

Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources

My wife and I have a small family farm on which we raise hay and livestock, this has been our goal to obtain and we have been working to keep it for over 37 years. We are both in our 70's. We feel threatened by the attempts to pass the KBRA and the three bills (SB265, SB206, & SB 264). The reasons we feel this way are as follows,

The 3 agreements were supposed to provide certainty of water deliveries, power rate benefit for irrigators, power rate benefit for irrigators, protection from the ESA and viable water storage for agriculture. None of those are delivered in the agreements.

SB 265: Lottery bonds are nothing more than borrowing against future gambling revenue that my grandchildren will end up having to pay for.

SB 206: The proposed amendments could make it applicable within the Klamath Reclamation Project. If the agreements go forward, the purpose of the Reclamation Project will be changed to include 50% fish and wildlife purposes.

SB 264: Grants authority to Oregon Water Resources Director to participate and further along the settlement which is unacceptable, because of all the negative reasons associated with the agreements.

Our forbearers that initially developed the Klamath Reclamation Project, wanted to create an agricultural economy out of a desolate desert. Thereby creating an economy that would provide jobs and the ability for families to live in this desert. Our forbearers also created dams for flood control and power generation. Clean energy which everyone is looking for now. Why would anyone want to destroy these things that they created for us and future generations?

The proponents of the KBRA should really be proud of their accomplishments to date. They have been able to divide about everybody with their desire to get their objective passed. They have divided the Upper Klamath Basin from the lower Klamath Basin. They have divided the Upper Klamath Basin water users into a couple of separate factions. They have divided the A water users from the B water users. They originated their plan in secret initially, not letting the public know what they were up to at the start of this big push to get the KBRA passed.

Agriculture is the biggest contributor to the Klamath County Economy after the damage to the timber industry due to the spotted owl. If there is a call on the water for agricultural use, then those making the call will be responsible for the economic consequences. The question here being, does the holding back of the water really benefit the fish? Really?

The proponents of the KBRA have put a lot of different subjects into one big package. Why not let the people decide on one issue at a time. The issue of the Dam removal being one issue and the 92,000 acres tree farm being another issue that might be better decided individually. This is a case of the Bureau of Reclamation/ Department of Interior trying to ram this thing through under the guise of a water issue solely.

The most recent article in the Herald & News, about the option of using Clear Lake as a storage reservoir. Sounds like a common sense approach and possibly one option that needs to be looked at seriously. It doesn't make sense to take out 4 good dams and lose the environmentally good energy that is produced by them.

Our forbearers that initially developed the Klamath Reclamation Project, wanted to create an agricultural economy out of a desolate desert. Thereby creating an economy that would provide jobs and the ability for families to live in this desert. Our forbearers also created dams for flood control and power generation. Clean energy which everyone is looking for now. Why would anyone want to destroy these things that they created for us and future generations?

Marvin Cantrell
21566 South Poe Valley Rd.
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97603-9672
541 882 1248
541 891 1484
cowflop.cantrell@gmail.com