

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

TINA BUNDY NAPPE



STATUS OF INTERVIEW:  
OPEN FOR RESEARCH



Interview Conducted and Edited by:  
Donald B. Seney in 1998

California State University-  
Sacramento

For the Bureau of Reclamation's  
Newlands Project Oral History Series



Interview desktop published—2019

Oral History Program  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Denver, Colorado

SUGGESTED CITATION:

**NAPPE, TINA BUNDY.** *Oral History Interview.* Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney. Edited by Donald B. Seney and desktop published by Andrew H. Gahan, 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 . . . . .	iv
Editorial Convention. . . . .	vi
Introduction. . . . .	viii
Oral History Interview . . . . .	1
Appointed to the Nevada State Board of Wildlife Commissioners . . . . .	1
Serving on the wildlife Board was a Learning Experience . . . . .	3
Formation of the Lahontan Valley Wetlands Coalition . . . . .	4
Wetlands Coalition was a Diverse Group. . . . .	6
Groups that Made Up the Wetlands Coalition . . . .	8
Many Different Points of View. . . . .	9
Setting the Number of Acres for the Wetlands. . .	11
Buying Water for the Wetlands . . . . .	12
Keeping the Coalition Together . . . . .	14
Efforts to Get Included in the Negotiations . . . .	20
The Role of Bob Pelcyger. . . . .	22
Getting Senator Reid's Support for the Wetlands . . . . .	24
If There was not Some Accommodation to the Wetlands, Public Law 101-618 not Going to	

Pass . . . . . 25

Help from Other Agencies and Organizations . . . 31

Strong Feelings about the Wetlands and the  
Outdoors . . . . . 35

First Water Rights Purchase for the Wetlands . . . 37

Getting Wetlands Section into Public Law 101-618  
. . . . . 39

Implementing Water Purchases for the Wetlands  
. . . . . 42

Getting Public Law 101-618 Passed. . . . . 45

Bob Pelcyger's Ideas for the Wetlands . . . . . 48

Using Mine-Dewatering Rights . . . . . 49

Other Possible Water Sources for the Wetlands  
. . . . . 50

Buying Carson River Water for the Wetlands . . . 55

Wetlands' Interests in the Settlement II Negotiations  
. . . . . 57

Water Purchases to Date for the Wetlands . . . . . 58

Land Exchanges between Clark and Churchill  
Counties . . . . . 59

Need for Urban Water System in Fallon-Churchill  
County. . . . . 65

Settlement II Negotiations . . . . . 70

Talks Continued After the Failure of the Settlement  
II Negotiations . . . . . 74

The Truckee River Partnership. . . . . 77

The TROA Negotiations. . . . . 78

The EIS and TROA. . . . . 80

Need to Finish the TROA as People Familiar with It  
are Still on the Scene . . . . . 81

Positive Effect of the Tribe and Pelcyger in Forcing  
Issues to be Resolved . . . . . 83

Management Plan for Stillwater Refuge and Carson  
Lake Pasture . . . . . 85

Transfer of Carson Pasture to the State of Nevada  
. . . . . 87

1990 Election Approving Question Five on  
Statewide Ballot . . . . . 91

Art and Photographs Created by Nappe's Father  
. . . . . 94

Money from Question Five Used for Wetlands and  
Other State Areas . . . . . 96

Reclamation Employees Going to Work for Other  
Agencies . . . . . 98

Staff Changes at the Reclamation Area Office  
. . . . . 101

## Statement of Donation

### STATEMENT OF DONATION OF ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW OF LEONTINE BUNDY NAPPE

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, LEONTINE BUNDY NAPPE (hereinafter referred to as "the Donor"), of RENO, NEVADA, 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 JULY 24, 1998 at RENO, NEVADA 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.
2.
  - 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: 7/24/98

Signed: Leona Nappe  
LEONTINE BUNDY NAPPE

INTERVIEWER: DONALD B. SENEY

Having determined that the materials donated above by LEONTINE BUNDY NAPPE 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

### **Editorial Convention**

A note on editorial conventions. In the text of these interviews, 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.

While we attempt to conform to most standard academic rules of usage (see *The Chicago Manual of Style*), we do not conform to those standards in this interview for individual's titles which then would only be capitalized in the text when they are specifically used as a title connected to a name, e.g., "Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton" as opposed to "Gale Norton, the secretary of the interior;" or "Commissioner John Keys" as opposed to "the commissioner, who was John Keys at the time." The convention in the federal government is to capitalize titles always. Likewise formal titles of acts and offices are



capitalized but abbreviated usages are not, e.g., Division of Planning as opposed to "planning;" the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992, as opposed to "the 1992 act."

The convention with acronyms is that if they are pronounced as a word then they are treated as if they are a word. If they are spelled out by the speaker then they have a hyphen between each letter. An example is the Agency for International Development's acronym: said as a word, it appears as AID but spelled out it appears as A-I-D; another example is the acronym for State Historic Preservation Officer: SHPO when said as a word, but S-H-P-O when spelled out.

## **Introduction**

In 1988, the Bureau of Reclamation created 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.

Questions, comments, and suggestions may be addressed to:

Andrew H. Gahan  
Historian  
Environmental Compliance Division (84-53000)  
Policy and Administration  
Bureau of Reclamation  
P. O. Box 25007  
Denver, Colorado 80225-0007

For additional information about Reclamation's History Program see:  
[www.usbr.gov/history](http://www.usbr.gov/history)

(Intentionally blank)

**Oral History Interview  
Tina Bundy Nappe**

Seney: My name is Donald Seney. I'm with Tina Bundy Nappe, in her office in Reno, Nevada. It's July 24, 1998. This is our first session, our first tape.

Good afternoon.

Nappe: Good afternoon.

Seney: I want to get you to tell me how it is you got involved, first of all, in the wetlands coalition, and maybe that takes a step back to other involvements, maybe. Whatever makes sense to us.

**Appointed to the Nevada State Board of Wildlife  
Commissioners**

Nappe: I was appointed as a Wildlife Commissioner in 1979, and I was appointed to that post because the Wildlife Commission had been revised.

Seney: This is the Nevada State Wildlife.

Nappe: The Nevada State Board of Wildlife Commissioners. It was to include a conservationists for the first time. I had been

active in conservation since 1967, working for a small institute called Foresta Institute for Ocean and Mountain Studies. It was a private institute owned by Dr. Richard and Maya Miller. I was hired as an Endangered Species Coordinator. I had no interest—I shouldn't say no interest—no knowledge of endangered species, but I had been collecting fish [in the Carson River] and taking them to Dr. Miller, who's an ichthyologist. He was on the I-U-C-N, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, when endangered species first became a very big issue, and he wanted to do something for the state of Nevada. So he hired. I was a long-term neighbor of his.

So that's how I was hired. I was then appointed to the State Board of Wildlife Commissioners, and I'm sure it was partly because I was the only woman they could think of, but, more importantly, I was a safe environmentalist. I was very honored to have Governor [Robert] List call me directly one day. I wondered who he was when I answered the phone, and he was interviewing me personally for the position. He asked me if I belonged to the Defenders of Wildlife, and when I said no, he was relieved. He asked me whether I wanted to be on the Wildlife Commission. I said I couldn't because I worked full time, but I really appreciated the invitation.

Then I went in to talk to my boss, who said, "What? You turned that down?" [Laughter] I was working in this same field. She said, "You can take leave time." So I called him back right away and said yes, I would love to do it.

### **Serving on the wildlife Board was a Learning Experience**

So that was in 1979, and I was on the Wildlife Commission until 1994. So it gave me a foundation that was good in one way, in that I was firmly grounded in the conservation movement, but I also grew to appreciate what the Department of Wildlife had to go through in terms of the parameters under which they operate. I began to realize there's a wide diversity of sportsmen, and that a conservationist should never say "sportsmen," because they are a range of perspectives.

Seney: Talk a little bit more about that, what you learned about—duck hunters, I take it, are different than deer hunters?

Nappe: ~~No, it's not that so much. They are different.~~ There is a culture in each group. The bighorn sheep people, if you go to their national meetings, are a very what I would call elitist group. They

were the top professional people. All these people are very dedicated. The first thing I began to appreciate was the amount of money they would put into ~~things~~ [projects] and the amount of time they would give, and what they were really doing for wildlife.

But what I mean by that, there are sportsmen conservationists who have a holistic view. There are people who do nothing but go out and buy a license and ~~go out~~ [hunt]. And there are some really far-right people. So you would go anywhere from what I call people who don't want any association with conservationists, to people who recognize that the environment is the bottom line. If you cannot protect the environment, you'll have nothing. And it's those people who are willing to form coalitions. So it's a big risk for somebody to reach out, to be part of a coalition.

### **Formation of the Lahontan Valley Wetlands Coalition**

Fortunately, a driving force for us was the disappearance of the [Lahontan Valley] wetlands. We were also very fortunate. I guess I need to step back, because I had been on the Wildlife Commission from '79 to '88 when this initiative began to occur, so I had a very, strong foundation with all of the division staff and with a number of the sportsmen. I hadn't been anti-hunting and I

---

### **Bureau of Reclamation History Program**



had credibility. When this came up, the Division—it was then Department—Director, Willie Molini, is very supportive of wetlands, and I have to give him credit. You do not have to be supportive of wetlands, because duck hunting, while it is very visible and somewhat elite, is still a very small percentage of any division's work, and certainly a very small percentage of their income. But he had a true commitment to the wetlands, and here was this tremendous resource that was going, and he is willing to work above and beyond, to help out.

So he convened the first meeting, and I'm not sure I even attended that meeting. He had invited everybody he could think of to it. But he is not the kind of person who could lead a group. It was either about then or immediately after, when Rose Strickland called me and she said, "Tina, you have the credibility of the sportsmen. We need to get together with everybody and we need the sportsmen. Let's start doing this."

So we had some preliminary meetings, and what finally came out of it was the Lahontan Valley Wetlands Coalition. And by default, in that role I became coordinator. Somebody had to coordinate this. I want you to know that a coordinator means a glorified secretary. I was

willing to maintain the mailing list. I was willing to call the meetings. I was willing to go back and review the minutes to decide what it is we had to do. I think I'm a good listener. I'm not critical of people because they have opinions that are different from mine.

### **Wetlands Coalition was a Diverse Group**

So we could convene what turned out to be almost twenty-one different groups at one point, and we were meeting every other week when we started out. We had sportsmen buying into it, in the sense of contributing. Because conservation groups, by and large, don't raise money. They're very poor with raising money, and, frankly, on the whole they're fairly careful with their money. They don't have the attitude of sportsmen, which is to give a lot. And I think it's partly a male thing. Ducks Unlimited, for instance, never invited women for many years to their functions, because they wanted men drunk, basically, so they'd spend more. And yet that was part of the flamboyance or how they get along with each other. It's a potlatch, who can give more. They raise a lot of money and they do a lot of good things.

Conservationists aren't that way. They're not into money-raising, but they are very good at

politics, much better so, actually, than sportsmen are. So, different people brought different things [skills] into this group, and it took probably close to six months to begin to sort out information from different people and begin to get past the prejudices we had.

Seney: Let me stop you and ask you two things. What year are we talking about?

Nappe: 1988. We started in March '88, because we were supposed to have a ten-year celebration. I just got a fax from Jim. We started in

Seney: Jim Giuidici.

Nappe: Jim Giuidici. And we were to meet—as I said, we were meeting every two weeks. In between meetings, we made appointments, as a group, with different key people in the state, so we could go and hear what other people had to say and build the information base.

I took the minutes. I had very lengthy minutes at that time. I'm not sure how accurate they all were, but it's the only way. I do not have a good memory, so that I wrote all of this down, I distributed the minutes and notices of the meetings. There are a number of things that we

had to sort out.

### **Groups that Made Up the Wetlands Coalition**

Seney: Actually, I wanted to ask you one other question. You've mentioned twenty-one groups.

Nappe: It was about that.

Seney: And maybe you can't remember every one of them, but could you list them? Could you mention them?

Nappe: Yes. I should have brought that list for you, of the original group on the original letterhead. It did include Ducks Unlimited, which normally doesn't belong to groups, and subsequently dropped out because they can't do that. Audubon, Sierra Club, Friends of Pyramid Lake, the Greenhead Club, Canvasback Club, [Nevada Waterfowl Association, Nevada Wildlife Federation, Nevada Trapper's Association] were some of the sportsmen's groups. I think we even had the Humane Society join at one point. And joining meant \$100 minimum. The Nevada Wildlife Federation were some of those groups.

But in addition to the formal groups, we had attending the meetings always somebody from the [U.S.] Fish and Wildlife Service, somebody from

the Division of Wildlife. We had people from T-C-I-D [Truckee-Carson Irrigation District] attending almost all of our meetings. We did not have anybody regularly from the [Pyramid Lake] tribe.

Seney: What was the purpose of T-C-I-D attending?

### **Many Different Points of View**

Nappe: Because it was an open forum. It was designed to find out enough information to create a future, a way to go. I think that the first thing we discovered is that everybody has some information, but nobody has an agreed-upon set of information. And although some people had a lot of information, everybody looks at things a little bit differently. And that's a little bit dangerous, because we are so secure in our knowledge.

There are facts, but there are different ways of looking at them. It was very confusing for the laymen. When you see all these specialists from the Department of Wildlife and Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Rec[lamation], they're all specialists and they don't agree with each other. How do you think we, as citizens who know nothing, comparatively speaking, are to clarify, make a path for our future, when we can't get

concurrence from all these specialists? So I will tell you, we spent hours going over stuff that was utterly boring, in retrospect, but it absolutely had to be sorted out.

Seney: Do you remember what some of those things were?

Nappe: I actually have it all in my minutes at home. I do have all of those issues. I would say that there were—an example is still ongoing. How much water actually should be going into the Stillwater area versus Carson Lake Pasture? What were the bird populations? How was it [the wetlands] going to be managed? What was the historical base [water supply]? Some people had a feeling that their opinion was valid, based on something that nobody else had known about, and it was old anyway, so what difference did it make? I could find some of that out for you, but I think it was a matter of developing a set of agreed upon facts based on the amount of information that was available.

Then the other thing is that some people had such long-term interests in certain areas, and one of them being somebody like Norm Saake, who I really do think that if there's ever a nature center built up [in Lahontan Valley], it should be named for him, because his commitment has been

tremendous. But at the same time, he was the greatest repository of his own information, and it doesn't mean that it was necessarily the most accurate information. You had to go out even to look at how to irrigate, say, Carson Lake Pasture and then go to T-C-I-D and see whether that's how they saw it, the same irrigation pattern.

### **Setting the Number of Acres for the Wetlands**

Now, some of that doesn't seem that important, given the big issues we were looking at, but when you're looking to buy water and transfer water, and you want to make sure your water gets ~~there~~ [to the wetlands]. Some of these things become monumental to look at. So we had to know how much water, first of all, had ever been there—and there's differences on that—where it had been, how much we really needed. How much water were we really going to need to save wetlands? We weren't going to get 100,000 acres. We knew that. We really wanted probably closer to 50,000 acres. Actually, we settled for 43,000 acres in our policy. We ended up, as you know, with 25,000 acres of wetlands.

Seney: Twenty-five thousand acres of wetlands.

Nappe: Acres of wetlands in the Lahontan Valley.

Seney: And that's pretty much the low number on both Carson Pasture and the Stillwater.

Nappe: It's low. We felt an absolute minimum was 43,000 acres. That's what we wanted.

Seney: And you came down from there.

Nappe: Well, we came down because—yes, we did.

Seney: You had to?

#### **Buying Water for the Wetlands**

Nappe: We had to. If you think about how it was at that time, there were no water rights at all for the wetlands. At all. And we were losing the drain water out of that.

Seney: That would lay at the feet of OCAP, increased efficiencies on the project?

Nappe: Yes. And because in Nevada, no one should ever depend on drain water anymore. I mean, there's not going to be any such thing. Drain water is waste water. We all know that. And somebody owns it. And if you aren't using it, they're going to get it upstream. And if you're at the bottom of the stream, you know that somebody's going to get it before you do. So we knew that those days



were going, and so we had to establish the fact that we had to buy water, we had to get into the agreement. We were not initially in the agreement. We had to find a vehicle, i.e., an agency that would help us get from here to there. The Nevada Waterfowl Association was incorporating, but it was neither a fundraiser nor good at buying water or holding water. We really went after the Nature Conservancy. And I mean we went after them. [Laughter]

Seney: How do you mean?

Nappe: Well, we contacted—Rose [Strickland] is really key on this. She contacted the Nature Conservancy. I think we contacted the—what's the other one, out of California?

Seney: The Environmental Defense Fund?

Nappe: No. They were active. There's another big land conservation group, the Trust for Public Lands. We went to both of them and tried to get them involved. Dave Livermore [of the Nature Conservancy] responded. This was their first big project dealing with water, because water is much harder to buy and hold on to, as you know, than land. A piece of land is there forever, but water is not necessarily there, especially when it's at a

terminus.

So we knew that we didn't have that expertise. We didn't have the money. We didn't have anything. So we had to get support. To his credit, Dave Livermore came in. Now, the Nevada Waterfowl Association did buy some water rights to try to transfer them. The Division of Wildlife purchased some inactive water rights as a way to try to get a place at the table.

Our first goal was to get a place at the table. We worked hard at that. If there's one thing I will say about the coalition, I think that we had built such strength and unity of position that we were worth considering as a place at the table, and we had a supportive person in the form of Senator [Harry] Reid.<sup>1</sup> There's no doubt about that.

### **Keeping the Coalition Together**

Seney: Right. As you're forming this in 1988, Senator Reid's negotiations are going on.

---

1. Harry Reid served the state of Nevada in the U.S. Senate from 1987 to 2017. Senator Reid also participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, Harry Reid, *Oral History Interview*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney, edited by Donald B. Seney and further edited and desktop published by Brit Allan Storey, senior historian, Bureau of Reclamation, 2013, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

Nappe: Right.

Seney: The one that Wayne Mehl<sup>2</sup> conducted.

Nappe: Right.

Seney: Did you enter into those as they were ongoing?  
Did you become involved in those, as the  
Wetlands Coalition?

Nappe: We became involved not on day-to-day stuff. We became involved as we began to write letters and as we began to talk to people, and as we began to push. It's my impression that Sierra Pacific Power Company and the tribe felt that between them they had divided the waters. We were a new influence, I would say, in that we supported indirectly T-C-I-D. We wanted to be sure there was wetlands down at the end. And T-C-I-D recognized that. We were a mixed blessing to them. Yes, we wanted water down there, but we were going to take a percentage of what did go down there to the wetlands. So we were a mixed

---

2. Wayne Mehl participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, Wayne E. Mehl, *Oral History Interview*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation oral history interview conducted by Donald B. Seney, edited by Donald B. Seney and further edited and desktop published by Brit Allan Storey, senior historian, Bureau of Reclamation, 2013, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

blessing.

We had another internal conflict that we had to deal with; that is, the conservationists, particularly the Sierra Club, had a very strong position in support of Pyramid Lake and of the fishery there and endangered species, obviously. The sportsmen, of course, could care less about the Pyramid Lake fishery. All they cared about was ducks. So their inherent kin, so to speak, were the farmers, and our inherent kin were the tribe. So it was a fish-versus-ducks issue in some areas, and it almost broke us apart in the first three or four months. But we knew that if we did not work together, we would all fail. There was no way.

In fact, the person who called me on this was Norm Sakee. I will never forget it, that he called me one day and he said, "Tina, we have killed the wetlands if we do not make this go, because people will ignore the wetlands. We have to stay together." So we did. And we worked whatever else we had [unclear].

Seney: How did you—you must have talked a lot.

Nappe: We talked a lot and we met all the time, and we knew we had no place to go. In a way, that was a blessing. We had no place to go. There was not

going to be water if we did not get together. Absolutely there would be none. So we all had different types of contacts.

Again, I want to give Rose and Dennis[Strickland], her husband Dennis, a lot of credit, because the Sierra Club is very nationally oriented. They're very political, and the sportsmen began to appreciate that. On the other hand, they had less contacts—I can't say less contacts—less kindred spirit with a lot of the local people that the duck hunters had. ~~They're lawyers, they're different people in the community.~~ [Duckhunters are lawyers and other professional people who had lived in this community for many years.] They also know where to go for things. It was just different sets of knowledge, and it became a matter of appreciating the skills that different people had.

It had gotten to the point that I believe, in '89, I think it was in the spring, the Sierra Club invited the coalition to meet with their conservation group to review and establish, their position on the Lahontan Wetlands. That's a big step, because what it did is developed a very solid perspective for the Sierra Club that was universal to all of us.

We did a number of drafts of what we wanted

to see in the legislation, and I would like to give Fred Wright a lot of credit for that. This is all pre-Jim Giuidici. All this happened before Jim came on. Fred and Rose—were the two key people in a lot of that. A lot of other people reviewed it. But conservationists and independent people have to take the lead on anything. Agencies can review ~~things~~ [documents]. They might even slip you a draft, as you know, but they can't front an issue. But Rose and her husband are very, very insightful people and driving people, and Fred was absolutely wonderful in this, too. He's very language oriented. When I say literally the two of them drafted it, I gave testimony, I did not write it. I mean, I had to agree with it, but I'm not that ~~kind of~~ [skilled a] person.

Seney: Would you be alluding maybe to the testimony—

Nappe: In Congress.

Seney: Right.

Nappe: That was developed collectively over a series of several meetings as to what we were going to say. It was very carefully crafted and agreed to. Everybody who wrote it went to Washington [D.C.]. Ken was there, Rose was there, Fred was there.

Seney: Ken Taber.

Nappe: Yes. We all went. We had a wonderful time, just a wonderful time.

Seney: So he tells me, that it was—

Nappe: It was wonderful.

Seney: And he signed it, Rose Strickland signed it. Let me see if I can find it. You probably remember the names of everyone who had their name on it. But, yes, it was clearly something worked out. And it's quite lengthy, going through each section of the law.

Nappe: Yes, because we had done a number of drafts.

Seney: Ken Taber, your name, Norm Saake's, Fred Wright's, Rose Strickland's listed at the end of the testimony. You say here simply contact representatives, but you mean to give credit for the drafting to this statement and position.

Nappe: Yes. Absolutely. Absolutely. Everything went through the group and had to be agreed to. This was not a vote up and down; this was a consensus issue for us that we had to all agree. And by and large, of course, by the end of the first year, we

were working quite well together, and it's held over ten years, for the most part.

### **Efforts to Get Included in the Negotiations**

Seney: I'm told that one of the people said that you had to really sort of kick the door down before you were invited to the party.

Nappe: Oh, yes.

Seney: Talk about that a little bit.

Nappe: Yes. Well, I think I had sort of indicated that. The two major players had divided the waters. The state of Nevada, in 1969, it approved recreation as a beneficial use of water. Frankly, the only reason they approved it then was to get through the interstate agreement that was in Congress in 1972, I think it was. So in order to get it through, they approved that. But that was not anything for wildlife. There was still no water being purchased for wildlife—very, very little of it. So if you want to create a right, when, in fact, the state law doesn't particularly give you one, that's really hard. And where are you going to get the money for it? Who's going to do this for you? Why should we pay any attention to you anyway? Because, of course, I think it was the Bureau of Rec said, well, there was never any standing for



water down there. I think he said there was not even any wetlands. The wetlands came after we had the irrigation project. That's what I heard. I remember that. [Laughter]

So you had to establish [facts] and say, "Wait a moment. That's not true." You have to go back and create that history and bring it forward. Really, the Bureau of Reclamation was not very supportive of us, and neither was the Fish and Wildlife Service. Between the Indians on the one hand and the farmers on the other, who cares about wildlife on this?

So, yes, it was yelling and screaming, probably, and in that area I think that Rose, in particular, was very good, because she had the greatest energy to go after this. But everybody did something. People like Ron Anglin<sup>3</sup> coming in every two weeks, providing information on the side, and Bob Hallock was there, Steve Thompson. All those people had tremendous concerns.

---

3. Ronald M. Anglin participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, Ronald M. Anglin, *Oral History Interview*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney, historian, Bureau of Reclamation, October 14, 1994, in the narrator's office in Fallon, Nevada, edited by Donald B. Seney, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

Seney: Bob Hallock is?

Nappe: He was with the Fish and Wildlife Service at that point. He got transferred fairly early, but he was very much involved initially in this, very upset about the whole thing. Ron Anglin had whole energy and perspectives and optimism that made a tremendous difference. And as I said, Willie Molini, not only through his support, but really supported it with his staff, Norm Saake, Terry Ritterer, those people were there.

### **The Role of Bob Pelcyger**

But to be there every two weeks after work, I think is, to me, the most remarkable commitment that the staff, the agencies, made, and some of them did it over and over again, as did some of the T-C-I-D people, were very, very good. Doris Morin, that you and I were talking about, she came to many of the meetings for us. So obviously they hoped to influence our position, and they did to some extent, but not in a bad way. [Robert] Pelcyger<sup>4</sup> could always correct it from a

---

4. Robert S. Pelcyger participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history Project. See, Robert (Bob) S. Pelcyger, *Oral History Interviews*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interviews conducted by Professor Donald B. Seney for the Bureau of Reclamation, in 1995 and 2006, in Reno, Nevada, and Boulder, Colorado, 1995 interviews edited by Donald B. Seney and all  
(continued...)

distance. [Laughter]

Seney: [Laughter] What are you thinking of, as you laugh like that with such gusto?

Nappe: He is so bright and so strong in what he says. We used to get very angry at him at times, not just the duck hunters, but some of us in conservation, because we had to take him on, too. And that was a new experience for him, I'm sure, because normally people in wildlife and Indian people work together.

In fact, I was really flattered. At one point I was asked to be on some board of ~~something that they had~~ [an Indian Organization]. I said I couldn't take on another obligation. Plus it was a conflict of interest for me to be on yet one more board, because I didn't necessarily support the Indians in everything. But I did support the position that the League of Women Voters had taken, that I had developed many years before, and that was my first [Nevada] experience, probably, in politics. The League of Women Voters had established a position that said that the Pyramid Lake Tribe had the right to the amount of

---

4. (...continued)

interviews further edited by Brit Allan Storey, senior historian of the Bureau of Reclamation, 2013, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

water to help them become self-sufficient. I believe that was the essence of our resolution. So I was still supporting that as a member of the coalition, and certainly would support endangered species. So we were supporting that.

### **Getting Senator Reid's Support for the Wetlands**

Seney: I want to get back a little to the politics of you getting involved. I can understand you get a person of energy like Rose Strickland, who, again, has been commended to me to interview over and over again, because she clearly is a key person, and you've alluded to her ability and her energy. Someone like that is very important.

Nappe: Absolutely.

Seney: As is someone like yourself, who's willing to do the work that's necessary to make things go. But you've also got to get through the door, and the door, I take it, was probably Senator Reid, was it?

Nappe: Obviously, without his support, it would not have happened.

Seney: Is that where you pushed into the process?

Nappe: Well, we pushed with everybody. We pushed with Pete Morros. Well, it wasn't Pete; it was

Roland Westergard at the time. We certainly pushed. We met with the state office. We met with Fish and Wildlife Service. Certainly we talked a lot with Wayne Mehl. We certainly met with Senator Reid. We certainly got involved with Sierra Pacific Power Company.

**If There was not Some Accommodation to the Wetlands, Public Law 101-618 not Going to Pass**

I'll tell you what the bottom line was, is we could kill the bill. That's the bottom line. And I'll give Rose credit, or the Sierra Club credit for that, too. They knew that when push came to shove, if there was not some accommodation for the wetlands, this bill was not going to pass. Reid knew that.

Seney: What the tape won't see is you've got a serious look, kind of serious look on your face. You mean this.

Nappe: Absolutely.

Seney: And you were confident of it.

Nappe: Absolutely. We had national contacts.

Seney: And you conveyed that?

Nappe: Well, I don't think we ever said that.

Seney: But it had to be understood.

Nappe: We did not come and say, "We'll kill your bill."  
We did not say that.

Seney: Right. I appreciate that.

Nappe: I think that would be highly inappropriate to do that. But our support would enhance the bill's prospects. Our opposition could kill it. So it was our job to make sure that not only locally but nationally we had support for that bill. And that's really what it comes down to. Aside from the fact that I do truly believe that Senator Reid was supportive. You know we did get our first money for purchasing water through Senator [Chic] Hecht, his predecessor, who had put money in to help T-C-I-D improve the irrigation district. That money was transferred to buying up water rights. So Senator Reid can't take credit for the first efforts probably nationally, even, of buying water rights. But it is true that I think he has a personal commitment to this. I did not ever question that.

The reality is, as you know, it was passed even then in the eleventh hour in Congress, and that didn't hurt impressing the sportsmen either, when they began to see the contacts that we had.

When we were in Washington, of course, we followed up on them. Rose has a huge e-mail list. It wasn't e-mail then, probably.

What is the Sierra Club? It's this political body. And here's Nevada Waterfowl Association and Ducks Unlimited, they pride themselves on their lack of politics. Well, that doesn't do you much good when it comes down to that. They, on the other hand, the Nevada Waterfowl Association started its fund-raising events, and they thought, "I wonder how much those conservationists are going to raise in the way of money and tickets. We'll show them." And, of course, they did. "You're going to charge how much to attend a banquet?" [Laughter] By that time I was used to it. I was used to going to big-horn sheep banquets, and fifty dollars is nothing.

Seney: Yes, yes.

Nappe: Well, these are twenty dollars, and that was modest. Sportsmen are good at raising money. They accept that they're better at it now. They said, "We'll be the financial end of it," and they said, "but we need the coalition as the policy end of things." And now that I'm not as active, things are beginning to fall apart a little bit. I think it's best to appreciate others' strengths and

compensate for them than it is to lord it over, because we needed everybody, absolutely everybody to make this work. But in the long run, the solidarity of this group of people, I think it was important.

We also, as a group, then, of course, joined with the Chamber of Commerce in total. We joined, the coalition joined. We were listed on the brochures that came out, that the Chamber put out.

Seney: Here in Reno-Sparks?

Nappe: Oh, yes. And we went on radio shows, where there would be a conservationist and a businessman, both supporting the negotiated settlement. That was very unique at that time, that we had all worked together. So a lot of good things came out of that. I hope T-C-I-D doesn't—I think they were good finally for T-C-I-D, too, because we really have—we've opposed Pelcygar's efforts to cut off the water supply. We're not supportive of that. We're fighting just like the farmers to get as much water.

Seney: That would be doom for the wetlands, wouldn't it.

Nappe: Absolutely. So we're not always supportive of Pelcygar's ideas. Of course, Jim will tell you he's



always taking on Pelcygar. [Laughter]

Seney: He did say that.

Nappe: He is.

Seney: Let me ask you. When you went around to Sierra Pacific Power and the state agencies and the federal agencies and these other entities to make your argument, in the process of kicking down the door, I'm sure you must have slightly tailored your presentation to each one of those groups, but can you remember the kind of arguments, in general, you presented?

Nappe: I can't remember anything specifically. We went to express our concerns; to get their perspective on how they looked at it, which was our first round; how were they seeing it; could we glean any information from them that we could use; would they be willing to help us in any way. Those were the major things that we looked at. This is our dilemma.

END SIDE A, TAPE 1. JULY 24, 1998.

BEGIN SIDE B, TAPE 1. JULY 24, 1998.

Nappe: And every time you do something like it, you meet with another person, you find out one thing

that's valuable, that you can turn around and use. And what you do after a while is you kind of worm your way through things. You pick up pieces of information and throw them back. You follow up on a lead. It's grunge work, very frankly, and you're always questioning what they can do, so that you become the gadfly. And where they might have been able to ignore you before, they can't now, because they have to think you're always there and you're always going to follow up. Again, to a large extent, that's a Rose or a Fred.

Fred was wonderful at that point. In fact, he was very cute. [A] Regional Audubon had a meeting up here [in Reno] and they had a panel on Lahontan wetlands, and he said, "Let me tell you, if you want to get something done, have women in your group." [Laughter] "And don't bother with the duck hunters. They don't read." [Laughter] It was really cute, because it's true, in a way. A lot of women are still more secretarial oriented and they like to see things done.

Seney: They keep the organizations running.

Nappe: They do. They do. And Rose—I've already mentioned Rose was doing a lot. Connie Douglas from Audubon was very active early on, too. So the Jim Giudicis who have become so invaluable

later, who does do a lot of that writing now, who was not there at first, but we did have, of course, Dave Yardas [of the Environmental Defense Fund], who is absolutely wonderful to have around, and his information. He attended a lot of the meetings and we did follow up with his information as well, to see what we could do.

### **Help from Other Agencies and Organizations**

Of course, the big thing is that agencies begin leaking suggestions to you. [Laughter]

Seney: Can you tell me a little about that? Can you be specific?

Nappe: Well, they might say, "Well, there's this going on in the regional office." In fact, I'm just telling you something that's happened just recently. "If your group does not intervene right away, I'm afraid that Pelcygar is going to get thus and so." So there's Jim Giuidici out there with a letter suddenly, saying that he's very, very concerned about—the issue right now is Pelcygar trying to place a 2.99 transfer rate on Carson Lake Pasture, so he sends out a big letter saying he's going to oppose this.

But that's the value of a citizen group, because

you can say things stronger. In fact, the letter he sent was so strong, it would never have come out from the coalition. I would never have allowed something like that under my signature, because I always tried to be nice. [Laughter] But he doesn't feel any such compunction.

Seney: Did this come out on the letterhead of the Wildlife—

Nappe: Well, Nevada Waterfowl Association.

Seney: That's what I mean.

Nappe: It's a slightly different group. Ducks Unlimited is so concerned with raising money that they really don't want any politics at all. They will not get involved in local issues unless it's clearly designed to affect the duck hunting season. It's the only time they really get involved. Whereas Nevada Waterfowl Association has always had a political base on it, and partly because the key people in it, Jim Giuidici, Hugh Judd, Ken Taber, were concerned about the buying and transfer of water, and there was some risk involved in that, and some protection. So they've always seen their role a bit differently. As a consequence, frankly, they don't raise as much money, but in some ways they're more valuable.

Seney: A little more nervy and confrontational, maybe?

Nappe: Yes. Well, yes. [Laughter] And much more—Jim, in particular, I have to give him a great deal of credit, because he's taken this on, I think, as his major outside interest, that he recognizes his responsibility as sports and rec and does well with it, but is always trying to be inclusive and broader.

He and I, for instance, just did a letter earlier this year on Stillwater, and we had to negotiate all the points as to what we would really agree with, so that we would both feel comfortable.

[Laughter]

Seney: Well, there is a place, too, isn't there, in all this for all that kind of—what I said, nervy and confrontational.

Nappe: Yes.

Seney: One of the avenues you take. And yours perhaps is a softer touch.

Nappe: Right.

Seney: That's another way to go.

Nappe: Yes. And Rose is good with nery letters, as well.

Seney: Is she?

Nappe: I mean, yes, she gets right to the point on that. The coalition might have its own positions, but, of course, it never deflected from the organization [members from] sending in their own letters. Increasingly that's occurred, because we have been not as strong on the coalition now as we were then. At that time, almost everything went through the coalition first, and the policy was sorted out, and then individual letters were written outside that, as well as the coalition letter. So one organization might want to emphasize things a little bit differently, but it was always important that we agreed on the main points, because we did not want to have any conflict with the overall legislation going through. We did not want to create a wedge. And there was no reason to, frankly, by the time we had sorted it out. We are in concurrence with the things that happened.

Seney: Yes. I'm only smiling because I've spoken to several of you, and you're all quite political, but with slightly different approaches to these matters.

Nappe: Yes. [Laughter]

**Strong Feelings about the Wetlands and the Outdoors**

Seney: And it's kind of interesting. And it says to me, too, how important these wetlands were. I mean, Dr. Taber and Jim Giuidici have expressed that to me, as hunters. I wanted them to talk about, you know, kind of from the heart, what that means to them, and clearly that meant a great deal to them. I really haven't asked you that question, why you felt so strongly about them, but clearly at that level each of your feelings were strong enough. I assume that's true with Rose Strickland. You're willing to overcome your differences because of the goal. But why do you feel so strongly about the wetlands?

Nappe: My whole feeling about the outdoors is probably more ethereal and contemplative than it is in reality. I don't go out as much, frankly, as most people do. I hadn't even been to the wetlands that much before this came up. I'd only been birding a couple of times. But the idea of anything going extinct or a body, a species going extinct, is the thing that really gets to me. I truly believe in the right to life of all creatures and the equality of life, and our responsibility to species. This was such a clear-cut disaster and had so many implications for policy nationwide, in terms of how we confront the loss of wetlands worldwide.

It, to me, was a major concern.

The year after the terrible drought, I remember when we passed the law in 1990, we went down there and we could see the birds and we could hear the birds. It was truly the most emotional thing that I think any of us had felt. Now, duck hunters don't always go down during the summer. [Laughter] If you ever interview Hugh Judd, you'll see. He's such a kick on this, because he cannot get duck hunters, for the most part, go during the hunting season. Birders go during the spring season. They're shore-bird oriented, they want to see all the babies and enjoy it. So there's all these tours going on.

So, to hear the avocets and the black legged stilts is just one of the most exhilarating experiences that I think one can have in life. And when you drive down there, taking people down there, and you look at that sea of grass—you're not really seeing that much water—and you look at that space with all that sound, I've had people who do very little birding before just be enchanted with the emotional feeling that that gives to one, because we don't experience it in our lives anymore. We don't experience that much space. We don't experience seeing birds that close. Within a few yards, you can see the nesting avocets with their young. You don't hear those



sounds, for the most part. And they're just overwhelmed with it, and I was overwhelmed. To see real water that I helped to get go down there, it's one of those experiences that makes one's life worthwhile. And that's the only thing I can say about it, that when I get, and am getting, older, I want to look back and feel that I have done something of value.

Another thing would be the sustaining of this organization that I just told you about. I was part of the creation of it. I'm trying to set it so that it has another ten years at least, the two of them now. That's important to me, as a heritage type of thing. So we all live for different things. Some people live to travel, some to buy new cars. I live to see the wild places saved.

Seney: And the level of emotional feeling about the issues around the Truckee and the Carson [rivers] are very interesting to me, because whether you're talking to the farmers, the tribe, people like yourself, I mean, there are some, the officials, who come and go, who don't have that feeling, but many, many people do. It comes from the heart, really, as well as the head.

### **First Water Rights Purchase for the Wetlands**

The Waterfowl Association feels as though their purchase of those few water rights to begin with in 1988, '89, was really the precedent for the inclusion of water rights purchases in Public Law 101-618.<sup>5</sup> Would you see it that way, too?

Nappe: They might. I'm not sure that I would have thought about it if you had not brought it up. Both the Division of Wildlife's purchase of water, inactive water [rights] in this case, and what the Nevada Waterfowl Association did is to get

---

5. Public Law 101-618 became law on November 16, 1990. The Law contains two acts: The Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribal Settlement Act and the Truckee-Carson-Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement Act. The main topics of the legislation are:

1. Fallon-Paiute Tribal Settlement Act
2. Interstate Allocation of water of the Truckee and Carson rivers.
3. Negotiations of a new Truckee River Operating Agreement (TROA).
4. Water rights purchase program is authorized for the Lahontan Valley wetlands, with the intent of sustaining an average of about 25,000 acres of wetlands.
5. Recovery program is to be developed for the Pyramid Lake cui-ui and Lahontan cutthroat trout.
6. The Newlands Project is re-authorized to serve additional purposes, including recreation, fish and wildlife, and municipal water supply for Churchill and Lyon counties. A project efficiency study is required.
7. Contingencies are placed on the effective date of the legislation and various parties to the settlement are required to dismiss specified litigation.

Source: [http://www.usbr.gov/mp/lboa/public law 101-618.html](http://www.usbr.gov/mp/lboa/public%20law%20101-618.html)  
(Accessed December 2011).

involved in what I call the purchase, transfer, and tracking of water. So that was extremely important, and it may have had some influence on this.

As I said, Senator Hecht had made funds available. The Nature Conservancy had agreed to get into the business at the national level. They'd agreed to take this on as a project. They may have seen what Nevada Waterfowl Association was doing. They may have recognized there was strong local support, which was the other thing, and that was an indication of it. So that may have had some influence. Collectively, everything probably counted at this point.

### **Getting Wetlands Section into Public Law 101-618**

Seney: Without your being at those first negotiations, Senator Reid's negotiations that were conducted by Wayne Mehl on his behalf, without your being there, how did, from the point those conclude and the law is sort of drafted up, how does the wetlands business get into the Public Law 101-618?

Nappe: Well, we were outraged that we weren't included. [Laughter] But when something like that

happens, as Betsy Rieke<sup>6</sup> said yesterday, sometimes you don't want to kill an issue, you want to be sure it continues so you can negotiate within it. And I think that's really what we saw. What we saw was an opportunity if we would go to Senator Reid and if we would go to the state, if we would go and we would hammer away and say, "Look. First of all, it's a federal law, and you have not done any mitigation for wetlands, and your actions are basically going to destroy more of them. So you have to provide a mitigation for the wetlands."

Seney: Is this under NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, that—you're shaking your head yes. Is that right?

Nappe: Yes, that's how we were looking at it, although there were no endangered species. That was the other thing we had to do. People searched hard for endangered species. We said, "You can't really kill one group of species or destroy them in

---

6. Elizabeth Anne Rieke served as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Science under the Clinton administration from 1993 to 1996. Ms. Rieke also participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, Elizabeth (Betsy) Rieke, *Oral History Interview*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation oral history interview conducted by Donald B. Seney, edited by Donald B. Seney and further edited and desktop published by Brit Allan Storey, senior historian, Bureau of Reclamation, 2013, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

order to protect another. Look what's happening throughout the West, if you don't start drawing the line here. And this is the last place. This is truly the last place that we can save anything in northern Nevada. So if we don't do it here, we won't have it at all." That had possibly some influence. Senator Reid probably has a much better scope of this, and Wayne Mehl, too. I would have to say, possibly if everybody wanted to, they could have continued to have ignored us, but then they would have had to start dealing with us nationally, because we did have those contacts.

Seney: Yes. I think there's feeling on the part of, say, Tom Jensen and Wayne Mehl, whom I've also interviewed, and Senator Reid, too, only much more generally. As I think is often the case with a member, they're not as really familiar with these things in their details. But apparently David Yardas and Graham Chisholm,<sup>7</sup> I don't know, would Graham have been on the scene at that point?

Nappe: No.

---

7. Graham Chisholm participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, Graham Chisholm, *Oral History Interview*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney, edited by Donald B. Seney and desktop published by Brit Allan Storey, senior historian, Bureau of Reclamation, 2011, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

Seney: But it would have been David Yardas then.

Nappe: Dave Yardas was extremely important.

Seney: He testified at—and I'm gesturing at these 1990 hearings, February 1990 hearings.

Nappe: He did. He was tremendous. And he had been working even before we got together and came in. Of course, he's so brilliant, one could hardly understand him. [Laughter]

Seney: Yes. [Laughter]

Nappe: But he was obviously very sympathetic, and his knowledge, basically trying to be somewhat equitable in what he was finding out, and certainly accurate, was helpful to us. So he was on well before we got together, but Graham really didn't come on until after the law was passed.

Seney: That's true. Right.

### **Implementing Water Purchases for the Wetlands**

Nappe: So he was basically an outgrowth of that law's passing, because we needed somebody—the Nature Conservancy needed somebody to buy up water.

Seney: Right. To implement the water purchases.

Nappe: Yes. But he, of course, picked up very fast. Graham is absolutely brilliant.

Seney: He's also very, very bright, yes.

Nappe: He's extremely bright. I'm just astonished at him all the time. And so personable on top of that, so that you really understand what he's saying. I think he's a remarkable person, tremendously.

Seney: He's very effective, I think.

Nappe: Both Jim Giudici and Graham were what I call second-tier people. They came in after the law was passed. They brought new energy to it, because we were truly quite worn out, and we didn't know what to do. Once the law passed, a lot of what we had done was done. We couldn't really participate very much in the negotiations as they got going. At least I couldn't, because I work full time. I think Rose participated in a lot of them. Susan Lynn was active in those. Graham could follow that. But Jim Giudici, for instance, and I, with working full time, we just can't do those things.

Seney: Right. He indicated during that period he was particularly busy with several law cases.

Nappe: He's always busy, believe me. So he's a second-tier person and he has remained tremendously committed. I think it's really wonderful.

Seney: It's clear he works very hard on this.

Nappe: He works very hard, with great conscientiousness. We could not have gone forward without him. And, of course, Ron Anglin got exhausted and got burnt out. His help was—as I say, he was less and less helpful. It's almost as if it was too much for him. So it's been wonderful to have Dan Walsworth move in [as the Manager of the Stillwater Wildlife Refuge]<sup>8</sup> and replace him now after quite a few years, because Dan has brought in all this energy and new ideas. And that revives one so much and gives one more impetus to go forward.

But after the bill passed, the coalition basically—the primary members, a lot of them disappeared. They've been transferred, they've gone on to other things, and we've gone on to

---

8. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, "Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge is located in the Lahontan Valley of north-central Nevada, near the community of Fallon, sixty miles east of Reno. This area has been designated a site of international importance by the Western Hemispheric Shorebird Reserve Network because of the hundreds of thousands of shorebirds, such as Long-billed dowitcher, Black-necked stilt, and American avocet passing through during migration." [www.fws.gov/refuge/Stillwater/about.html](http://www.fws.gov/refuge/Stillwater/about.html).



other things. You can't commit something forever to it.

### **Getting Public Law 101-618 Passed**

Seney: Did you lobby on behalf of the bill? Did the coalition? Did you buttonhole other members, or did Senator Reid's staff ask you to—

Nappe: Actually, I think we did contact some other members when we were back there. We might have. I don't know if we wrote any letters specifically. Obviously to our own delegation we certainly pushed a lot. Rose may have pushed through the national environmental coalitions to see where their key people were on this. But the actual bill that went in was not the one that was finally passed.

Seney: That's right. It had to be carved out.

Nappe: Yes, and run through a rider on somebody else's.  
[Laughter]

Seney: The Fallon Tribe settled the bill out of the Indian Affairs Committee.

Nappe: Yes. So that would have been a slightly different modus operandi.

Seney: Yes. Well, it was a very complicated series of parliamentary maneuvers on Senator Reid's part to get that through.

Nappe: Which makes him unique. I was saying, as I went out to lunch with somebody today, trying to do a bit of politicking myself because of the tight election he's in, that it would be impossible to do many things without him, because his knowledge of how to operate that system is so extensive and so well done, that nobody new coming in will have the capability of doing it, and my concern is that nobody will have the interest.

Seney: And he has staff people that are—Mary Conelly<sup>9</sup> locally.

Nappe: Yes, yes, who are very knowledgeable.

Seney: Larry Werner in his Washington office.

Nappe: Yes. And then Blaine Rose, of course. I don't know if you've interviewed her.

---

9. Mary Conelly participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, Mary Conelly, *Oral History Interviews*. Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation oral history interviews conducted by Donald B. Seney, edited by Donald B. Seney and further edited and desktop published by Brit Allan Storey, senior historian, Bureau of Reclamation, 2013, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

Seney: No.

Nappe: She was very, very powerful on this, almost too powerful, in a way. She is one of the people who decided to leave, I know, somewhat after this to go and pursue other avenues. But in some ways she's one of the strongest-willed women that I've ever seen, and maybe too strong at times.  
[Laughter] Another one.

Seney: She worked for Senator Reid, you mean?

Nappe: Yes. She was head of the office here, and she really handled a lot of the local work for him. She represented him at all the Chamber meetings. I would see her all the time. And she knew her information backwards and forwards, so she was extremely active. Mary is always very, very nice.

Seney: Mary Conelly.

Nappe: Yes. Is always very nice. Blaine was, as I said, a lot more abrasive as a person. She's from Elko, and I believe her father was a doctor there, so she came from quite a powerful family, and she's here doing something in accounting, I believe.

Seney: Here in Reno?

Nappe: Yes. I have not really been in contact with her for a number of years, but she was very important during this period of time.

### **Bob Pelcyger's Ideas for the Wetlands**

There were a lot of meetings. For instance, one of the issues, now that I'm recollecting them, that did come up was a Pelcygar idea, again. Boy, he threw them out. He had two ideas. One was to create wetlands with effluent water down in the Fernley area, take all that effluent and put it down there, and he said, "That should be sufficient for you," see, because then we wouldn't be fighting for wetlands down in Fallon. And we looked at that and we analyzed that, and we said, "Nuh-uh. We are not going to accept that." That was one of the issues he had.

Of course, he had another one, of recreating the wetlands at Winnemucca Lake.

Seney: Decoupling—

Nappe: All the water would go—yes, and we would get wetlands there. And we said, "Funny. Funny."  
[Laughter] "We'll never see wetlands there."  
[Laughter]

Seney: Well, the studies quoted by the waterfowl

coalition are that it would take 100 years, if ever, for Lake Winnemucca to become regenerated again.

Nappe: And there's a highway that creates a barrier, just to even rebuilding the trench. No, we were not going to be led down that garden path. We had Eco Vision come in that said that we could buy water. They were buying all of the mine-dewatering rights that came down [the Humboldt River], and he said, "Oh, you know, this is one way that we would put water into the wetlands." And we listened to him and we said, "No, no, no, no."

#### **Using Mine-Dewatering Rights**

Seney: What's mine-dewatering rights?

Nappe: The mines that are building these huge pits in northern Nevada have to pump water out in order to keep digging deeper and deeper. So talk about a system of dewatering with the pipes and the pumps that they have up there, it is unreal, and they are pouring maybe 100,000 acre feet into the Humboldt River, which has never had so much water in probably two or three hundred years down the river.

So Eco-Vision went and filed on those temporary water rights. Well, temporary—it's temporary as long as the mines are going, which could be twenty years, it could be five years. So he [Tom Gallagher] filed on them all up and down the river, and, of course, he was interested in selling them. So he came to talk to us about buying them for the wetlands.

Seney: This is Eco Vision.

Nappe: Eco Vision. Tom Gallagher. Sierra Pacific Power was very interested. They, in fact, underwrote him. That was scary to us. We were not interested in that. That was the other thing.

Seney: That would not be a reliable supply.

#### **Other Possible Water Sources for the Wetlands**

Nappe: Of course not. But, you know, everybody was trying to pull one over on us. That's why it was important to be together. Then we had the Dixie Valley thing. We'd take all the water rights that the Navy had purchased there, the ones that were existing, and pump it over the mountain into the wetlands. That's how we'd get our water. Well, we looked at that. We looked at all these things. These aren't things that just popped out.

Seney: Whose idea was Dixie Valley?

Nappe: Was it Claire Mahanna's? I'm not sure. It's not the first time it's come up. Claire Mahanna might have suggested it.

Then, of course, another one was to purchase water upstream on the Carson [River] and send it down. But you, of course, lose water on the way down there. You lose rights.

Seney: It would never get there.

Nappe: Of course it's not going to get there. Then, of course, another thing was to pump water in Lahontan Valley itself as a way of supplementing it, which, of course, makes real sense to us. So we have been through a whole lot of these efforts, and we said, "No, no, no, no. We want water that's down there. We won't transfer it."  
[Laughter]

Seney: This is serious business, isn't it.

Nappe: Oh, you bet. You bet it is.

Seney: It attracts all kinds of schemes and notions.

Nappe: Well, every once in a while something really good

comes out of it.

Seney: Right. I mean, you can't discount them, because imagination is useful.

Nappe: You invite them. You invite them. Brainstorming is extremely important on this. And some of these issues came up again on the second round of negotiations. So in being responsive to people and make suggestions to them, you do have to look them over seriously and make a response. But if we had not been together, we might have gotten sucked into one of these schemes that was around, but we wanted real water. [Laughter] "We want wet water," we said, "not paper water." [Laughter]

Seney: Paper water or inactive water rights, the kind that—

Nappe: Paper water is water you buy that you never receive. It could be inactive, but more likely it's water—you'll get your water every hundred years when there's enough in the system. We wanted water for drought years, so we got interested in the leasing programs. The legislature did pass a program on leasing, and the Nevada Waterfowl Association really looked at that, because they could see where they could be the first to lease water during a drought year. That's still a very



important part. I'm sure you've talked to Graham about this.

Seney: Yes.

Nappe: The whole leasing program. Again, one of the ideas was, "Well, you don't have to buy water. You can just lease water when you need it." And we said, "No, no, no, no, no. There may not be money when it's there. There may not be any water either. We want real water. Our own water."

Seney: Charlie Frey had an idea, Charlie Frey<sup>10</sup> and his leasing organization.

Nappe: Right.

Seney: This is a notion, if you're going to have a drought year, you need to know at a fairly early period, because the farmers have to plan. Then you would lease water from willing farmers and put that out into the wetlands.

---

10. Charles Frey, Jr. participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, Frey, Charles Jr, *Oral History Interview*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney, edited by Donald B. Seney and desktop published by Andrew H. Gahan, historian, Bureau of Reclamation, 2012, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

Nappe: Right. Which is possible to do, but you don't make that your primary source of water. I mean, we would like that as an option, and we objected strenuously, actually, in the E-I-S [Environmental Impact Statement] that came out. I think, what was it, over 75 percent, once you reach 75 percent you'll look at leasing as an option. We took strong exception to that language, because we think that our priority has to be to buy as much real water as we can and get it transferred, because eventually the whole process is going to run its course. Ron Anglin would say again and again, "You'll never get that much water. Nobody's ever going to sell that much."

Seney: That 125,000 acre feet.

Nappe: Yes. "Nobody will ever sell it." So it's been a race. We wanted to get as much as we could, and since we were the ones who were committed, we couldn't be sure—at least I can't be sure—what's going to happen after I'm no longer committed. At some level our commitments still have to drive the system. We have not institutionalized it enough. So, yes, we are in a race against time.

Seney: In that sense, the feds are certainly committed to Pyramid Lake.

Nappe: Yes.

Seney: I mean, the Department of the Interior and the higher-ups, Mr. [Bill] Bettenberg<sup>11</sup> and Mr. [Fred] Disheroon<sup>12</sup> in the Justice Department.

Nappe: And we're very suspicious of that at times, too.

Seney: How do you mean?

### **Buying Carson River Water for the Wetlands**

Nappe: Don't think we don't—every time Bill comes out to talk with us, which he does, he enjoys having breakfast with us, that we don't pin him to the wall, trying to sort out what he's saying, because we're always concerned that the Indians are going to get our water. [Laughter] They're already getting the .299—was it the .15 percent, is already, in effect, going to them. Every time we purchase water, we're losing a percentage of our water and

---

11. William D. Bettenberg participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, William Bettenberg, *Oral History Interview*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney, edited by Donald B. Seney and desktop published by Brit Allan Storey, senior historian, Bureau of Reclamation, 2009, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

12. Fred Disheroon participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, Fred Disheroon, *Oral History Interviews*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interviews conducted by Donald B. Seney, edited by Donald B. Seney and desktop published by Brit Allan Storey, senior historian, Bureau of Reclamation, 2010, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

we're still paying the O&M costs on it. So we're very sensitive about some of these things.

Seney: Yes. Well, this was something the tribe insisted on from the very first water purchases for the wetlands, wasn't it?

Nappe: They did.

Seney: That they adhere to the Alpine Ditch Decree's<sup>13</sup> notion that if you buy 3.5 acre-feet, you actually only get 2.99.

Nappe: Right.

Seney: Because of conveyance loss.

Nappe: Yes, but we agreed to that in order to get the process moving, but the state of Nevada has never agreed to it. And we don't support it as permanent policy. We would not do that.

---

13. The decree, initiated by the U.S. Department of the Interior on May 1, 1925 through *U.S. v. Alpine Land and Reservoir Company, et al.*, to adjudicate water rights along the Carson River. The decree was finally entered 55 years later on October 28, 1980, making it the longest lawsuit undertaken by the federal government against private parties over water rights. The decree established the respective water rights (to surface water only) of the parties to the original lawsuit, both in California and Nevada to Carson River water. For more information, see Babylon Software, [www.babylon-software.com/definition/ALPINE\\_DECREE\\_\(California\\_and\\_Nevada\)/](http://www.babylon-software.com/definition/ALPINE_DECREE_(California_and_Nevada)/) (accessed 5/2019).

Seney: But at this point you don't have any—Mr. Bettenberg is committed to the tribe, not the wetlands?

Nappe: Well, yes, I think it would be fair to say that his primary commitment is to the wetlands, and one of the things he likes to do—

Seney: To the tribe.

#### **Wetlands' Interests in the Settlement II Negotiations**

Nappe: I mean to the tribe. And, in effect, it's important for us and would have been important for us to keep on going, just to remind him of things. We have the highest regard for him and, of course, enjoy him tremendously. He's such a bright person. He was wonderful. And what a wealth of information he has. But, you're right, we are suspicious. We were suspicious, frankly, of Graham when he represented us, and of Dave Yardas, as a matter of fact, at the second round of negotiations. We put in our own person, Fred Wright, because we did not trust Graham and Dave, because they tried to be fair to all parties. So we weren't sure what they were going to come up with.

Seney: [Laughter] And you don't want fair.

Nappe: We wanted strong representation. We thought fairness would come out of the group. We didn't need to put in fair; we needed get fair. Of course, both of them were absolutely brilliant, and I know that Fred Wright really enjoyed it, too. He called—what did he say? "Me and the two kids." [Laughter] They were there. And, of course, they were so brilliant with the papers they come up with. It just used to be phenomenal to look at, to be aware of that. But, yes. And, of course, we could not have done that without Nevada Waterfowl Association. They paved the way, because we have no money to speak of in the coalition, at all. That's not our job.

#### **Water Purchases to Date for the Wetlands**

Seney: What sort of reports did you get back on the—well, before I ask about the settlement negotiations, how much water has been purchased so far for the wetlands?

Nappe: Jim just sent me a memo that says, "Shouldn't we celebrate our tenth year and 30,000 acre feet?" Now, that's not enough, but it's still pretty phenomenal. I mean, when I think about where we were ten years ago, how we had to establish the principle of buying water for wildlife at the federal level and at the state level. Let's not forget the states put in five million dollars.

Seney: Right.

Nappe: That was a novelty, too. At one level you can say that's just wonderful, but you see that kind of thing going on. Of course, it's been helped a lot by the southern Nevada people buying water and land [in northern Nevada to fuel development [in southern Nevada]].

#### **Land Exchanges between Clark and Churchill Counties**

Seney: That was my next question, had to do with the Dell Webb exchange. When I heard about that—and I know there's some controversy and accusations that have been made, but I think if I were one of the farmers, that would unnerve me almost more than anything else, the idea that people who wanted to develop in Clark County can come up to Churchill County with, I would think, tremendous resources—

Nappe: Right.

Seney: —buy land with water rights, give the water rights to the wetlands, exchange the land with the B-L-M [Bureau of Land Management], and go merrily on their way.

Nappe: Well, in fact, of course, not only is Churchill

County outraged, but it's Elko County that first raised the primary issue, because it was a lot of land in Elko County that was being purchased. In fact, the same issue's been raised in Clark County itself. It's one of those things one doesn't anticipate when a law is passed or a policy gets implemented. You don't really see the consequences until somebody gets a hold of it and starts blowing a hole in it, and it takes a while to figure out how you're going to stop it. And we didn't really want to stop it.

Seney: You don't want to stop it.

Nappe: Well, you have to understand I have mixed feelings. I guess that gets back to my job. My job is to provide employment in thirteen northern Nevada counties. So we have a staff in all those countries, so I have an office in Churchill County, Rye and Elko. Our job is to help communities grow and to have individuals prosper within them. We have two boards, one of which includes generally a business person from each of those countries and a county commissioner or their representative.

END SIDE B, TAPE 1. JULY 24, 1998.

BEGIN SIDE A, TAPE 2. JULY 24, 1998.

Seney: I have to start again. What's the matter with me



today? It's Friday. I've been working too hard.

Nappe: [Laughter] Would you like some water or something?

Seney: I don't think that would help. If it would help, I would take it. All right. I need to say we're laughing because I didn't turn the tape on here. The transcriber can either put this in or leave it out.

This is Donald Seney. I'm with Tina Bundy Nappe, in her office in Reno. I think we did this twice the first time, didn't we? In her office in Reno, Nevada. Today is July 24, 1998. This is our first session, second tape. The lucky thing is, I didn't let it go for twenty minutes before I noticed this.

Nappe: Yes. [Laughter]

Seney: So, go ahead.

Nappe: All right. We were talking about the—

Seney: The fact that you were in tune to the economic side, too.

Nappe: Yes. How do I view the exchanges where land

and water is purchased basically in northern Nevada, where the known values for wildlife and recreation are very, very well known and recognized, in order to exchange land in southern Nevada with B-L-M for expanded development? What would be my perspective on that? And my perspective is somewhat complex. Obviously I'm delighted to see lands that I really care about purchased. Secondly, like many northern Nevadans, I view southern Nevada's great growth with concern, but I don't view—

Seney: Why is that?

Nappe: Well, because of the political and economic implications for northern Nevada.

Seney: Power shifting in that direction too much?

Nappe: Seventy percent of the population now is in one county. That has shifted, say, about, well, maybe 67 percent is in southern Nevada. The rest of Nevada is only about 30 percent. Consequently, you can imagine what that does in terms of politics. The loss of water, not so much of land but of water, to environmental issues really reduces potentially the capacity for economic development in some areas, although it can also enhance it, depending on if it's a recreational use such as a reservoir for fishing.

Secondarily, it impacts the county's ability to plan, not that most countries plan anyway, but even in Clark County that's a concern, because Clark County, which is trying to just keep up with its growth, suddenly has an unexpected development because some developers come in and agreed with the Bureau of Land Management to get land in a certain area to which the developer now wants services, and that's not part of this plan in Clark County, which can barely keep up now with what's going on. So it has been a concern. For Elko County, it's a matter of outrage that somebody would be coming in and basically devastating potentially their economic base with these land exchanges.

So there are many ways to look at this. Churchill County is not alone in being concerned, and I believe that there is some effort to address that in some ways, but all of us would like to get our pet projects through before it's finalized.  
[Laughter]

Seney: [Laughter] Right.

Nappe: So that's how I look at it. As Rose said recently at a meeting, "Tina, I wish I knew where you were coming from when you say something," because I will explain a county's economic issue as well as a

concern for wildlife, because those things are not exclusive to me. They're very much part of the fabric of the county and hopefully part of its future. And that's why when Dan Walsworth came in with his Spring Wings event they had this year, it started on a role that we feel an obligation to pursue, which is, yes, there's a lot of water going into wetlands.

Can we help the community benefit with that in terms of tourism, in terms of events and highlighting this whole process? Because, let's face it, the county is doing nothing to preserve its open space.

Seney: Churchill County.

Nappe: Yes. It may object to all the lands and waters being bought up by the federal government, but it could be any other developer coming in, and they're not in any better position to address it. If they really want to keep greenbelt land, they need to have local policies to deal with that, but they won't develop them, and I know they won't, and I don't feel any obligation to help support something that the county itself is not willing to get behind. It's easy to get angry at the federal government because you think they should be more responsive because they're part of you. But if this were a private land developer coming in,

they wouldn't do a thing. And I think that's how I have to see it. At some point the county has to ante up and develop something that says, "If you really want a greenbelt and you want to sustain farming, I really support that." But saying that doesn't do anything long term, doesn't do a thing. And that's my concern. It's not happening here. We should be protected—

Seney: You're meaning Washoe County.

Nappe: Yes. We're losing all of our green spaces. We're not any better. Clark County never bothered to save a thing. Everybody moving into Clark County moved there to make money. Nobody moved in because of the quality of life. So if they had moved in and they really were supported, as they have been with Red Rock Park, they have been with Spring Mountain, so they got galvanized on that, then, of course, it's important to support that. I think it is important.

### **Need for Urban Water System in Fallon-Churchill County**

The problem with the Truckee River Agreement is not that it affects ranching; it is that it affects eventually the commercial development.

Seney: You mean the Truckee River Operating Agreement [TROA].<sup>14</sup>

Nappe: Yes. It reduces the water. Fallon desperately needs an urban system. You can't rely on farming for your primary water system, and you can't make that argument to anybody else, because nobody's going to buy that type of argument. What you can say—

Seney: You mean the argument in favor of inefficiencies.

Nappe: That we need to keep ranching in order to protect our water supply. That's not good business. They

---

14. "More than 27 years in the making, the Truckee River Operating Agreement (TROA) now guides use of the river that winds nearly 120 miles from the mountains of Lake Tahoe to Pyramid Lake and is the primary water source for Reno and Sparks. The long-pursued plan brings the Truckee River's management into modern times, protects the area from protracted droughts and offers a promising future for the region....

"The agreement brings an end to historic uncertainty between Nevada and California over distribution of the river's water, allocating 90 percent to Nevada. Beyond enhanced drought storage for the Truckee Meadows community, it modifies the operation of federal and selected non-federal reservoirs in the river system to protect and improve water quality and enhances conditions for the endangered Pyramid Lake cui-ui and the threatened Lahontan cutthroat trout. By retaining more water in upstream reservoirs, TROA also expands the range of recreational opportunities, including boating and fishing." See, Truckee Meadows Water Authority, "Truckee River Operating Agreement," [http://tmwa.com/water\\_system\\_settlement/](http://tmwa.com/water_system_settlement/) (Accessed 2/2019)

did have the opportunity in 1994 to possibly negotiate for a water system.

Seney: In the Settlement II negotiations.

Nappe: Yes, and they decided not to do that. People tend to forget that, and they say, "We never were offered that," but they were. We brought it up, too [in 1989].

Seney: My understanding is that they were offered something like that during the run up to Public Law 101-618.

Nappe: And we included it. We included it, by the way. We had something, nine or ten points that we had, and we recognized, our coalition, which should not have to take that on as a policy, that an urban water system was absolutely essential. Yes, we wanted to include it, but this is where time is important. The urban people were not involved in the original settlement. Only T-C-I-D was. And, frankly, they didn't think about urban needs.

By 1994, there was the beginnings of acknowledgment from the county and the city about that, but they still couldn't override what T-C-I-D was. Now we're down to 1998, and there's a lot more. There's Fernley coming on line,

there's Truckee coming on line. There's much more urban interest in Churchill County. Those interests weren't that much around in 1988. And, of course, Fernley has gotten something by participating in 1994. They have gotten a lot out of this.

So as the processes go on, these groups have become included, but T-C-I-D could have gotten a lot up front, but they just couldn't give—they didn't feel they had to give up anything. And in a way, that placed a—nobody could surmount that. I mean, we didn't know how to surmount that. And I have to include myself. I don't know if an organization, as small as it is, it suffers from what I call the risky shift. I think it's a term that I've heard before, learned in psychology. There's a very small group of people and nobody can break out of the box, so they basically almost become more intense. They use the example of somebody who's going to climb harder up higher than you would normally because he's got this group behind him, so he wants to show off. I sometimes feel that with T-C-I-D, is that the extremism prevails, and there's no room for reasonableness, and they can't get out of that box. Of course, they have attorneys who keep them in it, too.  
[Laughter]

Seney: Right.



Nappe: So it's a very unfortunate thing. It's my understanding that they were almost at some agreement for an urban water system in 1994, and at the very last moment T-C-I-D pulled out. I don't know if that's true, but that's what I'd heard.

Seney: Well, with all these negotiations, you get a lot of different viewpoints, and T-C-I-D has a different one, of course. Of course, strictly speaking, T-C-I-D was what they call the Lahontan Valley Environmental Alliance, which really was their negotiating entity with the farmers included in it. And because they appropriated the term environmental—

Nappe: I know. [Laughter] I always get a kick out of that.

Seney: Your side now has to be the conservation caucus. [Laughter]

Nappe: Yes. [Laughter] I thought that was cute when they started doing that.

Seney: Yes, and I understand there was some discussion on your side, what to call yourselves. You weren't sure.

Nappe: Well, we spent six months just trying to figure out

who we were and where we were going. I understand that "environmental" now is a bad term for some of the sportsmen, so we are back to the word "conservation" as more appropriate. But Lahontan Valley Wetlands Coalition doesn't tell you anything, necessarily.

### **Settlement II Negotiations**

Seney: What did you expect, the Lahontan Valley Wetlands Coalition, out of the Settlement II negotiations? What were you looking for?

Nappe: In the—

Seney: Facilitated negotiations, the '94, '95 negotiations that failed.

Nappe: First of all, my concern always, being the pessimist that I am, is to protect what I have, because I'm always afraid that the wetlands are going to be negotiated away. I'm concerned about that now. So it's important to be part of everything, because at some point maybe the farmers would get together with the Indians and the state of Nevada and say, "Well, if we didn't have to deal with the wetlands, then we'd still have more water," which, of course, they would.

And why would Reno care? I mean, let's face

it. Nobody on the Truckee River cares about the wetlands, and they're critical enough of the farmers for no reason. There's articles in the paper here talking about the value of ranching or the devaluation of ranching, and I take real exception to that, because, to me, not only has ranching as good of value as anything else, number one, but number two is, that's the water for development. And you can't tell me that if one of these developers was down there, they wouldn't be fighting for that water. They would.

So I never buy into the Chamber's caustic comments about Fallon, because if they were down there, they'd be exactly the same way. Their bottom line is, they want water to develop. That's all they want it for, and that's part of what Churchill County wants. That's a legitimate goal.

Churchill County doesn't phrase it that way, though, and they probably won't for another ten years. But underlying it, as I look at their water, I said, "This is your development water. You're not going to have greenbelt forever. There's too much land. It's too flat. And the development's moving down the canyon now, to Fernley. Eventually it will get to Fallon, and eventually it will get to Lovelock, where we're now dealing with the Humboldt River issues.

Seney: So your hope in the Settlement II negotiation was just to hang on to what you had.

Nappe: Hang on. Absolutely. Hang on to what I have, and make sure I didn't lose anything.

Seney: And again, you were initially worried that Graham Chisholm and David Yargas might barter that away, so you put Fred Wright on the case to watch them.

Nappe: That's right. To watch them. [Laughter] [Tape recorder turned off.]

Seney: I think, before we stopped, we were talking about the Settlement II negotiations, and you wanting to hold on to what you had as far as those negotiations.

Nappe: Yes.

Seney: Did you have much optimism that anything would come out of those when they began, do you remember?

Nappe: I think I have to be optimistic, because if you're not optimistic, you don't keep trying. I know that Rose was not supportive of that. This was a difference we had on the coalition. This was a place where I appreciate Jim Giudici so much,

because he did not question the value of doing this. He said, "We have to do this." As a sportsman, I was surprised and impressed with that, because he did not have to have that long vision, but he does have that long vision. And this is one area where Rose's back was up for some reason. It might be worth talking to her about that.

I was so appreciative, because my feeling is you have to be a player at all times. You can never, never be away from the table, and you never know when something really good will come out of it, because the future is generated by good ideas and things that were unexpected by the coalition, and because Senator Reid was very supportive and he found what he thought was the best [mediator] person [Gail Bingham]<sup>15</sup> for doing the job. So, yes, I guess in a way one has to be deliberately hopeful.

Seney: Were you surprised when nothing came of it, when it seemed to be T-C-I-D again or the Fallon community that walked away from it?

---

15. Gail Bingham participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, Gail Bingham, *Oral History Interview*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney, edited by Donald B. Seney and desktop published by Brit Allan Storey, senior historian, Bureau of Reclamation, 2009, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

Nappe: I was disappointed, I would say, because it meant we couldn't resolve these problems and to make sure that Fallon getting something out of it. Churchill County is getting something out of it. They truly feel that they're not getting anything out of it, that they're the scapegoat for everything going on. That has not changed. I don't know whether they would go for now the opportunity to have a water system. Of course, they could hook on to the Navy's or the Fallon Tribe, or has been guaranteed one..I don't know what the avenue would be for that, but I don't know if it is entirely closed, if it were a condition of bringing closure to the entire system. I don't know if they can expect that yet.

Seney: The city of Fallon is actually on a water system, isn't it? It comes out of the basalt aquifer out there. It's a county area that depends on wells which are recharged from the seepage out of the system.

### **Talks Continued After the Failure of the Settlement II Negotiations**

When those Settlement II negotiations failed, Pete Morros convened the tribe and the district together to talk. And according to the Western Water Advisory Commission Report, they met more than a dozen times and couldn't even agree

what to talk about. But apparently the feds are now involved, and those negotiations are still continuing. Are you aware of those?

Nappe: No, and I never read the Western Water Report. I understand that people were not happy, who did read it. I didn't know that the tribe was involved. I know that Pete is still trying to work with them. And when I talked with him the other day to see if he had any ideas that we could offer, because Congressman Ensign had said, "If I support the negotiated settlement, is there something that I can offer for the Churchill County people?"

So we were talking. So I called Pete Morros and he said that his concern is that if all the primary people signed on, there would still be years of litigation as T-C-I-D sought to appeal this, and what he was looking for was a permanent settlement. It's really believed by people less friendly to Pete Morros that he's a rancher at heart and he's very upset by not being able to give something to Churchill County. But he felt that if the original OCAP had been kept, rather than the new one, that that might be sufficient.

He also then—what was the other thing?  
Storage. Water storage was the second thing that

he thought might be of value.

Seney: Upstream?

Nappe: Upstream storage. And then the third thing we had talked about, but it's probably clear third in line, is an improved water system for the county. But he has not been able to get anything, apparently, anything resolved. Maybe the feds are a part of that, but, see, we're not part of that, so I don't know. I just call him and hope that he'll be frank with me, but others tell me, "Tina, he's not going to tell you what's really going on." They're very cynical, and I'm very trusting. I don't see why Pete wouldn't tell me what he really thinks. But maybe I'm wrong.

Seney: I understand he's going to retire soon.

Nappe: Yes, we understand that's happening. Yes, we hear that. I think he will. I think that his race is run with the new governor coming on, and a change. It's a good time to bow out.

Seney: Apparently the scuttlebutt is that the Republican will be elected, Mr. Guinn.

Nappe: Yes.

Seney: You feel that way, too?



Nappe: Oh, yes. I think we're all assuming that. It's a given. Absolutely a given.

Seney: And the Reid-Ensign race for the U.S. Senate is very tight.

Nappe: Very tight. It's very upsetting to me, because Ensign, to me, doesn't do anything.

Seney: He got a hold of you and others in the Wetlands Coalition, did he?

Nappe: Reid?

Seney: No, Ensign. You mentioned Ensign was the reason for calling—

### **The Truckee River Partnership**

Nappe: I'm part of another group called the Truckee River Partnership that we're on, and so one of the goals that we've had is to meet with all the candidates, set up individual appointments and talk to them about what we consider to be the importance. And that's how the issue with Ensign came about. There would be no reason for the coalition—

Seney: Okay. I was just wondering what the forum was.

Nappe: The Truckee River Partnership is an outgrowth of the negotiated settlement group that the Chamber put together in 1990.

Seney: To support the negotiated settlement.

Nappe: Yes. We're now pushing. We're pushing. We're trying to develop the public arm of TROA and to ensure that we're all together and supporting the settlement, and to do whatever we can to move it forward.

Seney: I know Susan Lynn<sup>16</sup> is part of that organization.

Nappe: She's on the board as well.

Seney: So what you're trying to do is to get the negotiated settlement completed.

### **The TROA Negotiations**

Nappe: Yes. We want all the signatures on it. That's our goal, is to get it pretty much through the way it is, get all the signatures on it, which, of course, we hoped would take a year, but now it looks as if it's

---

16. Susan Lynn participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, Susan B. Lynn, *Oral History Interview*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney, edited by Donald B. Seney and desktop published by Brit Allan Storey, senior historian, Bureau of Reclamation, 2017, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

gaining a life of its own. [Laughter]

Seney: [Laughter] These are the TROA negotiations.

Nappe: Yes. We're in the E-I-S now, and, of course, the deadline just came about. So who knows what's going to happen now. And then you have to go after and try to get the signatures of everybody on, and I'm sure that won't be easy. Everybody's beginning to unravel. There's little—it's like a family squabble coming up. The tribe's unhappy with this little thing, and Truckee [and the town of Truckee] wants something else, and Fernley just hasn't got quite enough. That's what you hear. Only Reno-Sparks and Washoe County are truly behind it, because, of course, they get the lion's share of everything in the changes that are occurring. [Laughter] And we're not entirely happy, but we know that it's the best we're going to get. And if we get this, then we can still work on some other things. It's not the end of the world.

Seney: I understand that the TROA negotiations had become more elaborate and more difficult as time has gone on.

Nappe: Well, it's been seven years.

Seney: Yes, I know.

### **The EIS and TROA**

Nappe: It has not been easy. And I know when you talk to Bettenburg, one of the problems we saw, too, immediately was that nobody is in charge at the federal level. And agencies can't go outside their line of authority and move into a leadership position beyond their agency. So they're kind of locked in, unless you get a Bettenburg in or somebody who can bang their heads together and say, "We will work as a whole," instead of each agency for itself; it makes it very difficult to operate. Then there was probably not all the information that was needed. And complaints that there isn't enough information now, and it's a very badly done E-I-S. That's what I heard from those who've actually read it or said they've read it.  
[Laughter]

Seney: Have you read it?

Nappe: No.

Seney: It's probably terribly lengthy, isn't it?

Nappe: It's probably terribly lengthy, and I just don't—what am I going to really do? I know that Rose did some work on it, Susan did some work

on it, but I have not.

Seney: The problem is that E-I-S had to be done before the TROA was finalized, simultaneous with it in order to, what, streamline the process and hurry it along.

Nappe: Yes.

Seney: And that's got to be fodder for the lawyers, I would think, in terms of "Is this an adequate E-I-S?"

**Need to Finish the TROA as People Familiar with It are Still on the Scene**

Nappe: Well, of course, that's Pete Morros's concern, too, is that it's open to subjectivity and our concern is that we try to build as much base for it as possible so that it is not subject to suit, because if it has to take much longer, with all the political changes that are going on, not to mention the incapacitation of some of us as we get older, it's never going to pass. And that's really not good for the state of Nevada. [Laughter]

Seney: That is a factor, isn't it.

Nappe: It's a huge factor.

Seney: When we spoke on the phone, you told me you were getting burned out. You've worked for years on this.

Nappe: Well, Pete Morros is retiring. His replacement may have no interest in this subject. If Ensign gets in, he doesn't have any interest in the subject. You've got changes in the state of Nevada. You've got changes in California.

David Kennedy, I guess, was the key water person and everybody said, "We've got to get this through before he retires, because he's committed." His replacement's not going to be committed. His replacement's going to come in and say, "Why don't we have more water upstream?" We've grown all this amount over the years, and the upstream users are already looking at it and saying, "Why do we have so little water? It's all coming through us. Why did we get so little of it?" So you have to really be aware that there are changes that start occurring. [Laughter]

Seney: I know the Reno-Sparks business community is very concerned that it unravel in terms of the 90-10 split on the Truckee.

Nappe: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. We are firmly—"we" being I'm a member of the Chamber, too.

Seney: Yes. Right.

Nappe: We feel this is really our last chance to assure water supply for Nevada, and it's a big concern, then, with T-C-I-D, because in the long run T-C-I-D will not get as much water, no matter what, if this doesn't get passed.

Seney: Yes. And yet I understand they're considering a lawsuit.

Nappe: Probably. Jim Regan [Chairman of the Churchill County Board of Supervisors] told me they spent a million dollars already just in appeals, and Bob Hatfield, who's head of the Carson River group now, says that they'd already spent a half million on the Carson River because of one letter that Pelcyger sent, wanting to tie the Carson River into the Truckee River process, because he [Bob Pelcyger] wants more water to go down the Carson River, of course, because that means there's less on the Truckee.

#### **Positive Effect of the Tribe and Pelcyger in Forcing Issues to be Resolved**

Of course, I was supporting him years ago. I kidded Pelcygar, I said, "I'm not letting you off the hook until you've resolved the Carson River

problems for us." [Laughter] He turned to me and he said, "I think you're flattering me, Tina." [Laughter] That's true. He's a very powerful person. None of this good would have come about without the tribe and we need to be aware of that, or without the Endangered Species Act. We owe a lot to the tribe.

Seney: And that includes, despite the fact they're competitors, that includes the wetlands, doesn't it.

Nappe: It does. It does. So, negotiations are a very precipitating factor for things. They're very valuable.

Seney: I know the TROA is very complicated and it's gotten more complicated, apparently, as people are trying to lock in positions and eliminate flexibility on matters that they think may some day work to their detriment. Are you familiar with the details?

Nappe: No, I have not been involved in that at all, and I guess that's part of the—I've never really gotten that much involved in the detail of TROA, other than breakfast with Bill, or with the OCAP. I probably should have. If this were starting out and we had really gone forward, I'd be doing that, but it's hard for us to take on those new issues.



### **Management Plan for Stillwater Refuge and Carson Lake Pasture**

The issue that we're trying to take on right now, very frankly, is the management plans for both Stillwater and Carson Lake Pasture, which are not monumental in terms of the overall issue, but they're important to resolve.

Seney: What's your problem with the management plan?

Nappe: It's not a problem; it's the first time that a management plan has ever been developed for Stillwater, because it was never truly a national wildlife refuge. Now it is, so you needed to assign the boundaries, what is the relationship with hunting and other uses, because it was basically an open-use program.

One of the things that's happened is the Fish and Wildlife Service now has an organic act, so there are some prescriptions on management plans. Wildlife comes first. You have to think about the needs of the birds, and you start thinking about recreation and it has to be multiple-use recreation. Well, that's new for wildlife refuges. Since Stillwater's never had its own plan, there have been historical assumptions on its use, and the sportsmen have had fairly open

use, as the rest of us have.

So, for the first time, we're looking at, "Yes, hunting seasons are October through January, and isn't it nice that birders don't like that time of year, so we should be continue doing what we've always done." Then there's the thinking, "Well, if there's going to be more use of wetlands, it's going to occur during the winter months as well, so how are we going to plan for that?"

It's beginning to raise a bit of controversy, because we didn't do the first thing that we needed to do, and that was we needed to decide what the needs of the birds were. But, see, that's not that well known. There's historical patterns, and some of those patterns are based on hunting, that birds fly from one place to another if they're hunted, but that's not necessarily what's best for them.

So we're getting into that; I don't know how much interest I have in that. I still think water is the most important thing. [Laughter]

Seney: Are you beginning to quarrel now, the bird-watching side and the hunting side, over the management plan?

Nappe: There's a little bit of that. It didn't occur—we had an all-day meeting, actually, February 8, about

twenty of us, and out of that meeting there seemed to be a great deal of consensus. In fact, Jim and I wrote a letter with that consensus. But there's an unraveling that's beginning to occur. Remember we're not meeting regularly and because Dan Walsworth, who's the new manager, is approaching it from his own style, and he knows that he's going to rub up against the Division of Wildlife, which considers it sort of their area, too. And he's trying to provide for more multiple-use in anticipation of it. And the feeling is, why plan for it until it's there? In the meantime, we are the greatest users. We fought for this water so that we can have our hunting.

For the most part, we don't object to hunting, the coalition. The Sierra Club, Audubon, we don't object to hunting. But we are going to be very interested in assurance that the birds come first and their needs. I don't think we have a quarrel with the duck hunters on that. I think the issue's going to be how do you have the kind of information upon which to make that sort of decision. What we have is a series of historical perceptions on both sides, and I don't deal too well with that.

### **Transfer of Carson Pasture to the State of Nevada**

Seney: What about the transfer of the Carson Pasture?

Let me turn this over.

END SIDE A, TAPE 2. JULY 24, 1998.

BEGIN SIDE B, TAPE 2. JULY 24, 1998.

Seney: What I want to ask about is, the Carson Pasture is slated to go to the Division of Wildlife of the state of Nevada, and apparently that's been held up, again thanks to Mr. Pelcygar raising the question of the transfer of water, and he wants the 2.99 rate. What's going on there?

Nappe: I don't know where that particular item is. It's been held up for seven years on a variety of issues, one of which has to do with the mercury on the land, not knowing what the borders are. I do think there's some concern by the Division of Wildlife on how financially they're going to manage it, though that wouldn't have held it up per se. They had to develop an agreement between the agencies. We used to go to meetings and we weren't sure whose responsibility it was to deliver, to create that agreement. It sort of got bounced around. I tried to clarify it in my minutes, and it never seemed to last, it got changed. So we were pushing on [the transfer].

We have supported transferring Carson Lake

to the state of Nevada, and we actually have looked at some preliminary management plans that were developed by the Division of Wildlife for that area. I have, maybe more so than most, fought to support the Greenhead Club having a role in the future management, since they've had one all these years.

Seney: They have essentially been the managers of the Carson Pasture for hunting purposes.

Nappe: That's a new concept for a public agency to have a private manager. How do you involve the private sector? It's easy when it's a private agency to do that, but when it's a public agency that basically has managed everything itself and basically had not charged additional fees for doing so, that's a new concept that has to be worked out to retain the Greenhead Club fifty-dollar fee for use of the land for hunting. I would also like to see a daily-use fee. I think we need to get people accustomed to paying for something. That's a new thing that has to be worked out, too, and I don't know if the Division will ever do that. The current administrator will not be there; they're hiring somebody new. So you're looking not only at the change of Pete Morros, but the director—he's a new administrator now—Willie Molini, who's been eighteen years in this position, is retiring.

Seney: As head of the Division of Wildlife?

Nappe: Wildlife. And I have no idea what those policies will be with those changes. So there's a lot of change going on right now. It would be important for a group like ours to, of course, sustain itself in the face of all this change and to work together on those policies, because this will be the first time a major hunting area was really not financially created by hunters. It will be public lands with basically large amounts of public monies that have purchased water. So sportsmen have, of course, continued to help a lot. They help save it. But I think it's important conceptually to recognize that the major hunting area in western Nevada is truly a multiple-funded agency, and so what other kinds of policies does one develop with that kind of process. That's a challenge. Actually, it's the kind of thing I enjoy, because I like to look at multiple partners and everybody working together conceptually.

But the Division of Wildlife has to also begin to look at things a little bit differently. Right now most of their operation money comes from sportsmen, so their primary constituent, from their perspective, is a sportsman, and when we layout their budget money, they always talk about their operating dollars, and they forget to add in that we expected in 1988 we would need at least 50

million dollars to purchase the water we needed. That's a lot of money for an agency that doesn't see that in three years [unclear] total budget. It's not coming from the sportsmen; it's coming from the federal government, from the land exchanges, from the public through the 5 million dollars that the public, the people of Nevada voted for.

It's a very different way of looking at it, and it's the way we have to go for protecting wildlife in the future. We really need to look that way.

#### **1990 Election Approving Question Five on Statewide Ballot**

Seney: The 5 million you allude to, that's the Question 5 money.

Nappe: The Question 5 money.

Seney: On the 1990 Nevada ballot. Did you guys play a role in that election?

Nappe: Yes.

Seney: What did you do?

Nappe: Well, many of our organizations contributed financially. Dave Livermore had sort of a

grassroots group.

Seney: You told me he was very influential in getting this going.

Nappe: The Nature Conservancy got it passed. Dave Livermore came down and saw it through the legislature. He developed the prospectus on it that we sent out statewide. He went immediately to develop the key support groups that would be on the letterhead, and he did that very quickly, because the Nature Conservancy had experience in doing this elsewhere, and they brought in somebody who talked to us one evening about what they needed to do. They did a survey to find out what the most popular animal was. Well, the bighorn sheep was the key animal that we looked at. They raised money, 300,000 dollars, in ads, commitments for this. And Dave went after the people who helped raise the money.

So, without the Nature Conservancy, this would not have happened. And the person who got the 5 million dollars in there was Virgil Getto, who was an Assemblyman from Churchill County. I'm not sure he's happy he did that, but he did it. [Laughter]

Seney: Because this came out of the legislature, an issue placed on the ballot.



---

Nappe: It was the legislature, went from the legislature to the ballot. And all the language. In fact, the language was on the ballot. Dave Livermore went through that language. I mean, he is a phenomenal person. Absolutely phenomenal. And did it while living in Utah, but he was down here all the time. He saw that through and we had groups meet to see what we could do at our little funky level. [Laughter] Basically it was ads.

There was a slide show. The Division of Wildlife produced a slide show that we used. So, yes, we were grassroots types of people.

Seney: Three hundred thousand at that point would have been a fair amount of money for a ballot question in Nevada, wouldn't it.

Nappe: Yes, for a 47.2 million-dollar issue, yes.

Seney: That was the total amount in Question 5?

Nappe: Yes. It was not very much money, but it was all we thought we could get.

Seney: So, as it's parceled out, obviously some went to bighorn sheep.

Nappe: No.

Seney: No?

Nappe: No, that's not what happened.

Seney: I'm sorry. You said that was the favorite animal.

Nappe: We used that as our insignia.

Seney: Oh, okay. [Laughter] That was even more calculated than that.

Nappe: It was very calculated.

Seney: I see. You even have a rendering of a bighorn sheep on your wall.

Nappe: Yes. I purchased that at the bighorn sheep—at Bighorn Unlimited auction.

Seney: It's a lovely pencil drawing. It's beautiful.

Nappe: The artist is a local artist. It's the only drawing I've ever seen at an auction, a sportsmen's auction I liked. Because it's so soft.

Seney: Most of them are not—it's not high art.

**Art and Photographs Created by Nappe's Father**

Nappe: No. The other three photographs are my father's.

He was one of the early photographers in this area, and his photographs are in Special Collections at the University of Nevada at Reno. He has a wonderful series actually on Pyramid Lake and fishing, snagging cui-ui fish.

Seney: Wow!

Nappe: We spent a lot of time at Pyramid Lake. He has a whole series on Virginia City characters. These are all his paintings and his drawings. He was a local artist who came here in 1940 and really was sort of a pioneer of sorts.

Seney: Lovely.

Nappe: He spent many years in the Orient. That's where he met my mother. So these have kind of an abstract Oriental flavor.

Seney: They do. Right.

Nappe: He went through a different series and he loved Mexico, and these were all done in Mexico. So I guess you could say that when I say I'm an internal contemplator type of person, I get it from an interest in arts and all those things.

But this is one of the few things I've

purchased. I've never gotten very many other pieces of art because I have so much of my father's stuff, I don't have any space left.

Seney: Your father's stuff is great.

Nappe: It is. I really enjoy it. I really admire him for it.

Seney: Is he still alive?

Nappe: No, he died in 1984. In fact, I was told that his collection was the first major collection of photographs of a Nevada photographer that is in existence, and it included photographs from where he grew up in Brooklyn. I had not even seen them until he died. There are all of these old photographs that he had from when he was probably a teenager, as well as a lot of his art. So it's a very full retrospective of his work.

#### **Money from Question Five Used for Wetlands and Other State Areas**

Seney: So the 43 million, you say, was Question 5; 47?

Nappe: 42.7.

Seney: And of that, 5 million went to the wetlands purchases.

Nappe: Was to purchase water for the wetlands. Thirteen million altogether went to the Division of Wildlife. Thirteen million went to the Las Vegas Wash. Five million went to Washoe County for local parks.

Seney: Something for everybody.

Nappe: You can almost guess who the politics were. And the balance went to state parks for projects that were, of course, very nicely scattered throughout the state. [Laughter]

Seney: Yes. [Laughter] Well, that's how it's done, isn't it. You don't get them passed otherwise.

Nappe: And I think there was—I'm not sure that anybody voted against it. There might have been one abstention or nay vote, but the entire legislature voted for it. That was a very good thing. That's starting out on a positive note.

Seney: Yes, and you're making sure you don't have the important local opposition to it.

Nappe: Right. And it passed with Clark County voting 66 percent for it. All the urban countries, which is interesting, voted to pass it. Some of the very rural counties voted it down.

Seney: Yes, but they're so small, they don't count.

Nappe: Of course not.

### **Reclamation Employees Going to Work for Other Agencies**

Seney: One of the things we talked about on the phone, when I talked with you initially, was something we did mention a minute or two when the tape was off, and that is this—maybe it's time to get to that, the business of Dave Overvold,<sup>17</sup> particularly, who used to work for the Bureau of Reclamation, who now is with T-C-I-D. You said that was not unique, and you had some views you expressed to me.

Nappe: It was Dimick.

Seney: Frank Dimick.

Nappe: He works for Pershing County Water District.

Seney: Right. You mentioned them both.

---

17. David Overvold participated in Reclamation's Newlands Series oral history project. See, David Overvold, *Oral History Interview*, Transcript of tape-recorded Bureau of Reclamation Oral History Interview conducted by Donald B. Seney. Edited by Donald B. Seney; further edited and desktop published by Andrew H. Gahan, 2017, [www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html](http://www.usbr.gov/history/oralhist.html).

Nappe: Yes, that was very—Dimick, in particular, was interesting for us, because when we met on the proposal of The Pershing County Water District to transfer the Bureau of Reclamation project over to them, they were going through what I suppose are "scooping meetings." They had a special meeting with some of us in Carson City at the Bureau of Reclamation office. And when we came in, it was clear they had been meeting previously.

If we had not known better, we would have thought that Frank Dimick was head of that office, still. He ran the meeting. He was in charge of the conversation. The rest of the staff, for the most part, were silent, never said much of anything. It was an unnerving experience for us to have that type of process occur, and we felt, or we were surprised by what we thought was the lack of equity in addressing the subject.

Seney: I take it transferring this project to Pershing County Water District is something you don't like.

Nappe: We're not supporting it at this point. There's no reason for us to support it. There's no public value out of it, and there's a lot of public value in keeping things the way they are. It includes

Lahontan—it includes Rye Patch Dam,<sup>18</sup> it includes Argenta Marsh, it includes a lot of land that's along the Humboldt River, where there is very little public access. We want to keep the public access around Rye Patch Reservoir. And in many ways there's not philosophically a difference in values, because the ranchers said subsequently they don't want to see a lot of people around Rye Patch, but that's not the same as ensuring a future of public use.

We're concerned about the future of Tulon [phonetic] Marsh down below. So we have a number of concerns, and we don't see any public benefit out of it. We did see that there was a good way for Frank Dimick to make some money for a while, while he explored it with them. [Laughter]

But again, as I feel and I know Betsy Rieke expressed the other day, at least when you start a process like that, you're talking. And when you talk, there's all kinds of things that come up where you might find agreement on a number of issues. So the process in itself has tremendous value because we're not interested in fighting over this over time; we're interested in public use for the land, but that doesn't mean we're necessarily

---

18. Constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1936 as part of the Humboldt Project, Rye Patch Dam is on the Humboldt River 22 miles northeast of Lovelock, Nevada.



against the farmers. So I think that part of it's very good.

Seney: What about Dave Overvold switching over from the Bureau of Reclamation to T-C-I-D?

Nappe: Maybe we're not surprised, but it doesn't build confidence in the Bureau of Reclamation, because if transferring to people they previously "monitored" is what they're looking to, then how can they possibly do a good job? They can't possibly. That's why Betsy Rieke's appointment is really valuable, because I believe she enjoys the confidence of the farmers, that she's fair and she's open, so that would make a big difference to us, but otherwise we'd be somewhat suspicious.

### **Staff Changes at the Reclamation Area Office**

The other thing that's happened over the years with the Bureau of Reclamation is that the staff turnover has been rather evident, and so when you go and you hope you've got a process started, suddenly that person's no longer there, they're somewhere else.

Seney: Area Managers particularly.

Nappe: Yes. So then there's this big gap, and, of course, a

new person coming in has to find out what the world's going on. So you never get anything done.

Seney: Yes. In this instance, Betsy Rieke's a bit different because she is knowledgeable about the project, more so than her predecessors were when they came in.

Nappe: She's very knowledgeable, and I assume they partly offered her the opportunity to come here as a way of helping to resolve problems. I would really hope that, particularly with T-C-I-D, that she would be able to offer some enlightenment so they would feel that they've derived some value out of this process.

Seney: Right. That's all the questions I have. Anything we didn't cover? Anything you want to add? Because I don't know everything—he says modestly. [Laughter]

Nappe: You know more than I do. [Laughter]

Seney: No, no, no, no. No way.

Nappe: With all the people you've interviewed.

Seney: Even if I've heard it, I can't remember it anymore. My memory's not what it was. So, anything else

we should add here?

Nappe: Not particularly, no, I don't think so. I can't think of anything else.

Seney: Let me say I can understand why this kind of thing is tiring to an individual. It takes a great deal of commitment. It seems like there's never a solution.

Nappe: No, there's no end. There are solutions, but they take so long in being achieved. You just think you've—it's like climbing a mountain. You think the peak is right in front of you, but the peak keeps getting higher and higher up, and it's just not quite there. It's just like this Truckee River Partnership. We thought, Susan Lynn, and I, "Well, it's just a one-year commitment. We can take on this other thing." It now looks as if the TROA may be extended. [Laughter] And we're both saying, "Oh, no."

Seney: It's open-ended.

Nappe: Yes. [Laughter]

Seney: Thank you very much. I really appreciate your time.

Nappe: Thank you very much. I really appreciate, if the Bureau of Reclamation has supported this, I really appreciate their doing so.

Seney: They have, very much.

Nappe: That's a wonderful thing, so I'm delighted with that.

Seney: Thank you.

END SIDE B, TAPE 2. JULY 24, 1998.  
END OF INTERVIEW.