

1 DOWNEY BRAND LLP
 STEVEN P. SAXTON (Bar No. 116943)
 2 J. MARK ATLAS (Bar No. 65086)
 MEREDITH E. NIKKEL (Bar No. 254818)
 3 621 Capitol Mall, 18th Floor
 Sacramento, CA 95814-4731
 4 Telephone: 916.444.1000
 Facsimile: 916.444.2100
 5 ssaxton@downeybrand.com
 matlas@downeybrand.com
 6 mnikkel@downeybrand.com

7 Attorneys for
 TEHAMA-COLUSA CANAL AUTHORITY

8 J. MARK ATLAS (Bar No. 65086)
 9 Attorney at Law
 332 West Sycamore Street
 10 Willows, CA 95988
 Telephone: 530.934.5416
 11 Facsimile: 530.934.3508
 jma@jmatlaslaw.com

12 Attorney for Protestants
 13 TEHAMA-COLUSA CANAL AUTHORITY,
 GLENN VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
 14 MYERS-MARSH MUTUAL WATER COMPANY

15 BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

16
 17
 18 In the matter of 2016 SWRCB Hearing re
 Cal WaterFix Petition for Change
 19
 20

**OPENING STATEMENT, TEHAMA-
 COLUSA CANAL AUTHORITY AND
 WATER SERVICE CONTRACTORS
 WITHIN ITS SERVICE AREA**

1 The Tehama Colusa Canal Authority, on behalf of the water service contractors within its
2 service area, will establish that the change in point of diversion requested by Petitioners for the
3 California WaterFix project will injure legal users of water in the Sacramento Valley. Water
4 agencies within the Authority's service area hold contracts with the United States Bureau of
5 Reclamation for delivery of Central Valley Project (CVP) water to irrigate 150,000 acres of
6 farmland along the west side of the Sacramento Valley. Those contracts entitle the water service
7 contractors to a specified amount of water whenever Reclamation is able to deliver such water.

8 Although Petitioners' modeling appears to present a project with minimal impacts to
9 water users, closer scrutiny reveals the injurious nature and extent of those impacts. The
10 Authority will present evidence showing that operation of the CVP under the proposed WaterFix
11 project will reduce allocations to water service contractors in its service area below the
12 allocations Reclamation would make without the proposed project. In particular, under a realistic
13 operations scenario for the proposed project, it is reasonable to expect that deliveries to water
14 service contractors within the TCCA service area will on average decrease by approximately
15 14,000 acre-feet annually in all year types. In below normal years, deliveries within the TCCA
16 service area will likely decrease by approximately 62,000 acre-feet on average. Reducing
17 allocations of water that Reclamation would otherwise be able to provide interferes with the water
18 service contractors' legal entitlement and results in injury.

19 In addition, under the same realistic operations scenario, deliveries to Central Valley
20 Project water users south of the Delta and outside of the Sacramento River watershed would
21 increase by approximately 193,000 acre feet on average each year under the proposed project. To
22 the extent that the reduced deliveries to water service contractors within TCCA's service area are
23 made in order to increase these supplies to users outside the area of origin, the proposed project
24 will result in injury to the entities within TCCA's service area.

25 The Authority joins in the evidence submitted by the Sacramento Valley Water Users and
26 their critique of the modeling results presented in support of the proposed project. In particular,
27 the modeling conducted by Petitioners has little, if any, relationship to how the Central Valley
28 Project and State Water Project would actually be operated if the requested change is granted.

1 The testimony and exhibits presented by Walter Bourez and Dan Easton will present a detailed
2 and realistic analysis of the operation of the proposed project that reveals significant injury to
3 legal users of water across the Tehama Colusa Canal Authority and beyond.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28