water users of the state is simply fallacious public policy. – *Testimony of Richard Pool, Salmon Fishing Equipment Manufacturer*”

“If enacted, H.R. 1837 threatens to undermine the 2000 Trinity River Record of Decision, and limits the ability of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage the Trinity River Division of the CVP to provide reliable quantities and quality of water for in-river restoration flow releases. The Yurok Tribe is the single largest harvester of Trinity River fall Chinook salmon and is dependent upon its fishery to meet our subsistence, economic and ceremonial needs. – *June 10, 2011 letter from Thomas O'Rourke, Yurok Tribe*”

Table 1: Estimates of San Joaquin Valley Employment Losses Due to Reduced Water Supplies ⁸		
Source	Biological Opinions (Salmon and Smelt)	Total 2009 Impacts (Drought + Biological Opinions)
UC-Davis (Howitt et. al.)	2,973	7,434
Univ. of Pacific (Michael)	1,392	5,567
UC-Berkeley (Sunding et. al.)	720 (Smelt only)	4,965

⁸ http://forecast.pacific.edu/water-jobs/SJV_Rev_Jobs_2009_092810.pdf, http://giannini.ucop.edu/media/are-update/files/articles/v14n4_3.pdf

Underlying the impacts of the drought on unemployment are the foreclosure crisis and housing collapse. The value of private building permits has declined by more than \$5 billion per year in the San Joaquin Valley, and home values have dropped more than 50 percent in most areas. Low-income cities on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley saw some of the biggest declines⁹.

Meanwhile, supporters of the H.R. 1837 also argue that fishermen have not been impacted by water shortages. In 2008 and 2009, the west coast salmon fishery was closed for the first time, resulting in 100 percent unemployment. Former Governor Arnold

⁹ <http://forecast.pacific.edu/water-jobs/Facts%20about%20Water%20and%20Jobs.pdf>

Schwarzenegger's Administration estimated that this two-year closure of the salmon fishery resulted in the loss of \$534 million and almost 5,000 jobs¹⁰. Other analysts have estimated significantly higher economic and job impacts as a result of this closure, while the University of the Pacific has estimated that the loss of employment due to the closure, without taking into account the impacts on the retail and restaurant related businesses, was 1,823 jobs¹¹.

¹⁰ Press Release, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, "Gov. Schwarzenegger Addresses Impact of Vote to Close Salmon Season for Second Consecutive Year," April 21, 2009; Press Release, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, "Gov. Schwarzenegger Takes Action to Address Impacts of Vote to Close Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries," April 10, 2008.

¹¹ <http://forecast.pacific.edu/BFC%20salmon%20jobs.pdf>

THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY WATER UNCERTAINTY ACT

The legislation as introduced has three titles. Title I seeks to make substantial changes to the Central Valley Improvement Act (CVPIA) (Section 34 of P.L. 102-575), including the repeal of many environmental protections. Title II of the legislation repeals the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act (Title X, Subtitle A of P.L. 111-11). Title III involves the conversion of long term contracts and acceleration of repayment of project costs.

TITLE I: SWEEPING CHANGES TO THE CENTRAL VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Title I of H.R. 1837 significantly amends the CVPIA and supersedes the application of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and California state law. Table 2 outlines the major changes H.R. 1837 proposes to the CVPIA.

Table 2. Comparison of Major Provisions of CVPIA and H.R. 1837	
Central Valley Project Improvement Act	H.R. 1837 San Joaquin Valley Water Uncertainty Act
Precludes new contracts from committing additional water for “any purpose other than fish and wildlife” before current and pending environmental obligations have been satisfied.	Amends CVPIA to remove the provisions that prohibited new contracts without meeting certain environmental criteria. (Section 103)
Directs the Secretary, upon request, to renew contracts for one 25-year term and allows successive renewals of 25 years.	Reverts contract renewal terms back to 40 years; removes conditions in place that must be met before contract renewal; and directs the Secretary, upon request, to renew existing long term contracts for a period of up to 40 years, and directs successive renewals of 40 years. (Section 103)
Established a “tiered water pricing system” to encourage water conservation and efficiencies.	Strikes the tiered water system. This would remove the incentive to conserve water and would encourage water service contractors, particularly those north of the Delta who are more likely to take a large share of their contracted supply, to take additional water under the terms of their contracts. (Section 104)
(No existing comparable provision.)	Repurposes the CVPIA restoration fund so monies can be used for any activity described in CVPIA, not just for restoration; limits restoration fund payments by power contractors to \$4 per megawatt-hour; prohibits the Secretary from charging restoration funds for other “environmental restoration or mitigation fees” before storing or conveying non-CVP water, delivering surplus water under Section 215 of the RRA, or delivering water for groundwater recharge; establishes an advisory board comprised of water and power contractors to make recommendations on how to spend the funds; and establishes December 31, 2020 as a deadline for completing fish, wildlife and habitat restoration under the CVPIA. (Section 106)
Dedicated 800,000 acre-feet of CVP yield for fish and wildlife purposes.	Requires the Secretary to replace the 800,000 acre-feet of water from CVP yield dedicated for fish, wildlife, and habitat restoration purposes under Section 3406(b)(2) of CVPIA by 2016 or suspend use of this water for such purposes until it is replaced. (Section 107)

IF THEY COULD TURN BACK TIME... REPUBLICANS FIND A WAY: SECTION 108(A)

Section 108(a) of H.R. 1837 states that in the operation of the CVP all requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), including biological opinions (BiOps) for listed species, would be met through the “Principles Agreement on the Bay-Delta Standards Between the State of California and the Federal Government,” known as the Bay Delta Accord. The Bay Delta Accord was signed in December 1994 and put into place water quality standards and operational constraints to protect the Delta and water supply reliability. In the Bay Delta Accord, it was agreed that there would be an immediate reconsultation of BiOps affecting the operations of the CVP.

Reverting to standards established in the Bay Delta Accord ignores the previous fifteen years of impacts on the Delta ecosystem from water diversions. The existence of Delta smelt and salmon is clearly in jeopardy, while the health of the Delta has continued to decline, as indicated by the two to three-fold increases in listed species since 1994. In addition, increased understanding of climate change and its impacts, such as sea-level rise and changes in the timing and amount of rainfall and snowmelt, requires flexible water management operations that protect species and water supply reliability.

The 1994 BiOps were subsequently reissued. In 2004, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) issued a BiOp making the astonishing claim that CVP operations did not jeopardize the continued existence of the delta smelt. In the same year, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued a BiOp with the same conclusion for salmon. Both of these BiOps were deemed “arbitrary and capricious” by the courts. Currently, the 2008 BiOp for delta smelt and the 2009 BiOp for salmon have found that CVP operations jeopardize the existence of these species.

Reverting back to the Bay Delta Accord environmental provisions would also stifle the ongoing efforts under the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDGP), a collaboration of State, Federal, and local water agencies, State and Federal fish agencies, environmental organizations, and other interested parties.

Section 109 directs the Secretary of Interior not to distinguish between naturally-spawned and hatchery-spawned salmon when making a determination under the Endangered Species Act. Hatcheries are an important short-to medium-term tool to sustain salmon populations in the face of habitat degradation. Currently, it is estimated that 90 percent of fall-run Chinook salmon populations, the backbone of the west coast salmon fishery, are derived from hatcheries. This has resulted in a decrease in genetic diversity of these salmon, leaving them increasingly susceptible to other environmental stressors, such as changing ocean conditions and climate change.

CUTTING TO THE HEADWATERS: SECTION 108(B) PREEMPTION OF STATE LAW

Section 108(b) of H.R. 1837 preempts state laws and regulations that restrict federal and state water project operations for the purpose of protecting endangered species, undermines decades of federal-state cooperation on endangered species protections and will likely lead to inadequate and inconsistent protection for valuable fish and wildlife resources.

TITLE II: REPEAL OF THE SAN JOAQUIN RESTORATION SETTLEMENT: MORE LITIGATION, MORE UNCERTAINTY

Title II of H.R. 1837 repeals the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act and preempts the application of California state law. Below is a description of the sections in Title II, which, if enacted, will lead to more decades of litigation and water supply uncertainty.

Section 201 repeals the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act (P.L. 111-11, Title X, Subtitle A). This Settlement was broadly acceptable to water contractors who prior to the Act had been operating under considerable uncertainty regarding their water supply due to pending litigation over the preceding two decades. Repealing the Settlement will result in a return to this uncertainty, as well as a possibility of dramatic cuts to water diversions.

Section 203(1) provides restoration flows of 50 cubic feet per second (cfs) from Friant Dam, except in a critical water year. Section 204 also directs the Secretary of Interior to implement a plan to recover and replace these restoration flows and fully mitigate any groundwater impacts from these flows. Flows considered under the draft

PRE-EMPTING STATE LAW, JUNE 2, 2011 SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER & POWER PART I LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON H.R. 1837



Rep. Grace Napolitano: Now, yes or no to Mr. Birmingham, Mr. Beck and Mr. Upton, does Westlands fully support the preemption of state law, Kern County and Mr. Upton?

Mr. James M Beck: Ranking Member, I was very specific in my testimony.



Rep. Napolitano: Yes or no, sir.

Mr. Beck: Yes.



Mr. Kole Upton: I would refer to Mr. Denham. Elections make a difference, he was elected in our area and I would agree with whatever he says. And this bill supports that.

Rep. Napolitano: Yes or no, sir.

Mr. Thomas Birmingham: Westlands supports the provisions contained in H.R. 1837.

Rep. Napolitano: Which means yes. Thank you, sir.

Subcommittee on Water & Power Ranking Member Grace Napolitano
James M. Beck, General Manager, Kern County Water Agency
Kole Upton, Farmer, Merced & Madera Counties
Thomas Birmingham, General Manager, Westlands Water District

Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (PEIS/R) range from 475 to 4,500 cfs from Friant Dam to protect salmon and habitat.

Section 204(m) preempts and supersedes any State law, regulation, or requirement that imposes more restrictive requirements or regulations for activities authorized under this Title.

Section 207 deems this Title to meet the requirements of CVPIA and California Fish & Game Code Section 5937. Violations of these laws were the basis for litigation in 1988.

Section 209 establishes a San Joaquin Fishery Restoration Fund comprised of Friant Surcharge payments, non-Federal contributions, and any funds from the San Joaquin River Restoration Fund (P.L. 111-11, Section 10009(c) (1)). This Fund would support the recovery, replacement, and mitigation of these restoration flows, and not the protection of salmon and habitat.

TITLE III: CONTRACT CONVERSION

Title III directs the Secretary of the Interior, at the request of the contractor, to convert their “water service” contracts to long-term “repayment” contracts. Repayment contracts repay the capital costs of the project in fixed annual installments. Water service contracts pay a combined capital and operation and maintenance charge for each acre foot delivered.

Conversion into repayment contracts under the terms of H.R. 1837 would require Reclamation to enter into subsequent repayment contracts under the terms of the legislation, and require that Reclamation make the determination that the CVP is complete. Once converted into repayment contracts, the amount of water under the contract would in all likelihood, be fixed in perpetuity. This would limit Reclamation’s ability for responding to water shortages, drought and climate change-related issues.

LETTERS OF OPPOSITION

The record of opposition to H.R. 1837 continues to grow. Western states are opposed to the precedent-setting trumping of state water law. Fishermen are opposed because of the negative impacts on coastal jobs and communities. Fishing, hunting, and environmental groups are opposed to the reversion of decades of environmental protections for the San Joaquin Delta.

Since last year, the Committee has recieved dozens of letters in opposition. The amendment in the nature of a substitute attempts to address some of these concerns, but not all have been met. These letters of opposition include:

U.S. Department of the Interior	Congresswoman Doris Matsui	State Senator Fran Pavley
State of California	Congressman Tom McClintock ¹²	Assemblymember Bill Berryhill
State of Colorado	Congressman George Miller	Assemblymember Joan Buchanan
State of Oregon	Congresswoman Grace Napolitano	Assemblymember Wesley Chesbro
State of Wyoming	Congresswoman Jackie Speier	Assemblymember Jared Huffman
<u>Elected Officials</u>	Congressman Mike Thompson	<u>Newspapers</u>
Senator Barbara Boxer	California Senate President pro	The San Francisco Chronicle
Senator Diane Feinstein	Tem Darrell Steinberg	The Sacramento Bee
Congresswoman Lois Capps	California Assembly Speaker John	The San Jose Mercury News
Congressman John Garamendi	Perez	The Contra Costa Times
Congressman Wally Herger ¹		Redding – The Record Searchlight
Congressman Dan Lungren ¹		Amador – Ledger Dispatch

¹² Opposition limited to water rights provisions

Woodland – The Daily Democrat
The Monterey County Herald

Water Districts and Local Governments

Butte County
Central Delta Water Agency
City of Stockton
Contra Costa Water District
Placer County Water Agency
Reclamation Districts 3, 150, 551, 554, 999
San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors
South Delta Water Agency

Business Groups

California Delta Chambers & Visitor's Bureau
The Contra Costa Council
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Stockton Chamber of Commerce

Environmental Groups

American Rivers
AquAlliance
California League of Conservation Voters
California Water Impact Network
Campaign for Common Ground
Concerned Citizens Coalition of Stockton
Defenders of Wildlife
Earthjustice
Environmental Defense Fund
Friends of the Eel River

Friends of the River
Institute for Fisheries Research
League of Conservation Voters
Restore the Delta
Safe Alternatives for our Forest Environment
Natural Resources Defense Council
The Nature Conservancy
Northcoast Environmental Center
North Coast Rivers Alliance San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust
San Joaquin Audubon Society
Save the American River Association
Save the Delta
Sierra Club California
Southern California Watershed Alliance
Commercial and Recreational Fishing and Hunting Organizations and Businesses
American Sportfishing Association
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
California Striped Bass Association
Coastside Fishing Club
Craig Hanson – “Outdoors” Radio Host
Federation of Fly Fishers
The Fish Sniffer
Fred Hall Shows Long Beach
Golden Gate Fishermen's Association
Jeff Robles Tackle Sales

Lower Sherman Island Duck Hunters Association
Monterey Fish Market
Northern California Federation of Fly Fishers
Northern California Guides Association
Northwest Sportfishing Industry Alliance Oregon & Washington
Outdoor Pro Shop
Pacific Catch Fish Grill
Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations
Pro-Troll Products
Rapala USA
Salmon Water Now
SF Crab Boat Owners Association
Small Boat Commercial Salmon Fishermen's Association
Water4Fish
Tribal Groups
Modoc Nation
Winnemem Wintu Tribe
Yurok Tribe
Agricultural Groups
Friant Water Authority¹³
Recreation Groups
Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance, Inc.

¹³ Opposition limited to San Joaquin River Restoration provisions

