

NOTE: This copy of Order WR 2009-0060 is annotated on page 59 to show the amendment to condition 3. a. (6) directed by Order WR 2010-0001.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

ORDER WR 2009-0060

In the Matter of the Unauthorized Diversion and Use of Water
by the California American Water Company

Parties

**Water Rights Prosecution Team¹
California American Water Company**

Interested Parties

**Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, City of Carmel by the Sea,
City of Seaside, Seaside Basin Watermaster, Pebble Beach Company,
Monterey County Hospitality Association, City of Monterey, City of Sand City,
Division of Ratepayers Advocates of the California Public Utilities Commission,
Public Trust Alliance, Carmel River Steelhead Association,
Ventana Chapter of the Sierra Club, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance,
Planning and Conservation League, California Salmon and Steelhead Association,
National Marine Fisheries Service**

SOURCE: Carmel River

COUNTY: Monterey

CEASE AND DESIST ORDER

BY THE BOARD:

INTRODUCTION

The California American Water Company (Cal-Am or CAW) diverts water from the Carmel River in Monterey County. The water is used to supply the residential, municipal, and commercial needs of the Monterey Peninsula area (peninsula) communities. In 1995 the State Water

¹ The Water Rights Prosecution Team includes: (1) James Kassel, Assistant Deputy Director for Water Rights, (2) John O'Hagan, Manager, Water Rights Enforcement Section (3) Mark Stretars, Senior Water Resource Control Engineer, (4) John Collins, Environmental Scientist and (5) Staff Counsels Reed Sato, Yvonne West and Mayumi Okamoto. In addition, for purposes of complying with *ex parte* prohibitions, Kathy Mrowka, Senior Water Resource Control Engineer, is also treated as a member of the Prosecution Team.

Resources Control Board (State Water Board) adopted Order WR 95-10 ([WR 95-10](#)). Among other matters, the order found that Cal-Am was diverting about 10,730 acre feet per annum (afa) of water from the Carmel River without a valid basis of right and directed that Cal-Am should diligently implement actions to terminate its unlawful diversion. Alleging that 13 years after the adoption of Order 95-10 Cal-Am continues to divert about 7,150 afa from the river without a valid basis of right, the Prosecution Team (Prosecution Team or PT) seeks issuance of a cease and desist order under Water Code section 1831, subdivision (d). Cal-Am requested a hearing. This order (1) finds that Cal-Am: (a) failed to comply with the requirements of Order 95-10, and (b) is in violation of Water Code section 1052; and (2) issues a cease and desist order (CDO).

The State Water Board finds as follows:

1.0 LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUING A CEASE AND DESIST ORDER

The State Water Board may issue a cease and desist order as provided in Water Code section 1831. Section 1831 provides in part:

- a) When the board determines that any person is violating, or threatening to violate, any requirement described in subdivision (d), the board may issue an order to that person to cease and desist from that violation.
- b) The cease and desist order shall require that person to comply forthwith or in accordance with a time schedule set by the board.
- c) The board may issue a cease and desist order only after notice and an opportunity for a hearing pursuant to Section 1834.
- d) The board may issue a cease and desist order in response to a violation or threatened violation of any of the following:
 - (1) The prohibition set forth in Section 1052 against the unauthorized diversions and use of water.²
 - (2) Any term or condition of a permit, license, certification, or registration issued under this division.
 - (3) Any decision or order of the board issued under this part.

Section 1832 provides:

Cease and desist orders of the board shall be effective upon issuance thereof. The board may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, upon its own motion or upon receipt of an application from an aggrieved person, modify, revoke, or stay in whole or in part an cease and desist order issued pursuant to this chapter.

² Water Code section 1052, subsection (a) provides “[t]he diversion or use of water subject to this division other than as authorized in this division is a trespass.”

2.0 NOTICE OF PROPOSED CEASE AND DESIST ORDER

On January 15, 2008, the Assistant Deputy Director for Water Rights³ issued a notice of proposed cease and desist order (draft cease and desist order or draft CDO) to Cal-Am. (SWRCB-7.) Among other matters, the draft CDO alleges that:

- 1) In 1995 the Board adopted Order 95-10. The order required Cal-Am to “diligently implement” measures to terminate its illegal diversions from the river (pp. 2 and 3, Facts 5 and 9).
- 2) Cal-Am has failed to comply with Condition 2 of Order 95-10. Condition 2, requires Cal-Am to terminate its unauthorized diversions from the river (p. 5, Finding 3).
- 3) Since 1995 Cal-Am has illegally diverted at least 7,164 afa from the river (p. 5, Finding 1).
- 4) Cal-Am’s diversions continue to have adverse effects on the public trust resources of the river and should be reduced (p. 5, Finding 2).
- 5) The ongoing diversion is a violation of Water Code Section 1052 prohibiting the unauthorized diversion or use of water (p. 5, Finding 1).

The draft CDO seeks to compel Cal-Am to reduce the unauthorized diversions by specified amounts each year, starting in water year 2008-09 and continuing through water year 2014. For example, in 2008-09 Cal-Am would be required to reduce its unauthorized diversions by 15 percent; another 15 percent reduction would be required in water year 2009-2010, etc. (Staff Exhibit 7.)

3.0 REQUEST FOR HEARING

On February 4, 2008, Cal-Am requested a hearing. (CAW-8, p. 2, ¶ 4.) Cal-Am’s request for hearing states, in part, that:

- 1) the terms and conditions of Order 95-10 are being met (id., p.2, ¶ 1);
- 2) the water diverted from the Carmel River is necessary to protect public health and safety (ibid.);
- 3) the schedule of reduction conflicts with the requirements of the California Public Utilities Commission (ibid.); and
- 4) the schedule for reducing diversions is not supported by the recitals in the draft cease and desist order and is unworkable (ibid.).

4.0 NOTICE OF HEARING

On March 5, 2008, the State Water Board issued a notice of hearing for this proceeding. (CAW-10.) The notice stated that the purpose of the hearing is to receive evidence to

³ The Assistant Deputy Director for Water Rights who issued the draft is James W. Kassel.

determine whether to adopt the draft CDO issued to Cal-Am. (*Id.*, p. 5, Purpose of Hearing.)

The key issue noticed for hearing is as follows:

Should the State Water Board adopt the draft CDO? If the draft should be adopted, should any modifications be made to the measures in the draft order? What is the basis for each modification?

(*Id.*, p. 6, Key Issue.)

4.1 Persons Intervening in the Proceeding

The notice also provided that persons wishing to participate in the proceeding must file a Notice of Intent to Appear. In addition to the Prosecution Team and Cal-Am, the following persons filed Notices of Intent to Appear and participated in the hearing:⁴

Planning and Conservation League
Public Trust Alliance
Carmel River Steelhead Association
Sierra Club, Ventana Chapter
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
National Marine Fisheries Service
California Salmon and Steelhead Association
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
Seaside Basin Watermaster
Division of Ratepayers Advocates, California Public Utilities Commission
City of Monterey
City of Seaside
City of Sand City
City of Carmel-by-the-Sea
Monterey County Hospitality Association
Pebble Beach Company

5.0 BACKGROUND

5.1 The Carmel River and Cal-Am Facilities on the River

The Carmel River is a central coast stream that flows into Carmel Bay about five miles south of the City of Monterey. The river drains a watershed area of about 255 square miles. Cal-Am owns and operates the San Clemente Dam, the Los Padres Dam and 21 downstream wells that divert water from the underflow of the river. (See Figure 1, Carmel River Watershed and Figures 2 and 3, Alluvial Groundwater Basin Showing The Location of the California American

⁴ Intervention by the Defenders of Wildlife and Mr. George T. Riley was denied. (May 13, 2008, Rulings on Procedural Issues, p. 4-5, Standing of Persons Filing Notices of Intent to Appear.)

Water Company Wells.) During 1994, the wells supplied “. . . about 69 percent of the water needs of Cal-Am’s customers. The balance of the water supplied to Cal-Am customers is supplied from: (1) San Clemente Dam and Los Padres reservoirs in the upper reaches of the Carmel River and (2) pumped ground water in the City of Seaside.”⁵ (Order 95-10, pp. 2-6.)

5.2 Cal-Am’s Rights to Divert and Use Water from the Carmel River

Order 95-10, section 4.3 (pp. 24, 25) found that Cal-Am has the following rights to divert and use water from the river:

- 1) A pre-1914 appropriative right for 1,137 afa.
- 2) Riparian rights for use within the Carmel Valley on parcels which adjoin the surface watercourse or which overlie water flowing in the subterranean channel. These rights cannot be used to serve water outside the valley or non-riparian parcels within the valley. The order recognized 60 afa of use.
- 3) An appropriative right to divert up to 3,030 afa of water to storage in Los Padres Reservoir from October 1 to May 31 pursuant to the conditions in License 11866. The actual diversion is limited to 2,179 afa due to siltation at Los Padres Reservoir.
- 4) Order 95-10 further found that Cal-Am was diverting about 10,730 afa without a valid basis of right (p. 36, ¶2).


The foregoing findings are binding on Cal-Am.⁶

On November 30, 2007, both the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD) and Cal-Am jointly obtained an additional right to divert water from the river. The State Water Board issued Permit 20808A authorizing the diversion of 2,426 afa water from the river to underground storage in the Seaside Groundwater Basin from December 1 of each year to May 31 of the succeeding year at a maximum instantaneous rate of diversion of 6.7 cubic feet per second (cfs). Thus, Cal-Am’s current legal rights to water in the river that may be used to

⁵ The relative quantity of water delivered from the wells to Cal-Am customers has not materially changed because Cal-Am has failed to develop any meaningful new source of supply. (See 14.0 Cal-Am Has Not Complied with Condition 2 of Order 95-10, *infra*.)

⁶ See Wat. Code, § 1126, subd. (d); see also *People v. Simms* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 468, 477 [principles of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel apply to administrative decision in appropriate circumstances]; *Pacific Lumber Co. v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (2006) 37 Cal.4th 921, 944 [discussing the characteristics of administrative proceedings that may be the basis for collateral estoppel]. These findings are also binding on the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, Pebble Beach Water Company, Carmel River Steelhead Association, Residents Water Committee, Ventana Chapter of the Sierra Club, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, Willis Evans, John Williams, and the California Department of Fish and Game. (Order 95-10, p.7, 2.0 Complaints; p. 9, 2.6 Interested Persons.)

supply peninsula cities is the 3,316 afa recognized in Order 95-10⁷ plus 2,426 afa under Permit 20808A⁸ for a total of 5,742 afa.



⁷ 851 afa is subtracted from this number to adjust for storage loss due to siltation at Los Padres Reservoir.

⁸ As will be discussed, *infra*, the actual amount of additional water supply that may be generated by this project is uncertain, but certainly much less than the face value of the permit.





FIGURE 3

ALLUVIAL GROUNDWATER BASIN SHOWING THE LOCATION OF THE CALIFORNIA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY WELLS



LEGEND

- Water Well
- ⊗ Gaging Station
- ▨ Alluvium
- - - Basin Subunit*


0 1 2
Miles

SOURCE: ORDER 95 - 10 (EXHIBIT SWRCB - 2)

* Subunits 1-4 form the Carmel Valley Groundwater Basin. The subunit boundaries are: 1. Via Mallorca Road (USGS Gage Near Carmel), 2. Scarlett Road (The Narrows), 3. Esquiline Road (USGS Gage at Robles Del Rio), 4. Sleepy Hollow Gage. Streamgaging will occur at the Highway 1 Gage (#1), Don Juan Bridge Gage (#2), and Sleepy Hollow Gage (#3).

FIGURE 4

**ALLUVIAL GROUNDWATER BASIN
IDENTIFYING RIVER MILES (RM)**



SOURCE: ORDER 95 - 10 (EXHIBIT SWRCB - 2)

* Subunits 1-4 form the Carmel Valley Groundwater Basin. The subunit boundaries are: 1. Via Mallorca Road (USGS Gage Near Carmel), 2. Scarlett Road (The Narrows), 3. Esquiline Road (USGS Gage at Robles Del Rio), 4. Sleepy Hollow Gage. Streamgaging will occur at the Highway 1 Gage (#1), Don Juan Bridge Gage (#2), and Sleepy Hollow Gage (#3).

5.3 Effects of Cal-Am's Diversions on the Carmel River in 1995

Order 95-10, section 5.0 (pp 25-29) found that fish and wildlife were being adversely affected by Cal-Am's legal and illegal diversions. Section 5.5 states:

To summarize, Cal-Am diversions have historically had an adverse effect on:
(1) the riparian corridor along the river below RM⁹ 18.5; (2) wildlife that depend on riparian habitat; and (3) steelhead and other fish which inhabit the river.

Cal-Am's combined diversions from the river have the largest single impact on instream beneficial uses of the river, although diversions by other water users also contribute to the adverse effects on fish and wildlife. (Order 95-10, 5.0 Effect of Cal-Am Diversion on Instream Beneficial Uses, p. 25.)

5.4 Conditions Imposed on Cal-Am by Order 95-10

The following conditions in Order 95-10 are particularly pertinent to this proceeding:

1. Cal-Am shall forthwith cease and desist from diverting any water in excess of 14,106 afa from the Carmel River, until unlawful diversions from the Carmel River are ended.
2. Cal-Am shall diligently implement one or more of the following actions to terminate its unlawful diversions from the Carmel River: (1) obtain appropriative right permits for water being unlawfully diverted from the Carmel River; (2) obtain water from other sources of supply and make one-for-one reductions in unlawful diversions from the Carmel River, provided that water pumped from the Seaside Aquifer shall be governed by condition 4 of this Order not this condition; and/or (3) contract with another agency having appropriative rights to divert and use water from the Carmel River.
3. (a) Cal-Am shall develop and implement an urban water conservation plan. In addition, Cal-Am shall develop and implement a water conservation plan based upon best irrigation practices for all parcels with turf and crops of more than one-half acre receiving Carmel River water deliveries from Cal-Am. Documentation that best irrigation practices and urban water conservation measures have already been implemented may be substituted for plans when applicable.
(b) Urban and irrigation conservation measures shall remain in effect until Cal-Am ceases unlawful diversions from the Carmel River. Conservation measures required by this Order in combination with conservation measures required by the District shall have a goal of achieving 15 percent conservation in the 1996 water year and 20 percent conservation in each subsequent year.¹⁰ To the extent that this requirement conflicts with prior commitments (allocations) by the District, the Chief, Division of Water Rights shall have the authority to modify the conservation requirement. The base for measuring

⁹ "RM" means river mile. See Figures 3 and 4.

¹⁰ Footnote 23 of the Order provides that "[e]ach water year runs from October 1 to September 30 of the following year."

water conservation shall be 14,106 afa. Water Conservation measures required by the order shall not supersede any more stringent water conservation requirements imposed by other agencies.

Litigation followed the adoption of Order 95-10.¹¹ The parties negotiated changes to some of the conditions in Order 95-10. Accordingly, on February 19, 1998, the State Water Board adopted [Order WR 98-04](#), replacing Condition 4 of Order 95-10 with the following:

4. Cal-Am shall maximize production from the Seaside Aquifer for the purpose of serving existing connections, honoring existing commitments (allocations), and to reduce diversions from the Carmel River to the greatest extent practicable during periods of low flow. Cal-Am shall minimize diversions from the Seaside Aquifer whenever flow in the Carmel River exceeds 40 cfs at the Highway One Bridge from November 1 to April 30. The long-term yield of the basin shall be maintained by using the practical rate of withdrawal method.

5.5 Decision 1632

The State Water Board adopted [Decision 1632](#) and Order 95-10 on the same day, July 6, 1995. Decision 1632 approved Application 27614 by MPWMD and the issuance of a permit to appropriate water from the Carmel River via the New Los Padres Project.¹² Up to 42 cfs of water could be taken by direct diversion, and up to 24,000 afa could be diverted to storage. The decision included numerous conditions to mitigate (1) the effects of the proposed project on the fish and wildlife in the river and (2) the effects of existing diversions from the river. Condition 11, specifically prohibited the MPWMD from diverting water pursuant to Decision 1632 unless Cal-Am had obtained an alternate supply of water for its illegal diversion from the river. Condition 11 recognizes that a contract between Cal-Am and MPWMD could be one means by which Cal-Am could obtain a legal supply of water. This means of providing a legal water supply for Cal-Am did not become available, however, because in 1995 the voters of MPWMD rejected the bond issue proposed to finance the project. (CAW, Exb. 32, pp. 2, 5-7.)

¹¹ MPWMD, CAW, the Sierra Club, the Carmel River Steelhead Association and the California Sportfishing Protection Alliance filed petitions for writs of mandate in Monterey County Superior Court (*Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board* (Monterey County Superior Court No. M 33519), *Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, California-American Water Company v. State Water Resources Control Board* (Monterey County Superior Court No. M 33520), and *Sierra Club, Inc. et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board* (Monterey County Superior Court No. 105610) against the State Water Board, challenging certain provisions in Decision 1632 and Order 95-10.

¹² See Figure 1.

5.6 Administrative Civil Liability Issued to Cal-Am

Condition 3(b) of Order 95-10 (p. 40) required Cal-Am to develop and implement an urban water conservation plan to conserve 15 percent during the 1996 water year and 20 percent during each succeeding water year. Cal-Am failed to conserve 20 percent during 1997 and on October 20, 1997, Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. 262.10-03 (ACL) was issued to Cal-Am. (PT-4.) The ACL proposed the imposition of civil liability on Cal-Am in the amount of \$168,000 for its failure to conserve water as required by Condition 3(b) and for the continuing unauthorized diversion of water from the river. This ACL Complaint was superseded on August 19, 1998, by ACL Complaint No. 262.5-6. (PT-5.) Both ACL complaints allege that Cal-Am's ongoing diversions from the river are unauthorized and illegal. (PT-4, ¶¶ 1, 3-6; PT-5, ¶¶ 1, 3-6.)

The initial ACL complaint was superseded in response to a Cal-Am settlement proposal. Cal-Am proposed that, in lieu of paying the civil liability, it would join in a number of transactions and undertakings with the Pebble Beach Community Services District (PBCSD) that would increase the amount of potable water conserved within PBCSD by approximately 400 to 500 afa. Cal-Am's proposal took effect pursuant to ACL Complaint No. 262.5-6, which states that the increased conservation would help to reduce damage to and to restore the public trust resources of the river. (PT- 5, ¶ 10.) The proposed civil liability was suspended pending compliance with the measures Cal-Am was to undertake with the PBCSD. The final order also required Cal-Am to reduce its illegal diversions from the river by 15 percent.

5.7 Cal-Am is an Investor-Owned Public Utility

Cal-Am is an investor-owned public utility holding a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity from the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC). Cal-Am must obtain approval from the PUC to: (a) charge higher rates; (b) recover expenses which are appropriate and prudently incurred; and (c) provide a fair return on Cal-Am's invested capital. (Exb. CAW-029, p. 2, 4-10.)

6.0 OFFICIAL NOTICE

As a preliminary matter, we will address papers requesting that official notice be taken of the official acts of other agencies. The State Water Board may take official notice of such acts as may be judicially noticed by the courts of this state. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 23, § 648.2.) The courts may take official notice of the “[o]fficial acts of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the United States and of any state of the United States.” (Evid. Code, § 452, subd. (c).) Factual statements contained in officially noticed papers are subject to the rules against hearsay. Neither the parties nor the State Water Board may rely upon statements of fact in officially noticed papers to bypass normal evidentiary rules.

6.1 Request for Official Notice by the Sierra Club

On November 10, 2008, the Sierra Club filed papers requesting that official notice be taken of five actions of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). (November 10, 2008, Sierra Club, Request for Official Actions of National Marine Fisheries Service etc.) The actions are:

- 1) The August 18, 1997 listing of the steelhead population within the California Central Coast as threatened under the Endangered Species Act¹³ (ESA). (62 Fed.Reg. 43937.)
- 2) The January 5, 2006 listing reaffirming the threatened status of the steelhead population within the California Central Coast under the Endangered Species Act. (71 Fed.Reg. 834, 859.)
- 3) The September 2, 2005 listing of the Carmel River as critical habitat for the steelhead. (70 Fed.Reg. 52488.)
- 4) The July 10, 2000 promulgation of a section 4(d) rule under the ESA defining exceptions to the “takings” prohibitions of the act. (65 Fed.Reg. 42422.)
- 5) The December 30, 1997 proposed rule under section 4(d) of the ESA pertaining to “takings” of West Coast Steelhead. (64 Fed.Reg. 73479 at 73483.)

The State Water Board will take official notice of the requested actions. Some of the foregoing actions have been codified at 50 Code of Federal Regulations at sections 223.102 and 223.203. Official notice is also taken of these provisions.

6.2 Notices of Potentially Relevant Information by Sierra Club

On March 25, 2009, the Sierra Club filed a Notice of Potentially Relevant Information. The notice referenced and attached a report prepared by the MPWMD staff for the March 26, 2009

¹³ 16 U.S.C. § 1531, et seq.

board meeting of MPWMD. Entitled "Carmel River Fishery Report for February 2009," the report consists of three pages of summarizing information addressing (1) aquatic habitat and flow conditions in the Carmel River, (2) the breaching of the sand bar for the Carmel River Lagoon by Monterey County Public Works, (3) the adult steelhead count at the San Clemente Dam for the early months of 2009 (See Figure 1), (4) the adult steelhead count at Los Padres Dam for the same period, and (5) a report of fish released from the Sleepy Hollow Steelhead Rearing Facility on February 20, 2009. While not expressly requesting that official notice be taken of the MPWMD staff report, the Sierra Club expresses the view that official notice may be taken of the staff report. Thereafter, on April 10, 2009, counsel for Cal-Am filed a paper entitled "Partial Opposition to Sierra Club Notice of Potentially Relevant Information." Cal-Am objects to official notice being taken of the staff report on the basis that the report is not an official act of an agency.

On May 21, 2009, the Sierra Club filed a second Notice of Potentially Relevant Information. The notice referenced and attached a report prepared by the MPWMD staff for the May 21, 2009, board meeting of MPWMD. Entitled "Carmel River Fishery Report for April 2009," the report consists of three pages updating the information addressed in the previous report. Counsel for the Sierra Club contends, without supporting papers, that the staff report was prepared in the regular course of business by MPWMD employees. The State Water Board declines to take official notice of the reports offered by the Sierra Club. In our view, the nature of the information is such that Cal-Am should have the opportunity to fully test the offer of such information and to rebut the information before it is admitted into the record. In addition, it is late in this proceeding to attempt to augment the record in a material way. Further, reopening the evidentiary record would substantially delay reaching a decision on the evidentiary record that ended on August 8, 2008.

Finally, on July 16, 2009, the Sierra Club filed a Notice of Potentially Relevant Information. The notice identifies four items that are relevant to some of the issues in this proceeding. These documents are:

1. PUC Decision 09-07-023, dated July 9, 2009, which among other matters, provides that outdoor watering may be restricted, adopts a rationale for rationing the use of water for outdoor irrigation and authorizes the use of flow restrictors on water meters for the repeated waste of water. Appended to the PUC decision are:

- (a) Settlement Agreement between the Division of Ratepayers/Advocates, MPWMD and Cal-Am on Water Conservation and Rationing.
 - (b) Rule 14.1, Water Conservation and Rationing Plan, for MPWMD, as amended and effective on February 11, 2009.
2. PUC Decision 09-02-009, dated February 20, 2009, which among other matters provides that Cal-Am may provide confidential customer water use information to MPWMD.

Official notice is taken of these papers.

6.3 Request for Official Notice by Cal-Am

On February 3, 2009, Cal-Am filed a request for official notice. Cal-Am requests that the State Water Board take official notice of the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Coastal Water Project published by the California PUC on January 30, 2009. Official notice is taken of the publication of the draft EIR.

6.4 Request by the Public Trust Alliance

On February 11, 2009, the Public Trust Alliance (PTA) filed a request for official notice. PTA requests that the State Water Board take official notice of the recent opinion of the California Supreme Court (Opinion No. S155589), *Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. State Water Resources Control Board* (2009) 45 Cal.4th 731. The State Water Board takes official notice of the opinion.¹⁴

6.5 Request by the National Marine Fisheries Service

On August 26, 2009, NMFS filed written comments on the draft cease and desist order released by the State Water Board on July 27, 2009. Among other matters, the comments note that findings made in “Section 17.4 Mitigation Measures to be Implemented Pursuant to Settlement” of the draft CDO are based upon a 2006 agreement that is no longer in effect and that a new agreement, dated March 3, 2009, between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and Cal-Am is now

¹⁴ A request for official notice or other notification is not required for the State Water Board to consider decisional law of the courts of this state. (See Evid. Code, §§ 451, 455.)

the controlling agreement. The State Water Board will treat the letter as a request that official notice be taken of the 2009 agreement and official notice is taken of the agreement.

7.0 EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO PUBLIC TRUST RESOURCES

The May 13, 2008 Ruling on Procedural Issues provided that “consideration would be given to the public trust within the context of the enforcement proceeding. . .”¹⁵ (Evidence Pertaining to Public Trust Resources Within an Enforcement Proceeding, p. 4, § 4.0.)

Based upon the Notices of Intent¹⁶ filed by some intervening parties, it appeared that these parties would seek to have the State Water Board apply the public trust doctrine to Cal-Am’s legal diversions in addition to the unauthorized diversions subject to the notice of hearing. Cal-Am filed a motion seeking to exclude such testimony from this proceeding. (CAW, Prehearing Brief on Procedural Matters, III. Scope of Hearing, pp. 8-15.) The May 13, 2008, Rulings on Procedural Issues provided that any attempt to apply the public trust doctrine to Cal-Am’s legal diversions was outside the scope of the issues noticed for this proceeding. Further, the Hearing Officers declined to initiate an ancillary proceeding to consider whether to apply the public trust doctrine to Cal-Am’s legal diversions. (*Ibid.*)

8.0 HEARING HELD

On April 1, 2008, the State Water Board held a public hearing in Monterey to receive public policy statements from anyone concerned with the draft CDO issued to Cal-Am. Seven days of evidentiary proceedings were held in Sacramento on June 19 and 20; July 23, 24, and 25; and August 7 and 8, 2008.

¹⁵ “The extent of harm to the public trust may be relevant to determining how long the schedule should be for achieving compliance. A cease and desist order may also include measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on public trust uses during a period of continuing violations before full compliance is achieved. Where the parties propose different remedies, public trust impacts will also be relevant to the . . . choice of remedies.” (*Ibid.*)

¹⁶ Persons seeking to intervene in a State Water Board proceeding must file a Notice of Intent. The Notice of Intent requires the filer to indicate the name of proposed witnesses and the subject of proposed testimony.

9.0 CAL-AM HAS BEEN PROVIDED A FAIR HEARING

Alleging the State Water Board has failed to provide due process protection, Cal-Am requests that this action be dismissed. (October 9, 2008 Closing Brief, p. 25, 8-17; also see CAW April 23, 2008, Motion to Ensure Due Process.) In its April 23, 2008 Motion to Ensure Due Process, Cal-Am states the State Water Board must afford Cal-Am its constitutional due process protections and alleges, that “[t]he structure of the proceeding gives rise to concerns that such protections do not exist in this proceeding.” Cal-Am has not alleged that those participating in the proceeding are or may be biased; rather, Cal-Am seeks a hearing that contains no appearance of bias. In Cal-Am’s view, the specific matters giving rise to an appearance of bias include the involvement of the following persons in this proceeding: (1) Mr. James W. Kassel, Assistant Deputy Director for Water Rights; (2) Ms. Kathy Mrowka, Senior Engineer in the Compliance Unit of the Division of Water Rights; and (3) Mr. M. G. (Buck) Taylor, Senior Staff Counsel assisting the Hearing Officers in this proceeding. Cal-Am made no allegation of improper bias on the part of either Hearing Officer.

During the conduct of administrative proceedings, the adjudicative function must be separated from the investigative, prosecutorial, and advocacy functions within an agency. (Gov. Code, § 11425.10, subd. (a)(4).) Cal-Am’s appearance of bias claims arise out of the fact that some of the personnel in this proceeding have had responsibilities in other proceedings or other State Water Board activities that are claimed to be inconsistent with their roles in this proceeding. More specifically, Mr. Kassel, who is part of the Prosecution Team in this proceeding, has general managerial responsibilities over personnel who include staff assisting the Hearing Officers in this proceeding. In addition, Ms. Mrowka, a witness called by the Prosecution Team in this proceeding, assisted the Hearing Officers and the State Water Board at the time Order 95-10 was adopted, and has reviewed and drafted responses to quarterly compliance reports filed by Cal-Am since the adoption of Order 95-10.

Cal-Am’s fair hearing argument relies on the view that an appearance of bias, without evidence of actual bias, is sufficient to deny due process. In *Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. State*

Water Resources Control Bd (2009) 45 Cal.4th 731, the California Supreme Court rejected that view.¹⁷ The court concluded:

In construing the constitutional due process right to an impartial tribunal, we take a more practical and less pessimistic view of human nature in general and of state administrative agency adjudicators in particular. In the absence of financial or other personal interest, and when rules mandating an agency's internal separation of functions and prohibiting *ex parte* communications are observed, the presumption of impartiality can be overcome only by specific evidence demonstrating actual bias or a particular combination of circumstances creating an unacceptable risk of bias. Unless such evidence is produced, we remain confident that state administrative agency adjudicators will evaluate factual and legal arguments on their merits, applying the law to the evidence in the record to reach fair and reasonable decisions.

(*Id.* at p. 741.)

Both separation of functions and *ex parte* prohibitions were in effect throughout this proceeding.

The March 5, 2008 Notice of Hearing included the following:

Hearing Officer and Hearing Team

State Water Board Members Arthur G. Baggett, Jr., and Gary Wolff will preside as hearing officers over this proceeding. Other members of the State Water Resources Control Board may be present during the pre-hearing conference, the meeting to receive public policy statements, and the hearing. State Water Board staff hearing team members will include Staff Counsel Buck Taylor, Engineering Geologist Paul Murphey, Water Resources Control Engineer Ernest Mona and Environmental Specialist Jane Farwell. The hearing staff will assist the hearing officers and other members of the [State Water Board] throughout this proceeding.

A staff prosecutorial team will be a party in this hearing. State Water Board prosecutorial team members will include Yvonne West, Staff Counsel, and Reed Sato, Director of the Office of Enforcement. Other members of the Prosecution Team from the Division of Water rights include Jim Kassel, Assistant Deputy Director for Water Rights, John O'Hagan, Supervising Water Resource Control Engineer, Mark Stretars, Senior Water Resource Control Engineer, and John Collins, Staff Environmental Scientist.

¹⁷ Cal-Am's appearance of bias test was supported by only one published opinion. (*Quintero v. City of Santa Ana* (2003) 114 Cal.App.4th 810, 817 (*Quintero*)). In addition, Cal-Am inappropriately cited the Court of Appeal's opinion in *Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. State Water Resources Control Board*, even though California Supreme Court had granted review. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.1105, subd. (d)(1) [when the California Supreme Court grants review, the Court of Appeal's opinion is no longer considered published; see also *id.*, rule 8.1115 [unpublished opinions should not be cited or relied on].) In *Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. State Water Resources Control Board*, the California Supreme Court disapproved of *Quintero* to the extent that it is inconsistent with the Supreme Court's decision. (45 Cal.4th 731, 740.)

The Prosecution Team is separated from the hearing team, and is prohibited from having *ex parte* communications with the hearing officers, other members of the State Water Board and members of the hearing team regarding substantive issues and controversial procedural issued within the scope of this proceeding.¹⁸

In addition, on May 13, 2008, various procedural rulings were made addressing Cal-Am's *ex parte* concerns. The rulings enlarged and made more explicit the prohibition against *ex parte* contacts within the State Water Board as follows:

Cal-Am's motion may be understood as a request for clarification as to the role of the Board personnel who were copied on the email and of other personnel. Those persons are: Michael Lauffer, Andy Sawyer, Larry Lindsay, Les Grober, Vicky Whitney, Tom Howard, and Dorothy Rice. These persons and Chief Deputy Director Jonathan Bishop are not involved in the day-to-day work of this proceeding but as part of management will be kept advised of the work of this proceeding. Some of these persons also exercise authority over the work of members of the hearing team in this proceeding. As a matter of practice in this and other water right proceedings, the State Water Board applies the same *ex parte* rules to supervisors and managers who are substantially involved in an advisory function, either through their supervision on the work of the hearing team members in the proceeding or through advice to Board members in the proceeding, as apply to hearing team members. These supervisory and management personnel do not accept *ex parte* communications from the Prosecution Team or the parties.

(April 13, 2008, Rulings on Procedural Issues Involving Considerations of a Cease and Desist Order Against California American Water (Cal Am) for Unauthorized Diversion of Water from the Carmel River in Monterey County.)¹⁹

The separation of investigatory and prosecutorial and adjudicatory functions is facilitated by the manner in which the Division of Water Rights is organized. The Division is divided into three major sections: the Permitting Section, the Hearings and Special Programs Section and the Enforcement Section. The first point at which all three sections share common management is

¹⁸ In addition to the foregoing, the hearing notice included an attachment entitled "Information Concerning Appearance at the Water Rights Hearing." The attachment provided the following guidance re *ex parte* contacts:

7. *Ex Parte* Contacts: During the pendency of this proceeding, commencing no later than the issuance of the Notice of Hearing, there shall be no *ex parte* communications between either the State Water Board members or State Water Board hearing staff and any of the other participants, including the members of the prosecution team, regarding substantive issues with the scope of this proceeding. (Gov. Code, §§ 11430.10-11430.80.) Communications regarding non-controversial procedural matters are permissible and should be directed to the State Water Board staff attorney on the hearing team, not State Water Board members. (Gov. Code § 11430.20.) A document regarding *ex parte* communications entitled "*Ex Parte* Questions and Answers" is available upon request or from our website at: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/docs/exparte.pdf>.

¹⁹ This discussions goes on to state that the hearing notice will be updated to make clear the role of supervisors and managers in this proceeding. The May 13, 2008 rulings on procedural issues were sent to all of the parties, but no subsequent hearing notice was issued regarding the *ex parte* issue.

at the level of the Assistant Deputy Director for Water Rights (Assistant Deputy Director), Mr. Kassel's position. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol.1, pp. 222, 17 - 223, 25.)

9.1 Mr. Kassel's Involvement in this Proceeding has not Violated Cal-Am's Due Process Rights

Mr. Kassel issued the draft CDO to Cal-Am. As the Assistant Deputy Director, he has managerial responsibilities over all the functions within the Division of Water Rights, including the Hearings and Special Programs Section and the Enforcement Section. However, his role as a manager over the Hearings and Special Programs Section is circumscribed once a notice of proposed cease and desist order is issued. That is, he is prohibited by *ex parte* rules from communicating with the hearing staff, the Hearing Officers and all the State Water Board members in regard to this matter. (CAW-10, p. 3, ¶ 4.)

Mr. Kassel testified during this proceeding at the request of counsel for Cal-Am. In response to questions from Cal-Am's counsel, Mr. Kassel testified to the following: (1) he approved the issuance of the draft CDO; (2) the draft CDO was prepared under his direction and the direction of Mr. O'Hagan; (3) before sending the draft CDO to Mr. Turner at Cal-Am, he discussed the draft order with Mr. O'Hagan and his counsel; (4) in accordance with his delegation of authority from the State Water Board (the delegation requires him to inform his superiors of controversial issues), copies of the draft CDO were provided to his supervisor (Ms. Whitney) and her supervisor (Mr. Howard); (5) following issuance of the draft order, he discussed the order with a number of persons outside of the State Water Board and the State Water Board's public affairs officer; (6) since issuance of the draft CDO order, Mr. Kassel has not spoken to anyone employed by the State Water Board about this matter other than members of the Prosecution Team and Enforcement Section; (7) his supervisor, Ms. Whitney, is responsible for supervising the Hearings and Special Programs Section with regard to an enforcement proceeding; and, finally, (8) that only he is responsible for the management and supervision of the Enforcement Section with regard to an enforcement proceeding. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. 1, p. 216,13 – p. 231,25.)

Mr. Kassel's testimony shows that he and the management of the Division of Water Rights have separate duties and responsibilities with regard to the (a) adjudicative and (b) investigative, prosecutorial and advocacy function in enforcement proceedings and that the separated duties and responsibilities are consistent with the *ex parte* prohibitions set forth in the March 5, 2008 Notice of Hearing and with the separation of functions required by the due process requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act. (See Gov. Code, §§ 11425.10, subd. (a)(4), 11425.30.)

We conclude that Mr. Kassel's involvement in this matter has not violated Cal-Am's due process.

9.2 Ms. Mrowka's Involvement in this Proceeding has not Violated Cal-Am's Due Process Rights

Ms. Mrowka is a Senior State Water Board Engineer. She was a member of the hearing team that assisted the State Water Board when Order 95-10 was adopted in 1995. (PT-2, p.2, Order 95-10 and Decision 1632, ¶ 1.) Among other matters, Condition 13 of the Order 95-10 required Cal-Am to file quarterly compliance reports. Ms. Mrowka reviewed the reports and drafted correspondence to Cal-Am for the Division. (PT-2, p. 6, *Compliance With the Order.*) Cal-Am did not introduce testimony or other evidence nor does the record contain testimony or other evidence demonstrating that Ms. Mrowka's evaluations of Cal-Am's quarterly compliance reports were prepared as part of an investigation leading to the issuance of the draft CDO.

For some years, Ms. Mrowka has served within the Permitting Section of the Division of Water Rights. (PT-1; RT, Ph. 1, Vol. 1 p. 31, 21 – p. 32, 6.) No one in the Enforcement Section has any managerial or supervisory responsibility over the Permitting Section. (*Id.*, p. 23, 8-18.) Finally, no one within the Division of Water Rights consulted with Ms. Mrowka before issuance of the draft CDO. (*Id.*, p. 91, 24 – p. 92, 4.)

Ms. Mrowka's direct testimony consists of a series of statements summarizing: (1) her professional background; (2) a description of the Carmel River watershed; (3) the background and history leading up to Order 95-10; (4) the contents of Order 95-10 and changes to the order; (5) her views on the intent of Order 95-10, as amended; and (5) Cal-Am's compliance, or lack thereof, with the requirements of Order 95-10. With minor exceptions, her testimony is no more than a summary of information found in the State Water Board's public records. The staff of the Enforcement Office discussed the draft CDO with Ms. Mrowka only after she was asked if she would appear as a witness. (*Id.*, p. 94, 5-25.) Ms. Mrowka was asked to be a witness shortly before the Notices of Intent to appear were due, that is after the draft CDO was already issued.²⁰ (*Id.*, p. 95, 1-4.) Ms. Mrowka, did not discuss her testimony or opinions on the draft CDO with any member of the hearing team. (*Id.*, p. 23, 15-19.)

Prior to this proceeding, Ms. Mrowka: (1) had not previously met or worked with Hearing Officer Wolff or any other member of the State Water Board as part of a hearing team other than

²⁰ The March 5, 2008, Notice of Hearing required the Notices of Intent to be filed by March 14, 2008.

Hearing Officer Mr. Baggett; and (2) had not worked with Mr. Baggett as part of a hearing team since 2004. (*Id.*, p. 20, 23-25.)

Ms. Mrowka's testimony shows she did not participate in an investigation leading to the issuance of the draft CDO for this proceeding, nor has she participated in the advocacy or prosecution of this case other than as a witness. Further, she has not assisted the State Water Board in its adjudicative functions for four years. Accordingly, we conclude that Ms. Mrowka's participation as a witness in this proceeding has not violated the requirement that the State Water Board must separate its (a) adjudicatory function from its (b) investigative, prosecutorial and advocacy functions and that her involvement in this proceeding has not violated Cal-Am's due process.

9.3 Other Due Process Concerns

Cal-Am contends that its due process rights were violated when Cal-Am's compliance with Order 95-10 was discussed during a meeting with State Water Board staff and Mr. Turner, the President of Cal-Am, because both Ms. Mrowka and Mr. Taylor were present. (October 9, 2008, Closing Brief, p. 25, 14; RT, Ph. 1, Vol. 1, p. 92, 16 -19; RT, Ph. 1, Vol. 2, p. 455, 19 – p. 456, 23.) The meeting occurred on December 13, 2007, before the draft CDO was issued. (RT, Ph. 1, Vol. 1, p. 92, 16-19.) The draft CDO was issued on January 15, 2008. Cal-Am alleges that this meeting reflects an improper mixing of advisory and prosecutorial roles and the action should be dismissed. (October 9, 2008, Closing Brief, p. 25, 15-17.)

Cal-Am points to nothing in the transcripts or exhibits, nor have we found anything in the record, that shows that Mr. Taylor was involved in the investigation, prosecution or advocacy functions of this proceeding. Further, Cal-Am has not pointed to anything in the record showing that Ms. Mrowka was involved in the investigation leading up to the issuance of the draft CDO. Indeed, her testimony shows quite the opposite. Ms. Mrowka was not identified as a member of the Prosecution Team in the Notice of Hearing and only became involved in this proceeding when asked if she would testify as a witness. (See 9.2 above, Ms. Mrowka's Involvement in this Proceeding Does Not Violate Due Process, ¶ 3.) We conclude that Cal-Am's due process concerns with regard to Ms. Mrowka's and Mr. Taylor's participation in a meeting with Cal-Am are not supported by the record in this proceeding.

9.4 The State Water Board Complied with *Ex Parte* Prohibitions

In its April 23, 2008 Motion to Ensure Due Process, Cal-Am also made claims that certain communications among staff were *ex parte* communications and that the composition of the Prosecution Team creates an appearance of bias. These communications include:

(1) Mr. Kassel sending copies of the notice of proposed CDO sent to Cal-Am to Thomas Howard, State Water Board Chief Deputy Director, to Victoria Whitney, Deputy Director for Water Rights, and to Andy Sawyer, Assistant Chief Counsel; and (2) Mr. Larry Lindsay sending copies of an email sent to the parties to various members of State Water Board management. Cal-Am also contends that listing Mr. Kassel as a member of the Prosecution Team creates an appearance of bias. We find that our Hearing Officers' April 13, 2008 responses to these concerns are appropriate and, by reference, affirm and adopt those responses in this order. (April 13, 2008, Rulings on Procedural Issues Involving Considerations of a Cease and Desist Order Against California American Water (Cal-Am) for Unauthorized Diversion of Water from the Carmel River in Monterey County.)

9.5 Cal-Am's Request for Dismissal Denied

Cal-Am's request that this proceeding be dismissed for lack of due process is unsupported by either the law or the record in this proceeding. More specifically, the record demonstrates there has been no improper mixing of the: (a) adjudicatory and (b) investigatory, prosecutorial and advocacy functions of the State Water Board. We conclude that Cal-Am has been provided a fair hearing and that its request for dismissal should be denied.

10.0 ORDER WR 95-10 DOES NOT AUTHORIZE CAL-AM TO DIVERT WATER FROM THE RIVER IN EXCESS OF ITS WATER RIGHTS

The notice of proposed CDO alleged two bases for issuing a CDO: (1) violation of condition 2 of Order 95-10; and (2) unlawful diversion of water in violation of Water Code section 1052. (Draft CDO at p. 5, Staff Exhibit 7.) Cal-Am contends that a CDO may be issued only on the first basis, that is, for a violation of Order 95-10. Further, Cal-Am contends that Order 95-10 authorizes Cal-Am to divert water from the Carmel River (even though Cal-Am does not hold water rights for those diversions) and that a CDO may not be issued for a violation of Water Code section 1052.

Cal-Am contends that Order 95-10 required the imposition of a physical solution and authorized Cal-Am to continue its diversions from the river in exchange for the performance of mitigation measures. (April 23, 2008, CAW Opposition to Pre-Hearing Briefs, p. 5, 10 – 6, 15; Cal-Am's October 9, 2008 Closing Brief, B. The State Water Board Can Issue a CDO Against Cal-Am Only If The Board Finds Cal-Am is Threatening To Violate Or has Violated Condition 2 Of Order 95-10, p. 5, 13 - 7, 9.) Cal-Am states "Order 95-10 is a unique, interim physical solution, which provides CAW with a non-traditional authorization to extract water in excess of its water rights." (Oct. 9, 2008 Closing Brief, p.4, 22-p.5, 1.)

The concept of a physical solution is a judicial development following the adoption of article X, section 2 of California's Constitution in 1928. Article X, section 2 provides, in part:

The right to water or to the use of flow of water in or from a natural stream or water course in this state is and shall be limited to such water as shall be reasonably required for the beneficial use to be served, and such right does not and shall not extend to the waste or unreasonable method of use or unreasonable method of diversion of water.

The judiciary, and the State Water Board in appropriate circumstances, may impose a physical solution, providing a practical remedy that avoids waste or unreasonable use and is consistent with the water rights of the parties. (*City of Barstow v. Mojave Water Agency* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 1224, 1249.) This is an equitable remedy developed by the courts to comply with article X, section 2. (*Ibid.*) The doctrine is used to develop solutions that maximize the beneficial use that can be obtained from a limited supply of water among competing claimants who have valid water rights. (See [State Water Board Order WR 2004-0004](#) at p. 15.) The courts have never used the physical solution doctrine to authorize the diversion and use of water in the absence of a legal right to divert and use water. (See *People v. Shirokow* (1980) 26 Cal.3d 301, 309 ["The rights not subject to the statutory appropriation procedures are narrowly circumscribed . . . and include only riparian rights and [pre-1914 rights]."]; *id.* at pp. 308-309 [water right permitting requirements are in furtherance of article X, section 2 of the California Constitution; Wat. Code, § 1025 [same]; cf. *City of Barstow v. Mojave Water Agency* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 1224, 1243 [A physical solution must protect water right priorities to the extent those priorities do not lead to unreasonable use].)

The State Water Board has no power to authorize the diversion and use of water except in compliance with the Water Code. Section 1225 of the Water Code provides that "[n]o right to

appropriate or use water subject to appropriation shall be initiated or acquired except in compliance with the provisions of this division.” Persons seeking authorization to appropriate water must file an application with the State Water Board.²¹ (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 23, § 650.)

Even assuming that the State Water Board has the authority to authorize the appropriation of water as a physical solution – without following the statutory procedures for approving a new appropriation – nothing in Order 95-10 suggests that the State Water Board intended to do so.

Cal-Am cites language indicating that the State Water Board issued Order 95-10 instead of referring the matter to the Attorney General for enforcement, but that language merely indicates that the board was using its prosecutorial discretion, not that the board believed it was conferring a water right.

In conclusion, we find that the conditions in Order 95-10 requiring Cal-Am to mitigate the adverse effects of its unlawful diversions do not authorize Cal-Am to divert water from the river in excess of its water rights. Accordingly, the State Water Board may issue a CDO for the unauthorized diversion of water in violation of Water Code section 1052, even if the State Water Board concludes that Cal-Am is in compliance with Order 95-10.

11.0 ORDER 95-10 REQUIRES CAL-AM TO DILIGENTLY IMPLEMENT ACTIONS TO TERMINATE ITS UNLAWFUL DIVERSIONS

Condition 2 of Order 95-10 (p. 40.) states:

2. Cal-Am shall *diligently implement* one or more of the following *actions to terminate its unlawful diversions* from the Carmel River: (1) obtain appropriative right permits for water being unlawfully diverted from the Carmel River, (2) obtain water from other sources of supply and make one-for-one reductions in unlawful diversions from the Carmel River . . . and/or (3) contract with another agency having appropriative rights to divert and use water from the Carmel River. (Italics added.)

Notwithstanding the plain meaning of Condition 2, Cal-Am has taken the position that Condition 2 of Order 95-10 merely requires it to *pursue* actions to obtain supplemental water supplies.

(CAW-8, p.2, ¶1.) By the use of such semantics, Cal-Am seeks to convert the requirement to

²¹ Cal-Am has an application (A30215) to appropriate water from the Carmel River that might lead to a permit authorizing the diversions and use of water. In the absence of a final environmental impact report (EIR) prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.), the State Water Board may not act upon the application. The MPWMD is the lead agency and has not certified a final EIR. (CAW - 032, pp. 2, 7-25.)

implement actions to terminate its unlawful diversions into a requirement that it merely pursue such actions.

Order 95-10 determined Cal-Am's water rights, or lack thereof, and the effect its diversions were having on fish and wildlife. (Order 95-10, pp. 25-29.) The order found that Cal-Am was diverting substantial amounts of water in excess of its rights (*id.* at pp. 17-24) and that its diversions, legal and illegal, were having an adverse effect on fish, wildlife and riparian habitat in and along the river. (*Id.* at pp. 24-29.)

Having found that Cal-Am was diverting water in violation of Water Code section 1052, the State Water Board could have initiated an enforcement action. (Wat. Code, § 1052, subds. (b)-(d).) But the State Water Board found that there were circumstances militating against the use of its enforcement options. The order states in part:

In the short term, Cal-Am cannot significantly reduce its extraction from the wells along the Carmel River. As previously stated, most of Cal-Am's supply is obtained from wells along the river. The people and businesses of the Monterey Peninsula must continue to be served water from the Carmel River in order to protect public health and safety.

Cal-Am introduced exhibits during the hearing which show that during 1980 and 1981, on the basis of available information the [State Water Board] was not of the opinion that the water pumped by the wells would require a permit from the Board. Further, Cal-Am does not contend that the wells are not extracting water from the subterranean stream. Indeed, Cal-Am has filed an application to appropriate water with the [State Water Board].

Cal-Am also supports the New Los Padres Project proposed by the District as one means for providing a reliable and legal supply of water for its customers. Finally, Cal-Am has cooperated with the District, [Department of Fish and Game], and others to develop and implement measures to mitigate the effect of its diversions on the instream resources of the river.

Under circumstances such as these, the imposition of monetary penalties makes little sense. Rather, the [State Water Board's] primary concern should be the adoption of an order which, until a legal supply of water can be developed or obtained, will require that Cal-Am: (1) minimize its diversions from the Carmel river, (2) mitigate the environmental effects of its diversions, and (3) prepare a plan setting forth: (a) specific actions to develop or obtain a legal supply of water and (b) the dates specific actions will have occurred so that progress can be objectively monitored.

(Order 95-10 at pp. 37-38 [citations omitted].)

Finally, the order states:

5. The [State Water Board] can request the Attorney General to take action under Section 1052. Alternatively, the [State Water Board] *can suspend such a referral provided that Cal-Am takes appropriate actions* to: mitigate the effect of its diversions on the environment and develop and diligently pursue a plan for obtaining water from the Carmel River on other sources consistent with California water law. The [State Water Board's] primary concern should be the adoption of an order requiring Cal-Am to (1) prepare a plan setting forth (a) specific actions which will be taken to develop or obtain a legal supply of water and (b) the dates specific actions will have occurred so that progress on the plan can be objectively monitored; (2) minimize its diversions for [*sic*] the Carmel River; and (3) mitigate the environmental effects of its diversions.

(*Id.* at pp. 39-40 [*italics added*].)

Condition 1 of the order places a cap on Cal-Am's diversions from the river until unlawful diversions are ended. Condition 2 requires Cal-Am to diligently implement one or more actions to terminate its unlawful diversion. (*Id.* at p. 40.) Condition 3 requires Cal-Am to implement water conservation measures to reduce its diversions from the river. Condition 4 requires Cal-Am to maximize production from the Seaside aquifer to reduce its diversions from the river. (*Id.* at pp. 40-41.) Conditions 5 through 10 are measures aimed at mitigating the adverse environmental effects of Cal-Am's diversions. (*Id.* at pp. 41-43.)

When the order is viewed in its entirety, we conclude that Condition 2 requires that Cal-Am diligently implement actions to terminate its unlawful diversions. We also conclude that Cal-Am's failure to comply with Condition 2 is adequate reason for the State Water Board to conclude that its suspension of an enforcement action for violations of section 1052 of the Water Code is no longer appropriate.

12.0 THE STATE WATER BOARD IS NOT ESTOPPED FROM ISSUING A CEASE AND DESIST ORDER

Cal-Am contends that the State Water Board is equitably estopped from issuing a cease and desist order pursuant to Water Code section 1052 and that "[t]he Board must allow CAW to continue to extract in excess of its water rights." The contention is based on the *City of Long*

Beach v. Mansell (1970) 3 Cal.3d 462, 487-501. Four elements must be present in order to apply equitable estoppel:²²

- 1) the party to be estopped must be appraised of the facts;
- 2) the party to be estopped must intend that his conduct shall be acted upon, or must so act that the party asserting the estoppel had a right to believe it was so intended;
- 3) the party asserting estoppel must be ignorant of the true state of facts; and
- 4) the party asserting estoppel must rely upon the conduct to his or her injury.

Cal-Am's contention founders on the second, third and fourth elements necessary to prove estoppel. Order 95-10 requires Cal-Am to diligently implement actions to terminate its unlawful diversions. As discussed in the Section 10.0, Order 95-10 does not authorize Cal-Am's unauthorized diversions, and the State Water Board never intended Order 95-10 to be interpreted that way. Cal-Am has been on continuous notice that its unlawful diversions are viewed as a violation of Water Code section 1052 and subject to enforcement since the adoption of Order 95-10.

Cal-Am contends that until it received the notice of proposed CDO that initiated these proceedings, it had not received any communication from the State Water Board indicating that Cal-Am might be in violation of the law. This contention is inconsistent with Order 95-10, which found that Cal-Am was illegally diverting from the Carmel River. However, even if it were true, it would not provide a basis for estoppel. Even where an agency has not taken an enforcement action for over a period of many years, it is not reasonable to assume the law will never be enforced. (*Feduniak v. California Coastal Com'n* (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1346, 1369.)

Moreover, the State Water Board made clear in subsequent communications, not just in Order 95-10, that Cal-Am was in violation of Water Code section 1052. In 1997 and 1998 the State Water Board issued an ACL to Cal-Am for failing to comply with Condition 3(b) of Order 95-10. An ACL may be issued for violations of Water Code Section 1052. Both ACL's allege that Cal-Am is in violation of section 1052 and find that such violations are occurring. (PT-4, ¶¶ 1, 3-6; PT- 5, ¶¶ 1, 3-6). The ACL's were issued because Cal-Am failed to implement the conservation measures required by condition 3(b). In addition, on June 5, 1998, the Chief, Division of Water Rights, advised MPWMD that Order 95-10 ". . . is only an interim measure to provide some relief during development of a water supply project and does not provide a basis

²² *Lents v. McMahon* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 393, 399. Estoppel may be asserted against the government where justice and right require it, but will not be applied against the government if to do so would effectively nullify a strong rule of policy, adopted for the benefit of the public. (*Ibid.*)

of right for continued diversion of water.” (PT-6, p.3.) Mr. Larry Foy of Cal-Am was sent a copy of the letter. Thus, Cal-Am has been and is on notice that the State Water Board could take action under Water Code section 1052 if it was dissatisfied with Cal-Am’s progress in complying with Order 95-10.

Thus, the second and third elements for estoppel clearly have not been established. The State Water Board clearly did not intend for Cal-Am to believe its diversions were legal, and Cal-Am knew its diversions were illegal. The fourth element, detrimental reliance, has not been established, either. Cal-Am introduced evidence that it has invested in the planning of long-term water supply projects, but offers no explanation as to how it has been harmed by that investment.

Even if the four elements for estoppel have been established, estoppel will not be applied to a public agency if a strong public policy will be violated. (*Phelps v. State Water Resources Control Board* (2007), 157 Cal.App. 4th 89, 114.) In particular “[p]ublic policy must be considered where a party raises estoppel to prevent enforcement of environmental statutes.” (*Ibid.*) In providing authority for the State Water Board to issue CDOs, the Legislature has declared, “that the state should take vigorous action to . . . prevent the unlawful diversion of water.” (Wat. Code, § 1825.) Preventing the State Water Board from issuing a CDO would be inconsistent with this policy. This principle applies with particular force under the circumstances presented here, where Cal-Am’s claim of estoppel is based on a State Water Board decision to forego enforcement in reliance on an order intended to eliminate Cal-Am’s unlawful diversions, but those unlawful diversions have not been eliminated over a decade later.

The proposed CDO does not seek to punish Cal-Am for failure to diligently implement actions to terminate its unlawful diversions. Rather the proposed CDO seeks to bring Cal-Am into compliance by compelling Cal-Am to annually reduce the unauthorized diversions by specified amounts starting in water year 2008 and continuing through water year 2014. (CAW- 7.)

If the State Water Board cannot compel Cal-Am to reduce its unlawful diversions, Cal-Am will have obtained a de facto right to divert the water from the river in violation of the statutory requirements for obtaining appropriate water rights, a result contrary to law and public policy. As this State Water Board explained in Order WR 2004-0004:

[A]fter the enactment of the 1913 Water Commission Act, a water user cannot establish a new water right simply by using water; the water user either must have an existing water right under some theory or must acquire an appropriative right by complying with Division 2 of the Water Code. The exclusive means of obtaining an appropriative right to divert and use water from a surface stream is by complying with the provisions of Division 2 of the Water Code. (Wat. Code, § 1225.) Equitable estoppel is not available. The [State Water Board] cannot give the respondents, through equitable estoppel, a water right that it could not give them in the absence of following the statutorily prescribed procedures. (*American Federation of Labor v. Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1017, 1039 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 109,122].)

Also, the California Supreme Court has made it clear that a water user cannot prescriptively acquire a water right against the state. (*People v. Shirokow* (1980) 26 Cal.3d 301 [162 Cal.Rptr. 30].) Based on the *Shirokow* decision, a water user cannot obtain equitable relief such as estoppel against the [State Water Board]'s enforcing the requirement that water users must obtain appropriative water rights under the Water Code if they do not have other water rights.

(*Id.* at p. 14.)

13.0 RES JUDICATA AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ARE NOT A BAR TO ISSUING A CEASE AND DESIST ORDER

Cal-Am contends that the doctrines of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel preclude consideration of the same claims and issues raised by the draft CDO as were decided by Order 95-10.²³ (Oct 9, CAW Closing Brief, 3. The Law Bars a Finding by the State Water Board that CAW has Committed a Trespass if it Complies With Order 95-10, pp 7-10.) *Res judicata* is a doctrine providing that when there is a final judgment on the merits of an issue, the same parties may not relitigate the same issue, giving the former judgment conclusive effect in subsequent litigation. (*People v. Barragan* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 236, 252.)²⁴ In its primary aspect, known as claim preclusion, it operates to bar a second suit between the same parties on the same cause of action. (*Ibid.*) In its secondary aspect, known as collateral estoppel, the prior judgment operates in a second suit as a conclusive determination as to issues in the second suit that were actually litigated and determined in the first suit. (*Ibid.*) The elements for applying the doctrine are: (1) a claim or issue raised in the present action is identical to a claim or issue

²³ MPWMD and the Seaside Basin Watermaster (SBW) make the same contention. (Oct. 9, 2008 Brief, p. 2, 18 - p. 4, 7.)

²⁴ The doctrine of collateral estoppel has been applied to the decisions of administrative agencies. (*People v. Sims* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 468; see also *Pacific Lumber Co. v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (2006) 37 Cal.4th 921, 944.)

litigated in a prior proceeding; (2) the prior proceeding resulted in a final judgment on the merits; and (3) the party against whom the doctrine is being asserted was a party or in privity with a party to the prior proceeding. (*Ibid.*) The doctrine will not be applied if injustice would result or if the public interest requires that the new action not be foreclosed. (*Citizens for Open Access to Sand and Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Ass'n* (1998) 60 Cal.App. 4th 1053, 1065; 71 Cal.Rptr. 2d 77.)

Cal-Am contends, correctly, that Order 95-10: (1) determined Cal-Am's rights to the use of water from the Carmel River; and (2) identified the effects of Cal-Am's diversions from the river on fish and wildlife along the lower 18.5 miles of the stream in 1995. (See sections 5.2 and 5.3 of this order.) Cal-Am also contends, correctly, that some of the parties to the first proceeding are also parties to this proceeding. Those parties include Cal-Am, MPWMD, the Pebble Beach Company (PBC), Sierra Club, Carmel River Steelhead Association (CRSA), and the California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (CSPA). While some of the issues presented in this case are identical to those adjudicated in Order 95-10, some of the issues clearly are not identical.

For example, the issues are identical, and findings in Order 95-10 are binding on Cal-Am and other parties to Order 95-10, insofar as the extent of Cal-Am's rights for water diversion and use from the Carmel River are concerned, except where Cal-Am obtained water rights through the State Water Board's issuance of a water right permit after Order 95-10 was issued. On the other hand, issues concerning the appropriate remedy for violations that are occurring or threatening to occur at the time of these proceedings are not necessarily identical to issues concerning the appropriate remedy for violations occurring when Order 95-10 was issued over a decade ago.

In particular, there is no basis for Cal-Am's claim that principles of *res judicata* or collateral estoppel preclude the issuance of a CDO for the unauthorized diversion or use of water in violation of section 1052 of the Water Code. That issue was not considered or decided in Order 95-10. At the time Order 95-10 was issued, the State Water Board did not have authority to issue a CDO for the unauthorized diversion or use of water. (See Stats. 2002, ch. 652, § 6 [amending Wat. Code, § 1831 to authorize issuance of a CDO for the unauthorized diversion or use of water or for violation of a State Water Board order]. See also Stats. 1980, ch. 933, § 13, p. 2968 [under the prior version of Wat. Code, § 1831, a CDO could be issued only for violation of a term or condition of a water right permit or license].) Obviously, the issue of whether a CDO may be issued under current law, based on violations that are occurring or are threatened

currently, presents a different issue from the issue whether a CDO could have been issued in 1995 based on violations then occurring and the law then in effect.

Cal-Am also contends that because its illegal diversions have continued unabated since the adoption of Order 95-10, no new evidence should be allowed as to the effects of its diversions from the river. Prior to the presentation of evidence on May 13, 2008, the Hearing Officers ruled that evidence as to the effects of Cal-Am diversions on the public trust resources would be considered within the context of this enforcement proceeding. Such evidence may be relevant to the State Water Board's consideration of what remedy may be most appropriate in this proceeding:

For example, the extent of harm to the public trust may be relevant to determining how long the schedule should be for achieving compliance. A cease and desist order may also include measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on public trust uses during a period of continuing violations before full compliance is achieved. Where the parties propose different remedies, public trust impacts will also be relevant to the . . . choice of remedies.

(May 13, 2008, Ruling On Procedural Issues at p. 4.)

This issue of how impacts on public trust resources should affect the remedy adopted in a CDO is somewhat different from the issue presented in Order 95-10. If Cal-Am's unauthorized diversions are continuing for a longer period than was anticipated in 1995 or those diversions are claimed to have impacts that differ from what those impacts were understood to be in 1995, those are relevant issues for the State Water Board's consideration.

Finally, the following events have occurred since the adoption of Order 95-10, on July 6, 1995:

- 1) The New Los Padres Project was not constructed. Order 95-10 was predicated, in part, upon the anticipated construction of the New Los Padres Project by MPWMD and Cal-Am's ability to use the water developed by that project to substitute a legal supply of water for its illegal diversions. (See Decision 1632, Cond. 11; Order 95-10, Cond. 2 (3).)
- 2) California Central Coast Steelhead has been determined to be a threatened species under the federal rare and endangered species act.
- 3) The Carmel River has been designated as habitat critical to the survival of the steelhead.
- 4) Cal-Am has made no meaningful progress in implementing actions to reduce its unlawful diversions from the Carmel River for 13 years. (See section 14.1 of this order.)

Because a CDO looks forward -- establishing appropriate terms to obtain compliance and to avoid or reduce impacts of threatened or continuing violations, as opposed to imposing penalties for past violations -- the State Water Board can and should consider this kind of evidence. The State Water Board is not limited to the facts as determined in Order 95-10. (See also Wat. Code, § 1832 [After notice and an opportunity for a hearing, the State Water Board may modify a CDO].)

We conclude that the doctrines of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel are not a bar to the Prosecution Team and other parties introducing evidence as to (1) whether a CDO should be issued, and (2) what modifications, if any, should be made to the remedies proposed in the draft CDO.

14.0 CAL-AM IS COMMITTING VIOLATIONS FOR WHICH A CEASE AND DESIST ORDER MAY BE ISSUED

14.1 Cal-Am has not Complied with Condition 2 of Order 95-10, and is Violating the Prohibition in Section 1052 of the Water Code Against the Unauthorized Diversion or Use of Water

As discussed above, the draft CDO alleges two bases for issuing a CDO: (1) Cal-Am is violating Condition 2 of Order 95-10, which requires Cal-Am to diligently implement actions to terminate its unlawful diversions; and (2) Cal-Am is unlawfully diverting water in violation of Water Code section 1052.

The Prosecution Team's case-in-chief that Cal-Am has not complied with Condition 2 may be summarized as follows:

- 1) Cal-Am has the legal right to divert only 3,376 afa from the Carmel River.
- 2) Cal-Am has annually diverted an average of 10,978 afa from the river since Order 95-10 was adopted. (PT Exb. 11A; RT, Ph. 1, Vol. 1, p. 40, 12-14.)
- 3) Cal-Am has diverted an average of 7,632 afa without a basis of right for the past 13 years.²⁵ (Id., p. 41, 12-14.)
- 4) Thus, Cal-Am has not diligently implemented actions to terminate its unlawful diversions as required by under Condition 2.

The Prosecution Team presented evidence sufficient to support all four contentions. Further, Cal-Am offered no evidence to rebut the first three contentions made by the Prosecution Team.

²⁵ Between 1995 and 2007 Cal-Am's unlawful diversions ranged between 9,471 afa and 7,007 afa. Water year 1998/1999 was the year in which unlawful diversions were lowest. (PT Exb. 11A, John Collins written testimony, Table 1.)

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Cal-Am contends that it is in compliance with Condition 2 and that if Cal-Am is in compliance with Condition 2, the State Water Board is precluded from issuing a CDO based on Cal-Am's violation of section 1052 of the Water Code.

Cal-Am advanced the following propositions in support of its contention that the State Water Board is precluded from issuing a CDO if Cal-Am is in compliance with condition 2 of Order 95.10:

- 1) Order 95-10 is an interim physical solution that authorizes Cal-Am to extract water in excess of that permitted under its water rights. (CAW Oct. 9, 2008, Closing Brief, pp. 4-6.)
- 2) Equitable estoppel precludes the issuance of a CDO. (CAW Oct. 9, 2008, Closing Brief, p. 15, 10 – p.17, 5.)
- 3) The doctrines of collateral estoppel and *res judicata* bar a finding by the State Water Board that Cal-Am has committed a trespass if Cal-Am has complied with Order 95-10. (CAW Oct. 9, 2008, Closing Brief, p. 7, 10 – p.10, 9.)

Each of these contentions is addressed and rejected earlier in this order. Thus, Cal-Am is in violation of the prohibition in section 1052 of the Water Code against the unauthorized diversion or use of water, which would establish adequate grounds for issuance of a CDO even if no violation of Order 95-10 had been proven.

We also conclude, as explained in section 14.2, below, that Cal-Am has not complied with Condition 2 of Order 95-10 requiring that Cal-Am diligently implement actions to terminate its unlawful diversions.²⁶ Violation of Condition 2 of Order 95-10 provides a second basis for issuing a CDO.

14.2 Efforts by Cal-Am to Comply with Condition 2 of Order 95-10

Cal-Am presented evidence that it has made efforts to comply with the requirements of Condition 2. Initially, Cal-Am looked to MPWMD to construct the New Los Padres Project approved by the State Water Board in Decision 1632 for a legal source of water. Before proceeding with the project, however, MPWMD sought to obtain public approval of the New Los Padres Project and authorization to fund the project. In late 1995, the project approval vote failed. (CAW-029, p.2, 21-25.)

²⁶ Cal-Am contends that Condition 2 of Order 95-10 does not require Cal-Am to reduce its unlawful diversions, so long as Cal-Am maintains an effort to acquire alternative water supplies. (CAW Oct 9, 2008 Closing Brief, pp. 10-12.) This argument is addressed and rejected in Section 11.0 above.

In 1996, Cal-Am began pursuing the Carmel River Dam and Reservoir Project. This project has not proceeded for a number of reasons, including but not limited to the following. First, in 1996 the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) listed the California Red-legged Frog as a threatened species and in 1997 NMFS listed the steelhead population as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Second, on August 6, 1998, the PUC required that Cal-Am prepare a long term contingency plan describing how the company would obtain a supply of water if the new dam project did not go forward. Third, in 1998 Assembly Bill 1182 was enacted. (Stats. 1988, ch. 797.) The bill requires the PUC, as opposed to Cal-Am, to study all available alternatives to the proposed Carmel River Dam and prepare a long-term contingency plan. (CAW-032, p. 2, 26 - p. 3, 2.) The PUC's planning process involved a four-step process culminating in Plan B in 2002. (CAW-032, p. 3, 7 - p. 4, 11.) In Plan B, the principal alternative to the Carmel River Dam Project is the Coastal Water Project, a proposed 10,370 acre-feet (af) desalinization project.²⁷ (CAW-029, p. 3, 1-3.) On February 11, 2003, Cal-Am requested the PUC to replace the proposed dam project with the Coastal Water Project. (CAW-032, p. 5, 25-27.) During the hearing, the PUC was preparing an EIR for the Coastal Water Project. On January 30, 2009, the PUC gave notice that a draft EIR was available for public comment for the Coastal Water Project. Project approval awaits a PUC decision on a final EIR and on the Coastal Water Project.

While pursuing the Coastal Water Project, Cal-Am has evaluated, to some degree, smaller project alternatives for obtaining a legal water supply including: (1) the evaluation of 3 million gallons per day (MGD) and 7 MGD desalinization plants; (2) additional groundwater production from the Paralta well in the Seaside groundwater basin (the inland area of the Seaside groundwater basin); (3) injection of treated wastewater at the mouth of the Carmel River and deep bedrock sources; (4) dredging the San Clemente and Los Padres Reservoirs; (5) importing water from the Arroyo Seco, Lower Salinas and Big (or Little) Sur Rivers; (6) purchasing water from the State Water Project and from local Carmel Valley holders of water rights; and (7) surface impoundments in the Seaside/Fort Ord area and Laguna Seca. (CAW-029, p. 4, 13-23.)

²⁷ CAW contributed substantial resources to the study of project alternatives required by the PUC (CAW-032, p. 5, 23-25; CAW-032C, p. 3, 2 - p. 6, 19; CAW-032D p. 3, 26 – p. 10, 18.) Subject to PUC approval, CAW can recover the cost for studying project alternatives.

Beyond mere evaluation, Cal-Am has gone forward on several projects, including: (1) gathering information for seeking approval of Cal-Am's water right Application 30215A, an application to appropriate up to 2,964 afa from the Carmel River; (2) negotiations seeking to obtain a temporary water supply from (a) the Margaret Eastwood Trust and Clint Eastwood from the Odello well fields and (b) water rights associated with the Rancho Cañada Golf Course; (3) a negotiated agreement to temporarily obtain water surplus to the needs of Sand City from the desalinization plant being built by the city; and (4) implementation of Phase I of the Aquifer Storage and Recovery project (ASR). (CAW-029, p. 3, 17- p. 4, 5; p. 4, 24 - p. 5,17.) Cal-Am's failure to complete negotiations to obtain a temporary water supply from the Eastwood Trust, Odello well fields and from the Rancho Cañada Golf Course is not explained.

On November 30, 2007, both MPWMD and Cal-Am jointly obtained an additional right to water from the river, Permit 20808A. This permit is a spin-off from the permit authorized in Decision 1632 in 1995 for MPWMD for the development of the New Los Padres. Permit 20808A authorizes the diversion of up to 2,426 afa of water from the Carmel River to underground storage in the Seaside groundwater basin from December 1 of each year to May 31 of the succeeding year at a maximum instantaneous rate of diversion of 6.7 cfs. The project is commonly identified as the Phase I ASR project. Thus, Cal-Am's current legal rights to water in the river that may be used to supply peninsula cities is the 3,316 afa recognized in Order 95-10²⁸ plus 2,426 afa under Permit 20808A, for a total of 5,742 afa. As will be discussed *infra*, the actual amount of additional water supply that may be generated by this project is uncertain, and certainly much less than the face value of the permit.

We are fully cognizant of the complex legal and institutional framework within which Cal-Am must operate to develop or obtain additional supplies of water. However, we find that nearly 14 years after the adoption of Condition 2 in Order 95-10, Cal-Am has implemented astonishingly few actions to reduce its unlawful diversions from the river. Most of Cal-Am's efforts toward obtaining additional water supplies have been directed toward large projects that could provide enough water both to offset its illegal diversions and to provide water for growth in its service area. We understand why such projects are desirable from the viewpoint of a utility, its customers and the PUC. Nevertheless, Cal-Am's only achievements toward reducing its illegal diversions have been the work done on two projects yielding small amounts of water. Significantly, these projects are in place largely due to the efforts made by other agencies, i.e.,

²⁸ 851 afa is subtracted from this number to adjust for storage loss due to siltation at Los Padres Reservoir.

MPWMD and the City of Sand City. But for the efforts of these agencies, Cal-Am would not have made any reductions in its illegal diversions from the river during the past 14 years, except conservation savings compelled by the ACLs issued by the State Water Board in 1997 and 1998. We conclude that Cal-Am should have made and should make greater efforts toward implementing smaller projects, and that Cal-Am should make such efforts irrespective of whether the PUC approves the Coastal Water Project or one of its alternatives.

Condition 2 of Order 95-10 requires Cal-Am to diligently implement measures to terminate its unlawful diversions, and not merely to evaluate, propose, or otherwise pursue lawful alternatives. While Order 95-10 requires Cal-Am to implement these measures diligently, not instantaneously, it has taken far too long, and the reductions in Cal-Am's unlawful diversions to date have been too small to satisfy the requirement for diligence. In reaching this conclusion, we are mindful that (a) the steelhead are threatened, (b) miles of the steelhead's critical habitat, the river, are dry five to six months of the year and (c) the manager of MPWMD estimates that the earliest that Cal-Am will be able to eliminate its illegal pumping from the river with deliveries from the proposed Coastal Water Project is 2016; 21 years after the adoption of Order 95-10. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. IV, p. 953, 7 – p. 954, 23.)

15.0 CAL-AM'S DIVERSIONS CONTINUE TO HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON FISH, WILDLIFE AND RIPARIAN HABITAT OF THE CARMEL RIVER, INCLUDING THE THREATENED STEELHEAD

Order 95-10 found that fish and wildlife were being adversely affected by Cal-Am's legal and illegal diversions. (Order 95-10, pp. 25-29.) The order states:

Cal-Am's diversions, standing alone, are not the sole cause of current conditions in the Carmel River. Other causes include the diversion and use of water by other persons and, significantly, a series of dry and critically dry years during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Nevertheless, Cal-Am's combined diversions from the Carmel River constitute the largest single impact to instream beneficial uses of the river.

(Order 95-10, p. 25.)

Cal-Am is responsible for approximately 85 percent of the total water diversions from the Carmel River and its associated subterranean flow. (PT- 45, p. 1, ¶ 2.)

Wells supply about 69 percent of the water needs of Cal-Am's customers. The balance of the water supplied to Cal-Am customers is supplied from: (1) San Clemente Dam and Los Padres reservoirs in the upper reaches of the Carmel River and (2) pumped groundwater in the City of Seaside.

(Order 95-10, p. 2.)

Order 95-10 concludes

[t]o summarize, Cal-Am diversions have historically had an adverse effect on: (1) the riparian corridor along the river below RM 18.5, (2) wildlife that depend on riparian habitat, and (3) steelhead and other fish which inhabit the river.

(*Id.* at p. 28.)

A fisheries biologist for the National Marine Fisheries Service, Ms. Joyce Ambrosius, testified during the hearing that Cal-Am's diversions result in a number of adverse impacts to steelhead. (RT. Ph. 1, Vol. 1, p. 45, 18-21.) As a result of direct diversions of water by Cal-Am and others, the Carmel River usually goes dry downstream from the Narrows (River Mile 9.5) by July of each year. From July until the winter rains begin, the only water remaining in the lower river is in isolated pools that gradually dry up as the groundwater table declines in response to pumping. Surface flow into the Carmel River Lagoon normally recedes after the rainy season in late spring and ceases in summer as rates of water extraction from the river and alluvial aquifer exceed the flow in the river. (PT-39, p. 4.) This results in the loss of river habitat and food production needed by juvenile steelhead. Steelhead are stranded in pools, and predation increases. (RT. Ph. 1, Vol. 1, p. 65.) Competition for food increases in the areas of the river that remain wetted. (*Id.*, p. 44.) Cal-Am's illegal diversions also reduce the flow to the lagoon, which is very important to ocean survival of steelhead smolts. (*Id.*, p. 44; CRSA-3, p. 7. See also PT-39, p. 4; PT-45, p. 3, ¶ 2 and p. 7, last ¶ - p. 7, ¶ 1.)

Riparian vegetation along the Carmel River has died off due to Cal-Am's diversions, and this has caused bank erosion. To fix the bank erosion, many property owners have installed riprap to protect their property. Riprap is destructive to stream habitat because it decreases the amount of riparian vegetation allowed to grow on the bank. The erosion also increases sedimentation in the river that adversely impacts the fish, and there is a decrease in the availability of large woody debris to the river.²⁹ (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. 1, p. 45, 1-11; CRSA-3, p. 5.)

²⁹ Although not directly stated in the testimony, sedimentation is a problem because it (1) cements the gravel needed for spawning habitat and (2) settles and blankets bottom-dwelling organisms that are part of the food chain. Large woody debris is important because it provides cover for fish and reduces predation.

Since the adoption of Order 95-10, a number of regulations have been enacted for the protection of the South-Central California Coast (SCCC) steelhead Distinct Population Segment (DPS) (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). These regulations include:

- 1) The August 18, 1997 listing of the steelhead population within the California Central Coast as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). (62 Fed.Reg. 43937.)
- 2) The January 5, 2006 listing reaffirming the threatened status of the steelhead population within the California Central Coast under the Endangered Species Act. (71 Fed.Reg. 834, 859.)
- 3) The September 2, 2005 listing of the Carmel River as critical habitat for the steelhead. (70 Fed.Reg. 52488.)

We find that Cal-Am's illegal diversions continue to have an adverse impact on fish, wildlife and the riparian habitat of the Carmel River. The regulations listing the SCCC steelhead as a threatened species and the Carmel River as critical habitat for the steelhead underscore the importance of reducing and terminating Cal-Am's illegal diversions from the Carmel River at the earliest possible date and of adopting conditions to mitigate the effect of the diversions.

16.0 PROJECTS AND ACTIONS THAT MAY AFFECT CAL-AM'S NEED TO DIVERT WATER FROM THE CARMEL RIVER

The following sections discuss projects and actions that may affect Cal-Am's need to divert water from the Carmel River.

16.1 Adjudication of the Seaside Groundwater Basin

Cal-Am produces water from the Seaside groundwater basin to serve customers in its main system. (MPWMD HS-13; RT, Ph. 2, Vol. V, p. 1324, 20 – p. 1325, 8.) Cal-Am gets approximately 25 percent of its supply from the Seaside basin. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. III, p. 753, 11-12.) Currently, Cal-Am may extract up to 3,504 afa from the basin. However, the basin has been adjudicated.³⁰ (MPWMD-HS13, RT, Ph. 2, Vol. III, p. 754, 13-16.) The judgment ordered mandatory reductions of the operating yield by 10 percent triennially beginning in 2009 until the operating yield equals the natural safe yield. (SBW-1, p. 2, 17-21.) Each triennial reduction will be implemented unless: (1) the basin is replenished from new water sources or (2) the level of

³⁰ A judgment has been entered in the Monterey Superior Court case, *California American Water Company v. City of Seaside et al*, Monterey Superior Court, Case No. M66343, dated March 27, 2006. The judgment adjudicated and limited rights to produce groundwater from the Seaside Groundwater Basin and implemented a physical solution for the management and protection of the basin. (SBW-2, ¶ 2.)

the groundwater is sufficient to prevent seawater intrusion. (*Id.*) The watermaster appointed pursuant to the judgment in the adjudication anticipates that the 10 percent reduction will be ordered every three years, and that this will result in a 417 af reduction in the water available to Cal-Am in 2009, and eventually a reduction of 2,010 afa by 2021. (SBW-1, p. 3, 4-9.) The 417 afa reduction represents about a 2.8 percent reduction in the supply of water available to Cal-Am and its customers.³¹ We find that the adjudication will decrease the supply of water available to Cal-Am for its customers. Nevertheless, we conclude that Cal-Am should be prohibited from increasing its diversions from the river to offset the loss in production from the groundwater basin. Water to offset the loss of groundwater production may be found by aggressively implementing: (1) the retrofit program; (2) the program to reduce the use of potable water for outdoor irrigation; and (3) the main replacement program and demand management by programs such as MPWMD's Regulation XV, prohibiting waste and non-essential water use. (MPWMD-SP3.) Such efforts may offset the loss of groundwater production over a period of years.

16.2 Aquifer Storage and Recovery Project

Cal-Am and MPWMD have developed a small supplemental supply of water by diverting water from the river during periods of high flow for storage in the Seaside groundwater basin. Water diverted during periods of high flow is piped to the basin and injected via wells into the groundwater. Water stored in the basin can be subsequently recovered for use. Permit 20808A authorizes the diversion of up to 2,426 afa of water from the river to underground storage in the basin from December 1 of each year to May 31 of the succeeding year at a maximum instantaneous rate of diversion of 6.7 cfs. The average annual quantity of water that may be obtained by the operation of the ASR project is estimated to be 920 af. A witness for MPWMD estimated that 400 af per year will become available in 2009, with the remaining 520 af available in 2010. (MPWMD-HS14B; RT, Ph. 2, Vol. III, p. 814, 11-22, p. 822, 23 – p. 830,10.)

Cal-Am and MPWMD may only divert water from the river when minimum flow requirements in the river are being met. Depending upon the water year type, the quantity that may be diverted to storage can range from zero up to 2,426 af. When no carry-over storage is available from the

³¹ Between 1996 and 2007 Cal-Am diverted approximately 10,967 afa from the Carmel River. (MPWMD- Exhibit DF2.) This includes the legal and illegal diversions occurring within the limit set on diversions by Conditions 1 and 2 of Order 95-10. During 2008 Cal-Am could produce up to 3,504 afa from the Seaside basin. (MPWMD- Exhibit DF5, slide 7, Status of Cal-Am's Compliance with Seaside Basin Adjudication in WY 2008.) These combined sources provide a supply of 14,471 afa to Cal-Am.

previous year and no water may be diverted from the river in the current year, no water will be available from ASR operations. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. III, p. 816, 16 -21.)

Permit 20808A is derived from and based upon Permit 20808 issued to MPWMD for the construction of the New Los Padres Dam. Permit 20808 was authorized by Decision 1632. Condition 11 of the decision provides: "Permittee shall not divert water under this permit unless and until California American Water Company (Cal-Am) has obtained an alternate supply of water for its illegal diversions from the Carmel River." Accordingly, any new water supply derived from Permits 20808 and 20808A must first be applied to reduce Cal-Am's illegal diversions from the river. We conclude that water developed by the ASR project should be used to reduce illegal diversions from the river. Although the operation of the ASR project under Permit 20808A is outside the scope of this proceeding, the water diverted illegally from the river by Cal-Am is within the scope of the proceeding. Accordingly, we conclude that Cal-Am's illegal diversions from the river should be reduced to the extent that water is available from the ASR project to supply Cal-Am customers.

16.3 Sand City Desalinization Project will Reduce Cal-Am's Diversions from the Carmel River

The City of Sand City is constructing a 300 afa desalinization plant. The plant was scheduled to deliver water to Cal-Am in the first quarter of 2009. (Sand City-1, p. 1, 20-23.) Of the 300 afa, 94 afa will be used to replace water being diverted from the Carmel River by Cal-Am for existing water use within Sand City; thus, once the plant becomes operational the city should no longer receive water illegally diverted from the Carmel River. The balance of the plant's production, 206 afa, is for future growth. Pending the need for the remaining 206 afa, Cal-Am may use the water to meet the needs of its customers. (Sand City 1, p. 3, 16-21.) Thus, using the production from the Sand City desalinization plant, Cal-Am can permanently reduce diversions from the river by 94 afa and, temporarily, by another 206 afa. Assuming the desalinization plant is operated at a constant rate and no production is used for future growth, the plant could reduce diversions from the river by about 0.8 af per day, or about 0.4 cfs.

16.4 Reduction of System Losses

Unaccounted loss is defined as the difference between metered production and metered consumption. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. IV, pp. 1004-1005.) As a general statement, all large water supply systems have losses between the point where water is diverted and the point where

water is delivered for use; such losses may be referred to as real losses. Cal-Am is no exception. The industry standard for unaccounted losses is 10 percent of total annual production. Cal-Am's losses are about 12 percent. (RT, Ph., 2, Vol. III, p. 746, 4 - 9.)

MPWMD has adopted a regulation requiring Cal-Am to reduce its losses to 7 percent. (MPWMD-SP3, p.1, Rule 160, G.) The prosecution team estimates that 549 afa could be saved if Cal-Am reduced its system losses from 12 percent to 7 percent. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. 1, p. 53, 24 - p. 54, 4; PT-49, p. 2.) Some unknown fraction of Cal-Am's losses may be due to faulty meter readings. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. III, p. 811, 1 - p. 812, 1.) The General Manager of MPWMD is of the opinion that water supply mains must be replaced to reduce Cal-Am's real system losses. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. III, p. 811, 21 – p. 812, 1.) Cal-Am proposes to undertake a 10 to 12 year program to replace its larger mains. However, Cal-Am is seeking PUC approval before commencing work on its main replacement program. (*Id.*, p. 812, 2-7; *id.*, p. 812, 9-17.) No evidence was introduced to substantiate that 10 or more years would be required to reduce system losses to an acceptable level.

Given the chronic shortage of water available for supply within Cal-Am's service area, evidenced by the nearly 14 years of ongoing illegal diversions from the river, about half of the 12 percent system loss may be viewed as preventable "waste or unreasonable use or unreasonable method of diversion" under Water Code section 100. The State Water Board has authority to compel Cal-Am to reduce its system losses. (Cal. Const., art. X, § 2; *Environmental Defense Fund v. East Bay Muni. Dist.* (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 183.) We are of the opinion that Cal-Am can proceed with a main replacement program at any time and that Cal-Am's wish to obtain PUC approval before proceeding with a main replacement program is only to assure that the funds expended for main replacement may be recovered from its customers.³²

We conclude that Cal-Am should be required to: (a) reduce its system losses by about 549 afa; and (b) immediately commence work to reduce the losses. Further, we are of the opinion that with the application of sufficient resources it should be feasible for Cal-Am to accomplish the

³² In general, private businesses acting illegally are not excused from immediately complying with the law in order to make sure they can recoup their costs from their customers.

work of replacing its mains within eight years.³³ Thus, Cal-Am should be required to reduce its diversions from the river by about 68 af per year until it has achieved 549 afa of savings.³⁴

16.5 Water Conservation

Order 95-10 included a condition requiring Cal-Am to develop and implement an urban water conservation plan. (Condition 3.) The condition required that conservation measures have a goal of achieving a 15 percent reduction in water usage in 1996 and 20 percent in each subsequent water year. Compliance with this condition is not at issue in this hearing. However, ten years have passed since the 20 percent reduction goal was ordered, and consideration should be given to how additional conservation measures may reduce the need to illegally divert water from the river. MPWMD and Cal-Am work together to implement conservation measures in the peninsula cities. (PUC Decision 09-07-023, pp. 1-2; Attachment 1 [Settlement Agreement Among the Division of Ratepayer Advocates, MPWMD and Cal-Am On Water Conservation and Rationing Issues for the Monterey Peninsula; Attachment 2, Rule 14.1 [Water conservation and Rationing Plan, Monterey District'.]) MPWMD has a greater array of regulatory tools. (MPWMD-SP12, p.10, 15 – p.11, 26 and p. 20, 3-5.) Block rate pricing of water also affects the use of water. Cal-Am must obtain approval from the PUC to impose or modify block rates. MPWMD has a retrofit program for toilets, showerheads and faucets. Retrofits are required for all title changes and for use and expansion changes. An estimated 664 afa has been saved since 1987. About two-thirds of the properties within MPWMD have been retrofitted. (MPWMD-SP12, p. 9, 8-16; RT, Ph. 2, Vol., IV, p. 1066, 12 - p. 1068, 11.) In our view, most of the remaining properties will probably be retrofitted within the next eight years, i.e., within 30 years of 1987. Over eight years, as much as 330 afa of water may be saved through continued retrofitting of properties, or roughly 41 af of additional savings per year for eight years.³⁵ We conclude that water saved by retrofitting properties should be used to reduce Cal-Am's diversions from the river.

Reduction in the use of potable water for outdoor use offers the possibility for additional water savings. (MPWMD-SP12, p. 7, 15 -20.) Outdoor water usage is estimated to be about 500 afa;

³³ Time can be saved on reducing system losses if Cal-Am does not wait for PUC approval before beginning work.

³⁴ The State Water Board recognizes that it is unlikely that exactly 68 af will be saved for each year Cal-Am replaces system mains to reduce losses and that during any given year the water saved may be more than or less than 68 af.

³⁵ The State Water Board recognizes that the actual amount of water saved by the retrofitting program during any given year may be more or less than 41 af.

less than 5 percent of total potable water use. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. IV, p. 1062, 8-23.) MPWMD recognizes that reductions in outdoor irrigation could save about 100 afa. (MPWMD-SP12, p. 8, 6-9.) Service addresses that use less water are rewarded with a lower block rate. An increasing block rate structure has been in place since 1997. Cal-Am has requested additional blocks for non-residential users in the current General Rate Case filing with the PUC (MPWMD-SP12, p.18, 6-9.) We conclude that the use of potable water for outdoor irrigation should be reduced. Greater efforts to minimize the use of potable water for outdoor irrigation will result in incremental water savings. We are of the opinion that it may be feasible to save 100 af over eight years, or roughly 12 af per year.³⁶ We also conclude that the water saved by reducing the use of potable water for outdoor irrigation should be used to reduce Cal-Am's diversions from the river.

16.6 Demand Management

Water conservation is a concept that encompasses a wide variety of potential actions in addition to retrofit programs and reducing the use of potable water for outdoor recreating. Water conservation also includes programs to encourage or require people to use less water. MPWMD has enacted regulations that may be used to manage user demand. (MPWMD-SP3 [MPWMD Regulation XV].) Cal-Am has entered into an agreement with MPWMD for the coordinated exercise of their respective powers in order to manage user demand. (PUC Decision 09-07-023, attachment [Settlement Agreement Among the Division of Ratepayer Advocates, MPWMD, and Cal-Am On Water Conservation and Rationing Issues].) In the agreement, Cal-Am agrees to implement Rule 14.1 Water Conservation and Rationing Plan as set forth in Appendix A in accord with MWPMD's Regulation XV as modified by Ordinance 137. Among other matters, the agreement provides that demand management or rationing may be initiated in response to a final CDO by the State Water Board. Joint Cal-Am and MPWMD efforts to manage user demand may be used to reduce Cal-Am's need to illegally divert water from the river. We conclude that Cal-Am, in conjunction with MPWMD, should undertake demand management to reduce Cal-Am's need to illegally divert water from the river.

³⁶ The State Water Board recognizes that the actual amount of water saved by reducing the quantity of water for outdoor use may be greater or less than 100 af and that the quantity of water saved in any given year may be more or less than 12 af.

16.7 Small Projects

Cal-Am introduced evidence that it had entered into negotiations to obtain a temporary supply of water from the Margaret Eastwood Trust and Clint Eastwood from the Odello well fields and from the Rancho Canada Golf Course. Cal-Am's failure to complete negotiations was not explained. (See section 14.2, ¶ 5, supra.) Other small projects that could provide a temporary supply of water may also be available. The addition of temporary small water supply projects would reduce Cal-Am's need to illegally divert water from the river. We conclude that Cal-Am should be required to develop small projects to provide a temporary supply of water for its customers and to reduce the illegal diversions from the river.

16.8 Cal-Am has Options for Responding to the Loss of Supply.

The subjects discussed in Section 16.2 through 16.7 illustrate the range of projects and actions that are available to Cal-Am to respond to the provisions in this order requiring that illegal diversions from the river be reduced (Condition 2) and for the loss of supply from the Seaside Groundwater Basin. In general, it is up to Cal-Am and to determine how it may best serve its customers while reducing its unlawful diversions from the Carmel River. Efforts to reduce the use of potable water may aid Cal-Am efforts to serve its customers while reducing illegal diversions from the river. Cal-Am can also seek to serve its customers and reduce illegal diversions by developing and operating temporary water supply projects until the proposed Coastal Water Project or the Regional Project sponsored by the Marina Coast Water District is constructed and becomes operational.

17.0 EFFORTS TO MITIGATE THE EFFECTS OF CAL-AM'S DIVERSIONS ON FISH AND WILDLIFE

This section addresses efforts to mitigate the effects on fish and wildlife of diversions, principally Cal-Am's, from the Carmel River. Mitigation efforts must be viewed in a larger context because the effects of Cal-Am's illegal diversions cannot be isolated from its legal diversions and the diversions of others. The following discussion is relevant to an understanding of what actions may be appropriate for consideration in the CDO adopted by the State Water Board.

17.1 Releases from San Clemente Dam³⁷

Because the Carmel River usually goes dry downstream from the Narrows (River Mile 6.5) by July of each year, DFG annually negotiates with Cal-Am and MPWMD a flow bypass for San Clemente Dam. The objective of the negotiations is to keep as much stream channel wetted below San Clemente Dam as possible during the low flow season. Per the agreements, releases from SCD are generally around 5 cfs during late summer. (PT-39, p. 4, ¶ 2.) The operation of San Clemente Dam pursuant to the bypass flow agreements with DFG is outside the scope of this proceeding.

17.2 Steelhead Rescue Efforts

Because the Carmel River bed begins to go dry in July downstream from the Narrows, MPWMD and the CRSA³⁸ make organized efforts to rescue steelhead stranded in pools. Rescue efforts are labor-intensive. Fish are scooped into buckets and transported to the lagoon or to upstream areas that have water. (CRSA-3, p. 6.) MPWMD annually rescues steelhead stranded due to dewatering between the Narrows and the Lagoon. From 1995 through 2005, a total of 208,015 juvenile steelhead were rescued. (PT-39, p. 5.)

The annual rescue effort only saves a portion of the steelhead lost in the lower river. Further, once rescued, the fish are subject to mortality due to a variety of factors such as capture, adverse conditions from competition and overcrowding in upper river segments or in the Sleepy Hollow Fish Facility (facility). MPWMD has spent over \$300,000 to improve rearing operations at the facility. The improvements, involving operational protocols, have resulted in increasing rearing survival. (MPWMD-KU1, pp.1, 6.) Nevertheless, fish mortality has been over 50 percent at the facility for a variety of reasons including high water temperatures, disease and predation. The fish that survive the summer and fall are released back into the river once winter flow reconnects the lower river to the lagoon. The State Water Board lauds the efforts being made by MPWMD and CRSA to rescue juvenile steelhead, but rescuing juvenile steelhead and rearing them over the summer cannot assure the recovery of steelhead populations and is not an acceptable long-term solution. (PT-39, p. 5, 12-14.) We find that these desperate efforts

³⁷ See Figure 1 for the location of San Clemente Dam.

³⁸ For more than 35 years, volunteers associated with the Carmel River Steelhead Association have been rescuing and rearing steelhead stranded on the Carmel River. (CRSA-3, pp. 5-6.) A voluntary effort of this duration is an extraordinary achievement.

and their tenuous success underscore the importance of reducing Cal-Am's diversions from the river by all practicable measures. Further, we conclude that Cal-Am should be prohibited from increasing diversions from the river and should be required to reduce the quantity of water diverted from the river for existing service connections.

17.3 Preservation of Riparian Vegetation

A close connection has been demonstrated between groundwater diversions and both the health of the riparian vegetation and channel stability. Plant stress is directly related to soil water availability and depth to groundwater. MPWMD determined that mitigation in the form of irrigation can be used to prevent plant mortality along the riparian corridor, thus contributing to habitat for wildlife and stable riverbanks. A monitoring system was implemented to measure plant stress, soil moisture, and depth to groundwater. When necessary, supplemental irrigation is applied to help mitigate the effects of unacceptable vegetation stress. (MPWMD-TC16, pp. 3-4.) For example, in 2007 MPWMD applied a total of 11.81 af of supplemental irrigation water to offset stress to riparian vegetation associated with water diversions from the Carmel River. (*Ibid.*, p.18.) We find that the recovery of riparian habitat and associated channel stability in the lower part of the river will not occur until the level of the underflow in the river is close enough to the surface of the river bed to supply water to the roots of riparian vegetation. Thus, significant improvements in the preservation of riparian habitat and increased channel stability will not be possible until Cal-Am's illegal pumping from the river is terminated. Some marginal improvement to riparian habitat and channel stability may be possible if Cal-Am is required to reduce its pumping from the river. Thus, we conclude that Cal-Am should be prohibited from increasing its diversions from the river. In addition, we find that Cal-Am should be required to reduce the quantity of water diverted from the river for existing service connections.

18.0 WATER NECESSARY FOR PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Under the heading titled "8.1 Considerations Mitigating Against the Use of Punitive Enforcement Options," Order 95-10 found that "[i]n the short term Cal-Am cannot significantly reduce its extraction from wells along the Carmel River." The order went on to state "[t]he people and businesses on the Monterey Peninsula must continue to be served water from the Carmel River to protect public health and safety." The order did not make a finding of what quantity of water was necessary for public health and safety in Cal-Am's service area. Indeed,

condition 3 of the order required a 20 percent reduction in the quantity of water diverted from the river. No single fixed quantity of water per customer will protect public health and safety in all water supply systems. The quantity of water required to protect public health and safety will vary from system to system and will vary, over time, within a particular system depending upon how the water supply system is built, modified and operated, and upon measures taken by the end users of water to conserve the use of water. Fourteen years have passed since Order 95-10 was adopted, making it appropriate to consider requiring Cal-Am to further reduce its illegal diversions from the river, even without a substitute supply.

Cal-Am contends that reducing the quantity of water currently being diverted from the river would jeopardize its ability to deliver water to its customers. (Nov. 11, 2008, CAW Reply Brief, p. 17.) Having sufficient water to operate a water treatment and supply system is a valid concern. Simply stated, sufficient water must be taken into the treatment system to meet daily user demand for water. If water is not available to supply user demand, some areas of Cal-Am's system will not have enough water to maintain pressure for delivery to users or for an emergency, such as a fire. We should not give too much weight to this contention, however, for three reasons. First, Cal-Am continues to make new connections to its system. If Cal-Am were truly concerned that the existing supply of water is inadequate, it could act to end new connections pursuant to Water Code section 350, et. seq., or seek an order from the PUC prohibiting new service connections in accordance with Public Utility Code section 2708. Second, having sufficient water to operate its system reliably is typically a problem for one day a year, although it could be for as long as 3 to 5 days at a time. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. V, p. 1292, 2-7.) Finally, having enough water to meet user demand can also be accomplished by reducing user demand. Such reductions can be accomplished by water conservation and standby rationing programs similar to that administered by MPWMD. (MPWMD - SP12, p. 4, 17-25; MPWMD - SP3, Regulation XV.)

MPWMD is a special-purpose district created to provide water resource management in the Monterey Peninsula area. It regulates all water distribution systems within its boundaries, including Cal-Am's. (MPWMD-1, p. 4, 1 – p. 6, 21; RT, Ph. 2, Vol. IV. p. 925, 14-25.) In the interim between the adoption of Order 95-10 and the hearing for this proceeding, MPWMD has treated the quantity of water that Cal-Am is taking from the river as part of the supply of water available to serve the needs of peninsula communities. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. IV, p.1008, 25 – p.1011, 24; p. 936, 5 - 21.) During this proceeding, MPWMD and many peninsula cities took the position that all of the water being diverted from the river by Cal-Am is necessary for public

health and safety. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. IV, p. 1046, 13-21.) Further, MPWMD and many peninsula cities also wish to have water for growth. MPWMD's water allocation program sets aside water for growth within the limits of the supply of water available within its jurisdiction, including the water being illegally diverted from the river by Cal-Am. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. IV, p. 953, 7 – p. 954, 23; p. 1046, 13 – p. 1047, 21; Carmel-1, p. 2, 3-22; Monterey-1, p. 2, ¶ 4; City of Seaside-4, p. 3, 19 - 24.) An unintended consequence of this arrangement may be that because the peninsula cities have had water both for existing uses and for growth, their residents have had little incentive to support or pay for a project or projects to obtain a legal supply of water that can be substituted for the illegal diversions from the river. In addition, diverting water from the river for growth is unacceptable when (a) Cal-Am has no legal right to divert the water, (b) the steelhead in the river has been declared a threatened species, (c) the river has been designated critical habitat for the steelhead and (d) miles of the river bed are dry for five to six months a year. Accordingly, we conclude that water should not be diverted from the river for growth and that the quantity of water that is illegally diverted by Cal-Am should be reduced over a period of years until illegal diversion from the river is ended.

The water available to supply Cal-Am's customers, from all sources (including Cal-Am's illegal diversions from the Carmel River), is in rough equilibrium with current customer needs. MPWMD's regulations to encourage conservation, the reduction of losses within Cal-Am's water system, and other measures can offset modest reductions in supply that are gradually implemented without presenting a threat to public health and safety. An immediate and substantial reduction in the quantity of water that Cal-Am diverts from the river could present a threat to public health and safety unless Cal-Am's customers can be required to scale back their use of water by an amount equal to the quantity of reduced diversions. MPWMD's regulation adopted to curtail consumption within the peninsula communities depends heavily upon public education and the cooperation of water users. (MPWMD-SP12, p. 18, 21 - p. 20, 11; RT, Ph. 2, Vol. IV. p. 1029, 4 – p. 1036, 6.) Effective control over the quantity of water used by many thousands of users through voluntary cooperation is an uncertain undertaking at best. Thus, an immediate and substantial reduction in the quantity of water that Cal-Am diverts from the Carmel River could present a threat to public health and safety.³⁹ The State Water Board concludes that an order requiring Cal-Am to immediately make substantial reductions in the

³⁹ The peninsula area economy is also dependent upon the vitality of the hospitality industry. A marked and substantial reduction in the quantity of water that Cal-Am may divert from the river would, in all likelihood, affect the number of visitors that can be served by the hospitality industry and the economy of the area. (MPHA-001, p. 4, 9-17; MPHA-010, p. 3, 14-25.)

quantity of water illegally diverted from the river could present an unacceptable risk to public health and safety. On the other hand, modest reductions in the quantity of water Cal-Am diverts from the river that are gradually implemented can be offset by the types of projects and actions previously described in this order⁴⁰ and do not present a threat to public health and safety. Thus, the State Water Board also concludes that Cal-Am should be required to make modest and continuing reductions in the quantity of water diverted from the Carmel River until such time as it has developed a project or projects capable of providing a new source of water to supply the needs of its customers to substitute for its unlawful diversions of water from the Carmel River.

19.0 OTHER MATTERS

19.1 Pebble Beach Company should be Subject to Limitations Imposed upon Cal-Am's Diversions from the Carmel River

The State Water Board strongly supports the use of recycled water for nonpotable water uses where recycled water is available in order to maximize the beneficial use of the state's scarce water supplies. In the past, the State Water Board has required that recycled water be used, instead of potable water for nonpotable uses, such as irrigation, pursuant to Water Code sections 13550 and 13551. (E.g., Decision 1625; see also Decision 1623-Amended; see also Order WQ 84-7 [requiring dischargers in water short areas who propose to discharge treated wastewater to the ocean to evaluate the potential for water reclamation].) Water recycling promotes the constitutional policy that the water of the state be put to beneficial use to the maximum extent possible. (Cal. Const., art. X, § 2; Wat. Code, §§ 100, 275.)

Pebble Beach Company (PBC) has a 365 afa water entitlement⁴¹ from MPWMD for developing properties within Del Monte Forest. The entitlement is used for making new service connections to Cal-Am's water system. The entitlement was granted as part of a contractual arrangement wherein PBC agreed to financially guarantee public financing of a wastewater reclamation project. PBC seeks to have its water entitlement for new growth excluded from any limitation that may be placed upon Cal-Am's withdrawals from the Carmel River. (Oct. 14, 2008, Closing Brief of PBC, p. 13, 20-22.). In addition, PBC contends that, during 2005-06, it relied upon findings and representations by the State Water Board when undertaking additional financial

⁴⁰ Section 16.0. Projects and Actions that may Affect Cal-Am's Need to Divert Water from the Carmel River, subsections 16.1 – 16.4.

⁴¹ In addition to PBC's 365 afa, the entitlement includes 10 afa for S. Lohr and 5 afa for W. Griffin, who are subject to conditions contained in this order.

arrangements to further upgrade the wastewater reclamation plant and when acquiring a reservoir to store reclaimed wastewater.

The Pebble Beach Community Services District (PBCSD) and the Carmel Area Wastewater District (CAWD) operate the CAWD-PBCSD Wastewater Reclamation Project. (PBC-2, p. 1, 25-27.) The project provides reclaimed wastewater for irrigation of the golf courses and other recreational open spaces located in the unincorporated Del Monte Forest area of Monterey County. (PBC 1, p. 2, 7-9.) The project was designed to deliver not less than 800 afa of reclaimed water and to free an equal amount of potable water for other uses. Operationally, some potable water was necessary to control salinity levels in the reclaimed water used for golf course irrigation and to meet irrigation needs during times of peak demand. (PBC-1, p. 2, 16-23.) During 13 years of operation, between 1994-95 and 2006-07, the project supplied an average of 706 afa of reclaimed water; 267 afa of potable water was required for salinity control and to meet peak irrigation demand. (PBC-2, p. 3, 1-28.) Public project financing was facilitated by private financial guarantees. The PBC guaranteed: (a) \$33.9 million in capital costs for the project, and (b) net project operating deficiencies. In return for the financial guarantee, PBC was granted a 365 afa potable water entitlement by MPWMD for future development of lands owned by PBC. (PBC-1, p. 3, 19 – p. 4, 2.) Based on this entitlement, water has been sold to over 500 homeowners in the Del Monte Forest. (RT, Ph. 2, Vol. II, p. 556, 14-15.)

During 2005-2006, the project was upgraded through the addition of 325 af of storage for reclaimed water and by improvements to the wastewater treatment plant to reduce the level of salinity in the reclaimed water. During 2009, these improvements should result in the project being able to operate without the need for potable water. (*Id.*, p. 4, 1-17.) The upgraded project cost \$34 million. PBC obtained the funds for the upgrade by selling 175 afa of the entitlement obtained from MPWMD to landowners in Del Monte Forest. (PBC-1, p. 3, 25 – p. 4, 2.)

A footnote in Order 95-10 recognizes the supply of water made available to Cal-Am customers by the project:

In addition to supplies from the Carmel River and pumped ground water in the area of Seaside, reclaimed water is available to some Cal-Am users from the Carmel Area Wastewater District Pebble Beach Community Services District Wastewater Reclamation Project. The Project will provide 800 acre-feet of reclaimed water for the irrigation of golf courses and open space in the Del Monte Forest. In return for

financial guarantees, the Pebble Beach Company and other sponsors received a 380 af of potable water entitlement from the District for development within Del Monte Forest. As of the end of fiscal 1993-1994, the District had not allocated the remaining 420 af of project yield.

(Order 95-10 at p. 6, fn. 2.)

On March 27, 1998, the Chief, Division of Water Rights, wrote MPWMD and Cal-Am concerning the relation of the project to the water being diverted from the river by Cal-Am and Order 95-10.

(PBC-7.) The letter states, in part:

The [State Water Board] has recognized that the Pebble Beach Company and other sponsors were project participants in, and assisted in funding, the wastewater reclamation project which enabled Cal-Am to reduce its delivery of potable water to Del Monte Forest property and thereby reduce the demand on the Carmel River by at least 500 afa and potentially 800 afa. Upon completion of the Del Monte Forest property, 380 afa will be diverted from the Carmel River by Cal-Am for delivery to these lands. Thus, there will be no net increase in Carmel River diversions in the future over the level of past documented diversions as a result of developing these projects. As a result of the reclamation project and especially during the interim period while the Del Monte Forest property is being developed, the net diversion from the Carmel River to serve Del Monte Forest properties will be less than the level that would have occurred if the wastewater reclamation project had not been developed. Thus under Footnote 2 of Order WR 95-10, the 380 afa is available to serve the projects.

As a result, Order WR 95-10 does not preclude service by Cal-Am to the Del Monte Forest property under the 380 afa entitlement granted by the District. As you are aware, the [State Water Board] is requiring Cal-Am to maintain a water conservation program with the goal of limiting annual diversions from the Carmel River to 11,285 afa until full compliance with Order WR 95-10 is achieved. While Cal-Am has been exceeding the limit, it is not the intent of the [State Water Board] to penalize the developers of the wastewater reclamation project for their efforts to reduce reliance upon the potable water supply via utilization of treated wastewater.

Thus, the [State Water Board] will use its enforcement discretion to not penalize Cal-Am for excess diversions from the Carmel River as long as their diversions do not exceed 11,285 afa plus the quantity of potable water provided to the Pebble Beach Company and other sponsors under this entitlement for use on these lands. This enforcement discretion will be exercised as long as the wastewater reclamation project continues to produce as much as, or more than, the quantity of potable water delivered to the Del Monte Forest property, and the reclaimed water is utilized on lands within the Cal-Am service area.

Footnote 2 of Order 95-10 deals with the issue of water use for purposes of projects in the Del Monte Forest. Consequently, the order does not provide discretion to address any projects involving the use of the unassigned 420 afa (800 afa minus 380 afa identified in the footnote equals 420 afa) developed by the wastewater treatment facility.

On October 18, 2001, the Chief, Division of Water Rights, sent another letter to MPWMD concerning this subject. The letter stated in part:

You specifically asked whether the use of a portion of the original Pebble Beach Company water entitlement from the CAWD reclamation project can be used on non-Pebble Beach Company properties within (1) the Del Monte Forest and (2) outside the Del Monte Forest. Cal-Am may distribute the new potable water supply anywhere in its service area, subject to the Carmel River diversion requirements of Order 95-10 (and any subsequent modification approved by the State Water Resources Control Board) and requirements (a) and (b) above.⁴²

(PBC-8.)

The letter expresses an intent not to penalize Cal-Am for excess diversions from the Carmel River to supply Pebble Beach as long as their diversions do not exceed 11,285 afa plus the quantity of potable water provided to the PBC and other sponsors under the entitlement from MPWMD.⁴³

The letters cannot be understood as a binding commitment that the State Water Board will never take an enforcement action that might affect PBC or others relying on the entitlement from MPWMD. Because the March 27, 1998 letter expressly identifies the State Water Board's action as an exercise of enforcement discretion, it serves as a warning that Cal-Am's excess diversions constitute an ongoing violation and that the State Water Board could take enforcement action. Nevertheless, as noted in the March 27, 1998, letter to MPWMD, the reclamation project constructed with PBC funding guarantees will not result in a net increase in diversions from the Carmel River and, in the interim before while Del Monte property is being developed, the net diversions from the river to serve Del Monte Forest properties will be less than the level that would have occurred if the reclamation project had not been developed.

⁴² The reference to the "requirements of (a) and (b) above" refers to the following: "Continual records must be maintained, on both a monthly and total annual basis, to document that (a) the new use of potable water does not exceed the historic quantity of potable water provided by the California-American Water Company (Cal-Am) to the Del Monte property and (b) the quantity of treated wastewater put to beneficial use equal or exceeds the potable water use."

⁴³ The letter of October 18, 2001, is also problematic. It should be noted, however, that the letter expressly states that Cal-Am's diversions from the river for the PBC are subject to Order 95-10 and any subsequent modification to the order approved by the State Water Board. This order is such a modification.

We conclude, therefore, that the State Water Board should not prohibit any increased diversions from the river by Cal-Am for deliveries made under PBC's entitlement from MPWMD. Nevertheless, any water users who receive water under the PBC entitlement should not be exempted from any conservation program or other effort to reduce Cal-Am's unauthorized diversions.

19.2 Any Monterey Peninsula Community that Wishes to Develop Water from a New Source for Growth Must First Apply Water from the New Source to Reduce its Share of the Water Being Illegally Diverted by Cal-Am; Only after its Share of Illegal Diversions from the River is Ended may Water from the New Source be Used for Growth

Some additional water has been developed for growth in Cal-Am's service area since entry of Order 95-10. The City of Sand City independently made an effort to develop water for growth within its jurisdiction. The city sought assurances from the State Water Board that any new water it developed would not be reduced to offset Cal-Am's illegal diversions from the river. (Sand City -1, Attachment A.) Whatever assurances may have been provided in the past, such assurances should not be provided in the future. All communities receiving water from Cal-Am are obtaining some portion of that water from illegal diversions from the river. Any community or combination of communities seeking to develop a new source supply must first apply water from a new source to reduce its share of the water being illegally diverted by Cal-Am. Water from a new source of supply should not become available for growth until after the community has fully substituted water from the new source for its share of the water being illegally diverted from the river by Cal-Am. Monterey Peninsula communities and their residents have little incentive to support efforts to develop new water supplies to replace the water being illegally pumped from the river by Cal-Am if water can be obtained for growth without having to reduce their pro-rata share of water illegally pumped from the river. Nearly 14 years after the adoption of Order 95-10, Cal-Am is unable to tell the State Water Board what project may be built to end its illegal diversions, when a project will be approved or when construction might be commenced. Indeed, there is no assurance that any project will be approved during the next several years.

19.3 Affirmation and Adoption of Rulings by the Hearing Officers

Unless otherwise expressly addressed in this order, all rulings of the Hearing Officers are affirmed and adopted by this order.

CONCLUSIONS

Order 95-10 does not authorize Cal-Am to divert water from the Carmel River in excess of its water rights, and Cal-Am is illegally diverting water from the Carmel River in violation of Order 95-10 and Water Code section 1052. The doctrines of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel are not a bar to the State Water Board's adoption of a CDO.

Condition 2 of the Order 95-10 requires Cal-Am to diligently implement actions to terminate its unlawful diversions. Cal-Am has diverted an average of 7,602 afa from the river without a basis of right for the past 14 years, and in the roughly 10-year period since it achieved the 20 percent reduction required by Condition 3 of Order 95-10, Cal-Am has not made any meaningful progress toward reducing the amount of its unlawful diversions. Further, Cal-Am has not diligently implemented smaller water supply projects that could have enabled Cal-Am to reduce its illegal diversion from the river and to alleviate the serious condition affecting the survival of steelhead.

Thus, Cal-Am has not diligently implemented actions to terminate its unlawful diversions under Condition 2. Cal-Am's only action reducing its illegal diversions has been the work done on two projects yielding small amounts of water: the ASR project and the Sand City Desalinization Plant. Significantly, these projects are in place due largely to the efforts made by other agencies, i.e., MPWMD and the City of Sand City.

The lower 6.5 miles of the riverbed are dry for five to six months of each year, due primarily to Cal-Am's diversions.⁴⁴ Cal-Am's diversions from the river continue to have an adverse effect on the fish, wildlife and riparian habitat of the river, including the threatened steelhead. Since the adoption of Order 95-10, the California Central Coast steelhead has been declared as threatened under the Endangered Species Act, and the Carmel River has been declared as critical habitat for the survival of the steelhead.

⁴⁴ See discussion under Section 15.0, supra.

The adjudication of the Seaside groundwater basin will decrease the supply of water available to supply Cal-Am's customers by 417 af in 2009, or by about 2.8 percent of the available supply. Other projects or regulatory actions can make additional water available to Cal-Am, including: (1) the Phase I and II ASR project; (2) the City of Sand City Desalinization Project; (3) the development of temporary small water supply projects (4) the reduction of system losses within the Cal-Am distribution system; (5) the retrofit program; (6) reducing the use of potable water for outdoor irrigation; and (7) other measures to reduce consumer demand for potable water.

MPWMD's water allocation program sets aside water for growth within the limits of the supply of water available within its jurisdiction. MPWMD views water illegally diverted from the river by Cal-Am as available water supply for growth. Because water has been available for growth, the peninsula cities and their residents have had little incentive to support or pay for a project or projects to obtain a legal supply of water that can be substituted for the illegal diversions from the river.

In consideration of the foregoing, we conclude that Cal-Am should be prohibited from further degrading conditions in the river by diverting water from the river for new service connections, and that Cal-Am should be required to reduce the amount of water being diverted from the river to serve existing service connections.⁴⁵ In reaching this conclusion, we are particularly mindful that (a) the lower 6.5 miles of the Carmel River bed are dry for 5 to 6 months of each year, (b) the steelhead is a threatened species, (c) the river has been declared to be critical habitat for the steelhead, and (d) the earliest date which Cal-Am's illegal diversions may be brought to an end is 2016, some 21 years after the adoption of Order 95-10.

⁴⁵ Cease and desist orders are exempt from the requirements of CEQA. (*Pacific Water Conditioning Ass'n., Inc. v. City Council* (1977) 73 Cal. App.3d 546,556.)

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED THAT Cal-Am shall cease and desist from the unauthorized diversion of water from the Carmel River in accordance with the following schedule and conditions.⁴⁶

1. Cal-Am shall diligently implement actions to terminate its unlawful diversions from the Carmel River and shall terminate all unlawful diversions from the river no later than December 31, 2016.
2. Cal-Am shall not divert water from the Carmel River for new service connections or for any increased use of water at existing service addresses resulting from a change in zoning or use. Cal-Am may supply water from the river for new service connections or for any increased use at existing service addresses resulting from a change in zoning or use after October 20, 2009, provided that any such service had obtained all necessary written approvals required for project construction and connection to Cal-Am's water system prior to that date.⁴⁷
3. At a minimum, Cal-Am shall adjust its diversions from the Carmel River in accordance with the following:
 - a. Commencing on October 1, 2009,⁴⁸ Cal-Am shall not divert more water from the river than the base of 10,978 afa,⁴⁹ as adjusted by the following:
 - (1) Immediate Reduction: Commencing on October 1, 2009, Cal-Am shall reduce diversions from the river by 5 percent, or 549 afa.

⁴⁶ Attachment 1 to this order, "Table 1, Projected Reductions in Illegal Diversions from the Carmel River," shows the reductions in illegal diversions from the Carmel River that should result from conditions 1, 2 and 3 of this order.

⁴⁷ Multiunit residential, commercial or industrial sites may currently be served by a single water meter. The installation of additional meters at an existing service will not be viewed as a new service connection provided that the additional metering does not result in an increase in water use. Metering each unit of a multiunit building tends to increase accountability in the use of water and the effectiveness of water conservation requirements.

⁴⁸ Each water year runs from October 1 to September 30 of the following year.

⁴⁹ Cal-Am diverts 3,376 afa under legal rights and, on average, 7,602 afa without a basis of right. (3,376 + 7,602 = 10,978 afa).

- (2) Annual Reductions: Commencing on October 1, 2011, the base shall be further reduced by 121 af per year through savings that will accrue from reduced system losses, the retrofit program, the reduction of potable water used for outdoor irrigation, demand reduction and similar measures. The 121 af reduction shall be cumulative. For example, 121 af shall be reduced in the first year and 242 af shall be reduced in the second year. Commencing on October 1, 2015, annual reductions shall increase to 242 af per year. The 242 af per year reduction shall also be cumulative. Annual reductions shall continue until all unlawful Cal-Am diversions from the river have been terminated.
- (3) ASR Project: The amount of water diverted to underground storage under Permit 20808A (Application 27614A) as of May 31 of each year and which will be supplied to Cal-Am customers after that date shall be subtracted from the base.⁵⁰ On June 1 of each year, Cal-Am shall submit an operating plan to the Deputy Director for Water Rights specifying the quantity of water it intends to supply from ASR Project for its customers after May 1 of each year. Water pumped from the project for delivery to customers should be consistent with the requirements of paragraph "c" below.
- (4) Sand City Desalination Plant: Once the Sand City Desalinization Plant becomes operational, 94 af shall be subtracted from the base. In addition, based on actual production from the plant, any other water that is produced and not served to persons residing within the City of Sand City shall be subtracted from the base amount for each water year.
- (5) Small Projects: Water produced from new sources developed pursuant to Condition 4 of this order shall be subtracted from the base.
- (6) Pebble Beach: Within 90 days following adoption of the order, the Pebble Beach Company shall certify, under penalty of perjury, the total quantity of water annually used under its water entitlement from MPWMD (for the funding assurances provided for the construction and expansion of the CAWD-PBCSD

⁵⁰ This condition shall apply to Phase I and Phase II of the ASR project.

The sentence in bold below shows the amendment to the last sentence of condition 3. a. (6) that is directed by Order WR 2010-0001.

wastewater reclamation project).⁵¹ Ten percent (10%) of the amount reported shall be added to the adjusted base to allow Cal-Am to divert water from the river to supply water for PBC water entitlements initiated in the following 12 months. Thereafter, the PBC shall annually submit, on September 30, a report to the Deputy Director for Water Rights accounting for any additional water that is diverted from the Carmel River as the result of an increased use of its MPWMD water entitlement. Increased diversions from the river by Cal-Am to satisfy PBC entitlements from MPWMD shall be added to the adjusted base, and are not subject to section 2 of this order. Water Diverted from the river by Cal-Am for PBC entitlements can only be served to properties that have received a PBC entitlement from MPWMD and which are located in the Cal-Am's service area. **After December 31, 2016, Cal-Am shall not illegally divert water from the river to supply the holders of PBC entitlements.**

- b. Either Cal-Am or the MPWMD may petition the State Water Board Deputy Director for Water Rights for relief from annual reductions imposed under condition 3., a (2). No relief shall be granted unless all of the following conditions are met: (a) Within 18 months of the adoption of this order, Cal-Am has imposed a moratorium on new service connections pursuant to Water Code section 350 or has obtained an order prohibiting new connections from the PUC pursuant to Public Utility Code section 2708 or MPWMD has imposed a moratorium on new service connections under its authority; (b) the demand for potable water by Cal-Am customers has been reduced by 13 percent;⁵² and (c) a showing is made that public health and safety will be threatened if relief is not granted. Any relief granted shall remain in effect only as long as (a) a prohibition on new service connections remains in effect, and (b) the 13 percent conservation requirement remains in effect.
- c. ASR project water stored in the Seaside groundwater basin under Permit 20808A (Application 27614A) should be used to mitigate the effect of Cal-Am's illegal diversions from the river. ASR water should be supplied to Cal-Am customers only during months when water is most needed in the river to preserve steelhead.

⁵¹ Water currently diverted from the river by Cal-Am to supply PBC entitlements is accounted for in the existing base.

⁵² For purposes of measuring compliance, the 13 percent reduction shall be measured against the adjusted base required by this condition for the year in which the conservation requirement is imposed.

Commencing no later than June 1 of each year, Cal-Am should use stored groundwater to supply the needs of its customers and reduce diversions from the river. Consistent with Cal-Am's operating plan, water should be pumped from the groundwater basin at the maximum practicable rate for as long as possible. This condition shall apply to both Phase I and Phase II of the ASR project. The river's habitat and fish may receive greater benefits from a substitution regime that differs from that called for by this condition, a regime requiring that substitution commence at a different date, at a different rate or be coordinated with the level of flow in the river. In addition, it may be desirable to hold stored water from one year to the next to assure that more water is available for the steelhead and its habitat in years when the potential for steelhead survival may be greater. Several substitution trials may be necessary to determine which regime will have the greatest benefit. The National Marine Fisheries Service and the California Department of Fish and Game are encouraged to negotiate different substitution regimes with Cal-Am. The State Water Board will honor such agreements, provided Cal-Am submits the written agreement to the Deputy Director for Water Rights no later than May 1 of each year and the written agreement is approved by the Deputy Director.

4. Cal-Am shall reduce its illegal diversions from the river at the same rate ASR Project water is pumped from the groundwater basin as long as stored water is available under the operating plan.
5. Cal-Am shall implement one or more small projects that, when taken together, total not less than 500 afa to reduce unlawful diversions from the river. Within 90 days of entry of this order, Cal-Am shall identify to the Deputy Director for Water Rights the projects that it will implement and shall implement the projects within 24 months of entry of this order. Cal-Am may petition the Deputy Director for additional time in which to implement the projects. However, no time extension shall be considered unless the petition is accompanied by detailed plans and time schedules for each project. Detailed justification shall be provided for additional time. Detailed justification shall be provided for any request for an extension to allow Cal-Am time to obtain prior approval from the PUC. To the maximum practicable extent, small projects shall be operated to reduce illegal diversions from the river during the months when surface flow in the river begins to go dry and through the months when surface flow in the river disappears below river mile 6.5.

6. Starting three months following adoption of this order, Cal-Am shall post quarterly reports on its website and file the quarterly reports with the Deputy Director for Water Rights. The quarterly reports shall include the following:
 - (a) Monthly summaries of the quantity of water it diverts from the river.
 - (b) Monthly summaries of the quantity of ASR project water diverted from the river under Permit 20808A and stored in the Seaside ground water basin. The monthly reporting shall also state the quantity of water beneficially used under Permit 20808A and the current balance of water in storage.
 - (c) Monthly summaries of the quantity of water being produced by the Sand City desalinization plant. The reporting shall identify new service connections within Sand City and thereafter report the quantity of water being delivered to the new connections. The monthly reports shall specify the quantity of water used to reduce diversions from the river during the reporting period.
 - (d) Monthly summaries of the quantity of water saved by reducing system losses.
 - (e) Monthly summaries of reductions in demand for potable water due to conservation actions such as increased water rates, MPWMD's retrofit program, efforts to reduce potable water for outdoor water use and demand reduction initiatives.
 - (f) Monthly summaries identifying all new service connections. The report shall include the Cal-Am account number, the service address, the name of each authority granting any approval required for connecting to Cal-Am's system and the name of each authority granting any approval required before commencing construction; the issuer of the each approval and the date of each approval shall be separately listed for each service address.
 - (g) Monthly summaries identifying existing service addresses that receive an increased supply of water due to a change in zoning or use. The report shall include Cal-Am account number, the service address and the name of each authority authorizing a change of use or of zoning and the date of such change.

- (h) Each quarterly report submitted by Cal-Am shall be certified under penalty of perjury and shall include the following declaration: *“I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that all statements contained in this report and any accompanying documents are true and correct, with full knowledge that all statements made in this report are subject to investigation and that any false or dishonest statement may be grounds for prosecution.”*
7. Starting six months after adoption of this order, Cal-Am shall file quarterly reports of its progress toward implementing Condition 3 (small project implementation) and note specifically any problems with its schedule of implementation.
8. The Deputy Director for Water Rights is authorized to modify the timing and the content of the reporting required by all of the provisions of this order to more effectively carry out the intent of this order.
9. Cal-Am shall comply with all requirements of Order 95-10, except as follows:
- (a) Condition 1 of Order 95-10 is superseded by Condition 2 of this order.
- (b) Condition 3(b) of Order 95-10 is superseded by Condition 2 of this order.
- (c) The last sentence of Condition 4 is deleted because the Seaside groundwater basin watermaster will determine the manner in which water may be withdrawn from the groundwater basin.
- (d) All other conditions of Order 95-10 shall remain in full force and effect until fully implemented.
10. The Deputy Director for Water Rights is directed to closely monitor Cal-Am’s compliance with Order 95-10 and this order. Appropriate action shall be taken to insure compliance with these orders including the issuance of additional cease and desist orders under Water Code section 1831, the imposition of administrative civil liability under Water Code section 1055, and referral to the Attorney General under Water Code section 1845 for injunctive relief and for civil liability. If additional enforcement action becomes

necessary, the Deputy Director is directed to consider including in such actions all Cal-Am's violations of Water Code section 1052 since the adoption of Order 95-10.

11. The conditions of this order and order 95-10 shall remain in effect until (a) Cal-Am certifies, with supporting documentation, that it has obtained a permanent supply of water that has been substituted for the water illegally diverted from the Carmel River and (b) the Deputy Director for Water Rights concurs, in writing, with the certification.

CERTIFICATION


The undersigned Clerk to the Board does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an order duly and regularly adopted at a meeting of the State Water Resources Control Board held on October 20, 2009.

AYE: Chairman Charles R. Hoppin
Vice Chair Frances Spivy-Weber
Board Member Arthur G. Baggett, Jr.

NAY: Board Member Tam M. Doduc

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Board Member Walter G. Pettit



Jeanine Townsend
Clerk to the Board

ATTACHMENT 1

TABLE 1
PROJECTED REDUCTIONS IN ILLEGAL DIVERSIONS FROM THE CARMEL RIVER
(all amounts are in acre-feet)

| Water Year (Oct - Sept) | Base Amount ¹ | Mandatory Cumulative Annual Reduction ² | Estimated ASR Project Operational Yield ³ | Estimated Sand City Desalinization Plant ⁴ | Estimated Small Project Output ⁵ | Estimated Coastal Water Project Output ⁶ | Total to Base Amount | Total Estimated Amount Diverted from Carmel River | Estimated Amount Diverted w/o Valid Basis of Right |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|-------------------------|---|---|
| 2009-10 | 10,978 | 549 | 145 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 769 | 10,209 | 6,833 |
| 2010-11 | 10,978 | 549 | 145 | 290 | 0 | 0 | 984 | 9,994 | 6,618 |
| 2011-12 | 10,978 | 670 | 145 | 280 | 0 | 0 | 1,095 | 9,883 | 6,507 |
| 2012-13 | 10,978 | 791 | 145 | 270 | 0 | 0 | 1,206 | 9,772 | 6,396 |
| 2013-14 | 10,978 | 912 | 145 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 1,317 | 9,661 | 6,285 |
| 2014-15 | 10,978 | 1,033 | 145 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 1,428 | 9,550 | 6,174 |
| 2015-16 | 10,978 | 1,275 | 145 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 1,660 | 9,318 | 5,942 |
| 2016-17 | 10,978 | 1,517 | 145 | 230 | 0 | 11,730 | 1,892 | 3,376 | 0 |

- 1) Cal-Am diverts 3,376 afa under legal rights and, on average, 7,602 afa without a valid basis of right (60 afa of the 3,376 afa is assumed diverted under riparian right to riparian vegetation along Carmel River).
- 2) Reduction in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 is initial amount of 5% (549 ac-ft). Starting October 1, 2011, add 121 af each year until October 1, 2015, when the annual reduction becomes 242 afa.
- 3) Average amount diverted for Phase 1 ASR project from water year 1994-1995 to 2006-2007 (R.T. Phase 1, Vol. I pp. 41-42). Amount may increase when Phase 2 of the ASR project becomes operational.
- 4) Number may vary based on actual production from desalinization plant. Assumes 3 months of operation in 2009-10.
- 5) Production from small projects cannot be estimated at this time.
- 6) Estimated production of Coastal Water Project (R.T. Phase 2, Vol. V, p. 1333).