

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Hubert B. Bruns



**STATUS OF INTERVIEW:
OPEN FOR RESEARCH**



Interview Conducted by:
Donald B. Seney in 1998
California State University-Sacramento
For the Bureau of Reclamation's
Newlands Project Oral History Series



Interview edited and desktop published—2011
By Brit Allan Storey, Senior Historian

Oral History Program
Bureau of Reclamation
Denver, Colorado

SUGGESTED CITATION:

BRUNS, HUBERT B., ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW.
Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral
History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney. Edited by
Donald B. Seney and final edited and desktop published by
Brit Allan Storey, senior historian, Bureau of Reclamation.
Repository for the record copy of the interview transcript is
the National Archives and Records Administration in College
Park, Maryland.

Record copies of this transcript are printed on 20 lb., 100%
cotton, archival quality paper. All other copies are printed on
normal duplicating paper.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
Statement of Donation	xv
Introduction	xvii
Oral History Interview	1
Grandfather Bought the Ranch Where He Now Lives in Fredericksburg, California, Alpine County, in 1873	1
Ranch Consists of about 700 Acres	3
The Ranch Was Originally a Dairy, but He Converted it to a Cow-Calf Operation	4
Water Rights on the Original Ranch Have a Priority Date of 1864	5
A Smaller Adjacent Ranch Acquired in the 1920s Has a Priority Date of 1878	5
“The Nevada users and California users didn’t get along very well in the early days, and Nevada sued Alpine County for water that they thought Alpine County was using and they should have had it down there. . . .”	5
How the Two Different Water Rights on Their Property Vary During Dry Periods	6
“Right now, we have plenty of water up there because we are using . . . treated effluent from Lake Tahoe and the law requires that none of	

that go into Nevada. So, four ranches in this area have divided up the water from Lake Tahoe. We each get one-fourth of it, and it's plenty for us. It's improved that part of our ranch by probably three or four times . . .”
..... 6

The Later Water Right Property Gets about 1,250 Acre Feet Annually of Treated Effluent From South Lake Tahoe 7

“I think we're probably the only users in the state of California that get that much free water. . . .”
..... 7

How The Ranch Ended up Getting Effluent Water from South Lake Tahoe for Free 8

Development Kept Catching up with the Capacity of the Sewage Treatment Facilities along the South Shore of Lake Tahoe from Stateline to Emerald Bay 9

There Were Occasional Spills of Partially Treated Water 9

“... the state legislature, in fact, decided that the effluent *had* to be exported from Lake Tahoe. . . .” 10

“... California decided they couldn't spend money in Nevada . . .” 10

“The Central Valley Water Quality Control Board would not allow effluent from this side to come into their area. So that left Alpine County the only logical way to go. . . .” . 10

“When they decided to send their water over into Alpine County, people were very upset. They

didn't want any effluent from up there. . . .”
..... 11

Chaired a Committee of the California-Nevada
Interstate Compact Commission to Work out
the Details of Where to Put the Effluent
Water 11

The Committee Wrote Rules Allowing the Water to
Go into the Carson River System So it Would
Be Delivered to the Fallon Area and the
Involved Parties Signed an Agreement to
Implement 11

within 12

State Water Project Money Could Be Used to Deliver
the Water If a Reservoir Site Could Be Found
..... 13

“We discovered that we can't send this water to
Nevada. But, if you can find a place to build
a reservoir, and find somebody to use it, we
will built the reservoir for you and you can
use the water.’ . . .” 13

“ . . . everybody was satisfied, and within about three
months, why they started building. . . .” . 15

First and Second Indian Creek Reservoirs 15

Water Quality in the Reservoir Was Inadequate So a
Second Reservoir Was Built 15

“They decided they would build a second reservoir
just below the original reservoir . . . And *that*
is *not* treated quite as well as the original, and
we get to use that entirely. . . . Now we divide
that second reservoir up between these four

users. . . . Their original took all of the nitrates and phosphates out of it so it wasn't as good a water for our irrigation. . . . but this has the nitrates and the phosphates left in it, and it just makes our grass grow like mad. . . .
." 16

" . . . we have a ditch that the four of us built . . . we had to borrow . . . we were making our payments, but the people up to the lake . . . took over all payments and everything—so we just get the water. . . ." 18

"We had a forty year contract that will be up in 2012, and then the people that are using it then are going to have a little argument because nobody in the valley wanted it . . . Now they want it. . . .and they're going to offer money for this . . ." 18

Appointment to the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission 20

Colonel Oren Barton Chaired the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission for a Time 20

Served on the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission for about Fifteen Years 20

State Senator Charles Brown from Inyo Country Recommended He Be Put on the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission . 21

Other Members of the Interstate Compact Commission 22

Senator Charlie Brown Wanted to Make Sure the Walker River Was Considered 23

Why the States Proceeded with the California- Nevada Interstate Compact Commission . . .	24
Federal Government Filed Suit to Adjudicate Water Rights on the Carson River	25
Why a Compact Was Advantageous to the States	27
The California-Nevada Interstate Compact Went Through the Nevada Legislature Quickly, but it Didn't Go Through the California Legislature as Quickly	28
At Hearings in California the Issue of Pyramid Lake Came up	28
“So after that session . . . before that natural resource committee, I asked (unclear) to have it transferred to the water committee. . . .” . . .	29
“. . . he said, ‘That won't make any difference, it'll be the same thing.’ But it wasn't. We barely appeared before Charlie Porter's committee, and it went through. Unanimous I believe.”	30
“. . . now the basis of water . . . how much water Nevada and California each had . . . that was tremendously important. . . it has not yet passed the Congress, but the states have agreed to abide by it, and they have. . . .”	30
“. . . first meeting we had on Tahoe . . . one guy there who represented Sierra Pacific Power said 8,000 for Lake Tahoe. . . .”	31
“. . . it eventually became 34,000 for Lake Tahoe, 23	

for California and 11 for Nevada. And Senator Harry Reid took that exactly and says 'I settled all the wars between California and Nevada.' . . ."	32
Pyramid Lake Issues	35
"The Pyramid Lake Indians were <i>behind</i> it all . . . and Senator John Tunney for California and Senator Edward Kennedy from Massachusetts stopped by the Pyramid Lake for one half day, and they got the Indians' viewpoint, and they decided no compact. . . ."	35
"The compact did not hurt Pyramid Lake in any way shape or form. It did <i>not</i> allocate water to that. California, our half of the commission, would have been willing to sit down and try to work something out. Nevada politically couldn't do that. . . ."	35
". . . the only water that had ever been allocated to Pyramid Lake was the approximately 3,000 acre feet. And that was in the compact. . . . the only thing that could keep Pyramid Lake alive was the big years and they'd get all that water anyway—there was no way to keep it from them. They had some of the people in California believing that if this compact were adopted Pyramid Lake would dry up in one or two or three years. . . ."	37
Member of Congress Eugene A. Chappie	39
Clair Engle	41
Local Reclamation Manager Said They Could Not Look at Additional Projects in the Area until	

after Full Development of the Newlands
Project 41

“ . . . they had *totally* overestimated, and after our
compact commission was organized about
one of the first things we *realized* was that
there was *no* water left in either the Carson
River *or* the Truckee River for agricultural
development. . . .” 42

“ . . . they came out with the Washoe Project . . . they
wanted 10,000 acres more in town, and then
they were going to put 10,000 more in Carson
Valley here where all of that development is.
But we decided right away that there was no
water, *and* that was our *unofficial* estimate
that they would buy up at least 20,000 acres
or more of agriculture land to use for
development *rather* than put in 20,000 acres
more of agriculture. It couldn’t be done. . . .”
. 43

Believes the Elevation of Pyramid Lake Will Rise
Due to Wet Years in the System 43

Support for Pyramid Lake in the East 43

“It was frustrating that they didn’t know what they
were talking about yet they had the power. . .
.” 44

“ . . . nevertheless, the area is getting the benefit of
our work because the two states are going by
it, and the *only* way that Senator Reid got that
through Congress was to promise the Indians
eighty million dollars to pay for the water that

was taken away from them. . . .” 45

“The gross was just give and take until we finally came as high as Nevada would go and as far down as California . . . our staff surveyed the Lake, and they determined that they had so much building capacity in Nevada and so much in California and then divided up about 11 to 23, about a third to two-thirds. . . .” 47

“Both sides had to give in a lot in order to come to some decision, and that was the final decision. We were under criticism from both sides. . . . I think we came to a pretty good decision. And . . . the senator [Harry Reid] took . . . practically word for word our language from Tahoe. And he didn’t give us any credit for it. . . .” 48

Sierra Pacific’s Position on the California-Nevada Interstate Compact 48

California-Nevada Interstate Compact Allotted 32,000 Acre Feet to the Upper Truckee Basin 51

Issue of Depletion and Return Flows Entered into Consideration of the Upper Truckee Basin Allocation During Compact and TROA Negotiations 52

Issue of Return Flows from the 32,000 Acre Feet Allocated to the Upper Truckee Basin . . . 53

Senator Laxalt Had California and Nevada Compact Representatives Back in D.C. Several Times to Support Passage of the California-Nevada

Interstate Compact in the Senate	55
It Was Only Carlie Porter’s Support That Got the California-Nevada Compact Approved in California	56
The Permanent Compact Commission Proposed for the California-Nevada Interstate Compact	57
Forest Service and Federal Position on Water Rights	58
Work on the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Began Almost Fifty Years Ago	58
The Surplus Years Are the Ones That Will Maintain Pyramid Lake	59
“Pyramid Lake has to depend <i>entirely</i> on those <i>big</i> years. . . .”	59
“You’re probably aware that Pyramid Lake dried up entirely years and years ago. . . .”	60
“. . . that’s the only thing that will dry Pyramid Lake up is a extended drought. . . .”	60
“. . . we all know now—anybody tried to use more water now, they’re not going to get it. . . . So, . . . the way it’s always going to be, Pyramid Lake is never going to dry up—compact or no compact.”	60
Washoe Project and Watasheamu Dam	61
“It wouldn’t have developed a lot of water. . . . but it would have provided a great deal of flood control, and it would have provided just unlimited recreation. . . .”	61
“. . . they don’t like government in here under any	

- circumstances. They were . . . independent, and they didn't want any government control. . . . would be sort of a gift to a lot of people that they would have to help pay for that they didn't need . . . Both of them were German descent . . . but they all were independent. They did things on their own. . . ." 64
- " . . . the cost/benefit ratio, according to the government survey, wasn't good. But, when you consider the benefit of flood control and the benefit of recreation . . ." 64
- " . . . we're developing a little of our own. Agriculture in this valley is on its way out. . . . agriculture in an area like this can't keep up with agriculture in the Central Valley. They can produce two or three times the amount of food products with an acre foot of water than we can. " 66
- "My view is usually the local managers [of the Bureau of Reclamation] . . . are fine. They know what's going on, but the politics up high is—we don't have too much respect for . . . " 67
- Pyramid Lake Task Force Report, 1971 69
- "It involved the Carson and Truckee and Lake Tahoe and how we could get more water into Pyramid Lake without *injuring anybody*. . . ." 70
- "The main *problem* was the inefficiency of the project in Fallon. . . . It was very inefficient and we found where they could, by doing

certain things . . .” 70

“ . . . those Federal guys wanted to bring water in
 from Honey Lake . . . and boy those people
 up there, they wouldn’t have anything to do
 with that. . . . not going to bring any water
 here from California to build up Pyramid
 Lake. . . .” 71

Winter Power Generation on the Newlands Project
 and the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge
 72

Water Operations on the Newlands Project 73

“After *we* let it be known that we felt that there was
 no surplus water and that there couldn’t be
 more land developed, they became much
 more efficient. And they don’t . . . waste, the
 water now. . . .” 73

“Water is like your operating capital in the bank.
 You want a little extra there . . . You should
 have enough *water* so you can operate freely.
 . . .” 74

Operation Issues on the Newlands Project 74

“ . . . in the compact . . . they [Truckee-Carson
 Irrigation District] said they *needed* 400,000
 acre feet . . . They wanted a lot more than
 they *really* needed. I didn’t go for that kind
 of stuff, but they should have *all* they *do*
 need. . . .” 75

“ . . . Pyramid Lake will get all they need from the big
 years. . . . Once in a while that tricky river
 runs up to a million and a half acre feet. And

that’s what Pyramid *has* to live on. They have . . . four feet of evaporation annually—which amounts to about 450,000 . . .” 76

“ . . . they wanted to preserve TCID, but I think that’s probably it. But they did not want to give TCID more than they needed. . . .” 77

Governor Ronald Reagan Appointed Him to the Pyramid Lake Task Force 77

Touring Lake Tahoe with Governor Reagan and Governor Paul Laxalt 78

Senator Harry Reid 79

The California-Nevada Interstate Compact Established 34,000 Acre Feet for Lake Tahoe and 32,000 Acre Feet for the Upper Truckee Basin 80

The 5,000 Acre Feet of Treated Wastewater from Lake Tahoe 81

Lahontan Water Quality Control Board 83

“ . . . we closed down all development from the state line north over to Emerald Bay. . . . But for thirteen months we did not allow a single building. And as a result, five water districts up at Tahoe got together and built the treatment plant over at Truckee. . . . when that thing opened up, the water that got into the Truckee River was of a higher quality than the water in the river. . . . I was just tremendously proud to be a part of that ” 84

“ . . . each one of them was starting to reach their capacity, and there was water treated effluent,

or partially treated effluent getting into the lake and into the Truckee River. And our efforts changed that . . .” 84

“We had an executive director, Roy Hampton, that was on the go. He wasn’t very popular in the state. You know there were nine regional boards, and ours was the most active. . . .” 85

Lake Arrowhead 86

The Wastewater Pipeline over Spooner Summit . 87

“I enjoyed the service on the Lahontan board more than any board I ever served on. . . .Because of the quality of the members, and their determination to do things—like we accomplished stuff over at the north end of the lake. We accomplished something at Lake Arrowhead. . . .” 89

Issue at the Truckee Reclamation District 90

“We didn’t *get* to fine them—it was such a violation that it was a felony, practically, and it was turned over to the attorney general of the state. . . .” 92

Lake Arrowhead 92

“ . . . when we had the meeting . . . our board notified them that they were going to be shut down and they couldn’t build any more unless they did something . . . that was the most beautiful planned public hearing we ever had. During the afternoon I said to one of the members, ‘Gee this sure is well organized. Must be

organized by a movie director or something
like that.’ . . . later, we found out that it had
been organized by one of the movie directors
. . .” 93

“ . . . sewage was getting into Lake Arrowhead. . . .”
. 94

“The Lahontan Board everything east of the summit
of the Sierras from the Oregon border to
about the upper one-third or one-half of Los
Angeles County and San Bernardino County.
. . .” 94

Tahoe Was the Most Troublesome Area to Deal with
. 96

“Fact is, they are still between one and two million
acres that could be developed in California *if*
the environmentalists would let them develop
the water—someday they’ll have to. . . .” . 99

STATEMENT OF DONATION
OF ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW OF
HUBERT B. BRUNS

1. In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 21 of Title 44, United States Code, and subject to the terms, conditions, and restrictions set forth in this instrument, I, HUBERT B. BRUNS (hereinafter referred to as "the Donor"), of ALPINE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA do hereby give, donate, and convey to the National Archives and Records Administration (hereinafter referred to as "the National Archives"), acting for and on behalf of the United States of America, all of my rights and title to, and interest in the information and responses (hereinafter referred to as "the Donated Materials") provided during the interviews conducted on and AUGUST 28, 1998 at ALPINE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA and prepared for deposit with the National Archives and Records Administration in the following format: tape recording and transcript. This donation includes, but is not limited to, all copyright interests I now possess in the Donated Materials.
 - a. It is the intention of the Archivist to make Donated Materials available for display and research as soon as possible, and the Donor places no restrictions upon their use.
 - b. The Archivist may, subject only to restrictions placed upon him by law or regulation, provide for the preservation, arrangement, repair, and rehabilitation, duplication, and reproduction, description, exhibition, display, and servicing of the Donated Materials as may be needful and appropriate.
 - c. For Donated Materials with restrictions, the National Archives will provide access to the Bureau of Reclamation, if the Bureau of Reclamation presents written permission of the Donor specifying the types of information and proposed uses of said information.
3. Copies of the Donated Materials that do not have Donor restrictions on their use, may be deposited in or loaned to institutions other than the National Archives, including the Bureau of Reclamation. Copies of unrestricted Donated Materials may also may be provided to researchers. The Bureau of Reclamation may retain copies of tapes, transcripts, and other materials if there are no Donor restrictions on their use, and Reclamation may obtain copies of tapes, transcripts, and other materials at the time that Donor restrictions on the use of the materials ends.
4. The Archivist may dispose of Donated Materials at any time after title passes to the National Archives.

Date: Aug 28 1998

Signed: Hubert B. Bruns
HUBERT B. BRUNS

INTERVIEWER: DONALD B. SENEY

Having determined that the materials donated above by HUBERT B. BRUNS are appropriate for preservation as evidence of the United States Government's organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, and transactions, and considering it to be in the public interest to accept these materials for deposit with the National Archives and Records Administration, I accept this gift on behalf of the United States of America, subject to the terms, conditions, and restrictions set forth in the above instrument.

Date: _____

Signed: _____
Archivist of the United States

Introduction

In 1988, Reclamation began to create a history program. While headquartered in Denver, the history program was developed as a bureau-wide program.

One component of Reclamation's history program is its oral history activity. The primary objectives of Reclamation's oral history activities are: preservation of historical data not normally available through Reclamation records (supplementing already available data on the whole range of Reclamation's history); making the preserved data available to researchers inside and outside Reclamation.

In the case of the Newlands Project, the senior historian consulted the regional director to design a special research project to take an all around look at one Reclamation project. The regional director suggested the Newlands Project, and the research program occurred between 1994 and signing of the Truckee River Operating Agreement in 2008. Professor Donald B. Seney of the Government Department at California State University - Sacramento (now emeritus and living in South Lake Tahoe, California) undertook this work. The Newlands Project, while a small- to medium-sized Reclamation project, represents a microcosm of issues found throughout Reclamation: water transportation over great distances; three Native American groups with sometimes conflicting interests; private entities with competitive and sometimes misunderstood water rights; many local governments with

growing water needs; Fish and Wildlife Service programs competing for water for endangered species in Pyramid Lake and for viability of the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge to the east of Fallon, Nevada; and Reclamation's original water user, the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, having to deal with modern competition for some of the water supply that originally flowed to farms and ranches in its community.

The senior historian of the Bureau of Reclamation developed and directs the oral history program. Questions, comments, and suggestions may be addressed to the senior historian.

Brit Allan Storey
Senior Historian
Land Resources Office (84-53000)
Policy and Administration
Bureau of Reclamation
P. O. Box 25007
Denver, Colorado 80225-0007
(303) 445-2918
FAX: (720) 544-0639
E-mail: bstorey@usbr.gov

For additional information about Reclamation's history program see:

www.usbr.gov/history

**Oral History Interview
Hubert B. Bruns**

Seney: My name is Donald Seney and I'm with Mr. Hubert B. Bruns in his home in Alpine County, I guess Fredericksburg, is it, Fredericksburg, California. Today is August 28th, 1998. This is our first session. This is our first tape.

So, good afternoon Mr. Bruns.

Bruns: Good afternoon.

**Grandfather Bought the Ranch Where He Now
Lives in Fredericksburg, California, Alpine
County, in 1873**

Seney: Why don't you begin by telling me about your family settling here on this land. As I arrived and complimented you on your home, you indicated that your great grandfather had actually built this home. (Bruns: Grandfather.) Your grandfather, right. When did he come and settle here?

Bruns: Well, my grandfather's name was Frederick Bruns. He came to this valley in 1870 and he worked for our next door neighbor for three years, and then he bought the ranch that we are now sitting on. After he bought the ranch, he went back to Germany and got his wife, and he had two

children at the time. And the Bruns's have lived in this house on this ranch ever since 1873.

My father and two of his sisters and two of his brothers were born in this house in the same room that I was born in several years later.

My dad bought the ranch from my granddad around 1902, I think, something like [that]¹ era. And then he married the school teacher that was boarding here and teaching school about 200 yards up the road. My older brother was born in 1906. Oh he was married in 1904, I believe. (Seney: Your mom and dad.) My mom and dad were married around 1904. My older brother Elmer was born a year later. Then my sister, Vernia (phonetic), who we celebrated her 90th birthday in this house just about two months ago. And then another brother was born

1. Note that in the text of these interviews, as opposed to headings, information in parentheses, (), is actually on the tape. Information in brackets, [], has been added to the tape either by the editor to clarify meaning or at the request of the interviewee in order to correct, enlarge, or clarify the interview as it was originally spoken. Words have sometimes been struck out by editor or interviewee in order to clarify meaning or eliminate repetition. In the case of strikeouts, that material has been printed at 50% density to aid in reading the interviews but assuring that the struckout material is readable.

The transcriber and editor also have removed some extraneous words such as false starts and repetitions without indicating their removal. The meaning of the interview has not been changed by this editing.

but passed away when he was five years old. And I was born in 1913, September 22nd.

Seney: Where does the name Fredericksburg come from? Is that for your granddad—his first name?

Bruns: Really I don't know. It was Fredericksburg. It probably was before my granddad. There supposedly was a brewery in this area that was known as the Fredericksburg Brewery. Not here, but down the road. Right now there is no Fredericksburg—except the name. And we're the center of it, and some of my neighbors call it Fredericksburg where they live, too. But there's no sign of a post office or anything of that sort.

Seney: I see there's a road sign from Fredericksburg Drive, or Road, or something like that. Right. Right. How many acres is this original part of your holdings here?

Ranch Consists of about 700 Acres

Bruns: Well, when I took over, it was about 700 acres. My dad built it up, and my granddad built it up after he had it.

Seney: Is that a pretty good size spread in this area—700 acres?

Bruns: Average.

Seney: Just average? (Bruns: Um-hmm.) How much is it now after you've—have you built it up some more. (Bruns: No, it's the same.) Yeah, but you did say that you own land in other areas around.

Bruns: Well, they're contiguous. It goes up to just where you came into the Alpine Valley there. We have land. What's known as Paynesville. And we own the land around there. (Seney: I see.) But my dad bought that small ranch up there in 1927. But it's contiguous to this ranch.

Seney: What kind of ranching do you do?

**The Ranch Was Originally a Dairy, but He
Converted it to a Cow-Calf Operation**

Bruns: We have cattle—beef cattle. My granddad and my dad had dairy, and I started out with a dairy, but I didn't like milking cows and being confined and so we went into beef. We sell the calves. Cow-calf operation is what it's about.

Seney: Those are, what, then sold to a feed lot that raises them up. How many head do you run?

Bruns: My son runs the cattle part of it, well, he practically runs the ranch now. About 450 cows. Plus the bulls and everything else that goes with

it.

Water Rights on the Original Ranch Have a Priority Date of 1864

Seney: Is that big, small, average, for this area? (Bruns: Average.) Just average. Right. You know we were talking to begin with about water rights here and about priority dates and the original ranch part that we are sitting on now you said has a 1868 priority. (Bruns: '64.) '64, I'm sorry, and then the other land you've added to it.

A Smaller Adjacent Ranch Acquired in the 1920s Has a Priority Date of 1878

(Bruns: Land up by Paynesville is about '78—something like that.) And you were saying that in a dry year you'll get water, but that other piece of property with the 1878 priority won't.

“The Nevada users and California users didn't get along very well in the early days, and Nevada sued Alpine County for water that they thought Alpine County was using and they should have had it down there. . . .”

Bruns: That part of our ranch won't. The Nevada users and California users didn't get along very well in the early days, and Nevada sued Alpine County

for water that they thought Alpine County was using and [they] should have had it down there. And the judge was pretty generous to Alpine County. He gave the water to Nevada after the first Monday in June all the water in the West Carson goes to Nevada, and the following week we get it all. When the river is low enough they don't always take it on the first of June. If there is a lot of water, but when the water gets low enough so that they think they're not getting enough, then they can take it on the first Monday in June or every other Monday after that during the summer. And once that starts—once the water gets low enough so that Nevada takes the water in their week, there's not enough left in the river for the later rights.

How the Two Different Water Rights on Their Property Vary During Dry Periods

So we get it on *this* part of the ranch, but our '78 right doesn't get any water after that.

“Right now, we have plenty of water up there because we are using . . . treated effluent from Lake Tahoe and the law requires that none of that go into Nevada. So, four ranches in this area have divided up the water from Lake Tahoe. We each get one-fourth of it, and it's plenty for us. It's improved that part of our ranch by probably three or four times . . .”

Right now, we have plenty of water up there because we are using water from Lake Tahoe, treated effluent from Lake Tahoe and the law requires that none of that go into Nevada. So, four ranches in this area have divided up the water from Lake Tahoe. We each get one-fourth of it, and it's plenty for us. It's improved that part of our ranch by probably three or four times—it has that much more production.

Seney: How much water is there that you four are dividing up?

**The Later Water Right Property Gets about 1,250
Acre Feet Annually of Treated Effluent From
South Lake Tahoe**

Bruns: About 5,000 acre feet.

Seney: So you're getting 1,250 acre feet. (Bruns: Just about, yeah.) That's a lot . . . you're smiling because (Bruns: Yeah, we use it here, too.) that's a lot of water up. (Bruns: That's a lot of water, yeah.) Yeah, what do you have to pay for that? Now you're really smiling.

**“I think we're probably the only users in the state
of California that get that much free water. . . .”**

Bruns: I think we're probably the only users in the state of California that gets that much free water.

Seney: So the price is right.

Bruns: The price is right.

Seney: How did that come to pass? How did that work out?

How The Ranch Ended up Getting Effluent Water from South Lake Tahoe for Free

Bruns: Well, this all my again. As a member of the interstate compact,² Lake Tahoe was one of our most difficult and important areas, and so all of us on the compact became very well acquainted around Lake Tahoe and being particularly interested in water, I knew what was going on in the south end.

Development Kept Catching up with the Capacity

2. Referring to the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission which negotiated a compact which "Would establish a commission to administer water rights involving Lake Tahoe and the Carson, Truckee, and Walker Rivers. Both States have ratified the compact and are abiding by it even though Congress has not ratified it. Some of the issues involved were addressed in P.L. 101-618, the Fallon Paiute Shoshone Indian Tribes Water Rights Settlement Act of 1990. (P.L. 101-618, November 16, 1990; 104 Stat. 3289 - 3324)." Copied from <http://www.fws.gov/laws/lawsdigest/compact.html#CALIFNEV> on March 12, 2011, at about 10:15 A.M.

of the Sewage Treatment Facilities along the South Shore of Lake Tahoe from Stateline to Emerald Bay

Many years ago, they'd built a—can't think what they call it—kind of a pond, but a pond that treats the effluent (Seney: Sediment pond?) they have a special name for it.³ And they thought they could treat the water for years to come. But in just a few years their pond was overflowing, and they built a secondary treatment plant—large enough, they thought, that would its effluent for years to come. (Seney: This is all in the [Lake Tahoe] Basin.) It's all in the south end of the basin.

There Were Occasional Spills of Partially Treated Water

They take water from the state line over to Emerald Bay, and at that time they were treating the sewage from the gambling houses in Nevada, and on a big weekend their sewer plant would overflow, and on occasion, they don't like to let a lot of information out, but they were bad, because they weren't, they were doing their best. But after the big weekends some partially treated water would [get] into the river and into the lake. And the state and a lot of people didn't like that. So

3. This is probably an oxidation pond—also known as a stabilization pond or lagoon.

they gave South Tahoe Public Utility District so many months, or maybe a year or two, to do something about it.

“ . . . the state legislature, in fact, decided that the effluent *had* to be exported from Lake Tahoe. . . .”

And the state legislature, in fact, decided that the effluent *had* to be exported from Lake Tahoe. They looked all around the lake and they found the only export possibility was where Kingsbury Grade goes over into Nevada; a possibility into El Dorado County and American River, and over into Alpine County.

“ . . . California decided they couldn't spend money in Nevada . . . ”

Well, California decided they couldn't spend money in Nevada so that was out.

“The Central Valley Water Quality Control Board would not allow effluent from this side to come into their area. So that left Alpine County the only logical way to go. . . .”

The Central Valley Water Quality Control Board would not allow effluent from this side to come into their area. So that left Alpine [County] the only logical way to go.

“When they decided to send their water over into Alpine County, people were very upset. They didn’t want any effluent from up there. . . .”

When they decided to send their water over into Alpine County, people were very upset. They didn’t want any effluent from up there.

Chaired a Committee of the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission to Work out the Details of Where to Put the Effluent Water

As a member of the interstate compact commission I was on the committee, in fact the chairman of a committee, to work out an arrangement so they could export water wherever it had to go because as you probably know, Lake Tahoe is a natural lake and it is also a reservoir for use in Nevada. And the Nevada people didn’t want them exporting any water that didn’t come back to Nevada.

The Committee Wrote Rules Allowing the Water to Go into the Carson River System So it Would Be Delivered to the Fallon Area and the Involved Parties Signed an Agreement to Implement

And so, our committee, after months and months of arguing, not arguing—working out together—(Seney: Probably some arguing.) yeah,

wrote regulations that allowed them to export effluent from South Lake Tahoe into the Carson River, and they had to be guaranteed that every drop got back to the Fallon area where it would otherwise been used if it hadn't been pumped out. So Alpine County Board of Supervisors and the South Tahoe Public Utilities District board of directors signed an agreement to allow the water to come over and piped it over the mountain and *first* they were going to dump it in the Carson River in (unclear) Valley, but the local people *absolutely* total objected to that and so did I. So I suggested that they continue the pipeline down along the highway, down the canyon, and across the county and dump it into the East Carson over there, or a tributary to the East Carson. And we signed an agreement and, incidentally, I was chair of the Alpine County Board of supervisors at the time, and I had to sign it. And I believe in all the years I was on the Board of Supervisors that was the—gave me the biggest thrill to sign that because I guess back in 1956 I was wearing a banner on my car—"Keep out Lake Tahoe Blue." And I was very happy to have an opportunity to help keep out Lake Tahoe Blue.

“ . . . within two weeks after we signed that agreement . . . they discovered in Sacramento that there was an agreement between the state of Nevada [and] state of California that neither state would discharge effluent or sewage into an

interstate river that went into the other state. So they were up a tree. . . .”

But, within two weeks after we signed that agreement with them, they discovered in Sacramento that there was an agreement between the state of Nevada [and] state of California that neither state would discharge effluent or sewage into an interstate river that went into the other state. So they were up a tree.

State Water Project Money Could Be Used to Deliver the Water If a Reservoir Site Could Be Found

A friend of mine who I'd worked with on the compact—are you familiar with Davis-Grunsky funds that California used to build. Well, this friend of mine was executive director of (Seney: These were funds under the State Water Project that were used to build facilities in the counties of origin) for recreation. (Seney: Right, right.)

“We discovered that we can't send this water to Nevada. But, if you can find a place to build a reservoir, and find somebody to use it, we will built the reservoir for you and you can use the water.' . . .”

My friend who was executive director of

that fund called me one day and, he said, “We discovered that we can’t send this water to Nevada. But, if you can find a place to build a reservoir, and find somebody to use it, we will built the reservoir for you and you can use the water.”

And it so happened that I and my next door neighbor had been searching all over these mountains to build a reservoir for ourselves because both of us were short of water a good many years, and we couldn’t find one. And we just had engineers looking at all these places, and they never recommended any. So I told this guy, “Gee, I don’t know. If there’s a reservoir up here, we’ll do our best.” And one night about midnight I woke up and I thought about a little valley in there where we ran cattle, and I knew that water came from the Carson over there for some neighbors, and it would run over there by gravity. And I thought, “Well, gee, maybe this place would be good enough for a reservoir. So the next morning I went at the soil conservation office before 8:00, and I was waiting out there for them to come in, and I caught them in the door, and I said “Gee,” I knew these guys really well and they’d worked on the ranch and stuff—or had done work for us—and said “if you could spend some time looking at this little area up there, I think maybe there’s a chance to build a reservoir.” So they were busy, but anyhow, they took a week

off and they went up there and they surveyed it. Then they took another week or so to work up the material they had, and they let me know that they thought a reservoir could be built in there that would hold 5,000 acre feet of water. So same day I called people in Sacramento and around, and we arranged for them to come up and take a look at it.

“ . . . everybody was satisfied, and within about three months, why they started building. . . .”

And everybody was satisfied, and within about three months, why they started building. And that fall they closed it and the same time they pumped it up.

Seney: Now this is Indian Creek Reservoir?

First and Second Indian Creek Reservoirs

Bruns: First Indian Creek Reservoir.

Water Quality in the Reservoir Was Inadequate So a Second Reservoir Was Built

They had to guarantee that trout would live in the water, and the people that built the first treatment plant up Lake Tahoe said, “Oh, yeah, there’s no problem. We can treat it so the fish will survive.”

But they survived awhile, but it wasn't . . . The led the people to believe it was better than what they really could produce. They had used small trial plants that worked, but this big one, when the weather got cold, they couldn't treat it that good. So they did put fish in there, and they survived, and they grew, but man o man, but a lot of them died, and the algae grew in there. So after, that was 1968 or 9 when they built that reservoir, and after a few years they decided that they'd have to build a separate reservoir. And then South Tahoe still has to maintain that reservoir with fresh water, and it's one of the best fisheries in the areas now.

Seney: I've fished up there. Not too successfully, I might say, but now in the--well, I'm not that good a fisherman--others do better I'm sure. But below that is . . .

“They decided they would build a second reservoir just below the original reservoir . . . And *that is not* treated quite as well as the original, and we get to use that entirely. . . . Now we divide that second reservoir up between these four users. . . . Their original took all of the nitrates and phosphates out of it so it wasn't as good a water for our irrigation. . . . but this has the nitrates and the phosphates left in it, and it just makes our grass grow like mad. . . .”

Bruns: They decided they would build a second reservoir just below the original reservoir where the water backed up just about to the base of the dam—of the first reservoir. And *that* is *not* treated quite as well as the original, and we get to use that entirely. It's 3,900 acres feet they store in there, and the other one they didn't build it to the 5,000 [acre feet] they can only store 3,200 and we had to use the rest of it in a hurry so it wasn't really full. Now we divide that second reservoir up between these four users. Gosh there's a lot of stuff that goes along with it. I don't know, maybe you have some questions?

Seney: Well, the newer reservoir, which is below the old one, the one you fish in, has signs don't fish in here, don't come near here really essentially. And that's because it's not treated as well—it doesn't meet the quality standards.

Bruns: Actually it's treated better. But . . . takes different things out of it. Their original took all of the nitrates and phosphates out of it so it wasn't as good a water for our irrigation. (Seney: Ah-hah.) But it couldn't take all the bacteria and—what's the other thing that will kill you? (Seney: That all right. We'll put it in the final manuscript when you look at it.) Yeah, the actually tertiary treatment plant could take all the nitrates and phosphates out of it, but it was very expensive.

They too (unclear) just by putting chlorine in it. But the stuff causes real disease (Seney: I can't remember either. I don't have any excuse here.) So, but this has the nitrates and the phosphates left in it, and it just makes our grass grow like mad. (Seney: That's why it's kind of greenish when you look down. How do you get that water? Do you have a separate ditch for it?)

“ . . . we have a ditch that the four of us built . . . we had to borrow . . . we were making our payments, but the people up to the lake . . . took over all payments and everything—so we just get the water. . . . ”

Yeah, we have a ditch that the four of us built to bring the water over here. And on top of that, see, we had to borrow from the home loan administration, and we were making our payments, but the people up to the lake were sure we might give that up or something so they took over all payments and everything—so we just get the water. (Seney: That sounds like an awful good deal to me.)

“We had a forty year contract that will be up in 2012, and then the people that are using it then are going to have a little argument because nobody in the valley wanted it . . . Now they want it. . . .and they're going to offer money for this . . . ”

We had a forty year contract that will be up in 2012, and then the people that are using it then are going to have a little argument because nobody in the valley wanted it, and some of the neighbors didn't want it. "Oh, you guys are crazy. It'll just ruin your land and you'll *sure* be sorry." But actually I and some of the others did considerable research on it and were quite satisfied that it wouldn't hurt our land before we took it. And it just improved the value of our land. (Seney: So as these other people who warned you . . .) Now they want it. (Seney: they look at how green grass is . . .) and they're going to offer money for this, and so the people that are using it, my son and our neighbor that are using it in 2012 might have to . . . *But* on the other hand what you said first that the water that's coming over here now, if it's taken away from them, has to be replaced, and I'm sure if they try to take it into Nevada they'd have to replace ours before they could take it. That's what I'm telling them anyway.

Seney: Right, this in [Public Law] 101-618, (Bruns: Right.) that this has to be done. You know, obviously, and one of the things I wanted to ask you about obviously is how do you get appointed chairman of the California side of the interstate compact commission.

Appointment to the California-Nevada Interstate

Compact Commission

Bruns: Well each member was appointed by the governor. Governor Goodwin Knight—then we had a meeting in Sacramento and elected our own officers.

Colonel Oren Barton Chaired the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission for a Time

And we elected Colonel Oren Barton (phonetic) the chairman, and I was vice-chairman, and served as chairman for about seven years and all of a sudden he passed away, like a lot of people do, and I was chairman and I just continued to serve.

Seney: How long did you serve on the commission?

Served on the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission for about Fifteen Years

Bruns: About fifteen years.

Seney: Now, you know, the governor didn't just drive down the road and see your name on a mailbox and decide to put you . . .

State Senator Charles Brown from Inyo Country Recommended He Be Put on the California-

Nevada Interstate Compact Commission

Bruns: No, I was recommended by our senator. Our senator at the time was Charles Brown from Inyo County. And he represented Inyo, and Mono, and Alpine County, and in those days the rural senators *ran* the senate and the legislature pretty *much*. So what Senator Brown wanted, he got. He not only—he had a lot of seniority.

Seney: Right, and you also mentioned . . .

END SIDE 1, TAPE 1. AUGUST 28, 1998.

BEGIN SIDE 2, TAPE 1. AUGUST 28, 1998

Bruns: . . . was with the army engineers, and his responsibility was maintaining of those banks along the river to keep the water . . . he was in charge of building and maintaining from flood damage (Seney: The dikes?) and he also had property at Lake Tahoe and was very interested in Lake Tahoe. And that's how come *he* was appointed.

Seney: And do you remember the other members and actually you have a copy there of the . . . they're listed here. California you're list as the chairman, Mr. Bachtoltz (phonetic) of Tahoe City is the vice-chairman, and I actually spoke to him and I think I'm going to go try to interview him. He

thought I should talk to you first before I talked to him. (Bruns: I liked him. He and I had a great time.) He sounds like an interesting man, right. And I know he lives in Tahoe City, so would that have been his connection? (Bruns: That was his connection.) A property owner-businessman, perhaps.

Other Members of the Interstate Compact Commission

Bruns: He owned a hotel and restaurant in Tahoe City at the time.

Seney: And I see Bill Gianelli is here as the director of water resources in Sacramento. I've interviewed him, too. (Bruns: Oh, have you? Is he still around there?) Well, he's down in Monterey. He's retired and lives in Monterey. (Bruns: I imagine he'd be retired.) Yeah, he's like yourself, sharp as a tack and going strong. He's a wonderful man. I really talked to him more about . . . I didn't realize he'd been on this commission. I really talked to him more . . . there's a part of this which is dealing more with the Central Valley, and the person who is in overall charge of this project wanted me to talk to him about California politics in regard to the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project. So that's how I happened to meet him. And he's on it because he really represents the state water

bureaucracy doesn't he?

Bruns: Well, he got off and Harvey Banks took his place.

Seney: Who succeeded him as water resources director, right? And then there's Ray Charlebois (phonetic) (Bruns: From Mono County. He was also recommended by Charlie Brown.) Why would someone from Mono County . . .

Senator Charlie Brown Wanted to Make Sure the Walker River Was Considered

Bruns: Because Senator Brown, when they wanted to divide the water between the two states and Tahoe and Truckee and the Carson, why Senator Brown said they have a lot of trouble on the Walker River—so he wanted that included. (Seney: And it was included.) It *was* included.

Seney: And then Alfred Hodder of Truckee, and he would have been, again, probably representing the upper Truckee River Basin interests?

Bruns: That would be Nevada County he was up there in Nevada County. Maybe he represented both Nevada and Sierra. I'm not sure. (unclear)

Seney: What about Randolph Duanto (phonetic).

Bruns: He didn't last very long.

Seney: Didn't he? And Charles Fogarty? He's listed as from Placerville.

Bruns: Yeah, (unclear) Mr. Bechtel, Mr. Charlebois, and myself were the only three that were the full fifteen years. And those come and . . .

Seney: Yeah, was it difficult for them because the issues were so complicated (unclear) would they mostly defer to you more senior members?

Bruns: Well, they had their own ideas—some of them were *very* on the ball to see that their particular area was not hurt. So they all got in and started, and they were all conservative.

Seney: What was it that led to the two states deciding to form this interstate compact commission, then get the authorization from Congress to do this?

Why the States Proceeded with the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission

Bruns: The Federal Government decided they were wasting water in the upper reaches of the Carson River *after* they . . . you're familiar with the Carson dam? (Seney: [unclear?]) No not that one. (Seney: The Lahontan?) Lahontan. (Seney: Right.) After that was built through the

government totally overestimated the water in the Truckee and the Carson rivers, and they built that dam, I think it started in 1901 or 1902.⁴ And their objective was to put in about a 150,000 acre feet, in that area. And there wasn't nearly that much water.

Federal Government Filed Suit to Adjudicate Water Rights on the Carson River

So in 1925 (unclear) the Federal Government on behalf of the Truckee Carson Irrigation District filed *suit* against all the water users on the Carson River above Lahontan. And that included people in Nevada—*only* in Nevada at first, but they called their suit the United States versus Alpine Land and Reservoir Company. A lot of people thought that was Alpine County, but it wasn't. That wasn't it. They . . . a lot of big ranches in Douglas County, Nevada, built reservoirs in Alpine County for use entirely in Nevada. Nobody in Alpine got any use out of it. Anyway that was the title of the suit that included all of the users in Nevada. And after a few years they brought California users into it so we're all involved. That was filed around 1925, and it lay dormant until around 1950. 1950 Judge Foley, who was the judge at the Third District Court, or whatever it is, the district court that represented

4. Reclamation built Lahontan Dam and Reservoir 1911-1915.

most of Nevada at the time, decided he wanted to finish that suit—bring it to a head—and caused quite a stir. And Alpine County was afraid that they'd take all our water if they got into that suit. So, our district attorney filed a petition to intervene in the suit—Alpine County. And by golly, all of the parties to the suit objected to Alpine County coming in, but Judge Foley let us in.

In order to get in, the county had to have an interest in water. So before we got in, why, our district attorney, Colburn Cooke (phonetic), hired an engineer . . . and they went over the map, they didn't get out on the land, and there was a map, and they filed on about 200,000 acre feet of water for Alpine County, and that's before they had the water resources board that was the state engineer then. And he accepted our filing. So there Alpine County had the right to store 200,000 acre feet of water, and they let us into the suit. And Colburn Cooke lived in Turlock, and he was a water lawyer. And he was one of the, apparently, better water lawyers in Central Valley at the time. And I can remember the first meeting Mr. Cooke and myself, I was chairman of the board of supervisors, had with this group that . . . and they were trying to decide what to do as a result of Judge Foley's determination to settle the suit. And Mr. Cooke got up and recommended that we form an interstate compact to settle it. And I can remember a guy by the name of Jim

Johnson and Fred Suttlemeir (phonetic) was on the Nevada side, and they got up, and they “Oh no, we don’t want any compact—that’ll take three or four years to settle this thing.” And we went home, and I guess Mr. Cook continued to be in contact with these people, and 1951 they decided to go by compact.

Why a Compact Was Advantageous to the States

So then it took the next three, four years, to determine exactly what the objective of the compact would be and the powers and what not. And in 1955, as you know, it had to be agreed to by the legislatures of both states and the governor’s signature, and the congress of the United States, and the president’s signature. (Seney: Right.) So it took through to the middle of ‘55 ~~‘95~~ to get all that done, (Seney: You mean ‘55.) and so our compact commission . . . once the compact is agreed upon and adopted by all the parties it’s their problem. The courts can’t do anything about it. They can decide whether a paragraph in the compact is constitutional or not, but all they can do is throw that out. The judge can’t go and decide that our decision on the water, here or there, was wrong.

The California-Nevada Interstate Compact Went Through the Nevada Legislature Quickly, but it

Didn't Go Through the California Legislature as Quickly

But, unfortunately, it went through the Nevada legislature boom, boom, boom—you know, like that.

At Hearings in California the Issue of Pyramid Lake Came up

We thought the same thing would happen in California, but we got down to Sacramento that first meeting, and good lord, people from up Pyramid lake were there. They had a former governor of the state of New York there (unclear) take the water away from the Indians. They had (unclear) formerly governor of Utah, head of big engineering firm there to tell (unclear) it was before the Natural Resources Committee. And we were thunderstruck. We couldn't believe it.

We just couldn't answer all their objections that day, so our chairman who introduced the bill (unclear). The next meeting was the same. And, I don't know, were before the committee three or four times that year. And every objection that we knew that was brought to a vote, it would go down.

“So after that session . . . before that natural resource committee, I asked (unclear) to have it

transferred to the water committee. . . .”

So after that session of that year, or that summer, all the time we were before that natural resource committee, I asked (unclear) to have it transferred to the water committee. You’ve probably heard of Charles, oh he was the chairman (Seney: Porter, Charlie Porter?) Charlie Porter! He was “Mr. Water” in California for ten years or more, and when they (Seney: Yeah from Los Angeles, wasn’t he?) No, he was from somewhere in the south—maybe he was from Los Angeles. Anyway, I told you how we got the water from Lake Tahoe, and when that—when the legislature decided that that water should be exported, the governor wanted credit for exporting it, and so did the legislature. And they all seemed to know that I knew something about it. So, I don’t know whether to tell you all this or not, but I was invited down there—go down there on a Monday and meet with the governor’s party. They took me into the back room of the capitol ~~I didn’t so~~ I didn’t know there was any such place. Coffee and donuts and whatnot, and on Thursday, probably, I’d go down and meet with the representatives of the legislature—Charlie Porter and those guys. And, anyway, Charlie Porter signed the bill—not signed the bill, but it was finally decided that it would be exported, and anyway up at the lake, Charlie Porter signed the papers that the

legislature would support this. And I was sitting by him, and he thanked me for my help. And he said “Anytime you have any problem, need any help, in the legislature, let me know.” So I asked someone to have it transferred to the water committee, and he said he wasn’t sure he could, and he tried, and he did. And our legal advisors from the attorney general’s office—every meeting we had legal advisors from the attorney general’s office, and engineers from the water.

“ . . . he said, ‘That won’t make any difference, it’ll be the same thing.’ But it wasn’t. We barely appeared before Charlie Porter’s committee, and it went through. Unanimous I believe. . . .”

Anyway, he said, “That won’t make any difference, it’ll be the same thing.” But it wasn’t. We barely appeared before Charlie Porter’s committee, and it went through. Unanimous I believe.

Seney: Well, he had a reputation for pretty much running that committee, didn’t he?

“ . . . now the basis of water . . . how much water Nevada and California each had . . . that was tremendously important. . . . it has not yet passed the Congress, but the states have agreed to abide by it, and they have. . . .”

Bruns: And it irritated the members of the Natural Resources Committee. So they did their work and it came to the floor of the house and we won by one vote. That made all the difference in the world because now the basis of water in this whole area until that was a decision of how much water Nevada and California each had, there wasn't much else they could do. So that was tremendously important. It did not pass—it has not yet passed the Congress, but the states have agreed to abide by it, and they have.

Seney: And it didn't, Public Law 101-618, the interstate allocations, they didn't do it all.

Bruns: It was changed, but that (unclear) the most important part of it, the division of water between . . . in Lake Tahoe between two states. Thousands of hours went into that to determine it.

“ . . . first meeting we had on Tahoe . . . one guy there who represented Sierra Pacific Power said 8,000 for Lake Tahoe. . . . ”

Fact is, Nevada, the first meeting we had on Tahoe, Nevada had got up and one guy there who represented Sierra Pacific Power said 8,000 for Lake Tahoe. And Jeff (unclear) of course wouldn't go along with that.

“ . . . it eventually became 34,000 for Lake Tahoe, 23 for California and 11 for Nevada. And Senator Harry Reid took that exactly and says ‘I settled all the wars between California and Nevada.’ . . . ”

And it eventually became 34,000 for Lake Tahoe, 23 for California and 11 for Nevada. And [Senator Harry] Reid took that exactly and says “I settled all the wars between California and Nevada.” Oh, that irritated me. Gosh, now I lost track of what I was going to say in all that.

Seney: Well, you were talking about all the allocation of water up at the lake and between the interstate compact.

Bruns: Oh, yeah, you asked me how come . . .

Seney: Well, to begin with, I asked you how come and there’s something more to the answer. What was it that got the interstate compact negotiations going. And I did want to ask you one thing, and that is when you said that here comes the Alpine Ditch case, and it’s revived in 1950, and it doesn’t really deal with Alpine County and your district attorney up there figures out that you guys have the right to store 200,000 acre feet, and that opens the door for you, I would assume you must have had something to do with influencing the district attorney to look into this. Does the board instruct him to look into this? You’re shaking your head

yes, but the tape won't see that. So the answer is yeah.

Bruns: Yes. (unclear)

Seney: What else was there besides the Alpine Ditch Decree business and storage in Alpine County and the questions on the Walker that Senator Brown raised that got the interstate compact commission going? Were there other issues too? Outside of this area.

Bruns: Well, Douglas County, Nevada, was the same—they had the same issues as we do. So the Federal Government wanted to cut the use of water up in this area by, well they didn't know how much, but that was the point of it. They thought they were wasting water up here.

Seney: And their point, too, was to make more water available for the Newlands Project.

Bruns: Newlands Project, yes, uh-huh. And I think the—I certainly never expected to have to sit on there for fifteen years, but it was by far the best thing to do. It had done by negotiation. There was no case law. There was nothing legal to go by. So it had to one way or the other, and the courts don't always go along. *However*, I and some of the other members of the compact commission

testified, well when this failed to go through congress then by that time Judge Holder was out, and Judge Thompson had taken over, and so he went ahead and put a final decree on the Carson River, but he took our work and included it in his decree. That is why many of us testified for it, and so they, I don't know just when the final decree was written, but . . .

Seney: 1980 was the year that it went into effect, yeah. So you feel Alpine County, and you yourself, were well treated in that Alpine Ditch Decree?

Bruns: We got just the way we were using . . .

Seney: It didn't alter your water duty or water right in any way whatsoever?

Bruns: No, but (unclear) was still in here *trying* to do something about it. But a lot of people don't realize that in a closed area, a valley, you can't waste water—even if you put too much water on your land. It eventually gets back to the center and it drains out into . . . anyway. You lose a little evaporation and that's all. So no matter *what* they decide they aren't going to get much more water than they would have otherwise. And some of this land here has been irrigated since 1850s and 1860s, and a lot of it is producing just as much as it did then. And you don't over-irrigate your land.

Seney: It's bad for it isn't it?

Pyramid Lake Issues

Bruns: So there you don't have much to stand on.

“The Pyramid Lake Indians were *behind* it all . . . and Senator John Tunney for California and Senator Edward Kennedy from Massachusetts stopped by the Pyramid Lake for one half day, and they got the Indians' viewpoint, and they decided no compact. . . .”

The Pyramid Lake Indians were *behind* it all, and they (unclear) didn't pass congress. I was there a number of times and I was just quite surprised to see that they had beat us there, and they (unclear) Washington, and Senator John Tunney for California and Senator Edward Kennedy from Massachusetts stopped by the Pyramid Lake for one half day, and they got the Indians' viewpoint, and they decided no compact.

“The compact did not hurt Pyramid Lake in any way shape or form. It did *not* allocate water to that. California, our half of the commission, would have been willing to sit down and try to work something out. Nevada politically couldn't do that. . . .”

The compact did not hurt Pyramid Lake in any way shape or form. It did *not* allocate water to that. California, our half of the commission, would have been willing to sit down and try to work something out. Nevada politically couldn't do that. The language that . . . the enabling language didn't authorize us to divide water *in* either state unless it had an effect on the other state like on us. So Nevada just said they could not possibly go along with allocating so much water to Pyramid Lake. But Pyramid appeared before the Nevada legislature, but it didn't do them any good. But in California there were some people that Pyramid Lake should get the water, and we should have given them some.

Seney: Was the issue to reduce the allocation, the 34,000 acre feet on Lake Tahoe, isn't it? 11,000 to Nevada, 23,000 to California. Was the objection by Pyramid Lake that that was too much water? You're shaking your head no.

“. . . the only water that had ever been allocated to Pyramid Lake was the approximately 3,000 acre feet. And that was in the compact. . . . the only thing that could keep Pyramid Lake alive was the big years and they'd get all that water anyway—there was no way to keep it from them. They had some of the people in California believing that if this compact were adopted Pyramid Lake would dry up in one or two or three

years. . . .”

Bruns: No. That was mentioned. It may have been in the back of their heads. Their objection was that our staff had researched every legal act that had ever been acted on water in the Carson and Truckee rivers, and the only water that had ever been allocated to Pyramid Lake was the approximately 3,000 acre feet. And that was in the compact. It listed everything, and they took for granted that that was all they'd ever get and that the lake would dry up. Well, the commission wouldn't allow that. On your big years—well the only thing that could keep Pyramid Lake alive was the big years and they'd get all that water anyway—there was no way to keep it from them. They had some of the people in California believing that if this compact were adopted Pyramid Lake would dry up in one or two or three years. And they wouldn't listen to us.

Seney: The three thousand acres business from claims 1 and 2 of the Orr Ditch Decree, which gives them a priority for water for agriculture, and when you listed that in there, they construed that to be *all* they would ever get rather than a minimum?

Bruns: That was arrogant, and then the people from Sacramento, “Well that's right”—they believed them. We'd get up and say that wasn't, but they

wouldn't listen to us.

Seney: I was going to ask you about the Nevada legislature. Did you go down to hear the debate before the Nevada legislature and you say they gave the Pyramid Lake tribe short shrift there. You're smiling at my characterization.

Bruns: Yeah. Boom.

Seney: I want to ask you what—you said that thousands of hours went into, and I have no doubt.

Bruns: (unclear) and I've talked it over, and each of us has donated over 3,000 hours to that.

Seney: To the commission, yeah. I have no doubt. These things are very time consuming. Not only the time you spend meeting, but the time you [spend] reviewing all of the very dense documents that come out of these things. I mean, it's a wonder anyone gets through them. I mean, they are among the most *boring* things one can read.

Bruns: Well, it depends. I usually enjoy reading that kind of stuff.

Seney: Uh-ohh. Now I'm really not . . . What was it, how did you get to that 34,000 acre feet number for the division between California and Nevada? First of all the gross number, and then the basis on

which it was divided. Now let me see if I . . .

END SIDE 2, TAPE 1. AUGUST 28, 1998
BEGIN SIDE 1, TAPE 2. AUGUST 28, 1998.

Seney: This is Donald Seney, I'm with Mr. Hubert Bruns in his home in Fredericksburg, Alpine County, California. Today is August 28th, 1998. This our first session, and this is our second tape.

Member of Congress Eugene A. Chappie

By the way, as we turned this over, we I mentions former congressman, former assemblyman [Eugene A.] Chappie, and he was the one, who you said earlier, handled these bills for you, and, in fact, he was the one who thought it wouldn't get to Carlie [phonetic] Porter's water committee.

Bruns: No, he, I thought should go there first. But, I didn't know that much about those committees down there until I got before them. I've been, as supervisor, I'd been before those—but not this serious a matter. He didn't know whether to go through Carlie Porter's committee or not, but he had it transferred to that committee because I asked him to—no it went to representative of the, I remember particular, from attorney general's office. He said, it won't make any difference.

We'll have the same opposition, but it did make a difference. Carlie Porter, there wasn't much good doing before his committee. Pyramid Lake got a short shrift here, too. And it went right through his committee. And *just* because it was Carlie Porter it went through this legislature. It would never have got out of the natural resources committee unless we had asked to have it transferred—because there was a George (Seney: George Miller.) Miller, (Seney: His father. It would have been his father. Senator Miller.) Yeah. It could be.⁵ (Seney: Yeah, the current congressman from Contra Costa County, George Miller, his father . . .) No, he was the southern one at the time, and he was on the resources committee, and then he came to Pyramid Lake for one day and knew it all. (Seney: Oh that's right you're . . . that's right. In the case of . . . this is later, however, isn't it?) Yes. (Seney: Yeah. Right, you're right about that. I was thinking about during the 1950s. That would have been his father.) His father. (Seney: Who was a . . . yeah.) This was '68 and '69⁶ when this was before the

5. This is a potentially confusing situation. State Senator (1948-1968) George Miller Jr. was the father of Member of Congress George Miller III of Martinez who has represented the East Bay since 1975.

Member of Congress George Paul Miller served from 1945 to 1973 and was not related to the other two; he also served in the California State Assembly from 1937 to 1941. All three were members of the Democratic Party.

6. Since George Miller Jr. died in 1968, this was likely George
(continued...)

legislature. (Seney: Yeah. That would have been the younger George Miller, right. By that time his father is dead) He didn't want—he was sure that our compact would ruin Pyramid Lake.

Seney: Yeah.

Clair Engle

Bruns: And actually, after 1960, around 1945 I knew congressman Clair Engle, did you know who he was.

Seney: Sure, I knew who he was, right.

Bruns: Clair Engle, I knew him quite well. He, as supervisor, used to come up here, and we used to—we took him to dinner, and we also had a few highballs with him. And he was a very levelheaded, down-to-earth sort of guy. And I wrote to him asked him if he would give the Bureau of Reclamation a little boost and see if they wouldn't study it—the whole valley for a reservoir for this part of the country. And he did.

Local Reclamation Manager Said They Could Not Look at Additional Projects in the Area until after Full Development of the Newlands Project

6. (...continued)
Paul Miller.

And I got a letter from the manager of the Reclamation in this area. Said “We cannot study Holt (phonetic) Valley now because until we finish the Lahontan project,” he said, “we’re now irrigating around 70- or 80,000 acres, and we want to build that up to around 140- or 50-, and when we get that done then we will consider other ones.

“ . . . they had *totally* overestimated, and after our compact commission was organized about one of the first things we *realized* was that there was *no* water left in either the Carson River *or* the Truckee River for agricultural development. . . .”

See, they had *totally* overestimated, and after our compact [commission] was organized about one of the first things we *realized* was that there was *no* water left in either the Carson River *or* the Truckee River for agricultural development.

“ . . . they came out with the Washoe Project . . . they wanted 10,000 acres more in town, and then they were going to put 10,000 more in Carson Valley here where all of that development is. But we decided right away that there was no water, *and* that was our *unofficial* estimate that they would buy up at least 20,000 acres or more of agriculture land to use for development *rather* than put in 20,000 acres more of agriculture. It

couldn't be done. . . ."

In 1950 they came out with the Washoe Project, have you ever seen that . . . I have all their books here . . . They had reduced their request—they wanted 10,000 acres more in town, and then they were going to put 10,000 more in Carson Valley here where all of that development is. But we decided right away that there was no water, *and* that was our *unofficial* estimate that they would buy up at least 20,000 acres or more of agriculture land to use for development *rather* than put in 20,000 acres more of agriculture. It couldn't be done. (Seney: Yeah.)

Believes the Elevation of Pyramid Lake Will Rise Due to Wet Years in the System

And 1960 to 19 . . . when was the first big drought? They are operating exactly as the compact said they should and Pyramid Lake rose 24 feet. *Not* because of the compact, but because we had some wet years. And that's the way it would have been if the compact had been adopted in Washington.

Support for Pyramid Lake in the East

They still . . . the Lake would have come up instead of going down. There was a little Indian

girl from some tribe in the East, Traveled here, and she sang, I can't think of her name now, she attended one of our meetings down there. And they told her that boy this was terrible, and the natural resources committee received dozens and dozens of letters from Harvard and Yale where this girl had gone and sang and then told them about this terrible project out here. And she didn't know one-twentieth of what you know about it, but, you know, Indians are a minority group.

“It was frustrating that they didn't know what they were talking about yet they had the power. . . .”

It was frustrating that they didn't know what they were talking about yet they had the power. And Senator Kennedy, we knew after we got back there a few times, that we couldn't get it through the Senate. We thought maybe we'd get it through the . . . *Unfortunately* Engle, you know, passed away and Kuchel, did you ever hear of Senator Kuchel (Seney: Thomas Kuchel.) he was there, and that George Murphy from Hollywood—that was the worst thing could happen. If Senator Kuchel and Senator Engle had been in when we got back there, we'd a had a compact. But with John Tunney, he was a nice guy, I talked to him a lot, but he was a friend of Senator Kennedy, and Kennedy said “no,” and that was it.

Seney: Well Kennedy made a trip up to Pyramid Lake and was made an honorary member of the tribe, and . . .

“. . . nevertheless, the area is getting the benefit of our work because the two states are going by it, and the *only* way that Senator Reid got that through Congress was to promise the Indians eighty million dollars to pay for the water that was taken away from them. . . .”

Bruns: He and Tunney visited for part of a day, and they [felt they] knew more than we did about . . . and that was the end of our . . . but, nevertheless, the area is getting the benefit of our work because the two states are going by it, and the *only* way that Senator Reid got that through Congress was to promise the Indians eighty million dollars to pay for the water that was taken away from them. And *now* he’s trying to still come out here and get some of our water. He trying to take some water away from Fallon for his Indian . . . to me that’s a conflict that he’s paying them eighty million dollars and I don’t think he can guarantee that they will all get that because so much a year, and one Congress can’t tie down the next Congress. *That’s* how it got through because he promised them eighty million dollars . . .

Seney: That money’s all been set aside. It was all set

aside.

Bruns: Is it set aside? They *will* get it?

Seney: There's forty-one or two in an endowment fund for the fisheries, and there's about an equal amount in an endowment fund for economic development. And all that money has been set aside.

Bruns: Oh, I didn't realize that.

Seney: Yeah. They have the fisheries money now. They . . . (Bruns: I guess they've *used* some of that.) Yes, they have, and they *won't* get control over the endowment fund until they sign off on the TROA under Public Law 101-618. They've got a—this TROA has to be completed, and they have to have signed off on the TROA—the tribe does. And then they'll get to spend the interest off of that 42 million dollar economic development endowment.

Let me go back, if I could, to the 34,000 acre feet number on Tahoe.

Bruns: Yeah, you asked me how did arrange that . . .

Seney: Yeah, right, and you did say, let me say that when you had a hearing that the power company guy gets up and says 8,000 only. Somebody must

have given a higher number and somehow you end up with 34—could you just (Bruns: Yeah. Give and take.) Talk about how that was done, and what the numbers were, and how you kind of came to the gross number, and then the way in which you divided it.

“The gross was just give and take until we finally came as high as Nevada would go and as far down as California . . . our staff surveyed the Lake, and they determined that they had so much building capacity in Nevada and so much in California and then divided up about 11 to 23, about a third to two-thirds. . . .”

Bruns: Well, the way it was divided is a little easier than the gross. The gross was just give and take until we finally came as high as Nevada would go and as far down as California . . . But, our staff surveyed the Lake, and they determined that they had so much building capacity in Nevada and so much in California and then divided up about 11 to 23, about a third to two-thirds. (Seney: Two to one kind of thing.)

“Both sides had to give in a lot in order to come to some decision, and that was the final decision. We were under criticism from both sides. . . . I think we came to a pretty good decision. And . . . the senator [Harry Reid] took . . . practically word

for word our language from Tahoe. And he didn't give us any credit for it. . . ."

Both sides had to give in a lot in order to come to some decision, and that was the final decision. We were under criticism from both sides. The business people up there were upset because we didn't give them more water. There was a *long* article in the *California Magazine* criticizing for giving them too much water, for it would be too much development up there. Didn't make any difference which side you were on or what you do. I think we came to a pretty good decision. And we must have because the senator [Harry Reid] took the—he didn't take the whole language of all the Three Rivers, but he took practically word for word our language from Tahoe. And he didn't give us any credit for it. It irritated me because he said "*I settled (unclear)*" and he didn't settle it. He doesn't know any more about water than the Man in the Moon. But he's a pretty good politician.

Seney: You must have had opposition from Sierra Pacific Power, again, who wanted to say only 8,000 acre feet for Tahoe because . . .

Sierra Pacific's Position on the California-Nevada Interstate Compact

Bruns: George Devore (phonetic) represented, he was an

engineer for Sierra Pacific, and he was appointed by their governor to serve on the commission for the first several years. And he was very talkative and he was a very nice fellow. But he was very conservative, and he was looking out for Sierra Pacific. (Seney: Sure.) 8,000 didn't amount to much, but I can *remember* him standing up and saying "8,000 is all we'll give." And they were already *using* much more than 8,000 up there. (Seney: Yeah, yeah.) And they could use a lot more than 34,000, but since *our* negotiations up then they decided that so many thousand, 10,000 lots are *not* developable, and so that's fine. He took . . . we arranged that when Stampede Reservoir was built California and Tahoe could get 10,000 acres [acre feet] out of that—it seems to me that's what it was in the original compact, and he took that out of it. And that's all right because they don't need any more up there anyway. Got too much now, really.

And there was a little . . . and in the Carson River about the only change was the addition of what you mentioned before—that they took the water away we were using from Tahoe that they'd have to replace it. That was a good thing because the guys that were negotiating with Nevada—they had two guys from Sacramento negotiating was Reid with some number of people from Nevada. (Seney: John Kramer and Markle)

Yeah, that's right, you know all that. They used to stop here and talk to me pretty near . . . at least every other meeting when they met in Nevada. And that's the only good thing . . . because the decree had already been settled, and the . . .

Seney: You know, let me stop you here. If these are dropping by, they're not just coming by for a cup of coffee or because it's convenient on the way home. (Bruns: No.) They're coming by because they need to see you. (Bruns: Oh, I guess so.) Well, don't be too modest here. And they need to see you because you've got a voice in this, and I wouldn't be surprised if you might have suggested to them that this guarantee for replacement for any water . . . (Bruns: No, they suggested that.) Oh Really?

Bruns: I said, boy if you can get that, that's wonderful. Because I don't know where they'd get the water, but that would almost prevent . . . Fallon from taking it away from us. (Seney: Yeah.) That's the thing. No, I thought that was great.

Seney: But that didn't come from you? (Bruns: No, it didn't come from me.) Okay, well, I'm giving you a chance to take credit for it, here, if it truly did. (Bruns: No. No.) Well, I can tell already that you've got a good grasp of these things, and, I mean, you take a long view of these matters, and I wouldn't be surprised if that had been your

suggestion or . . . (Bruns: If I'd thought about it I would have.) Why would do you think they were so interested in making sure that you were taken care of and these three other people.

Bruns: Oh, that was their responsibility to take care of California. We're the only ones that were . . .

Seney: You know, I've met Mr. Kramer. He's a very able man. I've not met Mr. Markle, but I'm going to be interviewing both of them. I'm sort of heading over the hill toward California. I started at the other end of the rivers and am working my way up, here. Now, there was another diversion in the compact that's of interest to me and to this project, and that's the 32,000 in the upper Truckee Basin on the California side of the border. And I understand that that was a hard one to come up with. Talk a little bit about what went into that decision.

California-Nevada Interstate Compact Allotted 32,000 Acre Feet to the Upper Truckee Basin

Bruns: I wasn't on that particular committee, but they came about the same as the Tahoe. They made a thorough survey of the area that could be developed, and they decided that that was about how much they could *use* up there, and Nevada didn't object too much to that. I don't know why,

but they didn't.

Seney: One of the elements that's come up in the TROA . . . have you paid any attention to the Truckee River Operating Agreement negotiations that have been going on? You have, you're shaking your head.

Bruns: I'm not really up on it, but, yes, you bet, everything is in the paper I read.

**Issue of Depletion and Return Flows Entered into
Consideration of the Upper Truckee Basin
Allocation During Compact and TROA
Negotiations**

Seney: Yeah. Right. Are you aware that one of the questions that had been raised by the Nevada interests on this 32,000 foot gross allocation to the upper Truckee Basin, that's 10,000 feet from surface water, 22,000 from groundwater, is this issue of depletion and how much will return back to the Truckee River. You're shaking your head yes. (Bruns: Yes, and they considered that return flow a lot.) That's what I was going to ask you. That's my understanding that in your deliberations in the interstate compact commission (Bruns: Very much.) you were dealing with this depletion business and return flows, too. Do you remember that debate even though you weren't on that committee

specifically, or did that go on . . .

**Issue of Return Flows from the 32,000 Acre Feet
Allocated to the Upper Truckee Basin**

Bruns: I don't remember too many details, but I attended some of their meetings, and yeah . . .

Seney: The question here is essentially if the allocation is 32,000 acre feet, how much of that will eventually find its way back down the Truckee River for reuse by lower Truckee River interests.

Bruns: Normally 50 percent.

Seney: Yeah, that's the normal number isn't it, and at this point the Nevada interests are saying, well, what if you get more efficient and you're only returning 45 percent? Or you're only returning 42 percent? Or 40 percent? Are you familiar with the fact they're raising this in the TROA . . .

Bruns: Not now, but I know they did at the time. That was discussed a lot.

Seney: Well, they're raising it again in the TROA negotiations.

Bruns: Well, I thought Reid's version of the division of waters took a lot of that out of there.

Seney: Well, that's what the California interests thought, too. They thought it was gross diversion at the point of diversion—that you measured at the point of diversion, and the trouble is in the operating agreement the Feds in Nevada and the tribe have raised this business of: what if you become more efficient—because we've based this on a 50 percent return. So, we assume if you use your 32,000 acre feet, we're going to get 16,000 back. What if you use 32,000 acre feet and we only get 12,000 back? So, we want you to use *less* than 32,000. We want you to use 28,000 because that will make sure we get enough return even if you become more efficient.

Bruns: I'm not aware of that . . .

Seney: So the argument that you all spent so much time on goes on in terms of the gross allocation on the upper Truckee Basin. You know, I'd like you to talk a little more—you've said a couple things about the final defeat of the interstate compact before the Senate. There were several attempts to pass it. And the closest it got was in 1986 when Senator [Paul] Laxalt backed it. The commission was still alive and functioning at that point wasn't it, in 1986—no, not at that point. (Bruns: No.) I mean not you personally, I mean the commission. Did Senator Laxalt call on you to come back and aid him in any way, or . . .

**Senator Laxalt Had California and Nevada
Compact Representatives Back in D.C. Several
Times to Support Passage of the California-
Nevada Interstate Compact in the Senate**

Bruns: We went back, both Nevada and California—some of the members. Bill Bechtolt (phonetic) and myself. I went back there, probably five or six times, and other members of the commission and several from Nevada were back there. We had *lunch* in the Senate restaurant, whatever, at Laxalt's on his credit card. Oh, we had a great time, back there. We didn't get too far back there.

Seney: What did he have you doing? What did he ask you to do? What did you volunteer to do on behalf of the . . .?

Bruns: Primarily we visited the various congressmen or their offices to try to convince them that we weren't so bad, and some of them were real acceptive to our thing, and some of them had already been convinced by . . . And all those guys are politicians. They don't tell you much what they're thinking. Even their staff doesn't. They're *always* very gracious, always give you a cup of coffee, but we didn't have a chance in the Senate. And they, like you say, have you ever talked to Senator Jacobsen who he's the oldest active of the Nevada legislature. He was in the

assembly for several years, and now he's been in the senate for several years, and he's running again—he shouldn't, but he's running again. But *he* told me that just two years ago, I think he told me, they were still trying to get it through.

It Was Only Carlie Porter's Support That Got the California-Nevada Compact Approved in California

But no votes . . . They don't have the right people back there now. See, that would have given the total control of the water into the permanent compact commission or it would have been entirely out of the courts. But that was never mentioned and Sacramento never heard of that. All they heard, the compact, if adopted, would dry up Pyramid Lake. That was the *sole*—you might be interested in this, Ray (unclear), (unclear), and myself we all went to the meetings together, and one day we were walking to a meeting at the capitol, and as we walked through the grounds we saw a group of people up on the steps, and out there with all kind of people. So we had a few minutes before the meeting, and we walked over to see what was going on. And, of all things, here up on the platform Pyramid Lake had a wickiup, and they had probably six or eight or ten Indians dressed up in feathers and buckskin suits, and they were dancing, and they had signs all over—"Save Pyramid Lake." That was just for our

benefit. And, gee, they had a lot of people, and boy that gets the people. Then that afternoon we walked into the meeting—the room was full. Those of us who were on the compact commission and trying to . . . we had to stand around the walls. We couldn't even find a seat. And boy, when the opposition talked, oh those people—you could tell that was just *it*. But when one of us got up to talk it was difficult because all these people were against us. They didn't know. You know this thing had been going on for years, and it was difficult, and you can't get that just be listening to . . . so we—it was just Carlie Porter that got that through for us.

Seney: What was this governing body that would have regulated . . .

The Permanent Compact Commission Proposed for the California-Nevada Interstate Compact

Bruns: It was probably very similar to the original compact—about six guys from Nevada and about six from California with a chairman appointed by the president representing the United States. And they would have had control—pretty much total control of the water.

Seney: You know, the Federal Government ended up objecting to the interstate compact because of the

clause in it that said any use by the Federal Government or its wards, and so forth, within a particular state would be charged against the allocation of that state. Explain to me what that means and why they objected.

Forest Service and Federal Position on Water Rights

Bruns: Forest Service thought they were a little bit above the rest of us, and that they could use whatever they wanted without being charged. That's the only thing. Both states were absolutely against. They say all water belongs to the state, and the Federal Government said it belonged to them. And that's what the Federal Government stood on—that it belonged to them. As far as I know, it belongs to the states. I guess it'd have to go to the Supreme Court of the United States to decide. Nevertheless, apparently it never has.

Work on the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Began Almost Fifty Years Ago

Anyhow, California block believes its theirs, and Nevada believes its theirs, and they didn't want their part in the . . . They appeared before a number of our meetings. That's a little hazy to me now because I was amazed the other day something came up about the compact, and my son Bruce says "Gee, how come it still

talking about . . . that was fifty years ago.” And I started to think, “By golly, almost fifty years.” ‘54, well ‘55 when we started. It just doesn’t seem *possible*.

Seney: Yeah, yeah. Well these things take a long time don’t they, in the water world, and they almost somehow never seem to die, these issues many of them. They come back, and they come back . . .

Bruns: Now this is a short area—does not have a lot of surplus water. Just last January, a year ago, they had all they could . . .

Seney: Temporarily a surplus . . .

The Surplus Years Are the Ones That Will Maintain Pyramid Lake

Bruns: *That* is what will maintain Pyramid Lake. It’s a shame because they’re trying to take so many acre feet here and so many acre feet here, and those acre feet that they’re trying to take are so valuable to the local area and to Fallon, and an acre foot doesn’t mean much in Pyramid Lake, and twenty or thirty thousand is not going to have any effect on . . .

**“Pyramid Lake has to depend *entirely* on those
big years. . . .”**

Pyramid Lake has to depend *entirely* on those *big* years.

“You’re probably aware that Pyramid Lake dried up entirely years and years ago. . . .”

You’re probably aware that Pyramid Lake dried up entirely years and years ago.

Seney: Well, I understand that it did historically.

“. . . that’s the only thing that will dry Pyramid Lake up is a extended drought. . . .”

Bruns: Because of a eighty year, or a hundred year drought. And that’s when Tahoe was way down, and the pine trees grew up and all that. But that’s the only thing that will dry Pyramid Lake up is a extended drought. No use upstream is ever going to dry up Pyramid Lake.

“. . . we all know now—anybody tried to use more water now, they’re not going to get it. . . . So, . . . the way it’s always going to be, Pyramid Lake is never going to dry up—compact or no compact.”

And as what we all know now—anybody tried to use more water now, they’re not going to get it. They can’t build another reservoir without the

consent of Pyramid Lake, and they'll never get it. So, the way it is now, the way it's always going to be, Pyramid Lake is never going to dry up—compact or no compact.

Seney: Let me ask you about the upper Carson [River] and the Bureau of Reclamation and the Washoe Project in the 1950s and the 1960s. When the Watasheamu Dam was being discussed. What was your view on the Watasheamu Dam?

Washoe Project and Watasheamu Dam

Bruns: I think it was strange it wasn't built.

“It wouldn't have developed a lot of water. . . . but it would have provided a great deal of flood control, and it would have provided just unlimited recreation. . . .”

It wouldn't have developed a lot of water. I think the *maximum* they thought it would develop was at 20,000 acre feet, and I don't think it would have developed that *much*, but it would have provided a great deal of flood control, and it would have provided just unlimited recreation. That's what the country needs. Place for recreation that you get—it's good for the people, you know. And there would have been thousands of people using it. Roland Westergard is his

name (Seney: I've interviewed Westergard, right.) he told me sometimes there is as many as 40,000 people recreating on Lahontan Reservoir.⁷ That's *tremendous*. We had *days* it was 5 to 10,000 people on this reservoir if it had been built. And it would have save unlimited flood damage, but it apparently will never be built now. *Originally* reason it wasn't built was because big landowner over here, Dresser (phonetic), and big ground holder, Dangbert (phonetic), had enough water for themselves, and they didn't want the government in here.

Seney: That was the reason, huh? I interviewed, and this is not a good day for my memory either, his first name is Bob, and he was with the Bureau of Reclamation in Carson City for a *long* time. He was acting project manager sometimes. (Bruns: Yeah, I don't remember either.) I *know* you know who he is. And he was in charge of the Watasheamu business here, and he told me without being specific who it was, as you have been, that it was the water rights holders who really kyboshed it. That you couldn't get enough of them to go along with the project. What sort of acreages do these two ranches hold?

7. After consulting with Reclamation's regional recreation coordinator, the editor believes this is likely a rough annual figure for recreation at Lahontan Reservoir on the Newlands Project. The Lahontan State Recreation Area is managed by the Nevada Division of State Parks.

- Bruns: Those ranches, they were big. Now they're all dissolved. But, gee, Dressler, he probably had around 20,000 acres in this particular area, and Dangbert had more than that. (Seney: Wow, so that would make them really the major ranchers. With early priorities for their water?) Yeah.
- Seney: My understanding is that you would have had to give up your water rights and contract back water from Watasheamu. Is that how it would have worked?
- Bruns: No. Well, their intention was to develop water for agriculture, and they had a price set for supplemental water and a price set for a full supply if they put in new land and made you have to get a full supply from the reservoir. The prices were different. We had to pay a little more for supplemental, but we wouldn't have to give up any of our rights. Maybe, if it had gone through, maybe that held it up or something. But, no, there was never any talk as far as *we* knew about having to give up our rights.
- Seney: Yeah. But still these two, Dressler and Dangbert wouldn't have anything to do with it.

“ . . . they don't like government in here under any circumstances. They were . . . independent, and they didn't want any government control. . . .

would be sort of a gift to a lot of people that they would have to help pay for that they didn't need . . . Both of them were German descent . . . but they all were independent. They did things on their own. . . ."

Bruns: Not to my knowledge. They would . . . I don't think it would have had much effect on them except they don't like government in here under any circumstances. They were just, well, independent, and they didn't want any government control. And they thought this reservoir would be sort of a gift to a lot of people that they would have to help pay for that they didn't need, and all that kind of stuff. Both of them were German descent, and, you know, those German people, my dad came from German, well, my Granddad not my dad, but they all were independent. They did things on their own. They didn't want the government doing anything. Course Germany changed when Hitler got in, but, no, they didn't want the government control. Maybe they don't want it known, but they were the primary reason that that . . .

". . . the cost/benefit ratio, according to the government survey, wasn't good. But, when you consider the benefit of flood control and the benefit of recreation . . ."

And then later on the cost/benefit ratio, according

to the government survey, wasn't good. But, when you consider the benefit of flood control and the benefit of recreation it's impossible to put a value on recreation, but . . .

Seney: Is flood control, as this area down here develops, more and more likely to be what drives the pressure for a dam on the upper Carson?

Bruns: Well, it sure did this time. Boy there was a lot of damage along that river. Development along the river really shouldn't have been there, but . . .

Seney: Is any of your property along the river? (Bruns: No.) So you didn't get damaged by the flood.

Bruns: Not one bit.

Seney: Yeah, and you're up nice and high here where your house is. If this floods, why everything will be flooding.

Bruns: We got a little flood out of the mountains up here, but not enough to do *extensive* damage. It washed out some ditches and stuff like that.

Seney: Do you still take an interest in the development in the area here, and have you tried to influence the sort of pace of development on the Nevada side?

**“ . . . we’re developing a little of our own.
Agriculture in this valley is on its way out. . . .
agriculture in an area like this can’t keep up with
agriculture in the Central Valley. They can
produce two or three times the amount of food
products with an acre foot of water than we can. ”**

Bruns: No. No. Fact is we’re developing a little of our own. Agriculture in this valley is on its way out. People come in here, and Oh its so beautiful, so green, and so nice, we just have to keep it this way, but they don’t know how hard you have to work to keep it. And agriculture in an area like this can’t keep up with agriculture in the Central Valley. They can produce two or three times the amount of food products with an acre foot of water than we can. This is the place to live, and that’s the way its going to be in the future. They’re doing everything in the world to keep it green, but nature doesn’t have it that way.

Seney: You know, this is a Bureau of Reclamation project, and one thing the senior historian’s asked me to do, and he hasn’t told me what to do or how to handle it or who to talk to . . .

Bruns: Oh, you mean you’re connected somehow with the Bureau project?

Seney: Right, this is a Bureau of Reclamation oral history on the Newlands Project, right. (Bruns: Oh

really!) Yeah. Maybe the static on the phone line was too much, but I'm a professor of government at CSU in Sacramento, but, on this, this is a Bureau of Reclamation Project through the office of the senior historian in Denver—which is part of the Office of Policy Analysis. And they've asked *me* to do this. And they haven't put any restrictions on me—who I talk to, who I don't talk to. In fact, we thought when I began it would be a couple of years is all it would take. But it's been much longer because there are more and more people who need to be talked to—like yourself who have information and a point of view we want to hear on this. So, one of the things that they do want me to ask about is people's experience with, reactions to the Bureau. And we're not looking here to whitewash the Bureau, make it look good or make it look bad. But just what have your dealings been with the Bureau.

“My view is usually the local managers [of the Bureau of Reclamation] . . . are fine. They know what's going on, but the politics up high is—we don't have too much respect for . . . “

Bruns: My view is usually the local managers, the local people that manage the local area are fine. They know what's going on, but the politics up high is—we don't have too much respect for . . .

- Seney: When you say politics up high, what do you mean? Can you give me an example of what you mean.
- Bruns: Well, they just don't listen to us little guys. And they *often* don't come up with practical solutions. I've been to various hearings and listened to them talk—what they're going to do with their water up here. Why they need it down below. And you talk to a local manager, well we can't do anything about it "That's what the big wigs say." *Usually* these guys around here are pretty practical. What did you say the guy's name was that you work for?
- Seney: That I work for. His name is Brit Storey. He's the senior historian for the Bureau of Reclamation so he's not . . . in Denver. He's not someone you'd ever run into in terms of . . . you know, he's not a policy maker. He runs the history program, and most of these federal agencies under some recent statute have a history program. And this is the Bureau of Reclamation's. To make sure they keep their records and preserve the information about the projects for scholarly use. I'm really glad to know you are writing a book on all of this because people's memories are very important. And their experiences in, you know, recording all these water conflicts and what's gone on. You know, one of the things that you have here in your things that you brought out was a copy of the

Pyramid Lake task force—the final report of the task force in 1971. Did you take part in that, or why did you have a copy of that?

Pyramid Lake Task Force Report, 1971

- Bruns: My name is in there. I was on it.
- Seney: Oh, you were on it. I've read this report, and I guess I never look at the names in the front.
- Bruns: Couple pages I had there. (Seney: No, back further up in front. It should be right up in front. Yeah, there's your signature on it. Right. With Elaine Brookman of Bookman-Edmonston) No, she was from Las Vegas. She was an assembly woman.
- Seney: Roland Westergard who was . . .
- Bruns: Rodda, did you ever know him in Sacramento? He was Al Rodda (phonetic)
- Seney: Yeah I knew who he is. He was actually a neighbor of mine. Right.
- Bruns: He was, I believe, the attorney for the Bureau.
- Seney: No, that wouldn't have been the person I'm thinking of. Charles Renda, you mean. (Bruns:

Yeah.) Tell me about your work on the Pyramid Lake Task Force.

“It involved the Carson and Truckee and Lake Tahoe and how we could get more water into Pyramid Lake without *injuring anybody*. . . .”

Bruns: It was very interesting. It involved the Carson and Truckee and Lake Tahoe and how we could [get] more water into Pyramid Lake without *injuring anybody*. And we didn't find a great deal of anything that could be done along the rivers up here.

“The main *problem* was the inefficiency of the project in Fallon. . . . It was very inefficient and we found where they could, by doing certain things”

The main *problem* was the inefficiency of the project in Fallon. As you are aware, the first one ever built in the United States under the Reclamation Act. It was very inefficient and we found where they could, by doing certain things, they could up with about 60 or 70,000 acre feet they saved, and they did some of it at our recommendation, but I think just getting dust right now. But *that* was . . . *they* on that task force there was somebody from Washington, somebody from Denver, somebody from Sacramento, and two of us from California, and six from Nevada.

“... those Federal guys wanted to bring water in from Honey Lake . . . and boy those people up there, they wouldn’t have anything to do with that. . . . not going to bring any water here from California to build up Pyramid Lake. . . .”

And, those Federal guys wanted to bring water in from Honey Lake, you know up there. (Seney: Yes. Yes.) And they were determined that that was the place to help, and boy those people up there, they wouldn’t have anything to do with that. And I don’t blame them. They came and so myself and [Robert G.] Eiland, who represented California, we supported them, and there was no . . . not going to bring any water here from California to build up Pyramid Lake.

Seney: Yeah. Yeah. This report does, and I have read it, it again its primary priority is making sure there is sufficient water for the Newlands Project, as the first priority. And then the second one is to . . .

Bruns: Well, that wasn’t the objective—that was to get more water to Pyramid Lake so that the Newlands Project was protected.

Seney: Right. Exactly. To make sure it was protected. And then to get more water for Pyramid Lake. And one of the things that had gone on for a long time was the winter power generation on the

Newlands Project. Remember looking into that?

Winter Power Generation on the Newlands Project and the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge

Bruns: Yes, that wasted some water, so I don't think they use it any more.

Seney: No they abandoned it about this time—the winter power generation. The argument in favor of it was it helped to defray the O&M costs on the project. And also, it sustained the wetlands out at [the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge.] ~~the end of Pyramid Lake.~~ But they had no right under the Orr Ditch Decree to run water for power. They had it only for irrigation. Did you remember that the tribe was very upset about that winter power generation. (Bruns: No I don't recall whether they were or not.) One of the things that came out of this was the OCAP. Remember the Operating Criteria and Procedures that the Secretary of the Interior *imposed* on the Newlands Project?

Bruns: Yes. I know their operating criteria. (Seney: Yeah. Was that something that the Task Force recommended, do you remember?) No. No. We didn't, not that I can recall. I know that I would have pulled their operating criteria. That's where they don't use . . . well, common judgement.

Seney: Are you talking about the Newlands Project.

Water Operations on the Newlands Project

Bruns: Yeah. No. Somebody, whoever set up in Washington and Denver . . . that operating criteria doesn't really *fit* the area. It fits what they *want* it to do, but it doesn't . . . found in that for that project, the Federal Government wanted the project, and they advertised all over the country for people to come in and use it, and it wasn't those people's fault. Like I told you before, they told me they didn't want to develop anything upstream until they got their 150,000 acres. And the farmers, they didn't know the difference. They thought, "Gee, if there's always water to build a total of 150,000 acres why we don't have to be efficient." Weekends they'd open their canal and it'd go out in the desert, you know, and nobody get up at night and changed their water.

"After we let it be known that we felt that there was *no* surplus water and that there couldn't be more land developed, they became much more efficient. And they don't . . . waste, the water now. . . ."

After *we* let it be known that we felt that there was *no* surplus water and that there couldn't be more land developed, they became much more efficient. And they don't use, or waste, the water now. They use what they need. But they aren't

wasting it.

“Water is like your operating capital in the bank. You want a little extra there . . . You should have enough *water* so you can operate freely. . . .”

Water is like your operating capital in the bank. You want a little extra there so you don't . . . it's the only way to operate, you know. The same way with water. It's not right to have to get up at midnight to save a little bit of water and let the lower end of your field go. You should have enough *water* so you can operate freely. *Not* waste it. But to try to cut it down to the last drop of water to make people . . . farming is hard enough as it *is* without having to face those kind of things. Central Valley did the same thing, you know. They want to use the water for fisheries and things like that and . . .

Seney: But you thought, when you looked into it, as a member of the task force, that out on the project they could have made better use of the water and subsequently did make better use of the water?

Operation Issues on the Newlands Project

Bruns: Oh, yeah. They, California projects, you know have all you automatic gates, and you can press a button here and open a gate over there. Down there they can't do that. They're getting better,

but they have these long canals, and if somebody wanted to irrigate up at the head of the canal, they had to shut the bottom off and back that canal up all the way up the way so he could get water out and then, like I say, on the weekends it went out in the sagebrush, and they had some *ponds* out there that they really didn't need, and they lost a lot through evaporation and . . . (Seney: Groundwater infiltration.) yeah. And we recommended, as you read in there, I'm sure, that those be dispensed with. And that would have saved them a lot of water. But they have improved . . . I guess they have cemented some of their canals, and they have done quite a bit of work to save water.

“ . . . in the compact . . . they [Truckee-Carson Irrigation District] said they *needed* 400,000 acre feet . . . They wanted a lot more than they *really* needed. I didn't go for that kind of stuff, but they should have *all* they *do* need. . . .”

They, in the compact, they wanted, I believe, they wanted . . . they said they *needed* 400,000 [acre feet] (Seney: 405,000, yeah) whatever. They wanted a lot more than they *really* needed. I didn't go for that kind of stuff, but they should have *all* they *do* need.

“ . . .Pyramid Lake will get all they need from the

big years. . . .Once in a while that tricky river runs up to a million and a half acre feet. And that's what Pyramid *has* to live on. They have . . . four feet of evaporation annually—which amounts to about 450,000 . . .”

And Pyramid Lake will get all they need from the big years. (Seney: Yeah.) Once in a while that tricky river runs up to a million and a half [acre] feet. And that's what Pyramid *has* to live on. They have, well, I guess you know, four feet [of] evaporation annually—which amounts to about 450,000 just evaporates off of there. (Seney: Right, it's a huge evaporation load.) It's very expensive recreation. And Lake Tahoe is the same way. They lose three feet a year [in evaporation,] 375,000 about. (Seney: Yeah. Right.) So both of them are very expensive recreation areas.

Seney: Did you run across a man named William Veeder when you were working on this. Or did you . . .

Bruns: What was the last name?

Seney: William Veeder. He was a Justice Department attorney who represented the Bureau of Indian Affairs. (Bruns: Yeah. I didn't remember who he represented, but the name is familiar.) And I actually interviewed him, too, in Washington, D.C., and he wrote some of the reactions on

behalf of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Task Force report. And his view was that the report was pretty much stacked in favor of TCID, the members of the report—I don't want to impugn this to you necessarily, and I don't know if he would include you in that, but that it was a report that really was stacked in favor of TCID, and it didn't really represent much the Indian point of view. How would you respond to that kind of criticism.

“ . . . they wanted to preserve TCID, but I think that's probably it. But they did not want to give TCID more than they needed. . . .”

Bruns: Yeah, they wanted to preserve TCID, but I think that's probably it. But they did not want to give TCID more than they needed. But they didn't want to take water away from them because there was a couple guys from the Feds that would have. But, of course, the whole thing was stacked by Nevada. But, you know, Nevada had six members, Federal Government four, and [California] Nevada two.

Seney: Who appointed you on this team?

**Governor Ronald Reagan Appointed Him to the
Pyramid Lake Task Force**

Touring Lake Tahoe with Governor Reagan and Governor Paul Laxalt

Bruns: Governor [Ronald] Reagan. Might be interesting Governor Reagan and Governor [Paul] Laxalt took a tour of Lake Tahoe one day on Harvey's Club houseboat, and I was one of those invited to go along to kind of . . . they took the tour to see what was going on in Lake Tahoe and to learn about water in Nevada, generally. Laxalt was very much aware. Of course, Reagan didn't know anything about it. But I had a chance to talk to Reagan that day, and been upset ever since because a few years after that Reagan was president and Laxalt was one of his main helpers, and I didn't even both to get a picture taken with them, and here I was running around with them both.

Seney: Yeah. Was Gene Chappie there that day, do you remember?

Bruns: I don't believe so. Maybe he was. I don't remember him.

Seney: Because I know he had something to do, at least as he explained it to me, with getting Reagan and Laxalt together over some of these matters. Maybe it was at a later time. Was this the first time they'd met over this issue, did you get the feeling?

Bruns: Well, they were friends all the time they were both governors so they talked about it. This was the first *big* event that they got together. However, Chappie may have been there. I just don't remember.

Seney: Right, and your impression was that Laxalt was up to speed on these issues and Reagan . . .

Bruns: Well, of course, he favored the Lahontan over . . . well, I think he was practical on the thing, and a lot of the people that were supporting . . . I support, heck, I was born and raised with Indians. My dad had a family living here. I think the Indians are *great*. I don't do anything to help them, but I wouldn't do anything to hurt somebody else just to help them if I didn't think it was practical. And I think report on that was pretty practical.

Seney: Yeah. Well, it's clear that certainly the people in the irrigation district considered Senator Laxalt to be an ally of theirs. And I think he thought of himself in the same way. Senator Reid it's quite a different situation.

Senator Harry Reid

Bruns: Senator [Harry] Reid angling to get votes. Yeah. He's something like president. He puts his finger

in the air and whichever way the wind is blowing. He's in quite a tussle right now with the guy from Las Vegas. (Seney: Apparently it's a tough race.) Yeah. It's a tough race. (Seney: Yeah.) If I was Nevada I'd sure vote for . . . (Seney: Ensign.) Ensign, yeah.

Seney: You don't think much of Senator Reid's negotiated settlement, then?

Bruns: No. Huh-uh. He didn't know what he was doing.

**The California-Nevada Interstate Compact
Established 34,000 Acre Feet for Lake Tahoe and
32,000 Acre Feet for the Upper Truckee Basin**

Seney: Outside of the compact matters, which he took credit for, as you say, and simply took the numbers you all had developed, some people have said to me that, for better or worse, those numbers were sort of set in stone—the 34,000 for Lake Tahoe, then 32,000 acre feet gross diversion for the upper Truckee Basin. Once you guys had kind of pronounced on them that they just came right into the settlement act without *any* real discussion of change. Is that . . .

Bruns: Well, it would be very difficult because they would have nothing to go on to change it. We didn't have too much to go on to settle that, and it was agreed by the California legislature and all

the people, and all the people around here, and the Nevada legislature—they thought it was OK and would be very difficult . . . They'd have to go through the same long period of negotiation that we did to change it.

Seney: Yeah. Yeah. Well, you know the settlement agreement doesn't have a whole lot to do with the Carson River. (Bruns: No.) It's much more oriented toward the Truckee.

Bruns: Because it was already settled, and like I say (unclear) on the Carson that gave us this extra water that you mentioned first.

Seney: Yeah. Right. Right. That's really quite a bonus, I mean for you . . .

Bruns: Well, it would be if they could ever carry it out.

The 5,000 Acre Feet of Treated Wastewater from Lake Tahoe

Seney: Yeah. Well, it's again the idea that they'll have to replace it if they take it away from you. I think I would agree with you that that means Lake Tahoe, the public utility district, up there will never trifle with that. Because where are they going to find 5,000 acre feet of water? You're smiling again because they won't find it will

they? I mean, you may have to pay more for it. Anything you pay will be more than you're paying for it now. When it comes up, because they're probably a bidding war over that water. (Bruns: There will be.) Yeah. But again, that's not suitable for M&I purposes. It's only suitable . . . (Bruns: Not now.) Yeah, but presumably if there's enough growth here, who's to say that some water agency won't want to purify it enough to use it as M&I water? Right.

Bruns: They probably will develop new treatment that can do it. It would [be] terribly expensive to try to make it so it could be used for M&I for drinking. They guaranteed that it would be for drinking—for human consumption. But it . . . anybody'd be crazy to drink it. There are a few people did drink it up there, but there's no way anybody should ever drink treated water because you don't know if somebody may have turned the tap the wrong way up there at that time or could have gone wrong. When everything is working perfect, yeah. I was trying to think of that word—the little bugs that go along with bacteria, the ones that can't be killed by any kind of . . . Anyway, when I was on the Lahontan board, people from the state and people from other parts of the state were very interested in this. But this was the best treatment used in treated water. Like in San Francisco, those places there's no agriculture right close where they can *use* it that

good. Los Angeles, down there in southern California, they wanted, at one time the water resources control board wanted . . . I don't know, they had in mind using a million acre feet, I believe. They used to ask me to talk about it down there at those meetings sometimes. They were using around 200,000 altogether in the state. They wanted to build that way up, but I guess it's never gone that far.

Seney: As a member of the Lahontan Water Quality Control Board, you dealt with Lake Tahoe water quality issues. (Bruns: Primarily, yeah.) Was there any aspect of the Newlands Project that impacted on your responsibilities there? (Bruns: No.) And I take it though, you would be concerned about water quality in the lake itself as that water goes into the Truckee and certain standards have to be maintained?

Lahontan Water Quality Control Board

“ . . . we closed down all development from the state line north over to Emerald Bay. . . . But for thirteen months we did not allow a single building. And as a result, five water districts up at Tahoe got together and built the treatment plant over at Truckee. . . . when that thing opened up, the water that got into the Truckee River was of a higher quality than the water in the river. . . . I was

just tremendously proud to be a part of that ”

Bruns: We never worried too much about the water coming out of Lake Tahoe, but we closed down all development from the state line north over to Emerald Bay. And, oh, we caught heck for that. But for thirteen months we did not allow a single building. And as a result, five water districts up at Tahoe got together and built the treatment plant over at Truckee. I'm sure you heard about . . .

Seney: Yes. I've talked to Craig Woods actually at the Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency.

Bruns: And when that thing opened up, the water that got into the Truckee River was of a higher quality than the water *in* the river. After it went through the grounds. I was just tremendously proud to be a *part* of that because we . . . oh they were mad at us up there when we closed down . . . a lot of tradespeople had to leave the lake because there was nothing doing up there.

“ . . . each one of them was starting to reach their capacity, and there was water treated effluent, or partially treated effluent getting into the lake and into the Truckee River. And our efforts changed that . . . ”

But it resulted in that each one of them was starting to reach their capacity, and there was

water treated effluent, or partially treated effluent getting into the lake and into the Truckee River. And our efforts changed that—up until now, anyway.

Seney: Well they're apparently still in good shape.

Bruns: That was considered, probably, one of the best treatment plants in the world.

Seney: Well, according to them it's maybe number 2 in the country now. Apparently there's one in Maryland or Pennsylvania that's (Bruns: That's better?) slightly better, yeah.

“We had an executive director, Roy Hampton, that was on the go. He wasn't very popular in the state. You know there were nine regional boards, and ours was the most active. . . .”

Bruns: We had an executive director, Roy Hampton, that was on the go. He wasn't very popular in the state. You know there were nine regional boards, and ours was the most active. Seven out of the nine years that I was on the board, and I think four bills were introduced in the legislature to reduce our power because of closing down all that up to the lake. Three of them never passed, and one of them did pass, and Roy Hampton says that the one that did pass was more of a benefit to us than it

was . . . but they tried to reduce our power because . . . oh, those boards have *tremendous* power. But a lot of them are run by politics, and they don't do what they . . .

END SIDE 2, TAPE 2. AUGUST 28, 1998.

BEGIN SIDE 1, TAPE 3. AUGUST 28, 1998.

Seney: My name is Donald Seney, I'm with Mr. Hubert Bruns in his home in Fredericksburg, Alpine County, California. Today is August 28, 1998. This is our first session and our third tape.

So you were saying about Lake Arrowhead you got them to . . .

Lake Arrowhead

Bruns: Export the water, and they're irrigating alfalfa ground down near Apple Valley, not in Apple Valley, I don't think. (Seney: Victorville, Apple Valley area down there.) Yeah. Oh yeah and in Victorville, too. We got five sanitation districts in that area to incorporate and build a treatment plant near Victorville. It just started as the Mojave River. It works fine. There was a *great* deal of opposition to this plant up here. This new plant and secondary treatment plant. (Seney: Here in Tahoe, you mean?) Here in Tahoe, the one they're using now. And being on the board, I knew how that would work down here, and I

knew that this one would be the same. It was kind of a help because there was a lot of opposition over here. They didn't want any secondary . . . *actually* this not secondary, this is tertiary treatment, but they call it advanced secondary to get around the . . . well, Federal Government does not want to finance any more tertiary treatment plants because they say it costs more than its worthwhile. So, in a case like this, they . . . You know, a lot of people think tertiary is a type of treatment. As you know, tertiary is a third degree. It could be the development of the world or whatever. It doesn't have anything to do with . . . but it's a third stage treatment. And they go through the primary, the secondary, and then they filter it, and that's a third stage, but they call it advanced secondary until they could get the money from (Seney: To get around the Federal language.) Yeah.

Seney: I see that they've been building a new pipeline up over Spooner Summit.

The Wastewater Pipeline over Spooner Summit

Bruns: Yes. The original pipeline . . . they got rooked on that original pipeline. The contractor took the resident engineer to lunch over in Stateline while the people, while all his men put that pipeline in. And they didn't put the necessary sand around the

pipeline. It was on rocks, and it wasn't put in right, and its been leaking ever since they started using it. So now they are replacing that whole thing because it was . . . they sued the outfit that put it in and they sued the engineer, and they *won*, but the damage was done. Now it's costing them, I don't know how many millions to replace it.

Seney: Well the Lahontan Quality Control Board fined the South Tahoe Public Utility District, didn't they, for those spills and what not. What were the years you served on the Lahontan board.

Bruns: From 1973 to 1984 for eleven years.

Seney: And who appointed you to that? Did Reagan appoint you?

Bruns: Yes. Reagan and then "Sunny" Brown, and (Seney: And Deukmejian, too?) I was appointed to fill in a young lady resigned up there, and I filled her last three years and then I was appointed twice after that. (Seney: Once by Brown, or twice by Brown.) Yeah. And when it came to George Deukmejian, is that his name, he wouldn't have anybody that was appointed by Brown so that was the end of . . . (Seney: And he didn't care that you had first been appointed by Reagan?) No, Brown didn't care about that. (Seney: But, I mean, Deukmejian didn't erase the stain . . .) No. No. But it was unusual for anybody to be appointed

for a third term anyway. I was because I'd only served three years, I guess, on my first term. But a *lot* of people only served one term on that board. It's kind of, in some places, political. It wasn't political here. I didn't get it because . . . *Chappie* recommended me.

Seney: Chappie recommended you to Reagan, and Reagan appointed you. Yeah. Yeah. And I expect this is based on all of your experience with both the local government here and with the commission. Did you enjoy the service on the board?

“I enjoyed the service on the Lahontan board more than any board I ever served on. . . .Because of the quality of the members, and their determination to do things—like we accomplished stuff over at the north end of the lake. We accomplished something at Lake Arrowhead. . . .”

Bruns: I enjoyed the service on the Lahontan board more than any board I ever served on.

Seney: Why is that?

Bruns: Because of the quality of the members, and their determination to do things—like we accomplished stuff over at the north end of the lake. We accomplished something at Lake Arrowhead. All

the way up and down, and we accomplished something, and so many of those members were just the nicest people you could want to serve with. There were a couple environmentalists, but they weren't violently—you know, they were all willing to work the deal out somehow or another—to compromise.

Seney: What role did you play in the moratorium on the north end of the lake that led to the Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency.

Issue at the Truckee Reclamation District

Bruns: Oh, I talked about a little bit and voted for it. Voted to continue it. If I went to do it now, I wouldn't have done that. I would ~~have allowed~~ ~~the~~ recommend allowing them to continue to build a limited number of homes or whatever they needed because it wouldn't have hurt anything to build it. But we *had* to put the pressure on them to get something done. You might be interested in this, I don't know if it should go on tape or not, but Truckee Reclamation District treated their effluent, their sewage, in *ponds* and there was quite a bit of development there. And they were getting more than the capacity of their pond, and our staff was over there one day looking around, and they walked across a culvert and there was quite a stream of water coming out of that end of the culvert, and they looked over here and [there

was] nothing coming in. “What in the world’s going on here?” So they investigated, and these guys from the Truckee Reclamation District had put a pipe from the last of their treatment ponds underground into the culvert underneath. So they thought our staff would never know it. And that was going directly into the Truckee River. And, boy that caused a lot of . . . our board was pretty upset, and we recommended that those guys go to prison. Because that was a total violation of the law. I think . . . (Seney: It wasn’t an accident. It was deliberate.) It wasn’t an accident. It was deliberate to get around . . . and our staff just happened to see that water come out of there. A thing like that it [was] turned over to the attorney general to prosecute. He asked our recommendation, and we recommended that somebody go to prison over there, but they never did. They talked their way out of it. I think somebody was fined, and the manager may have lost his job. I’m not sure.

Seney: Did the board fine. Could the board fine?

Bruns: Yeah, you could fine. The board had that authority to fine, and then they make an appeal.

Seney: Do you remember if you fined them for it?

“We didn’t *get* to fine them—it was such a violation

that it was a felony, practically, and it was turned over to the attorney general of the state. . . .”

Bruns: We didn't *get* to fine them—it was such a violation that it was a felony, practically, and it was turned over to the attorney general of the state.

Seney: So you took it from the administrative process into the criminal process because you thought it was serious enough?

Bruns: They asked us what we would recommend. We recommended it, but I don't think they did what we recommended. But it was an interesting part of our term on there.

Lake Arrowhead

And traveling, I got to travel all over the state, you know, and gee, we visited—you know where California City is? (Seney: No.) Out in the desert there someplace northeast of Los Angeles. We met in California City one time, and, of course, we me *lot* of times, or several times, up at Lake Arrowhead. That was *nice* up there, that was beautiful. (Seney: Yeah. That is beautiful.) Little Lake Tahoe. You've probably been there. (Seney: Yes, I have. Right.) It's just, we rode around the boat. You can't see any homes because those people wanted to preserve the area. And actually you look at a map, and there's

homes everywhere. And that was the most affluent *area* that we had to deal with.

“ . . . when we had the meeting . . . our board notified them that they were going to be shut down and they couldn’t build any more unless they did something . . . that was the most beautiful planned public hearing we ever had.

During the afternoon I said to one of the members, ‘Gee this sure is well organized. Must be organized by a movie director or something like that.’ . . . later, we found out that it had been organized by one of the movie directors . . .”

And when we had the meeting we notified them, our board notified them that they were going to be shut down and they couldn’t build any more unless they did something, and we held a meeting, public hearing, for it. And that was the most beautiful planned public hearing we ever had. During the afternoon I said to one of the members, “Gee this sure is well organized. Must be organized by a movie director or something like that.” End of the meeting or sometime later, we found out that it had been organized by one of the movie directors and they had it all planned. Speaker followed speaker, and it just all fit in. And it was very interesting meeting. But this didn’t talk us out of what we were going to do. We did allow them a little room. They could

build a few homes and stuff like that, but they only had so many months to do it, or we would have shut them off entirely. And they went ahead and built a new secondary plant and exported it.

Seney: Was this because they were compromising Lake Arrowhead by pumping sewage . . .

“ . . . sewage was getting into Lake Arrowhead. . . ”

Bruns: Yeah, sewage was getting into Lake Arrowhead.

Seney: Well you were doing them a favor in the long run. In terms of saving the lake.

Bruns: Yeah, but they don't . . .

Seney: But they don't see that at the moment probably. (Bruns: Yeah. For them.) How extensive is the, you said there are eight water control boards in the state. (Bruns: Nine.) Nine. How extensive, what is the boundaries of the Lahontan Water Quality Control Board?

“The Lahontan Board everything east of the summit of the Sierras from the Oregon border to about the upper one-third or one-half of Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County. . . .”

Bruns; The Lahontan Board everything east of the

summit of the Sierras from the Oregon border to about the upper one-third or one-half of Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County.

Seney: Everything *east* of the summit. So that includes Lake Tahoe, obviously . . .

Bruns: Absolutely, the whole of Lake Tahoe. That was the most interesting part of it—the most difficult part of it. And, of course, Lake Arrowhead was tremendously interesting because I heard of it all my life. And to get there and have something to do with it—it was interesting . . .

Seney: I remember visiting it as a kid, yeah. I remember as a kid going up there and just being agog at how beautiful it was.

Bruns: They had to rebuild their dam, you know. They got money. Those people up there have money. (Seney: Yeah. Right.) They rebuilt the dam and covered up the old one with water.

Seney: It's one of the most exclusive areas in Los Angeles, you know. There's so much money there. (Bruns: Yeah.) Right. Right.

Bruns: Yeah. Some wealthy people. But it was interesting, that meeting I'll never forget that meeting because it was *so* well planned and so

articulate that gee. Some of the meetings we attended got pretty rough, you know. Guys, overbearing and wouldn't listen to us, but these people were very acceptive. They knew that we had a job to do, and so they benefitted. They got us to relax a little bit for a temporary, and we benefitted, the state benefitted, because now *that lake* will be *clear* for years to come *because* of what we did. (Seney: Yeah. Right.) Because of what we did.

Seney: Was Tahoe the most troublesome area you had to deal with?

Tahoe Was the Most Troublesome Area to Deal with

Bruns: Absolutely. All over around Truckee they built a lot between Tahoe and Truckee, you know, up in those hills, in those mountains, and we closed those guys down. There was a developer up there from San Diego or someplace, one of the largest contributors to Reagan's campaign. And he was pretty upset. He was one of the guys that helped get those three bills in the legislature to reduce our . . . but it didn't do him any good. Because he was influential in politics in California. I don't know what his name was. I don't remember. We had so many people. I've often said I've had—through my years I've had to listen to at least somewhere around a hundred different attorneys

appeared before us. And engineers by the dozens appeared before us. (Seney: Right.) Something you get used to when you do that.

You can tell if a guy knows what he's talking about in the first five minutes he gets up there. If he knows anything about water you know it. You can tell. If he doesn't, if he's putting on, you can tell it. If he doesn't know anything about it, like some of these attorneys. They just make believe. They think they can threaten you—they're [an] attorney, they know more than you do. But you got to get used to that kind of stuff.

Seney: Did you—who managed the staff on the Lahontan Water Quality Control Board—(Bruns: Roy Hampton.) and reporting to the board, I take it, on that. And, again, I meant to ask you too, when you said you closed up some of these people up in the hills in Truckee, would they have been on septic tanks that weren't adequate? (Bruns: Yeah.) So you would have authority over that too, I mean it's the quality of the water that gets into the river . . .

Bruns: Any development that gets over six lots or twelve lots—I've forgotten the actual number—it comes to the state. Otherwise it's just county for one or two.

Seney: I see. Yeah, so it's a single development then they wouldn't come to you . . .

Bruns: Yeah. They had to comply, but the county has the enforcement.

Seney: Well, I think that's all the questions I have for you. There are probably lots more things we could talk about. And if I think of them and I'll come back and see you if that'll be alright.

Bruns: Sure.

Seney: Anything else you want to add that we haven't discussed.

Bruns: Philosophically. (Seney: Please.) Applies to this area and all over the country. When this old world was put together, that great power that put it together they knew what they were doing. they put plenty of fresh water on this earth to satisfy several billion people, and they put plenty of land, rich land, to feed all those people. They wouldn't have done it otherwise, but it's obvious they did. But I think he was wise, too. He put a lot of the water over here, and a lot of the land over here. We have access to only a small part of the available water. The rest of it we have to work for and move, like governor Brown did, (Seney: Pat Brown.) Pat Brown, into southern California, yelled because it was taking water from the north

or the south, but they had a lot more water in the north than they need and a lot more land in the south than they need.

“Fact is, they are still between one and two million acres that could be developed in California *if* the environmentalists would let them develop the water—someday they’ll have to. . . .”

Fact is, they are still between one and two million acres that could be developed in California *if* the environmentalists would let them develop the water—someday they’ll have to. But all over the world your leading countries, Turkey and Egypt and in South American they’re doing that. The United States environmentalists are “Oh no, we can’t do that.” They’re protecting their wild rivers, you can’t build any more dams. What happened, Bureau of Reclamation and California water people did build dams and build recklessly sometimes. Now they have to look at the environmental, but the environmental people ~~don~~’t have to give in to allow development or people are going to starve. There’s plenty of water. I mean, when you think of it.

I was at a water meeting in Carson [City] several years ago. There was a guy there from Canada, engineer. And he laid out a plan, and he said, “In years to come there’s going to be three

or four large aqueducts from Canada down as far as Texas through Oklahoma, and even maybe to southern California, southern Nevada and southern California.” Because there’s millions and millions of acre feet of water going up north. There’s the Nelson River, and the Churchill River up in the central part that discharge millions of acre feet into the Hudson Bay. Some of that can be taken down without hurting the environment. There are environmental people in Canada that are going to oppose it. But the day is coming when Canada, one of their biggest exports will be water, and they will get millions and millions of dollars [from] the United States.

I guess you’re aware that 80 percent of the population of the United States is within one hundred miles of some water—either the shores of the Great Lakes, or the Pacific, or the Atlantic, or the Gulf of Mexico. And in the center, gee where you fly from here to Washington or New York or wherever you fly, you can see just millions and millions of acres are nothing. You see a little round place where they’re (unclear) well, 160 acres or so, and over here another one. But all of that is fertile land, and they got to bring water in. And there’s plenty of water available.

But I have nothing against this thing—a permanent thing they’re putting up in the sky for whatever use it’s going to be. Some engineers say

it's worthless, some say it isn't. But for just a *fraction* of the money they're putting up here (Seney: The Space Station, you mean.) [they could] develop water so the future there wouldn't be a water shortage. They're going to have to think of that in the future, but somebody's going to have to talk to the Sierra Club and the environmentalists to get them back on their feet. I believe in protecting the environment or I would never have joined the Lahontan Water Quality Control Board. And we did a lot to protect the environment and always will, but there're people going to starve if they don't develop the water, and the water is there.

I don't know about that big dam in Africa, in Asia . . . (Seney: In China.) No, well, in China, too. (Seney: It's the Three [Gorges] *Rivers* Dam.) Yeah, the Three [Gorges] *Rivers* Dam, and they're displacing hundreds of thousands of Chinese (Seney: And covering one of the most beautiful places in the world apparently, with water.) Three Gorges, is that what they call it. (Seney: Yeah. Something like that.)

And then we have to develop—we can't really do that you have to develop small reservoirs, *off*-stream reservoirs, and some places they're going to have to invade the environment because welfare of the people are going to be a

little bit more important than protecting environment. Highways is the same. They used to—the state was going to build a highway from A to B, there was a direct line. Nobody could do anything about it. Houses, trees, whatever. Today the state has to come to the county and to the public before the build a new road and see if its right. And it's happened here in Alpine County. And that's good because you're getting a better . . . it fits the environment better than those engineers who didn't give a hoot. And water's the same way. They build a lot of reservoirs probably where they could have, you know, fish can't get up, and I think fish have to come second to people, but not entirely.

Seney: Alright, well, I may come and see you again, but for now, on behalf of the Bureau that I appreciate your giving me this time.

Bruns: Yeah, I finished cutting hay this morning so . . .

Seney: Good. Thank you Mr. Bruns.

END SIDE 1 TAPE 3. AUGUST 28, 1998.
END INTERVIEW.