EXHIBIT 10
DATE 3-8-11
HB 309

From: Donald Bishop <db.flyz@gmail.com>
Subject: **HB 309**
Date: March 8, 2011 8:46:11 AM MST

Gentlemen,

My name is Don Bishop, and I live in the Belgrade and Manhattan, MT area.

I come to you as an irrigator and cattle ranch owner opposed to HB 309. I also come with comments on behalf of the Federation of Fly Fishers (whose international headquarters are in Livingston, MT) and on behalf of Bud Lilly (SW Montana legend) who is unable to attend today due to health-related issues.

On the surface, HB 309 appears to be a simple designation of irrigation related definitions. Instead, it provides a list of terms with understandably vague explanations that raise doubt regarding the status of ANY Montana waters which contribute to irrigation AND WHAT STREAMS DON'T IN THIS DRY STATE?!

Less than two years ago, a well reasoned compromise resolved the issue of stream access from bridges, and that bill resolved a real issue. I have spoken with other rancher/farmers and Farm Bureau members who do not feel HB 309 addresses any real need. There is no history of repeated abuses along irrigation ditches, nor any reason to expect such in the future. Who out there is itching to fish someone's irrigation ditch or set up elk camp and 4-wheel on irrigation ditch banks? Even the Farm Bureau mailings - which call for a Yes vote on this "farm" issue, detail no void filled or problem solved.

At real issue here is stream access, and we all know about ultra-wealthy land owners who have long fought stream access, including one who claims an irrigation-related exemption to access which has been repeatedly denied. This HB 309 would raise the specter of subjecting cash-strapped counties to being repeatedly held hostage to expensive lawsuits by wealthy landowners, a strategy long employed down on the Ruby River.

We come to you as recreationist and conservationist organizations who have a long history of providing manpower and raised funds for the well being of the waters of Montana, and whose members travel to Montana from literally all around the world - contributing mightily to the tourist economy of the state. The potential negative economic impact on our $300M+ tourist industry by driving away these people because of restricted public access could be huge, to say the least.

I can assure you, not one of the opponents of HB 309 that I am aware have any bone to pick with irrigators, farmers or ranchers. Rather it is felt that this bill attempts to address an issue that really isn't there. Vaguely defining terms subject to various interpretation will not clarify , but rather RAISE issues of contention.

The overwhelming message we have to Montana's legislature is : HB 309 is an example of too much government. Don't pander to the ultra wealthy. Don't open this can of worms and subject Montana's counties and public to duress. PLEASE, DON'T PUT MONTANA'S STREAMS BACK UP FOR SALE TO THE HIGH-ROLLERS!

Thank you for your time.

From: Donald Bishop <db.flyz@gmail.com>
Subject: **HB 309**
Date: March 8, 2011 8:44:01 AM MST

Gentlemen,

My name is Don Bishop, and I live in the Belgrade and Manhattan, MT area.

I come to you as an irrigator and cattle ranch owner opposed to HB 309. I also come with comments on behalf of the Federation of Fly Fishers (whose international headquarters are in Livingston, MT) and on behalf of Bud Lilly (SW Montana legend) who is unable to attend today due to health-related issues.

On the surface, HB 309 appears to be a simple designation of irrigation related definitions. Instead, it provides a list of terms with understandably vague explanations that raise doubt regarding the status of ANY Montana waters which contribute to irrigation AND WHAT STREAMS DON'T IN THIS DRY STATE?!

Less than two years ago, a well reasoned compromise resolved the issue of stream access from bridges, and that bill resolved a real issue. I have spoken with other rancher/farmers and Farm Bureau members who do not feel HB 309 addresses any real need. There is no history of repeated abuses along irrigation ditches, nor any reason to expect such in the future. Who out there is itching to fish someone's *irrigation ditch or set up elk camp and 4-wheel on irrigation ditch banks? Even the Farm Bureau mailings* - which call for a Yes vote on this "farm" issue, detail no void filled or problem solved.

At real issue here is stream access, and we all know about ultra-wealthy land owners who have long fought stream access, including one who claims an irrigation-related exemption to access which has been repeatedly denied. This HB 309 would raise the specter of subjecting *cash-strapped counties to being repeatedly held hostage to expensive lawsuits by wealthy landowners, a strategy long* employed down on the Ruby River.

We come to you as recreationist and conservationist organizations who have a long history of providing manpower and raised funds for the well being of the waters of Montana, and whose members travel to Montana from literally all around the world - contributing mightily to the tourist *economy of the state. The potential negative economic impact on our $300M+ tourist industry by driving away these* people because of restricted public access could be huge, to say the least.

I can assure you, not one of the opponents of HB 309 that I am aware have any bone to pick with irrigators, farmers or ranchers. Rather it is felt that this bill attempts to address an issue that really isn't there. Vaguely defining terms subject to various interpretation *will not clarify , but rather RAISE issues of contention.*

The overwhelming message we have to Montana's legislature is : HB 309 is an example of too much government. Don't pander to the ultra wealthy. Don't open this can of worms and subject Montana's counties and public to duress. PLEASE, DON'T PUT MONTANA'S STREAMS UP FOR SALE TO THE HIGH-ROLLERS!

Thank you for your time.