ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Ronald M. Anglin
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

October 14, 1994
Fallon, Nevada

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Interview Conducted by:
Donald B. Seney
Historian
Bureau of Reclamation

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Oral History Program
Bureau of Reclamation

Anglin, Ronald M. ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW.
Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney, Historian, Bureau of Reclamation, October 14, 1994, in the narrator's office in Fallon, Nevada. Transcription by Barbara Heginbottom Jardee. Edited by Donald B. Seney. Repository for the record copy of the interview transcript is the National Archives and Records Administration in College Park, Maryland.

Interview formatted, printed, and bound 2003.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Oral History Interview: Ronald M. Anglin*

FAMILY AND EARLY LIFE

Seney: Today is October 14, 1994. My name is Donald Seney, and I'm with Mr. Ronald Anglin of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in his office in Fallon, Nevada. Good afternoon, Ron.

Anglin: Good afternoon.

Seney: Why don't we begin by your telling me about [yourself]. First, give me your birth date and where you were born and where you grew up.

Anglin: Okay, I was born September 30, 1947, in Sibley Hospital in Washington, D.C. My grandfather had moved to Arlington, Virginia, during the Depression, from North Carolina,

---

* This manuscript was delivered to Mr. Anglin in September, 1995. The cover letter that accompanied the manuscript included the following: "We would like the enclosed back thirty days from the day you receive it, I hope that will not be inconvenient. If I do not receive the edited manuscript back from you in sixty days I will assume that you wish to make no corrections, and we will proceed with publication." As of July,1996 no corrected manuscript had been received from Mr. Anglin.

Unless otherwise indicated, material in brackets was inserted by editor.

and my mother ended up graduating high school, Washington High School, in Arlington, Virginia. My father came up there, they had both been from a rural town in North Carolina. My father came up there, they were married. They both came from a rural town in North Carolina, Weldon, were married during the Second World War, and I was born and raised in the Arlington area. At the time I was raised there, Arlington was rapidly going from a semi-rural area to an urban area, and now it's converted into a metropolitan area, a city.

As I was growing up, I was always interested in the outdoors, I spent most of my time following the creeks down to the Potomac River.

Seney: And these <u>were</u> the outdoors when you were growing up.

Anglin: These were the outdoors, playing along the Potomac River, up and down the Potomac River. I had one great uncle that had a real interest in the outdoors and he was -- I don't want to call him my mentor, but I was always interested in him. When I was in high school I went and took a bunch of aptitude tests to try to determine which direction I should go, and they told me I should be a forest ranger, a gunsmith, or a clock repairman. And so I went through an apprentice program as a gunsmith

and worked as a gunsmith for ten years, paid my way through college as a gunsmith.

Seney: Did you enjoy that?

Anglin: Oh yeah, I enjoyed it.

Seney: Still do it?

Anglin: I still, to a limited extent, do it, and I'm a firearms instructor for the Fish and Wildlife Service now. I've always had an interest in firearms and I enjoy teaching people how to use firearms properly.

Seney: Let me go back for a minute and ask you what your dad did.

Anglin: My dad was a person that got married young and he had a lot of opportunities that were offered to him. He had an opportunity to go to the Naval Academy and he turned it down because he wanted to get married. He had an opportunity to play football at North Carolina State, and he couldn't because he had three kids. And so he had a number of opportunities, it ended up he was -- in his early years, twenties and thirties, he was very frustrated, he was a carpenter and had seven kids. And he always told me that if you have an opportunity or see an opportunity, grab it, because they

only come once or twice.

Seney: What did he end up doing?

Anglin: He was a carpenter.

Seney: All his life?

Anglin: All his life, until he died. And my mother was home up until most of my brothers and sisters were grown.

Seney: Where do you come?

Anglin: I'm third. I've got a sister that's just fifty, and a brother that's forty-eight. I'm forty-seven. I've got a sister that's forty-five now, a brother that was born in '52 so that must make him forty-two. I've got a brother that was born in '56 and a sister that was born in '62. So I came from a relatively large family. I grew up in a Catholic neighborhood and I was Southern Baptist.

Seney: They must have all thought you were Catholic.

Anglin: Well, yeah, they probably did. But I ended up, it's interesting, two of my three brothers have ended up marrying Catholic women. I'm married to a Catholic woman. My two other brothers are married to Catholic women.

Seney: Do you have a large family?

SEEKING A HIGHER EDUCATION

Anglin: Two. I have two boys. I have a boy that's going to the University of Arizona right now, majoring in architecture. And I've got a boy that's in ninth grade here in the schools in Fallon.

And my interest, working in the gun shop in Falls Church, Virginia, there was a man who became kind of a mentor, kind of like my grandfather -- even asked my father to adopt me. He was the Head of the English Department at George Washington University, a man by the name of Ernest Shepherd [phonetic spelling], went by the name of "Shep." He spent a lot of time in West Virginia. His wife was from West Virginia, and she was in charge of the libraries for Washington, D.C. So anyway, we became good friends over the years and they convinced me to go on to school and pursue -- between them and my father -- pursue a degree in wildlife and forestry.

Seney: So once you got out of high school you went on to college?

Anglin: I started in junior college and I worked at it, and I was drafted and turned down by the

military, because I'd worked in Montana and picked up some parasites, and so they made a hole in my stomach and the military turned me down. This was during the height of the Vietnam War. I ended up going to the University of West Virginia and majored in forestry. I met my wife at the same time. She was going to the University of West Virginia majoring in biology.

Seney: What were you doing in Montana, by the way?

Anglin: I was working for BLM [Bureau of Land Management], I was surveying for BLM.

Seney: Was this a summer kind of job?

Anglin: It was a summer job.

Seney: A college kind of job?

Anglin: Well, yeah, it was kind of in between trying to figure out what I wanted to do. And so I applied for a summer job, BLM was hiring, I was on a survey crew there outside of Helena, and enjoyed it.

Seney: Learn anything valuable there?

Anglin: Well, I spent a lot of time dealing with topo [topographical] maps and locating, surveying

corners that had to do with mining claims of the 1860s, and we'll get to it in just a second, but when I was living in Washington state, I ended up writing the history and it was dealing with some of these mining claims I was surveying in the 1960s, I was researching them in the 1980s when I was in Washington state.

So I went to the University of West Virginia. I first got a degree in business at a junior college, and then I got a degree in forestry and wildlife with the University of West Virginia.

Seney: Is that a well-known forestry and wildlife place?

GOING TO WORK FOR THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Anglin: It's a well-respected, East Coast, undergraduate school in forestry and wildlife. The graduate program has progressed, from my understanding, substantially since I was going to the University, and now it's recognized as a pretty good graduate program also. I left there, went back and was working at the gun shop and applied for a job with Fish and Wildlife Service and was able to get hired at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Laurel, Maryland. (aside about noise) I was hired at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center as a

wildlife biologist, a GS-5, worked at Patuxent dealing with canvasback ducks, and they had me working on Chesapeake Bay, and I worked everything on Chesapeake Bay that was titled from Cape Henry to Cape Charles -- all the rivers. (move to quieter location) I was hired by Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Laurel, Maryland, to work with canvasback ducks, and I was working for the Migratory Bird Habitat and Research Lab.

Seney: Now this was with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Anglin: This was U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This was my first job with them, and I was hired in November 197[2?]?

Seney: Hard to get hired? Or were they looking for people?

Anglin: Well, they were looking for some bodies, and I had a couple of contacts living in the Washington, D.C. area, they were able to help me get my first job, get my foot in the door.

Seney: By "contacts" you mean?

Anglin: People inside the Service.

Seney: That you'd met through University of West

Virginia?

Anglin: I met through the University, I met through the gun shop, had met through the church that I was brought up in, and they were able to open a door for me and help me get my first job.

Seney: Is that unusual in the Fish and Wildlife? Is that pretty much the way it works?

Anglin: That's pretty common in natural resources. I think it's pretty common for anybody for their first job. You have to have a break. And I don't hold it against anybody that gets a break on their first job. After their first job, they should be on their own and they should be working for themselves. But it's kind of going to work in a university, you go through school and get your degrees and then you're trying to get a job as an associate professor or whatever it is -- you get a break, somebody opens the door for you and you get your foot in it and you're able to sell yourself and you get a job. And that's what I had. I had a door opened for me and I was able to step in and sell myself after that.

Seney: What was your first reaction? Did you say, "Gee, this is what I've been looking for"?

Anglin: Well, it was a little strange, because when I

first went to work for them they didn't tell me what I was going to do, they just said that I was going to be working with canvasbacks. So I came to work the first day in, I guess you must say "street clothes." I wasn't well-dressed, but I was in nice slacks and loafers and a shirt and sweater, and I spent that day on a boat out running around Chesapeake Bay, shooting ducks in the middle of November, and it was quite cold and nasty that particular day. (laughter)

Seney: Shooting ducks, because you were . . . .

Anglin: Collecting them for food habits.

Seney: So you wanted to open them up and see what they were eating.

Anglin: Right. We did food habit work on these canvasbacks.

Seney: What did you find, by the way?

Anglin: They were shifting their diet from vegetation, which they had predominantly eaten in the Bay, wild celery. But over the years the celery and the vegetation of the bay was being destroyed because of pollutants coming into it, and the huge increase in populations around Chesapeake Bay, and so it shifted to clams, and

they wanted to know if that was affecting their reproduction. I don't think they ever substantiated one way or the other. And then over the course of the three years I worked there, we banded canvasbacks on half-a-dozen locations on the Bay. We color marked and we painted them three or four different colors.

Seney: The purpose being?

Anglin: To locate their migration, see where they were moving around in the Bay, how the populations were being affected at different times of the year.

Seney: Is that interesting work?

Anglin: I found it fascinating. I really found it fascinating, really enjoyed working on the Bay. I spent probably seventy percent of my time working on the Bay. Every month of the year that it wasn't frozen, I was out on the Bay doing something, working with the watermen or doing benthic sampling, checking the bottom for organisms.

Seney: Benthic?

Anglin: Benthic sampling is where you put a dredge down, you grab a collection of mud off the bottom and you look at the bottom organisms,

or you look at the plants, and you try to determine what's available for the birds to feed on. Then you correlate that with what you may find in the bird after you shoot the bird for food habits work.

And I was lucky at the time to work with a man by the name of Fran Euler [phonetic spelling]. Fran Euler was an old, old naturalist with the Service. He had been originally hired in the 20s and then he had retired and they brought him back, and this was in '72. And he recently died here -- I guess he was ninety-five or something like that. But he was an old naturalist, something that the Service is lacking now is naturalists. He was a person that looked at all of the flora and fauna out there and could tell you more about it than a lot of the biologists or specialists today. I mean, that's just part of the way the world is now -- we're more and more specialized in our outlook.

Seney: He gave you a different point of view, did he?

Anglin: He gave me quite a different point of view. I used to take him out on the Bay, and I guess my whole life I have tried to learn from older people, because I feel that they have a lot of knowledge, and it's so easy for us to think that knowledge starts with us -- we walk through the door and everything is starting with us,

when in fact there's a whole history of events that have occurred prior to you that affect that you're doing today. And so as I said earlier, the university professor, Ernest Shepherd, I spent a lot of time with him. He had grown up on the Potomac River in the early 1900s. I went to a lot of the places he went to. He gave me a rifle that he'd bought in Washington, D.C., in 1914 that he shot turtles on the Potomac River. And so I learned a lot from this old man. And then Fran Euler is another time. When I met Fran Euler I learned a lot from Fran Euler, because Euler had spent most of his life working on Chesapeake Bay, and he had regular transects where he would go around and he'd look at different plants and animals every year on the Bay, and his records went back fifty years.

Seney: "Transects" -- by that you mean regular points?

Anglin: Regular points that he would go and he would observe what was there at that time, be it plants, animals, or whatever, and he would record it and write it down. And he had these vast collections of data over a long period of time. And that's one of the reasons that the Service hired him back, is because he had this knowledge that very few people had had. And so I tried to get as much knowledge as I could out of him, and I would be out and I'd find something that would be unusual to me. Like I

found some prehistoric oysters that I'd found down on one of the rivers on the Bay, and they were real big oysters. I brought them back and he wrote me a long dissertation about where the oysters came from and why this bed of oysters was here and how it developed geologically and so on and so forth. So he had a world of knowledge that I was able to glean bits and pieces of. Did I learn as much as he did? Of course not, but I picked up pieces of his understanding of the natural resources.

Seney: Did he teach you how to be curious and how to ask questions? Was that part of it too?

Anglin: Well, I don't know if he did that, because I always ask questions -- I'm a real curious person, I like to determine that. So I think that's part of my nature, and that's probably part of the reason I've looked for older people over my life that had knowledge that I could gain from it. And during the course of my work there, they sent me to the Mississippi River and I worked collecting canvasbacks and doing the same basic types of work with canvasbacks on the Mississippi River. They had me bring a boat from the Georgia line to Delaware one time, looking for osprey up the Intercoastal Waterway. So it was a real good foundation in basic biology. But I realized at Patuxent that I did not have the credentials to be in research.

The Fish and Wildlife Service and in most scientific communities, if you don't have a Ph.D., you're beating your head against the wall. And it's nothing against you, that's the nature of the beast. If you're in the university, if you don't have a Ph.D., you're really limited. I didn't have a Ph.D., I had a bachelor's of science, and so I could see the writing on the wall: I could either go back to school and get a doctorate, or I could go into refuges. So I looked around and a lot of the people at Patuxent at the time wanted me to stay.

GOING INTO WILDLIFE REFUGE WORK

Seney: That would have been part of the research arm, then, of the bureau?

Anglin: It was the research arm of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Seney: I'm sorry, Service, right.

Anglin: It had switched from the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife about the time that I went to work for them. It went from the Office of Biological Surveys in the 1940s to the U.S. Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife. They combined fisheries and wildlife together and took them out of the Department of Agriculture and made the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in

1942 or '43. It was the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and then it became in '72 or '73, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Seney: Which is part of the Department of . . . .

Anglin: Department of the Interior. The Fish and Wildlife Service has always been the biological arm of the Federal government.

When I realized I didn't have a future in research, I worked to try to get out of, look for another job. And I found another job with Refuges in California, and my wife and I moved to the Central Valley of California in September 1975.

GETTING MARRIED

Seney: When were you married, by the way?

Anglin: I was married December 16, 1972.

Seney: Tell me a little bit about meeting your wife and who she is.

Anglin: Okay, my wife's name was Kathleen Perparnik [phonetic spelling]. Her parents were both from Wisconsin. Her father moved to the Washington, D.C. area just prior to the Second World War and was actually drafted in

Arlington, Virginia. He ended up marrying his wife. Her name was Eileen Piper. That marriage had four kids. My wife is the youngest. She has a twin brother, but she was the last one that came out, so she claims that she's the youngest. We actually grew up about two blocks apart, but didn't know each other. I knew her sister. Her sister is deaf and I used to ride a school bus with her sister. And so I knew her sister, and then I met her at the University of West Virginia. I took her name off a bulletin board, she was looking for a ride back to the Washington, D.C. area. I gave her a ride home and we became friends and ended up marrying each other. Now she's my best friend and I'm her best friend.

Seney: When were you married? What was the date?

Anglin: December 16, 1972. I'd started work for the Fish and Wildlife Service on November 13, 1972, then we got married a month later. We weren't going to get married until I had a job. We had dated for two or three years, but I was looking for a job. So I guess I was twenty-five and she was twenty-four when we got married. We got married in Arlington, Virginia.

Seney: Why don't you mention your two children and their names and when they were born.

Anglin: Our first son is Seth McCray [phonetic spelling]. He was born June 19, 1976, in Los Banos, California. And then my other son is Chad Piper, and he was born in Moses Lake, Washington, November 21, 1979.

WORKING AS THE SAN LUIS REFUGE IN CALIFORNIA

Seney: So you must have gone out to Kesterson, then, Wildlife Refuge, when you came to California.

Anglin: I was stationed at the San Luis Refuge and I was in charge of Merced and Kesterson Refuge at the time. At the time, it was the first time I'd gone into Refuges and Refuges felt that people that came out of research were not trusted. And so I had a lot of trouble with the first supervisor I worked for. He was an old Refuge person that felt that anybody that was in research was -- I don't know if he felt you were a Communist or what, but he had some really hard feelings about it.

Seney: So there's antagonism within the Service.

Anglin: There was at the time. He actually met me at the front door of his house. My wife and I flew out from Virginia, we'd never been to California, Central Valley, California, from Arlington is cultural shock to begin with. I'd

never been on a refuge, didn't know anything, really, about refuges. He invited my wife and I over to his house for Sunday dinner. We went to the front door, rang the doorbell and this man came to the front door, I'd never met him before and I said, "Hello, I'm Ron Anglin, this is my wife Kathleen," and he looked at me and he said, "I want to get something perfectly clear from you right now, son: You don't know a fuckin' thing about nothin'." And I looked at my wife and she looked at me and we shook our heads, "Are we at the right house? Where'd this guy come from?" This man was a legend in his own mind and from there we had a downhill relationship. I spent about two-and-a-half years, three years with that man.

Seney: Wondering, probably, if you'd made the right choice, huh?

Anglin: Oh, a lot of times I wondered if I'd made the right choice. That was one of the things I disliked about the Service at the time: When they had a problem they wouldn't address the problem. And they knew they had a problem, they wouldn't address the problem with this individual. They addressed it after I left, but I spent two-and-a-half years with this man. When I first went into the office, there was a sign on my desk in Latin, and you had to ask him what it meant if you didn't know Latin, and

you had to go into him, "Okay, now what does this mean?" He said, "I've got you by the balls, your heart and mind is going to follow." And so that's kind of the relationship that we had. The only thing I learned from that man that I can say I honestly learned from him, that I know how, if I wanted to walk in and make an employee cry. I have told my own employees that, I think that we can get along a lot easier, and I've worked with people that can walk right in here every day and make you miserable. And if that's what we want to do, I've worked with him, I know how to do it. I don't believe in dealing with people that way.

Seney: What is a refuge?

Anglin: Well, there are a lot of different types of refuges. The ones in the Central Valley of California, there was a Lee Act refuge -- the Merced was a Lee Act refuge. A Lee Act refuge was a mitigation for agricultural depredation There was an overland refuge there, Kesterson Refuge . . . .

Seney: Let me stop you just to say that for those of us who don't really understand what that means, that means agricultural usage had taken up bird habitat. So you were making up for that loss of bird habitat by creating a new bird habitat.

Anglin: And then also planting crops to lure the birds into the refuge.

Seney: What were you planting to lure them in?

Anglin: We planted corn, we also planted millet, and we planted alfalfa, we planted grains -- anything to attract the geese and birds.

Seney: To feed on.

DEFINING A REFUGE

Anglin: To feed on, to keep them off of the private lands. One of the real problems that the Fish and Wildlife Service has, and we call ourselves the refuge system, but it's actually a collection of lands that vary tremendously from one part of the country to the other. They could be from migratory birds to endangered species to big game. I can't say that we have any cultural refuges, but that might be something that comes in the future. We have lizard refuges, we have butterfly refuges, we have, like I said, big game, waterfowl, shore birds -- it runs the whole gauntlet [gamut] of habitat. It's the largest collection of habitat in the world set aside for wildlife.

Seney: What's the total acreage of all the refuges, do you know offhand?

Anglin: It's larger than the Park Service. When they recently, under the Native Claims Act, they transferred most of the lands in Alaska went into the refuge system, and that had to do with hunting and the type of public use that could be allowed on a refuge that couldn't be allowed on a National Park. And so they went into the refuge system.

Seney: So you can hunt on a refuge?

Anglin: Well, that's an interesting position too that most people have a problem with, because the term "refuge," people assume the word "refuge" is like "sanctuary," and the two of them, to most people they think of a sanctuary and a refuge as a refuge, it's a place where you seek sanctuary, and you can get away from problems. If it's a bird, you get away from hunters. Well, most of the land that the Fish and Wildlife Service acquired in the 30s and 40s was the prime waterfowl habitat that hunters had protected and kept into these private hunting preserves. And then when the Service came along and wanted to create refuges, they went to where the prime waterfowl habitat was where these hunt clubs were and they acquired those lands. And some say that they made a pact with the devil in the 30s and opened refuges up to hunting to sell migratory bird stamps so that they could get more money to acquire more

lands. You can get into the philosophical argument back and forth: you should hunt on a refuge, you should not hunt on a refuge. I'm of the philosophy that hunting, per se, as long as it's controlled, does not hurt anything. There are others now in the Fish and Wildlife Service that believe very strongly that there should be no hunting on national wildlife refuges. I don't know where the argument is going to go over the next twenty or thirty years in our society, but ultimately I think that hunting will be stopped on national wildlife refuges. I think that when we lose migratory bird hunting in this country we're going to lose a part of our heritage that I hate to see go, because I think hunting has been a very large part of the conservation movement, since the very beginning of it. Most of the early people in the natural resources were hunters and fishermen. Hunters and fishermen have been the ones traditionally that have coughed up the dollars to protect these things. I don't know if you've dealt with very many environmental groups, but a lot of environmental groups have great ideas, but they have no money. Hunters traditionally will raise money, and lots of money, to protect what they believe in. You can look at Ducks Unlimited, you can look at the Isaac Walton League, you can look at any of these early conservation movements -- they were predominantly hunters. Audubon -- the

Audubon Society -- [John James] Audubon was a hunter. I'm also on the Heritage Committee for the Fish and Wildlife Service, looking at the history of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and one of the things that I recently learned about the Heritage of the Fish and Wildlife Service -- and it kind of parallels me and it parallels other people -- is that Fish and Wildlife Service has traditionally been a mentor organization. And if you go back and you look at the early history of the conservation movement, and you look of the early history of people that got into conservation, they got into it more as a mentor. When you go back, there was a man, I believe his name was Blair [phonetic spelling]. Blair became the first President of the Smithsonian Institute -- and I may be wrong if he was the President or not, I really don't remember -- but he was interested in birds, and he found a particular bird that he thought was rare, and he wrote Audubon a letter. Audubon had looked for the early explorers, he went and spoke to Daniel Boone. When he was young, he went and spoke to these people. So these early explorers were his mentors. Blair came along and he found this bird that he thought he was rare, he wrote Audubon a letter, Audubon said yes, indeed, it was a rare bird, and Audubon took him under his wing and used him and was his mentor and moved him along. Blair moved along through the organization and became, I

believe, like I said, the first President of the Smithsonian Institute. There was another man that came along that was Merriman [phonetic spelling]. Merriman came along and he also was interested in the outdoors, and he spoke to Blair and Blair took him on as a mentor, and moved his career along. As we go along, I'll get into a little bit more, but there was a man by the name of Vernon Mills. Merriman became a mentor to Mills. Mills came to the Lahontan Valley, explored in Lahontan Valley for migratory birds in the 1800s. His descendants now still live in the Lahontan Valley and farm in the Lahontan Valley, and they came here because of the mentor program that kind of had developed in the conservation movement. There's another early old fellow . . . .

END OF SIDE 1, TAPE 1.
BEGINNING OF SIDE 2, TAPE 1.

Anglin: Mills was a mentor to Ray Alcorn.

Seney: So there's kind of a direct line here.

THE IMPORTANCE OF HUNTERS TO THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Anglin: It's kind of a direct line. And I've had mentors, seeking out older people as mentors as my

career has developed, and they have helped me along through my career. So I feel very strongly that that's how the Fish and Wildlife Service is, and that's how the organization has moved along, and I come from a background that -- I grew up in Arlington, but I've always had this deep desire to be outside hunting and fishing and shooting and so on and so forth. So these people moved me in that direction. And so that's why I feel, because of my background, I feel that hunting has a place on National Wildlife Refuges. There's an awful strong body on the other side of the equation that's anti-hunting, and anti-exploitation of National Wildlife Refuges, but I feel hunters have really paid a high price to protect these lands over the years, and there's a lot of people who've come along lately that don't have this deep commitment.

Seney: Politically, the hunters are important to the Fish and Wildlife Service, are they not, in terms of providing you support and so forth?

Anglin: They have been, but as we become more and more of an urban country, hunters and traditional outdoors people that you would think of -- and I'm not saying that a person that backpacks or rides a mountain bike is not an outdoors person -- but what I have always traditionally thought of as an outdoors person

is a person that's hunting and fishing and living outdoors. Our society is getting to have fewer and fewer of these type of people in it. And it gets into the philosophy of why people hunt and why people don't hunt, and how. I've spent a lot of time thinking about it, and I think that a person inherently, genetically, or something, has a predisposition to be a hunter. I think that's where I come from. Somewhere in my genes I have this hunter desire. I have one great-uncle that had that, out of all of my relatives he was the only one that had this burning desire, I'm the only one in my generation that has this same desire. My two boys, I brought them up hunting and fishing, but they don't have the same desire that I have. And so I have always felt that it's something that you're born with and you can't get away from it. But our society, as we become more and more urban, we have less and less time for these people to develop that, I guess, instinct or whatever it is that makes us a hunter.

WORKING IN THE SAN LUIS REFUGE

Seney: Let me go back to Los Banos and the refuge. How long were you there?

Anglin: I was there about three years, and I worked at Kesterson, and this was prior to when Kesterson blew up and became the toxic

problem area that it turned into.

Seney: Any hint at the time you were there that it was going to such a problem?

Anglin: When I was there, the National Park Service used it as wintering area for all the livestock out of Yosemite, and the area was absolutely hammered. There was not even a blade of grass growing out there in the area. Between the Park Service and the private landowner out there, that area was hammered. There was hardly a blade of grass out there. There were these settling ponds that the Bureau had put in.

Seney: Bureau of Reclamation?

Anglin: The Bureau of Reclamation. It was a Bureau of Reclamation overlay. Originally they had . . . .

Seney: When you say "overlay," what does that mean?

Anglin: The Bureau of Reclamation had prime jurisdiction, they either acquired it or had taken the land out of public domain so they had withdrawn the land, they had first withdrawal on the land. They turned around, and since Bureau of Reclamation is not a land-managing agency, the Fish and Wildlife Service is, they turned around and transferred the management authority to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

They still had primary jurisdiction over the area for what it was originally set aside for, which was at Kesterson, which was the evaporation of drainwater, and we had secondary jurisdiction for everything else. They [had] done the same thing with the Park Service. You go down on the Colorado River, there is a number of Park Service areas, Bureau of Reclamation created the dams, the Park Service has come in, they're an overlay over the top of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Seney: Did you deal much with the Bureau down there?

Anglin: Very little. Very, very little.

Seney: I mean, once they do this, they really turn it over.

Anglin: They just basically get out of it altogether. And so you have very little input with the Bureau of Reclamation, except on that part of the management that they deal with. When I left California, I moved to Washington state.

GOING TO WORK IN WASHINGTON STATE

Seney: How does that work, by the way? Do you bid a job?

Anglin: You put in for it. We have something we call "green sheet" -- it's a list of jobs around the country. And you go down the ranking factors and you see if you have the qualifications for that job. If you have the qualification for the job, then you apply for it, and then they go through a selection process and it's kind of like a crap shoot. You put your name in and you may or may not get drawn, and you can get on a rollercoaster getting way high, thinking you're going to get the job, and get way low when you don't get it. You really have no control over it, once you put your name into a hat. I put my name in the hat for the one in Othello, Washington. As I said earlier, I was having a lot of trouble with the project leader at the time. He had some shenanigans going on with migratory birds that I didn't particularly care for.

Seney: What does that mean?

Anglin: He would chase birds out of a closed area. He wanted his hunting average to go up, so he had me go into a closed area. He really got in trouble. That was what finally got him in trouble.

Seney: He wanted his kills to go up, is that what that means?

Anglin: He wanted his hunting average to go up at the time.

Seney: So the fewer birds there are and the more that are killed, the better it looked for him?

Anglin: He thought so. He's dead now. He died a number of years ago. Like I said, he was from the old school and I don't care what profession you get into, you have some that are real stinkers in it, and I considered him one of the real stinkers. But he finally got himself in trouble over that one -- trouble enough that they finally got rid of him.

So anyway, I moved up to Othello, Washington, I worked for a man up there who I really respect, John Taylor. At the time I moved there I was the Assistant Manager of that refuge there. Out of that office we managed the Columbia Refuge, which was another Bureau of Reclamation overlay, partly owned by the Fish and Wildlife Service, partly owned by the Bureau of Reclamation. It was kind of a hodgepodge, and then we had the lands that had been transferred to us for management from the Department of Energy along the Columbia River at Hanford, Washington, where they created the plutonium for the first [atomic] bombs. And so we had management responsibility for those, and I worked up there for a number of years. John

Taylor left, another manager came in who we had disagreements on a number of times.

But anyway, to make a long story short, I got very interested in the history of the central part of the state of Washington. Over the course of seven or eight years that I was there, I worked very closely with Bureau of Reclamation and put together a history of the Columbia Basin prior to the development of the Columbia Basin Project by the Bureau of Reclamation. This is being published, supposed to come out the spring of '95 by the Washington State University at Pullman. I collected all this information, put it together into a manuscript, and when I left the state of Washington, I felt very strongly that this belonged to the people in the state of Washington, and so I gave it to the historical society there with no strings attached. I said, "If you all can make any money on it, you can turn around and use it for other historic research." I probably had $5,000-$10,000 of my own money tied up into it, because I went all over the country collecting material. But I felt very strongly, I still do, that when you move to an area, you owe something to the community in which you live in. You should give something back to wherever you live. So anyway, when I left the state, I felt that I owed them something. I gave this back to the state, gave it to the Grant County Historical Society.

Nat Washington, who was the former state senator up there, he drew up the legal documents, I transferred it to them, it kicked around for a number of years, and then the University saw it, read the manuscript, and felt that it was the best history dealing with the central part of the state, and so they wanted to publish it, and so the historical society transferred it to them. I don't know how any money will exchange hands in the future. The only thing I said is if it ever was published I wanted my name on it, and so that's what I get out of it. But it really deals with the history of the state of Washington, and how the Indians use the resources there, and how the white man and the Europeans came in and traveled across the country. And I became convinced that if early man in fact did come across the Bering Straights and into the country, that one of the primary migration routes was this trail that I researched. And a lot of people that looked at the manuscript came to that same conclusion. They found some extremely early remains along these trails, and I felt very strongly, and I argued with the Fish and Wildlife Service that this was part of their responsibility. The Manager at the time said, "No, it's migratory birds." I said, "No, it's all of the resources that you have under your jurisdiction to protect. These trails and the artifacts that are found along and associated with these trails, that's

your responsibility too. You need to protect those resources. Your job is the caretaker of all of the resources out there, not just one part of it, not just migratory birds, or not just mammals and whatever. It's all the resources that you have on that land." And so I felt strongly, one of the reasons I was collecting that information at the beginning was that I felt that to manage a parcel of land you need to understand the history of the land. If you don't understand the history of the land, and understand what has taken place prior to your coming there, then you're going to make all the same mistakes that everybody else did, and you won't know why you can't grow anything here, because somebody has dumped thousands of pounds of pesticides or fuels or whatever else here and covered it up with something else. So you need to understand the history of the resources that you're managing. And so when I move into a new area, I try to learn as much as I can about the history of the resources that I've been asked to protect.

After I was at Othello for about eight years they asked me if I would go down and manage the Umatilla Refuge in Umatilla, Oregon which is down on the Columbia River. I went down there and managed that for about four or five months and tried to get them straightened out. They'd had some problems there, and I then went back to Othello when

they asked me afterwards would I come down to Stillwater. I transferred down here to Stillwater in August of 1986.

COMING TO THE STILLWATER REFUGE IN 1986

Seney: Did you know anything about Stillwater before you came down here?

Anglin: Not a thing. I didn't know anything at all about it, I had no preconceived notions at all. When I first came down here, I had a couple of managers call me up and said that you will probably perish down there within six months.

Seney: Why would they say that?

Anglin: Because they felt that it was a political hot potato down here that I would get myself in trouble right off the bat.

Seney: What makes it a political hot potato?

Anglin: Well, if you look at all the issues that you're dealing with here, every issue that we're dealing with in the western United States, besides mining, the issue here -- and as we talk now I'll switch back and forth to the Truckee-Carson River Systems, Truckee-Carson Irrigation District [TCID], and the Lahontan Valley, and the Newlands Project. The

Newlands Project encompasses all the problems the Department of Interior is dealing with except one, which is mining. And somebody'll say, "No, there's not," and I said, "Well, you stand back and you look at it, you got endangered species, you got grazing, you got water problems, you got urbanization, you got conflicts internally between the Bureau of Reclamation, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the BIA [Bureau of Indian Affairs] -- all sisters of the one agency, the Department of Interior. And it's all sitting in the bastard child of all of the agencies, which is the Great Basin. The Great Basin has always been the bastard child of all the other land management agencies in this country. None of them want to deal with the Great Basin because it is always on the fringes of their regions. The Great Basin is on the fringe of the Fish and Wildlife Service Region 1, Region 2, and Region 6, and so each one of them have a piece of the Great Basin and none of them really want to deal with it.

DEFINING THE GREAT BASIN

Seney: Define the Great Basin for me, describe it.

Anglin: The Great Basin is about 400,000 square miles and it encompasses most of Nevada, a part of California, the southern part of Oregon,

southern part of Idaho, about half of Utah, and depending on who wants to look at it, takes in a little bit of Arizona also. And it's a big area, and you would think that when you say "Great Basin" most people would understand some basic things about the Great Basin, but a lot of people that I've dealt with over time in Interior and even in the Fish and Wildlife Service, they'll call me up on the telephone from Washington, D.C., and say, "Tell me about the problem." And I say, "You answer one question for me first." And they say, "What's that?" And I say, "Where does the Carson River flow?" And invariably I will get answers like, "To the Pacific Ocean." And so automatically I knew that their level of knowledge of the issue that they wanted to understand was zero, and I would have to start from zero and try to build them up to some level so they would have at least a rudimentary understanding of the issue they were trying to deal with. It became very frustrating to me to continually go over these same basic things.

Seney: So you had a lot to learn when you got here.

Anglin: Yes.

Seney: Obeying your rule of wanting to learn as much as you can about the area under your authority.

LEARNING ABOUT THE PROBLEMS IN THE NEWLANDS PROJECT AREA

Anglin: Absolutely. And I spent a lot of time researching on my own the history of the Newlands Project and the history of the Stillwater Marsh and the history of the conflict here that's been going on for, you know, the "Middle East" of water wars in the West. And I've tried to understand and tried to not blame any of the issues on any one group. I mean, it's hard for some people to look at the people in Churchill County and say that they're anything but a bunch of damned farmers, or a bunch of bastard farmers or whatever term you want to hear from people about them. And I said, "Well, you have to understand that these are my neighbors, these are the people that my kids associate with, these are people my wife goes to church with, these are people I've had in my Boy Scout groups, these are people that I care a great deal about. These are not bad people." They are doing exactly what the Federal government told them to do. The Federal government in 1902, as one of these signs says, and I'm sure somebody else has spoken about it, "Come settle the land. We'll give you land of milk and honey. We'll have water, you can grow crops, you can grow kids. Come do this." Well, the people did! And over time, when the government built the Project they failed to look

at the big picture, they failed to take in all of the resources and look at all the resources here. We allocated the resources then. I firmly believe that to understand or to build an understanding of a relationship or a management philosophy or your life or anything, you should have a good foundation under it. The foundation is the key to everything. The foundation is the key to the house you live in today. The foundation is the key to our democracy we have today -- that's our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, that's the foundation of our society. The foundation of your marriage is -- you know, sex is only a small part of it as your relationships develop over time, but it's a big part, and that's part of the foundation of your relationship. And so the foundation is the key to everything, and this Project was built on a crummy foundation. They came here and they -- I'll say "they" an awful lot -- but they, the government, came here, the scientists came here, and they looked at "How do we develop an irrigation project out here?" And they based their knowledge on the twenty wettest years in the last, if I recall right, 300 or 400 years, wettest years in the Great Basin. So they based all of their Project on these twenty extremely wet years, and they built and designed a Project on these wet years. And I think originally they designed the Project for like 250,000 acres. And they had to scale it

back and scale it back and scale it back and scale it back, and now they're down to about 77,000 acres, of which they really irrigate about 57,000 acres. And it was a bad foundation. They allocated all of the resources of these two river systems, the Truckee River and the Carson River, to create agriculture in the desert. They took it away from the Indians. They didn't ask the Indians if they wanted to give it up, they basically took it from the Indians. They had created the Dolz [phonetic spelling] Act in the 1880s. The Dolz Act was a settlement act, much like our Homesteading Act. In the Lahontan Valley they took all these bands of Indians that were running around here, and they said, "Alright, we're going to settle you on these little plots of land," and that's what the Dolz Act did and we came along in 1902 and said, "Ah, well, we made a mistake with the Dolz Act. Let's turn around, we'll give you ten acres of water-righted land for all this land, and we'll turn around and do you some great things here," and they didn't do that. And it went along for a long period of time with not really caring about the original inhabitants, if we're going to say in water rights in the West, which is "first in time, first in right," which is whoever came first. Well, the wildlife came first. That didn't count in 1902. The Indians, we had just finally had the last fight with the Indians about 1890 or something like that at

Wounded Knee up in North or South Dakota. We had the last fight with them, so the Indians were not part of the equation, and we created an irrigation project, based on bad data. And we went along and we built this irrigation project, we built the infrastructure, and we built the populations -- we built everything, one on top of the other as we've gone along over the last ninety years, on a bad piece of foundation.

As I told you earlier, I was told by, I think it was one of the Regional Directors for the Bureau of Reclamation, that they spent $4 million creating this Project out here in the desert. And I'm not being critical of the Bureau of Reclamation, I'm not saying the Bureau of Reclamation is the bad person. They were doing what the government told them to do, "Go out and build an irrigation project." They went out and built an irrigation project -- they're engineers! They think linear. Biologists think circular, they [engineers] think linear. You give me a job, I'm going to get it done. So they got it done, but they spent $4 million building this Project. We spent $4 million building it, the irrigation district has spent $8-10 million fighting in a court, the Indians have spent millions of dollars fighting in a court. The government has spent probably $50 million fighting in court over the years, and now to straighten it out, it's going to cost a quarter of a billion dollars, $250 million to

straighten out a $4 million project, and somebody needs to stand back and say, "Why?" There's got to be a better way to resolve these issues, but we've built all this infrastructure on top of this really poor foundation, and now we're constantly dealing with this crumbling foundation underneath of us, and there's no way to resolve it. We're now locked in a series of negotiations and I hope the negotiations develop something positive.

THE SETTLEMENT II NEGOTIATIONS

Seney: These are the Settlement II negotiations?

Anglin: The Settlement II negotiations. I hope they develop something positive, because we need to reach some solutions, we need to come up with How are we going to allocate these resources? We have to go back now and say, "We made a mistake in 1902. We didn't think about the wildlife, we didn't think about the Indians." And they have legitimate rights to using some of these waters. How do we go back and allocate water to the Indians and to the wildlife, also provide water to the rapid urbanization of this area, and also provide water to these legitimate farmers, the ones that really want to farm? The ones that are hobby farming and the ones that are on extremely marginal ground, we must ask ourselves Is this

the best way to use these limited resources we have in the West, to put it out on very marginal lands because this individual has a right to this water, because from 1902 somebody gave that person that right? I mean, they're tough questions.

PUBLIC LAW 101-618 AND THE OCAP

Seney: Let me ask you, some people I've interviewed have commented to me that they think these Settlement II negotiations aren't really necessary, that the framework to settle all these questions is really in Public Law 101-618. Do you agree with that, or have you thought about that?

Anglin: No, I don't agree with that at all. I don't agree with that because I believe parts of it are in there.

Seney: What isn't in there, you think?

Anglin: Churchill County. Churchill County is not in 618. When 618 was going through, I worked extensively on 618, and I felt I did the best I could. I spoke to some of the community leaders at the time and I said, "You're on a merry-go-round, start grabbing brass rings. The merry-go-round is only going to go around once, you'd better get some brass rings."

"What do you mean, 'brass rings'?" And I said, "You know what you need, and I know what you need. You need a water delivery system for the community, you need roads, you need schools, you need to get the community set up to go into the twenty-first century. I know you're working hard to come into the twentieth century, but the rest of the world's getting ready to go into the twenty-first century. You need these things to get going." And I had people in the community [who] said, "Well, TCID's representing us in these negotiations." I said, "They are not representing me. I'm a taxpayer in this community and TCID does not represent me. I do not own water, I do not pay any money to TCID. TCID represents a part of the community, only a portion of the community. You as the Commissioners and the County Planners, you are the ones that are supposed to represent me, and you're not doing your job. You're letting TCID represent you, and TCID is not representing the whole community. And when TCID walked, the community was dropped out of 618. The reason that piece of legislation went through, now it was easy. You had the wetlands, which is apple pie and motherhood; you had the Pyramid Lake Indians and the Fallon Indians, which is a guilt trip by the anglos in the country now, we feel guilty about what we did to the Indians. So you have that part of that

equation. So you have two very positive parts of the equation to go through. Part of it, the urbanization in Reno, so out of the four pieces, you had three pieces that were positive were going through. Churchill County was left out because Churchill County [TCID] walked. You can argue, and I know that you've probably heard that there's arguments both ways that these people walked; they didn't walk, they got thrown out; or whatever the reason, but they weren't in the final conclusion of the piece of legislation. So Churchill County didn't get anything. And the people of Churchill County have sat and argued many, many times that 618 destroyed the county. And I had a discussion with them over here at the Community Center a couple of weeks ago. I said, "618 did not affect the community, really. It has almost nothing to do with the community except for recoupment. OCAP affects the community. OCAP changed the community. OCAP affected the wetlands. OCAP is the operating criteria and procedures of the Newlands Irrigation Project. That is what affected the community." When that document went through, it changed the way Churchill County could now use agricultural water in the community -- changed it drastically. Changed the amount of drainwater that was now reaching the wetlands, so that instead of having 43,000 acres of wetlands on

the average, we were now down to almost zero. It just destroyed the wetlands. And right or wrong, and we can argue the equation that the Fish and Wildlife Service was heavily involved in OCAP to protect the *cui-ui*, to get more water into Pyramid Lake. OCAP tried to do three things: reach a non-jeopardy position for the *cui-ui*, maximize the use of Carson River water and satisfy the legitimate water right users in Lahontan Valley. The wetlands weren't part of it.

THE STILLWATER WETLANDS

Seney: The Stillwater Wetlands?

Anglin: The wetlands, all the wetlands in Churchill County were not part of the OCAP, they did not have a legitimate water right, because all the water was allocated in 1902. And I argued with people in the Justice Department at the time. They said this many times to me, "That if the Newlands Irrigation Project had been operated correctly and efficiently since 1902, that the wetlands [would have] ceased to exist in 1902. So the government has no responsibility." I said, "This is absurd! The wetlands [have] been here for 10,000 years." "We don't care. [If] the Project was operated correctly and efficiently from 1902, the wetlands cease to exist in 1902, so the Federal

government has no responsibilities to the wetlands."

Seney: It was the inefficiencies that kept the wetlands going.

Anglin: It was through the inefficiencies. That is the same argument that Justice uses now for the ground water, which is basically the water supply for the community. So the Federal government feels it has no responsibility to mitigate for the loss of the ground water, because if the Project had been operated correctly and efficiently from 1902 forward, the water that filled up the difference, the sixty foot of elevation that the water table rose, wouldn't have happened. So they have no responsibility. I think that's an absurd way to look at something, from the Federal government's point of view, but that's what the Federal government's position is. I argued as much as I could that the wetlands have been here. They said, "No, they haven't."

Seney: So your view is that the OCAP works against the interests of the wetlands.

Anglin: Oh absolutely! But it was <u>supposed</u> to. That's what it was supposed to do. If you recall what I said, Maximize use of Carson River water, supply legitimate water right users, and reach a

non-jeopardy position for the *cui-ui*. The wetlands were operating on the inefficiencies of the Project, and everybody told me, "If you want water for those wetlands, go buy it. If you want to protect those wetlands, get money and go buy the water for the wetlands."

END OF SIDE 2, TAPE 1.
BEGINNING OF SIDE 1, TAPE 2.

THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT AND ITS EFFECT ON PYRAMID LAKE AND STILLWATER MARSH

Seney: Today is October 14, 1994. My name is Donald Seney and I'm with Mr. Ronald M. Anglin, at his office in Fallon Nevada. Ron, let me kind of summarize and see if I can point you in a certain direction here. The Fish and Wildlife Service is, kind of, of two minds in this area, it's my understanding. You've got some of your people up at Pyramid Lake, and you've got you and your operation down here in the Stillwater Marsh, and your interests don't coincide, do they?

Anglin: Well, they do and they don't.

Seney: Explain it me.

Anglin: Well, the Fish and Wildlife Service has an obligation to protect species and keep species

from becoming endangered. That is one of our overriding concerns in this country. (tape turned off and on) The Fish and Wildlife Service has responsibility for the Endangered Species Act. The Endangered Species Act is a very powerful Act in this country, extremely powerful Act. If a species is becoming endangered and you can do anything at all to protect that species from becoming endangered. The *cui-ui* in Pyramid Lake was one of the first species listed on the Endangered Species Act. It had been a threatened species before the Endangered Species Act even came in existence.

Seney: What moved it from being "threatened" to "endangered"?

Anglin: It has to do with the threshold level of where it could cease to exist. If it's in a threatened category, it's threatened, but it doesn't have a likelihood of becoming extinct. When it goes into the endangered species category, it has a high likelihood it could become extinct. And so they're trying to protect it from that, trying to keep it in the other category and actually get it out of it.

THE HISTORY OF PROBLEMS ON THE TRUCKEE RIVER AND PYRAMID LAKE

Pyramid Lake has a history of problems, all of them relating way back in the history of the state. When we first settled the state, again we didn't give a damn about the Indians. And we turned around and we logged the Upper Truckee River, we logged the Upper Carson River too. We logged it for the timbers to put into the mines of Virginia City and so forth. And they had big sawmills on the Truckee River and big processing areas, and tremendous amounts of sawdust went down the system and plugged the whole system up, smothered out the fish fry and it smothered out the trout and the *cui-ui* that were in it, went all the way and flushed into Pyramid Lake. Tremendous degradation of the system. And they had laws in the 1870s to stop them from dumping sawdust in the river because they were destroying the fisheries.

Then you had the Truckee Meadows. Truckee Meadows was a huge agricultural area right on the river, and it had all this agriculture and it was degrading the river too. It was pulling the water out, degrading it and hurting the Truckee River. Then in 1902 the Bureau came along and they put a dam. There was a lot of series of dams on the river prior to that. Irrigation diversion dams, and then there were some small hydroelectric dams I was told that were built on the river. And then the Bureau came along in 1902 and they started working

on Derby Dam, and they started working on Derby Dam which is a diversion dam on the Truckee River where they diverted part of the Truckee River into the Lahontan Valley and ultimately into Lahontan Reservoir. But this history of the degradation of the river prior to the Newlands Irrigation Project was there. Creating the dam exacerbated the problem that was already there. And it diverted tremendous amounts of water out of the Truckee River over here. At times people told me that over fifty or sixty percent of the Truckee River was being diverted into the Lahontan Valley. The wetlands in the Lahontan Valley were doing great during this time. You had agriculture and you had the wetlands. Everything was great in the Lahontan Valley. It was the land of milk and honey because they were putting a lot of water into the system.

World War II came along, the Navy used Pyramid Lake as a testing area for torpedoes. What they did to the bottom of that lake, I haven't a clue, but they fired torpedoes and probably detonated torpedoes, did all kinds of further degradation of that system in the 1940s. But we were in a time of war, we could do this kind of stuff, and nobody cared about the Indians. Things went along like this until the 1960s, and then the Indians started to get some clout. Or earlier than that, in the 1940s, the Lahontan cutthroat trout became extinct,

ceased to exist in Pyramid Lake -- there were some other strains scattered around the state of Nevada, but that strain became extinct. The *cui-ui* appeared to be on the road to extinction.

The Fish and Wildlife Service was concerned about the *cui-ui* but was also very concerned about Anaho Island, which is out in the middle of Pyramid Lake, which is the largest colony of white pelicans in North America, and pelicans have to have an island in a lake that is predator-free, they can't deal with ground predators, because they nest on the ground. If they have to deal with coyotes or foxes, they would destroy the colony real fast. So there is very limited areas where you can have this. The Service was very concerned, if you read the files of the Stillwater Refuge, that Pyramid Lake was going to drop in elevation to the point that there'd be a land bridge over to Anaho Island. And so we were very concerned about this and all our documentation was concerned about this. And then we get into the *cui-ui* was coming along at the same time. And during the time that this lake was dropping, again as I said earlier, we had an extremely wet cycle in the 1880s to 1900. It had filled up Pyramid Lake and overflowed it in Winnemucca Lake and created Winnemucca Lake. As the climate changed and the lake level started to drop and the diversion started to increase, Winnemucca Lake progressively got

lower and lower until it eventually went dry. We were concerned that Pyramid Lake was continuing to drop and we were going to have a land bridge and that was going to allow the land predators to get over there.

The Service was concerned about the *cui-ui* and the pelican. The Endangered Species Act was moving its way through Congress, and the Indians were flexing some of their might, and they were trying to stop the diversions that were occurring from the Truckee River during the winter months for the sole purpose of creating power out of Lahontan Reservoir as a revenue source for Churchill County. So they were trying to reduce this, and through an agreement they came to the understanding that they would not be able -- the Bureau and the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District -- would not be allowed to divert water during the winter months to create hydroelectric power. Again, Fish and Wildlife Service loved it [the winter diversions] from the standpoint of the wetlands. Water was coming down in great quantities of prime water coming down the system, and we were ending up with it in the wetlands. Wetlands were doing great! Just absolutely fantastic, because you had all this prime water -- best water it had since before the Project, before any development occurred on the river.

Seney: Because this was not wastewater, there was no irrigation -- this was running straight through.

Anglin: Prime water, absolutely straight Truckee River water, going into the reservoir, creating hydroelectric power, and coming right out to the wetlands. Great water! Wetlands were doing great!

THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT AND THE FIRST OCAP

The Endangered Species Act came along and they came up with the first OCAP. The OCAP is the operating criteria and procedure for the Project. There's been a lot of OCAPs since then. The OCAP we're dealing with now is the 1988 OCAP. But basically, OCAP tightened up the irrigation project and said, "Guys, you've got to live within your means. You cannot have all this extra water, we're going to tighten you up here and you're going to be able to have water, we're going to supply water to legitimate water-right users, but we're going to tighten you up and there's not going to be all this wastewater coming down there," which was supplying the wetlands. So as they tighten it up, tighten the efficiencies up to protect the *cui-ui*, because they were very concerned about the *cui-ui*, we're also concerned about the pelicans -- try to

raise that level [of Pyramid Lake] up. We tightened the efficiency and the noose tighter and tighter on the Project. And the tighter we tighten it up on them, the more the Project has screamed, because it's like a junkie. If you look at the Newlands Irrigation Project as a junkie, they had all the heroin they wanted, and now we're weaning them off of that heroin, and the more we wean them off of that "drug," the more they're screaming, and they're going to scream more and more and more and more, because the noose is getting tighter and tighter on them.

THE ALPINE DECREE

And during this same period of time, the Alpine Decree was working its way. Alpine Decree is the law that adjudicated the water on the Carson River. The Alpine Decree took, I think, forty-three or fifty-three years to work its way through. If you go back in the history of this place, and I know you've heard it before, Mark Twain said 150 years ago, "In Nevada whiskey is for drinkin' and water is for fightin' [over]." And they're still doing it. But the Alpine Decree took a long time to work it's way through the courts, and it segmented the river. And it said, "Alright, you can have water down there in the Lahontan Valley, you can have the consumptive use of the agriculture

crops, 2.99. And the difference between the 2.99 that you can put on the field and what it takes to grow alfalfa, guess where they're getting that from? They're getting it from the ground water, it's being sucked up out of the ground water, which is not there, as far as the Federal government is concerned, because it's inefficiency of the Project. So I don't know what they're going to do if they lower the ground water table, they can't grow alfalfa. I can see that.

Seney: Two point nine nine [2.99] is the acre-feet, you mean.

Anglin: Two point nine nine [2.99], the ground out here has a water duty of 3.5, 4.5, I believe it's 2.5. Benchlands has 4.5, bottomlands has 3.5, and pasturelands I believe has 2.5 or 1.5 -- I can't remember exactly which one it is. But the consumptive use of the crop, alfalfa being the major crop here, is 2.99. So whatever is used above that, certain people felt it was the nonconsumptive use and it went through the system and should end up in the pastoral lands, which are the wetlands.

DISPUTES BETWEEN PYRAMID LAKE AND STILLWATER REFUGE

Seney: I want to get back to the kind of quarrel

between your people at Pyramid Lake and you all down here at Stillwater Refuge. Because you say you really began to suffer down here once the OCAP comes into effect, and that was the OCAP that was intended to ameliorate this land bridge problem and the *cui-ui* problem.

Anglin: That's right. And that's because the Service -- part of the problem of this whole issue is you've got all these "children" of Interior. You've got the Bureau of Reclamation, the BIA [Bureau of Indian Affairs], BLM, Fish and Wildlife Service -- all of them in there, all of them fighting over the same thing. And then internally inside those, the Fish and Wildlife Service, you've got the refuge, which is migratory birds; the other side of the equation you've got ecological services which is primarily dealing with the Endangered Species Act of it. You have land managers like myself, resource people that are tied to the land, trying to manage the land better, and you have people that are regulatory branch. You have a regulatory branch of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and you have a land management branch of the Fish and Wildlife Service. A lot of times they don't come together.

Seney: And you're in the land management part.

Anglin: I'm in the land management -- I'm not the

regulatory branch. This is the regulatory branch over here. There are people in the Fish and Wildlife Service that would say that the regulatory branch ought to be with EPA [Environment Protection Agency] because that's a regulatory agency, where the Fish and Wildlife Service has not been a regulatory agency. And so Fish and Wildlife Service is constantly fighting this battle internally: Are we a regulatory agency or are we a land management agency? Are we the biological arm of the Federal government, or are we a regulatory agency? What are we?! And that's part of the problem here. Am I going to criticize my counterparts in ecological service? No, they're doing exactly what they're supposed to.

Seney: These are the ones up at Pyramid Lake?

Anglin: These are the ones in Reno that deal with the *cui-ui* issue.

Seney: And the endangered species generally.

THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Anglin: And endangered species. And endangered species has precedence over all other acts of the Federal government that deal with natural resources. The Endangered Species Act is an

extremely powerful Act. If you had to weigh between migratory birds and endangered species, endangered species is going to win. The Endangered Species Act is so powerful; we think we have problems here -- we haven't even begun to touch the iceberg on what's going to happen on the Columbia River. When we start dealing with an endangered species on the Columbia River, and the hydroelectric plants on the Columbia River -- and there are people saying we need to blow up dams on the Columbia River to protect the fish runs. I don't think it's ever going to happen, but there are people that say we should do it. The Endangered Species Act is an extremely powerful act. And it's up for renewal this next year.

Seney: What do you think is going to happen with it?

Anglin: I don't know, I think it's going to be changed. I think that there are a lot of people that would like to see it changed. It's done a lot of good. There have been a few examples where people look at it and say, "They've gone too far." It's made a lot of people stop and think before they go off and do developing. If the Endangered Species Act had been in place and some of the environmental acts we have today had been in place in 1902, they'd have never built this Project, because this is not a cost-efficient

project. I don't think that anybody that's dealt with this Project will ever tell you that it's a great project, but it's what we are stuck with today.

THE NEGOTIATIONS SURROUNDING PUBLIC LAW 101-618

Seney: Let me change the subject slightly to ask you, What role did you play in the negotiations surrounding Public Law 101-618?

Anglin: I was heavily involved in 101-618 from the standpoint of dealing with the wetland aspect of it, writing the Section 206 portion of it that dealt with the wetlands. I spent a lot of time dealing with the environmental groups behind the scenes, trying to provide them with information on how best to deal with it, because I am the keeper of the information on the wetlands -- the biological information dealing with wetlands. The environmental communities didn't have that information, so I provided it to them, provided it to the congressional aides, I provided it to anybody that had a need for it.

Seney: When you're talking about environmental groups in this case, you're talking about the Nature Conservancy and the Environmental Defense Fund primarily?

Anglin: The Environmental Defense Fund, the Nature Conservancy, Lahontan Valley Wetland Coalition, the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club. I was instrumental in helping them form the Lahontan Valley wetlands coalition, which was a coalition put together to protect and save the Lahontan Valley wetlands. The coalition was made up of all the environmental organizations, because a coalition is stronger than any one by itself. So the coalition was made up from hunters to nonhunters, from the Trappers' Association to the Defenders of Wildlife -- just about every aspect of the environmental organizations in between were there, coming together and focusing on one thing: to protect the Lahontan Valley wetlands. We never felt that we could ever get back to what was here historically, which was anywhere from 100,000-200,000 acres of wetlands, prior to any development on the Carson River. What we decided to try to work towards was to protect a portion of it, roughly 25,000 acres of what was here originally. The original pieces of legislation, there were three areas that were asked to be protected: the Carson Lake Pasture at 10,200 [acres], Stillwater at 14,000 [acres], and the Fernley Wildlife Management Area at 2,600 acres. I argued many, many times that it was getting confusing, just talking about Stillwater and talking about the environmental, or talking

about the Lahontan Valley wetlands was confusing enough -- when you threw in Carson Lake -- and it wasn't really a lake it was a pasture, and it wasn't really a pasture it was the Greenhead Hunting Club -- that was confusing. The people just didn't understand what anybody was talking about. I said, "To make it simple, let's call it Stillwater Marsh Lahontan Valley Wetlands and just talk about two areas: Stillwater and Carson Lake. Let's drop out Fernley, because Fernley's not in the Lahontan Valley, and it's really always been an area that was receiving seep water off of the Project. And so let's just drop that." So in the sausage-making process they dropped Fernley and they threw in 800 acres in the Fallon Indian Reservation.

Seney: So these were the things you were considering as you were (Anglin: Right.) working up to the negotiations. (Anglin: Right.) Who did you deal with as you were negotiating these things? Obviously you dealt with all the groups you're talking about, but people in Senator [Harry] Reid's office?

Anglin: I dealt with people in Senator Reid's office, I dealt with people in Senator [Bill] Bradley's office extensively. There was a man in Bradley's office named . . . . Gosh, I can't think of his name right now. (pause) Tom Jensen.

Tom Jensen was in Senator Bradley's office, and he was instrumental in working through the piece of legislation. [I] spent a lot of time out here with Jensen, showing him the issues. I gave many, many -- literally hundreds -- of tours, ground tours, overflights of the area, slide presentations, talks, luncheons, dinners, anything I could to promote the Lahontan Valley Wetlands. I spent a lot of my own money flying back to Washington, D.C., talking to different environmental groups dealing with the issue.

Seney: When you say your own money, you mean your personal funds?

Anglin: My personal funds. I took time off, I took annual leave and used my money to fly back to Washington, D.C. to talk to environmental organizations to try to protect these wetlands, because these are terminal wetlands, and terminal wetlands are, acre-for-acre, some of the most productive wetlands in the world. And they were being destroyed, and they needed a champion, they needed somebody out there trying to protect them. But they also needed somebody that had the knowledge of the area. So as I said before, the Service has been the keeper of the knowledge. The Service has been interested in these wetlands since the 1880s. As I said, Vernon Mills was here in the

1880s. Some of his ancestors are in this valley today because of him being here in the 1880s. The Service was here before the Bureau of Reclamation. We were concerned about these wetlands 110-120 years ago. We were concerned about protecting these wetlands. And when they put me down here, when I looked at the issue, the issue here was water -- we had to have water for the wetlands. And so I devoted all my energy to trying to secure water for these wetlands, because that was the most important thing that we had to do. And I felt so strongly about it -- there was another individual working here at the time, a fellow by the name of Steve Thompson who was the biologist -- he felt strongly about it at the time too, and he still does, because his grandfather used to take him duck hunting out on the Stillwater Marsh. And to see the Stillwater Marsh being destroyed hurt him. His grandfather had taken him out there, his grandfather had died, and to go out there and see what was happening, it bothered him. And so we fought and argued with people and we would do it with the understanding that I would stand up and argue until they were really hammering on me, politically, and then I would step down and he'd stand up, and he'd argue until they hammered on him, and then I'd step back up. It was back and forth. We looked at it like building a house. And we used the

analogy back of the foundation. We built a good foundation with the community first. We took these people from TCID Board out to the marsh. Some of them hadn't been out in the marsh in twenty-five years. As kids their parents had taken them out on the marsh and showed them the marsh and hunted the marsh. They hadn't been out there in twenty-five years, and they didn't know what was happening to the marsh. We took them on "donut tours." We'd take them out there and provide them donuts and coffee and sit around and kick the cow pies and talk ducks and talk agriculture. "What are you guys here for? You're growing crops. That's what I'm doing. I'm growing sago palm weeds so the birds can eat it. I'm doing the same thing you're doing. I got to have water, I got to grow crops. I got to have quality water that I can grow crops with. So do you." So we built our foundation with the community that way. And I don't know, maybe you've come across people that dislike me in the community. And I recognize that I have been involved in fundamental changes to this community, major changes, I guess you could say, because I have worked in this so long now. Since I came here, this community is going to change. There's nothing the community can do about it, it's changing. But I do not feel any hatred against me in the community. And I'm not saying that everybody likes me, but I think

everybody recognizes that when they deal with me, they get the truth. You might not like it, but you're going to get the truth from me. And so I think that I have the respect of the people in the community from that aspect. And so Steve and I looked at it as laying the groundwork, "Let's build a foundation with the community, and let's get the community to know who we are, what we're doing, why we're here."

At the same time we had a fish die-off. We were able to bring national and international attention to the plight of these wetlands. And we were able to build on that, and then come up with positive stories and some negative stories and war stories. Over the course of the time I've been here, there's probably been almost 2,000 stories written on this place, and either the newspapers, magazines, or whatever. I mean, it's incredible the number of stories that I've seen written on this place. There's a full-length movie coming out on it this fall, or this winter. It's called *Stillwater* and it deals with this whole issue, the problems that are here.

Seney: This is a documentary?

Anglin: Documentary, yeah. There was a group from the Discovery Channel that came out here this past summer and filmed me and discussed the

history of the Stillwater Marsh and how the Indians used the marsh, and "Why are you concerned about the Indians? Why are you concerned about how the Indians used the marsh today?" Because I believe that you have to look back to move forward. And am I trying to take all the recognition for this? No, I'm not. There were a tremendous number of people that came before me, that I was able to build on what they did, and stand on their backs and move forward. There'll be a lot of people that come after me that will be able to stand on me and build on and go forward from there.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE AND THE STILLWATER MARSH

Seney: But let me ask you this: Who do you report to in the chain of command in the Fish and Wildlife Service?

Anglin: My supervisor has changed over the period of time, but my direct supervisor right now is Bob Fields. Maybe it's better if I explain how the Fish and Wildlife Service works. The Fish and Wildlife Service is like a lot of Federal agencies, a line organization. It goes from the Director in Washington, D.C., in this case who's Molly Beatty [phone]. Molly Beatty's in Washington, D.C.; Mike Spear is located in Portland, Oregon; to me, Ron Anglin. That's

the chain of command. I recognize, and I think anybody else does in the bureau, I perceive that there are many, many middle managers in between. From Mike Spear it goes to John Doebel who is the Assistant Regional Director for Refuges and Wildlife. From John Doebel, he has an assistant, but it goes to Bob Fields who is the Zone Supervisor for Refuges in California and Nevada. From Bob Fields it goes to me.

Seney: Let me ask you, with that in mind, What have been the views of your superiors in terms of your actions here? Obviously you keep them informed on what you do, and you don't do things they don't want you to do -- I assume you don't. That's got to be a judgement call. You're smiling, and I know how these things work. But I assume that there's support for protection of the wetlands up the chain of command. Can you give me a sense of how that's worked as you've negotiated over 101-618 and done these other things?

Anglin: The Fish and Wildlife Service has had a love-hate relationship with Stillwater since it was established in 1948. The original plans were drawn up on Stillwater in the 1930s, and it was originally established in 1948. It's had a love-hate relationship. When this area has a lot of water, it is incredible. It is absolutely the most

productive marsh that the Fish and Wildlife Service has.

Seney: What do you mean when you say "productive"?

Anglin: It produces more birds, more plants, more wildlife, more everything, than any other habitat of it's size that the Fish and Wildlife Service has. It's incredible, absolutely incredible when it has water in it. It has everything to make it work. It has good growing seasons, it has good temperature, good light, good clean water, evaporation, the salinities, everything is just incredible. It's just an absolute garden when everything is working together. And when the Fish and Wildlife Service and the people that have been involved with it have seen it like that, it's the greatest place in the world. When the group of people that get associated with it, when it's dry like right now, it is the most God-forsaken piece of trash that they've ever seen in their life and they don't ever want to come down here. I've had people say that their understanding of what Stillwater is, their definition of Stillwater is a sink in the desert we're pouring endless amounts of money into.

Seney: Because they've never seen it good state.

Anglin: They've never seen it when it's hot. When it's

hot, it's hot -- and when it's not, it is nothing out there. And it's very hard. And that's the cycle of the Great Basin. It goes boom and bust, and boom and bust, and boom and bust. And so the Fish and Wildlife Service relationship with this place is boom and bust, boom and bust. And they've spent millions of dollars out here in the 50s, and in the 1970s they wanted to give it back to the Indians. They just wanted to walk away. They put a manager in here and said, "Close it down. We're tired of it, we don't want to deal [with it]. It's nothing but problems. We don't want to deal with the problems down here anymore." They've had a love-hate relationship with it. They recognized that it is a productive area when there's water, but when there isn't water it's not worth dealing with.

Seney: So part of your job is to kind of keep them warm toward the thing (Anglin: Right.) whether there's water or not.

Anglin: Right. When it comes back, it'll outproduce anything you got. If you put water in it, it'll outproduce anything you got, right now -- acre-for-acre, it'll outproduce it. And it's very hard for them to deal with it -- extremely hard for them to deal with it.

You asked me what my relationship with my superiors has been. I feel very

strongly in the Federal government or anybody, if you have a boss, unless you're a benevolent dictator, that you keep your boss informed. I think the absolute worst thing that a person can do is to hide things from their supervisor, because if you do, he or she cannot protect you, and it'll piss them off to no end if you're doing something and they get caught blindsided.

END OF SIDE 1, TAPE 2.
BEGINNING OF SIDE 2, TAPE 2.

Anglin: I feel very strongly that you must keep your supervisors informed. You do not do what a lot of us think that our supervisors do to us, like mushrooms, keep us in the dark and feed us shit all the time. I believe that you should keep your supervisor informed. If your supervisor is informed, they can protect you, if your supervisor is not informed, they will get you, they will come back to haunt you. And so I've always kept my supervisors informed. They've told me at times that I'm on very shaky ground. I went to the White House one time on this issue and . . .

TAKING THE STILLWATER MARSH ISSUE TO THE WHITE HOUSE

Seney: Tell me about that.

Anglin: Going to the White House? There was a fellow by the name of Sig Rogich who was one of George Bush's advisors -- I don't know exactly. He had hunted the Stillwater Marsh, had very strong emotions about the Stillwater Marsh, was from Nevada.

Seney: How'd you know about him? How'd you find out he was there?

Anglin: Well, it goes back to, I have a good friend up in Reno named Dr. [Kenneth D., D.D.S.] Taber And Dr. Taber, when he was going to medical school in Washington, D.C., the two of them shot on a pistol team together, and he used to come into this gun shop that I worked at and we hunted and shot on a pistol team together. And when I moved to Nevada, Nevada being a "good old boy" state, I was able to -- I hadn't seen Ken in fifteen years and we struck up a relationship again, and he was able to open some doors for me.

Seney: He's out here, obviously, by now?

Anglin: Well, he's up in Reno. He's a dentist in Reno. He's lived in Reno all his life. His father was a judge in Reno, and he hunted the Stillwater Marshes and talked about it. But anyway, he was able to open some doors. I don't remember exactly how it came to [be] now. They knew

that Sig Rogich was working in the White House and thought that maybe I could help this piece of legislation through, and would I go talk to Sig Rogich, because I was the only one that was fully informed on it. And so I said, "I can't do this unless you get it cleared with my supervisors." Because I told my supervisor I was going to go do this and he said, "Ron, don't go do it. You'll get fired over this." And I said, "I don't know why, I'm not doing anything wrong. I've been in the White House before." "I don't care, a person at your level does not go to the White House and talk to the White House." So anyway I flew back to Washington, D.C. I forget if it was on my own money or on their nickel, but I flew back to Washington, D.C., and I went into Refuges and Ken had called me the night before and he said, "It's all arranged, you're going to the White House at nine o'clock in the morning." And I said, "Ken, I told you, they don't want me to go." And he said, "Well, we've talked to John Turner," who was the Director of the Fish and Wildlife.

Seney: This is Rogich, or your friend Dr. Taber?

Anglin: Dr. Taber said that they had spoken to John Turner and John Turner was the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service said he thought it was a <u>good</u> idea that I would go talk to Sig

Rogich. So I went into Refuges and I felt that I should touch base with Refuges in Washington, D.C., and I went in and I talked to a lady there, a good friend of mine, and I told her, "I'm supposed to be at the White House," and she said, "Ron, don't go over there, they'll fire your ass." And I said, "Well, I don't see why. I'm just going to go over there and talk about what I'm supposed to be protecting." And they said, "Don't do it." I said, "Well, I've been told to do it." So she got on the phone and she called the person who's in charge of all the refuges downtown, and he ran down the hall and talked to John Turner. Turner said, "Tell him to be over there." So I went over to the White House. I came back and they told me I used up a lot of chips. "Don't do that again. Don't do that one again." (knock at door, tape turned off and on)

Seney: You used chips because somebody at your level is not supposed to go? If anybody was supposed to go, the big boys are supposed to go, and maybe you'd be lucky enough to stand in the back of the room or something or other.

Anglin: Right. A person at my level shouldn't be negotiating at that level.

Seney: Tell me a little about the meeting. What can you tell me about the meeting?

Anglin: Well, at the meeting I had a video produced by a friend of mine, Doug Masters [phonetic spelling]. A woman had produced a full-length movie on the area and I told her I needed two-and-a-half to three minutes of dynamite footage on the Stillwater Marsh and what was happening out there. So she put me together a three-minute video that was dynamite with some music to go along with it. And it was professionally done, and I took it over there and I walked in there and he told me, "You've got just a few minutes. I'll talk to you, but just a few minutes." So I walked in there, and I said, "All I want to do is show you a video." I stuck the video in and he watched the three minutes and he talked to me for two hours, because it opened up all of his emotions about the area, which is what I was trying to do. And I knew if I could get in there with something that could grab him, then I could talk to him.

Seney: Do you feel this meeting did you some good?

Anglin: I think so. I don't know. You never know. You never know what occurred behind the scenes, what occurs behind the scenes on some of these issues. But I think that it helped. I'll always think that it helped. He may have talked to some people. He told me afterwards, "I don't care, call me up anytime you want. If it has to do with Stillwater Marshes, I'll talk to

you and I'll see what I can do."

Seney: But you didn't dare do that.

Anglin: No, I never called him again. I was smart enough to realize that I didn't have any chips right then to play with. I had to get some more chips. As they say, you know, as you go along in your career, if it's you at the university or wherever, you get chips to play poker with. And you don't want to retire with any chips, but you don't want to run out of chips before you retire. And so I try to use my chips sparingly, and when I think that I have something that's really worthwhile, then I use my chips. But until then I try to hoard chips.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE TOWARD THE STILLWATER MARSH

Seney: What was Turner, the then-head . . . .

Anglin: Turner was the head of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Seney: What was his attitude toward the Stillwater Marsh?

Anglin: He was very supportive of it. Before John Turner there was Frank Dunkel. Frank Dunkel

was the Director, and his Deputy was Steve Robinson. Steve Robinson was from Carson City, and Steve Robinson was very concerned about the Stillwater Marshes because he recreated down here. And so he was supportive. He was able to pull some strings. Then when Turner came along, Turner was a Republican from Wyoming and he was very supportive. And I got John Turner out here, we did a water rights celebration. We got the Nevada Waterfowl Association to buy water and we used that as a leverage [for] a media campaign with the Nature Conservancy to turn water into the wetlands, the first legal water that the wetlands had ever had. And we used that as a precedent.

Seney: How many acre feet was that?

Anglin: Two hundred and fifty, it was nothing -- but that wasn't the point. The point was to set a precedent. We set a precedent, and it was a lot of hurdles to go through because every time we tried to figure out a way to get water to the wetlands, people in Interior threw up roadblocks and said, "You can't do this." And it finally took a document -- it took five lawyers and twenty-five pages to basically say that the Federal government could buy water on a Federal project and transport it through Federal facilities to a Federal wildlife area.

Took twenty-five pages to write this, to say that I could buy water on a Federal project, transport it through Federal facilities, to Federal land.

Seney: In other words, the Fish and Wildlife Service could buy it from the Bureau of Reclamation, and bring it through the Newlands Project canals out into the Stillwater Marsh.

Anglin: Right. It sounds absurd, but this is another one of the children of the Department of Interior, and they don't talk. They're siblings that don't talk a lot of times.

Seney: Let me ask you about the Fish and Wildlife Service. Is it the kind of organization where you can go to the top? Can you talk to Turner? And I'm sorry, I've forgotten the woman who was his successor. Her name is?

Anglin: Oh, Steve Robinson.

Seney: Can you talk to [him], or do you have to go through the chain of command?

Anglin: We have a chain of command. There's always going to be a chain of command. If you circumvent the chain of command, you're using chips. Not saying that you can't do it, but it's a bureaucratic system. It's got some very rigid

rules in there, and the rules are not written rules. You can go around them, but you may pay the price if you go around them. I feel that your responsibility as a land manager or a person that protects the resources is to do whatever it takes to protect the resources. That's what you, Don, put me here for, is to protect your resources, which are the wetlands and the migratory bird resources in Lahontan Valley.

Seney: So you do have to stick your neck out a little bit.

Anglin: You have to stick your neck out quite a ways.

THE 25,000 ACRE ALLOCATION FOR WETLANDS IN PUBLIC LAW 101-618

Seney: Was it hard to get the 25,000 acre allocation for Stillwater that's in 101-618?

Anglin: It took a lot of negotiation, there was a lot of sausage made and given.

Seney: Can you give me a sense of what was required there?

Anglin: As I said before, we dropped the Fernley area and they added 800 acres at the Fallon Indian Reservation. At Stillwater we could have tried

for the whole pie. We can manage about 27,000 acres of wetlands, we have control structures and stuff out there. We can move 27,000 surface acres out there at any given year.

Seney: And make good use of it.

Anglin: And make good use of it. But there was no way that we could do that and protect the other important wetlands which is Carson Lake down here.

Seney: Carson Lake really being Carson Pasture? (Anglin: Carson Pasture.) Which is a bird habitat.

Anglin: It's another marsh. And the difference between Carson Lake and Stillwater is Carson Lake is like a big saucer, it just fills up, and it's very shallow, but it's a saucer. And it just fills up, almost like a contact lens or a saucer -- just fills up. And as it fills up it spreads and it slowly gets bigger and bigger and bigger.

Seney: How many acres again?

Anglin: It could be 27,000.

Seney: That alone can be 27,000.

Anglin: And Stillwater is a series of impoundments that goes from deep water impoundments to very shallow impoundments. What you're always trying to create in dealing with wildlife and habitat is edge. The more edge you got, the more species that move back and forth across from one habitat to another habitat. An edge is in between these, and that's what you're trying to create is edges. The more edges you have, the more different types of species.

Seney: So an edge would be the ground in between these impoundments, when we're talking about Stillwater Marsh.

Anglin: No, you're talking about going from maybe water to uplands. Or you may be going from tules to open water. You may be going from open water to . . . .

Seney: Those transition points, is what you talk about as edges.

Anglin: The transition zone is habitat. That's what you're trying to create, more of these edges and different types of habitat is what you're always trying to create when you're managing land, because that's where you get most of the interaction between different species. So Stillwater goes from deep water to shallow water where Carson Lake is just a big playa

and it's great for shorebirds and has limited use for other types of birds.

Seney: But let me say, if you had your choice, you'd want the water out in Stillwater, rather than Carson Lake.

Anglin: Yeah. Really, you want both of them, because you want to have both types of habitats.

Seney: But if you had to choose?

Anglin: If you had to choose, put it in Stillwater, because Stillwater, I think, has been there a lot longer.

Seney: And has more edges.

THE ROLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN PROTECTING THE WETLANDS

Anglin: Has more edges. But I felt very strongly, and I still feel very strongly, that the only way you can protect the wetlands in Lahontan Valley was to make people of the state of Nevada part of protecting these wetlands. If you couldn't convince the people in the state of Nevada that they were worth saving, then why do you think the Federal government should come in here and save it? I don't believe that the Federal government should save everything for

everybody. You can't. The Federal government doesn't have enough money or resources to protect everything. The people in the states have to protect some of their resource. So not being a good bureaucrat, I turned around and said, "Carson Lake, I feel very strongly, should go to the State of Nevada." If I'd have been a good bureaucrat, [I would have said], "Carson Lake ought to become part of Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge" and get more land, get bigger.

Seney: Get more people working for you.

Anglin: You build an empire, just bigger and bigger and bigger and bigger. I said, "No, that's not what we need. We need to have State involvement in this issue." So at the same time we were working through that part of it, we were also promoting a bond issue, and the Nature Conservancy went overboard trying to promote a bond issue called Proposition V. We had a state senator who at the time was Virgil Ghetto who has been very supportive of the wetlands, spent his youth out in the wetlands. Also, he's a politician and lives in the community and he's concerned about agriculture too. Some of his best friends have been Fish and Wildlife Service people that he's known over the years as he's grown up. And so we got Proposition V, it was passed by the

voters, and the bond initiative, get $5 million to go out for the State to acquire water for the wetlands. And now we've been working to try to get that land transferred to the State of Nevada as a big chunk of the land. And it goes back to what I believe about hunting. I believe that hunting on National Wildlife Refuges, because they're called Refuges and Sanctuaries, will become a thing of the past. And I think that the people in the state of Nevada, if they want to hunt migratory birds, they ought to be allowed to hunt migratory birds in wetlands that are in their state, as long as you can hunt migratory birds. And so I felt that the people in the state of Nevada should have an area that they can hunt if they want to hunt. And that's the reason I argued that Carson Lake should become a state wildlife management area.

Seney: Has that happened?

Anglin: It has not happened. It's close to happening now, but it's been, like most everything you get involved with them, this issue is just, every thing you open up is another can of worms. And that's a can of worms.

Seney: How have your superiors felt about that?

Anglin: They've been supportive of that.

Seney: The real problems are here, rather than up the chain of command.

MERCURY CONTAMINATION ALONG
THE CARSON RIVER AND CARSON LAKE

Anglin: Yeah, the reason it hasn't occurred is because during the Comstock days, they lost so much mercury in the system, they lost 7,500 tons of mercury that came down the Carson River, spread out across it, there's mercury out at Carson Lake. There was talk about making it part of a Superfund cleanup site. Nobody's ever going to clean up the mercury in this valley. There's not enough money in the Treasury of the United States to clean up the mercury. It never will happen. The state is concerned that if they were ever forced by the Federal government or by some group to clean it up, that they don't have enough money to clean it up. And so they want an indemnification clause in any kind of a contract that was transferring it to them to relieve them of the burden. And so that's part of the problem. We're about worked through that right now.

THE WETLANDS ON THE FALLON RESERVATION
AND RELATIONS WITH THE TRIBE

The Indian wetlands, on the other hand,

the Service has been asked to manage those wetlands.

Seney: These are the ones on the Fallon Reservation.

Anglin: On the reservation. We've been asked to manage those wetlands for them and help them identify their water source and do that.

Seney: How many acres of wetlands on the reservation?

Anglin: Eight hundred acres. If somebody will say well, we're screwing the Indians again, you're only giving them 800 acres. They only have 800 acres of wetlands, that's all they've got, that's all we can physically manage out there on that parcel of ground for them is about 800 acres. And so that's the reason they've got the 800 acres.

Another thing that I'm trying to do with the Indians to help the Indians here in the valley is I had an ethnography produced.

Seney: I have a copy, it's excellent.

---

* Catherine S. Fowler, In the Shadow of Fox Peak: An Ethnography of the Cattail-Eater Northern Paiute People of the Stillwater Marsh. Cultural Resources Series Number 5. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 1, Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge. 1992

Anglin: Thank you. Again, it goes back to my belief that you have to understand the resource that you're managing. And I was collecting all this material on how the Indians used the marsh and what the resource values were, and I talked to a number of people and was able to direct funds that way and have Dr. Fowler* at the University, who's probably the foremost ethnographer in the country, produce an ethnography on these native people and how the native people used the Stillwater Marsh and all the resources in the Stillwater Marsh.

To give you an example of how the Indians feel about this, last spring they had a powwow, it was a powwow at the reservation. It was one clan or one band -- I don't know what it exactly it was -- but they called me up and they said, "Would you come down to our powwow?" And I said, "No, I won't come down to your powwow, because powwows are Indian celebrations and they're not normally for white men." And they called me back up and they said, "No, we really want you to come down. You've done a lot for us and we want you to come down." So I went down there. To make a long story short, I only stayed at the powwow for a while, and then a couple of people, the grandson of the lady who's spoken of in the book, Wuzzie George, and his wife -- his wife is just a beautiful lady. She's from a

tribe down in New Mexico or Arizona. Just a really striking, beautiful woman. But anyway, he asked me, and she did, would I take them out to the marsh and show them how his grandmother and grandfather lived out in the marsh. And so I felt honored. These Indians asked me to go out, so I went out in the marsh and I showed them where a bunch of different -- where their ancestors had camped and used the resources -- and took him out and showed him where they'd gotten their drinking water, and he bathed in the drinking water. For some reason I had a metate, a grinding stone that I'd found at this site. I don't know why I ever picked it up, because I just don't pick up arrowheads and stuff, I just don't have any need for that stuff. But I'd picked it up a couple of years ago, and I'd had it. He said he didn't have anything from his grandma, so I gave it to him. He went away and his family went away, and they were just deeply touched that somebody would have shown them the marsh. But I felt that is my responsibility, is to try to work with the native people and the resources out here.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THE TJ DRAIN ON THE RESERVATION

So another thing I'm trying to do with the tribe, that deals with the wetlands, is there was a drain -- it's specifically mentioned in a

piece of legislation -- the TJ Drain. The TJ Drain is a drain that was built for the Indians under another piece of legislation to help the Indians that not a lot of it got accomplished. And it cut into glens of extremely saline water, toxic water, and it was dumping it into the Stillwater Marsh and killing everything that was out there. So we wrote in a piece of legislation to stop this drainwater from going in there. To make a long story short, that's another can of worms that we haven't been able to close because there are people that are farming and they don't want to give up the farm. So I'm in the process right now of, when the Service acquires a piece of land that is excess to our needs that is high-quality agricultural land and adjacent to the reservation, that I am striking up agreements with the tribe to farm that land in exchange for not farming their land that is draining into the TJ Drain, move them over to here and ultimately I can save the government $15-20 million by not having to deal with the TJ Drain.

Seney: No one is quite sure what to do about that, are they?

Anglin: They don't know what to do with it, no. This way, I can get them off the ground, get them on the high productive ground, take their water

rights over there. Once we get the Indians off of the ground, and no additional cost to the government, then we go back in and fill the damned drain up. To me, it's a solution that has promise for a long period of time, instead of trying to come up with an engineering solution to an environmental problem. Engineering solutions to environmental problems generally, or at least the ones I've been involved with, are not the way to go because they cost you too much money over too long a period of time. You come up with an engineering solution to the TJ Drain, you'll be paying for it for the next hundred years. I mean, yeah, we got to pump the water up and we're going to spray it out onto the ground. Alright, now what are you going to do with the salt? And how are you going to pay for the pumps? And who's going to replace all this stuff? And it's going to wear out. I mean, you're coming up with all these great solutions, engineering solutions, to spend millions of dollars, but the maintenance is going to be incredible -- forever. And I haven't seen anything that's lasted my lifetime, hardly. I mean, you go down and buy something, it's guaranteed for life, and most people lose the contract before they're dead, and it's worn out and thrown away.

RELATIONSHIP WITH TCID

Seney: How has your relationship with TCID been?

Anglin: I think it's been good, for the most part. TCID has a role in this community. When I came here everybody told me TCID is a bunch of bastards, and they've been a bunch of bastards, and they were not a benevolent dictator, they were a bunch of bastards. They controlled the power, power was water. "You want water, buddy? You play ball with me. I want my son playing quarterback on the football team if you want water this next winter for your livestock." I mean, they played hardball with the community, and you either played ball with TCID or you didn't get water. And they ran roughshod over the Fish and Wildlife Service here for a long time. We built literally millions of dollars of stuff out at Stillwater for TCID, for no other reason than a revenue source for TCID. Pasturelands, canals, structures -- all put in to create and use the drainwater that was going out there, because when Stillwater was originally established, it was established under the Tri-Party Agreement. The Tri-Party Agreement was TCID, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Nevada Department of Wildlife. I run cattle out there. Thousands of cattle have been run out there for the sole purpose of providing revenue to TCID. Has nothing to do with land management, has to do with generating revenue for TCID.

Seney: And keeping TCID happy.

Anglin: Keeping TCID happy. We had muskrat trapping out there. They trapped thousands of muskrats out there, for their furs -- literally thousands and thousands of rats out there. We imported rats to create rats out there -- strictly as a revenue source for TCID. We did lots of things for TCID. TCID was a bunch of bastards for a long period of time before I came here. I mean, the records are full of it in this community: you either played ball with them or you didn't get things.

Since I've been here, my relationship with TCID has been very open and cordial. We've had our disagreements, but I do not believe that TCID holds any -- I think hatred is the wrong word for it -- but they don't dislike me, they don't dislike the Fish and Wildlife Service. They may dislike the ecological service part of it, but they don't dislike the refuge portion of it.

I don't dislike TCID, I don't dislike the people in TCID. I think they make some dumb choices when they have choices to make, but I don't dislike TCID. I think that if TCID was ever completely pulled out of here there would be a huge power vacuum that would have to be filled by something or somebody, where you would end up like Russia where the power vacuum that's going on right now in Russia and

the collapse of Russia. I think the same thing would happen to this community for a period of time, because they have been the power broker in the community for the last seventy-five years. Right or wrong, good or bad, that's the facts of life. And you have to deal with TCID. And I think it's unfortunate that TCID, some of the decisions they make, but I think it's also unfortunate that some of the decision-makers in the Federal government feel so strongly against TCID. TCID is a fact of life, you have to deal with them. You can't say they're a bunch of -- I hate to use it on your tape -- but a bunch of God damned farmers. They're doing what the government told them to do. They're not my enemy, they're doing exactly what the government has told them to do.

Seney: So they have to be dealt with.

Anglin: They have to be dealt with. I might not like the decision they made. I mean, in my personal opinion, it was a dumb decision the other day to not supply water to the Indians. I mean, I can understand the principle they're standing on, I think it was dumb decision because it set a precedent for the government to come in here now and start taking the Project over. I think it was a dumb decision. They made it, they're stuck with it. I don't know.

Seney: Why don't we end there.

END OF SIDE 2, TAPE 2.