

**JOHN W. OGAN**, Oregon State Bar No. 06594  
jwo@karnopp.com  
KARNOPP PETERSEN LLP  
1201 N.W. Wall Street, Suite 300  
Bend, Oregon 97701-1957  
TEL: (541) 382-3011  
FAX: (541) 383-3073

**BRENT H. HALL** Oregon State Bar No. 992762  
brenthall@ctuir.com  
73239 Confederated Way  
Pendleton, Oregon 97801-0638  
TEL: (541) 276-3165  
FAX: (541) 276-3095

**TIMOTHY R. WEAVER** Washington State Bar No. 3364  
weavertimatty@qwestoffice.net  
Law Offices of Tim Weaver  
402 E. Yakima Avenue, Suite 710  
Yakima, Washington 98901  
TEL: (509) 575-1500  
FAX: (509)575-1227

Of Attorneys for Amicus Curiae, The Confederated Tribes  
Of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, Confederated Tribes  
Umatilla Indian Reservation, and Yakima Nation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF OREGON

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, et al.,

Plaintiffs

and,

STATE OF OREGON

Intervenor-Plaintiff

v.

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE,  
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, and U.S.  
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,

Defendants,

and

NORTHWEST IRRIGATION UTILITIES,

Case No. 01-0640-RE (Lead Case)  
CV 05-0023-RE (Consolidated Cases)

DECLARATION OF GARY JAMES  
IN SUPPORT OF MEMORANDUM  
OF AMICI WARMS SPRINGS,  
UMATILLA, AND YAKAMA TRIBES  
IN OPPOSITION TO MOTIONS FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

**DECLARATION OF GARY JAMES**

W594.01(e)Declaration of Gary James.doc

PUBLIC POWER COUNCIL, WASHINGTON  
STATE FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
FRANKLIN COUNTY FARM BUREAU  
FEDERATION, GRANT COUNTY FARM  
BUREAU FEDERATION, STATE OF IDAHO,  
INLAND PORTS AND NAVIGATION GROUP,  
and KOOTENAI TRIBE OF IDAHO,

Intervenor-Defendants.

COLUMBIA SNAKE RIVER IRRIGATORS  
ASSOCIATION and EASTERN OREGON  
IRRIGATORS ASSOCIATION,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CARLOS M. GUTIERREZ, in his official capacity  
as Secretary of Commerce, NOAA FISHERIES,  
and D. ROBERT LOHN, in his capacity as  
Regional Director of NOAA FISHERIES,

Defendants.

---

I, GARY JAMES, HEREBY STATE AND DECLARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. My name is Gary James and I am employed as Fisheries Program Manager for the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), I have held this position for the last 26 years. I graduated from Oregon State University in 1979 with a B.S. in Fisheries Science.

2. As CTUIR Fisheries Program Manager since 1982, my work has been the planning, development (interagency and public coordination), implementation, operation and monitoring of complex (all-H) fisheries restoration programs. I discuss some of these programs below, organized by categories of work involved, in a sequence that follows project inception to completion. Some of these programs, such as the Umatilla and Walla Walla Basins where CTUIR has been the lead project sponsor (and I as their technical representative), are known as

Columbia Basin success models for working with stakeholders to reestablish lost salmon runs (see Attachment 1, "Umatilla and Walla Walla Basins Fisheries Restoration Programs").

3. The purpose of my declaration is to (1) advise the court of the "boots-on-the-ground" approach used in selecting actions for habitat enhancement and hatchery supplementation in the recent Memorandum of Agreement the CTUIR, Yakama Nation and the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon entered into with the Action Agencies (Fish MOA); and (2) advise the court of the successes in increasing numbers of "natural" spawner returns that the CTUIR has observed resulting from carefully designed and implemented supplementation programs.

4. Too often these supplementation efforts are either ignored or derided, yet tribal supplementation programs are returning increasing numbers of natural spawners. My professional experience developing and implementing supplementation programs over more than 20 years tells me that carefully planned and executed supplementation is a way to increase viable natural spawners, particularly when used in conjunction with other habitat actions.

5. I offer no opinion on the hyper-technical debate over whether natural spawners from hatchery origins are good fish or bad fish for purposes of ESA listing - to me that is like arguing "red fish" over "blue fish". I only know that these hatchery-origin natural spawners become part of the listed population, and our findings, based on scientific comparisons in one subbasin, are that these fish are just as fit across all life stages as so-called "wild" fish.

### **Project Planning Experience**

6. In 1984, I authored the first in a long series of subbasin plans (for the Umatilla, John Day and Grande Ronde Subbasins in NE Oregon and SE Washington) that formed the

backbone for identification of fisheries resource problems and project funding needs for numerous fisheries and land management entities (James 1984).

7. These plans were instrumental in selecting projects for the very first Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC), and subsequent funding by Bonneville Power Administration (BPA).

8. The methodology for identifying resource problems and needs was to examine habitat and fish status at the local on-the-ground level, stream-by-stream. This necessarily involved extensive coordination with other local tribal, federal, state and private managers who also worked in those streams and were the most familiar with the specific habitat conditions.

9. As discussed more below, this “boots-on-the-ground” approach was used to identify and select habitat and hatchery projects for the Fish MOA.

10. I was also a key player in the additional NPCC subbasin planning efforts in 1990, 2000 and 2004 (CTUIR was the lead in developing Umatilla and Walla Walla basin plans).

11. Similarly, I continued my involvement in project planning by serving on the State of Washington’s Recovery Board and NOAA’s ESA Recovery Planning in 2006-2008.

12. All these efforts were similar in that they utilized habitat and fish status data to define problems and prescribe solutions. Importantly, each subsequent planning effort produced increasingly sophisticated data bases and models to use in identifying limiting factors and needs.

13. The Fish MOA project selection process built on and expanded these earlier efforts. The ability of the tribes to identify habitat projects and benefits grew from the wealth of information gained from decades of subbasin planning, supplemented and updated by new information we gathered working and living with these streams on a continual basis. The tribes’ recent Fish MOA project selection process used the most current planning information. The

benefits estimates for these projects were assayed using the method described in the Declaration of Bob Rose.

14. I am confident that the best possible project planning occurred in the Fish MOA project selection process.

### **Project Development and Implementation**

#### Fish Passage Improvements:

15. An example of a successful fish passage improvement project in which I played a major role in development and implementation is the Umatilla Basin Project. That project provides for enhanced flow in the Umatilla River through a water exchange with irrigators whereby Umatilla River water is left instream for fish. The project happened because traditional adversarial interests joined forces to support and secure benefits for both fish and agricultural interests. This project exemplifies the type of locally negotiated successes that CTUIR has implemented. The operations and maintenance of this cornerstone project is included in the Fish MOA.

16. The CTUIR also developed and implemented millions of dollars of specific fish passage improvements at irrigation diversions in the mid-to-lower Umatilla and Walla Walla Basins. Projects such as improved ladders at diversion dams and protective screening on diversion canals are key fish restoration components. Remaining projects of this type (along with operations and maintenance of existing projects) are included in the Fish MOA. The CTUIR has coordinated and promoted these projects with various irrigators who realize that cooperation for improved fish passage means less hassle for irrigation operations.

18. The CTUIR staff and its local on-the-ground-co-managers identified numerous other small passage blockages in mid-to-upper basin tributaries (road bridges, culverts,

#### **DECLARATION OF GARY JAMES**

W594.01(e)Declaration of Gary James.doc

abandoned small diversion structures, etc., sometimes referred to as “imminent threats”) in subbasin planning efforts and many of the required fixes are also included in the Fish MOA.

19. Collectively, these projects will provide unimpeded fish access to an anticipated 100-200 plus of miles of habitat.

Habitat/floodplain Improvements:

20. As I intimated earlier, the largest category of CTUIR Fish MOA projects are habitat improvement actions.

21. The CTUIR Department of Natural Resources’ Mission Statement emphasizes the need to provide good quality river and watershed habitat that will support and sustain tribal first food values. This has been the driving force in identifying and implementing habitat projects that promote natural floodplain function (hydrology, geomorphology, connectivity, riparian vegetation and aquatic biota).

22. Through extensive subbasin planning efforts and methods described above and in the Declaration of Bob Rose, habitat limiting factors and restoration needs were thoroughly identified prior to the MOA negotiations. The Fish MOA expansions for habitat enhancement actions were designed to address these limiting factors and needs.

23. In addition, the monitoring of past actions, along with coordination with local landowners, allowed the CTUIR to fine tune the approaches and target priority areas for proposed projects.

24. The MOA increased funding for habitat enhancement threefold. Over the 10-year MOA period, habitat improvements are expected to occur in more than 200 stream miles in the Umatilla, Walla Walla, John Day, Grande Ronde and Tucannon subbasins.

Hatchery/Supplementation:

25. Hatchery actions have been a key component of CTUIR co-managed fish restoration programs. Supplementation projects have been used to reintroduce extirpated populations and to boost declining or depressed populations. The impacts of human-induced fish mortalities occurring during a salmon's journey to the ocean and back has most often resulted in two spawners not replacing themselves. This deficit adult return situation has required that managers consider an artificial tool such as hatcheries to boost smolt numbers and achieve greatly improved adult-to-adult return rates.

26. The CTUIR operates a total of 11 hatchery satellite facilities located in the Umatilla, Walla Walla and Grande Ronde Basins. The facilities are utilized to acclimate and release juvenile fish in natural production areas and to hold and spawn adults used for broodstock.

27. The hatchery programs are implemented in a diverse manner according to specific subbasin situations and management objectives. Examples of successful CTUIR hatchery reintroduction/supplementation efforts have occurred in all three of our subbasins.

28. With the Fish MOA funding secured, these projects are more than reasonably certain to continue. In addition, a new facility will be constructed in the Walla Walla Basin following Section 7 ESA consultation. These existing projects and their results are described below.

**UMATILLA BASIN:**

29. The CTUIR used aggressive hatchery programs in the Umatilla Basin to reintroduce salmon and supplement the existing ESA-listed steelhead population. An average annual return of 14,000 salmon today (resulting from BPA plus all other funding sources)

replaces a run that was extinct for nearly a century. Benefits of continued Fish MOA funding of hatchery programs in the Umatilla Basin are estimated to be 7,000 returning salmon/steelhead per year.

30. The spring Chinook program has been the most successful with annual returns rebuilding to 4,000-5,000 fish (Figure 1). The program originally used Carson stock for reintroduction, but now has sufficient Umatilla returns for its own broodstock. The success of this program is demonstrated by the approximately 1,000 spring Chinook that spawn naturally in the upper Umatilla River annually and deposit about 2 million eggs (Contor 2008). This program has also allowed for Indian and non-Indian salmon fisheries in the Umatilla River during 15 out of the last 19 years.



Figure 1 Adult and jack spring Chinook salmon returning to Three Mile Falls Dam, Umatilla River (1989-2008)

