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I, Tim Stroshane, declare:

I am self-employed, primarily as a consulting policy analyst with Restore the Delta and, at times, for other entities seeking expert review and analysis on environmental and water resources issues. My qualifications have been previously submitted in this proceeding in Exhibit RTD-1. In addition to my qualifications in RTD-1, University of Nevada Press published my 2016 book, *Drought, Water Law, and the Origins of California’s Central Valley Project*, which examines the historical role of water rights in the design of key components of California’s largest public water system. In this rebuttal phase, I testify as an expert based upon my education and knowledge of the public trust doctrine, the California State Water Project and federal Central Valley Project, the 2009 Delta Reform Act, Petitioners’ proposed Delta Tunnels California WaterFix Project (“Petition Facilities”), and my participation in SWRCB water quality control plan phases 1 and 2 and parts 1 and 2 of the California WaterFix change petition proceeding. I am not an expert in endangered species law.

BASES FOR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

There are two separate bases for my rebuttal testimony. First, I rebut the “reasonable protection” standard offered in Petitioners’ Part 2 written and oral testimony as insufficient to meet the public trust standard of protection. Second, I address as misleadingly incomplete Petitioners’ written testimony as to the source of water for anticipated maintenance of and increases in long-term average deliveries to south-of-Delta water service contractors of the CWF H3+ scenario over the No Action Alternative. While both address public trust issues, they are for purposes of my testimony separate matters.

*Standards of Protection.* Petitioners assert that the Petition Facilities, if approved and operated as proposed, will be reasonably protective of public trust resources,

Petitioners seek to apply to the Petition Facilities a distinct, lower standard for “reasonable protection” of fishery resources in this proceeding than is required to satisfy the Board’s obligation to apply a public trust analysis.¹ Petitioner witness Marin Greenwood stated in his testimony:

Throughout my testimony, I describe various measures that will be included in the CWF [Petition Facilities] for the protection of fisheries. For those species that are protected by the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the level of protection that I have analyzed is consistent with the requirements of the ESA, pertinent biological opinions and other applicable requirements, including the Fish and Game Code and Water Code, which I have determined also meets the standard for reasonableness. For those species that are not subject to the ESA, etc., my analysis only considers the standard of reasonableness regarding impacts on fish and wildlife.

¹ The Board’s obligation to apply a public trust analysis, including a determination as to water availability in the system, is not to be confused with the Board’s obligation in the context of considering an application for a new water right to demand a “water availability analysis.” In that context, “water availability analysis” is a term of art. In my testimony, I am not using “water availability analysis” or any similar phrase as a term of art or otherwise referring to an analysis of the availability of water for purposes of an application for a new water right. The water availability issue addressed herein is a broader public trust issue: have Petitioners established that there is enough actual water (not “paper” water) in the Delta system to both protect the public trust and allow the project, as proposed, to proceed?
Petitioners’ witnesses’ assurances that Petition Facilities will be reasonably protective of fishery resources in the Delta represent a lower standard of protection than that called for by SWRCB public trust obligations, as set forth in California decisional and statutory law. (See, for example, National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal.3d 419, 444, 446-447 [explaining the State’s continuing duty to consider and protect public trust resources]; United States v. State Water Resources Control Board (1986) 182 Cal.App.3d 82 [the “Racanelli Decision”], at pp. 150-151 [explaining the Board’s continuing duty under National Audubon].) I contrast these standards of protection below.

Maintenance of and Increases in SWP Deliveries. My Part 2 Rebuttal Testimony also addresses the following assertions by DWR Part 2 witnesses Gwen Buchholz and Erik Reyes:

CWF H3+ will modernize and add flexibility to the state’s water system by aligning water operations to reflect natural seasonal flow patterns due to the creation of new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with state-of-the-art fish screens and reduced reliance on south Delta exports. CWF H3+ will capture additional flow during wetter periods when unregulated flows are available. CWF H3+ will increase average annual deliveries of water conveyed through the Delta as compared to the No Action Alternative over the long-term, and especially in wetter water years. (See Exhibits SWRCB-102 and DWR-1016.)

Simulated long-term average deliveries to CVP and SWP north of Delta and south of Delta water service contractors were similar or higher than NAA under CWF H3+ scenario.

The July 2, 2018 ruling stated that San Joaquin County et al. parties “may offer testimony concerning the potential for the WaterFix Project to cause an increase in
diversions from the Delta during Part 2 rebuttal, provided that the testimony identifies
the Part 2 case-in-chief evidence to which it is responsive.”

As explained below, these and other similar statements by Petitioners’ witnesses
are misleadingly incomplete because they ignore or mask the role of water transfers in
maintaining and increasing reliance on Delta water exports under CWF H3+. In fact, in
discussing deliveries under CWF H3+, Petitioners’ Part 2 witnesses avoided mention of
water transfers in their written testimony. (SJC-351.) The significance of that omission—and
its implications for the public trust and the public interest—are explicated in my
testimony, below. Water transfers are market-based actions to supplement contractors’
Table A SWP contract amounts during years when Table A allocations by DWR are
reduced because of SWP’s junior water rights relative to decreased hydrologic flows
(especially from the Feather River). They are intended to facilitate movement of water
from north-of-Delta willing sellers (who are often senior water right holders) through the
Delta in exchange for monetary compensation or related consideration.

Water transfers are demonstrably important to expected operational use of
Petition Facilities. (RTD-158, pp. 192-198; RTD-130, pp. 21-23; RTD-12, pp. 8-12, 49-
59.) A key question in the long-term with Petition Facilities in place (from the standpoint
of project objectives, purpose, and need) is when and under what project allocation
conditions water from north of the Delta moves—under SWP contract terms or under
market-based transfer activity seeking to meet supplemental demand? As I summarized
evidence in my Part 2 testimony for Restore the Delta (RTD-12) market-based water
transfers are obscured in the Change Petition and Petition Facilities’ environmental
compliance documentation. Yet, many public statements and recent SWP contract
amendment negotiations concerning California WaterFix and other water management
tools exhibit widespread understanding by Petitioner DWR and SWP water service
contractors that water transfers and exchanges are considered integral to successful

My testimony addresses the serious and misleading omission in the above-referenced Part 2 testimony of DWR witnesses concerning deliveries under CWF of any discussion concerning the importance of water transfers to Petition Facilities’ successful operation. Their silence in Part 2 of this Hearing contrasts with the open, visible, and active negotiations undertaken by DWR and its SWP water contractors since February 2018 to amend SWP contracts to allocate costs of Petition Facilities and create new “water management tools,” an important component of which is mechanisms to increase water transfers and exchanges facilitated by Petition Facilities. (SJC-343, SJC-344.)

Analysis performed by California Water Impact Network for a Phase 2 water quality control plan Workshop 3 (RTD-131) raises serious doubts about whether such water transfers—and the water rights on which they are based—are available to be transferred in light of SWRCB public trust flows identified in its 2010 Delta Flow Criteria Report. (SWRCB-25.)

My Part 2 rebuttal testimony will first briefly compare and contrast the standards of protection identified above, and, second, describe the scope of public trust analysis, including factors to be considered in completing public trust deliberations concerning the California WaterFix Change Petition. Such factors include: the beneficial uses of the Delta, including public, fishery, and ecological uses (SWRCB-27; RTD-20, pp. 22:20-23:26); whether water is available to serve these uses (State Water Resources Control Board v. United States (1986) 182 Cal.App.3d 82, 103 [the Board must consider amounts of water required for recreation, and preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources]); an economic evaluation of the uses to be served (CSPA-27); and the regional scale impact of the project. (RTD-12, p. 63:14-66:23.)

THE LOWER STANDARD OF REASONABLE PROTECTION

THE LOWER STANDARD OF REASONABLE PROTECTION

THE LOWER STANDARD OF REASONABLE PROTECTION
Among the primary objectives of both state and federal endangered species acts (ESAs) are avoidance or reduction of take of listed species by permitted actions, and avoidance of jeopardy to the continued existence of listed species—that is, the avoidance or prevention of their extinction. While it is a goal of both ESAs’ species management to recover listed species to population levels sufficient to de-list them, regulatory actions under the ESAs focus instead on incidental take limits and prevention of extinction rather than enlisting permittees (e.g., through incidental take permit conditions, Section 7 reasonable and prudent alternatives, or Section 10 habitat conservation plans) per se in the project of species recovery.

The SWRCB elsewhere summarized the present 2009 incidental take permit (ITP) concerning longfin smelt for the SWP, as well as the 2008 Delta smelt and 2009 salmonid biological opinions. (SWRCB-25, pp. 20-24.) It is my understanding that a draft ITP and biological opinions have been issued for Petition Facilities. (SWRCB-105; SWRCB-106; SWRCB-107.)

The SWRCB has stated:

Recent flow regimes in the Delta have contributed to the decline of native species and encouraged non-native species. Flows into and within the estuary affect turbidity, salinity, aquatic plant communities, and nutrients that are important to both native and non-native species. However, flows and habitat structure are often mismatched and now favor non-native species. (SWRCB-25, p. 40.) In this context, the phrase “recent flow regimes” includes those set forth in the ITP and the biological opinions, as well as the flow regimes reflected in water quality objectives of SWRCB’s Water Rights Decision 1641 and 2006 Water Quality Control Plan. The SWRCB also stated:

There is sufficient scientific information to support the need for increased flows to protect public trust resources; while there is uncertainty regarding specific numeric criteria, scientific certainty is not the standard for agency decision making.
Recent Delta flows are insufficient to support native Delta fishes for today’s habitats. Flow modification is one of the immediate actions available although the links between flows and fish response are often indirect and are not fully resolved. Flow and physical habitat interact in many ways, but are not interchangeable.

These last two passages from SWRCB’s 2010 Delta Flow Criteria (DFC) Report indicate that SWRCB recognizes that the present regulatory regime for flows and other water quality and endangered species protections do not adequately protect listed native and other aquatic Delta species, while providing conditions more conducive to non-native species. This is confirmed by continued declines of Delta smelt and salmonid abundances. (SJC-352, SJC-353, SJC-354, SJC-355, SJC-356, SJC-357, SJC-358, SJC-359.)

Despite being a state agency, Petitioner DWR ignores its own public trust responsibilities in its case in chief. I conducted computer searches of DWR’s Part 2 case-in-chief documents (including the Written Testimony of its Part 2 witnesses), as well as of the Hearing transcripts of DWR’s Part 2 witnesses’ direct testimony. None of DWR’s Part 2 witnesses’ testimony exhibits contained express “public trust” References. (SJC-348, SJC-349.) In the rest of DWR’s case in chief I found just five exhibits that contained references to “public trust”: Exhibits DWR-1043 (a UC Davis Ph.D. dissertation on hydrodynamics and water quality); DWR-1095 (California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s signed incidental take permit for the Change Petition facilities, containing just one textual reference to “public trust”); DWR-1098 (a 1997 recreation survey by the California Department of Fish and Game for the Delta Protection Commission, containing a single reference with “public trust”); and DWR-1107 (Volume 1 of the 1995 Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Working Paper,
which contained a table of contents for Volume 2—which is not included in the exhibit—
containing a “public trust doctrine” section).

Rather than expressly addressing the “public trust” as such (that is, using the
term “public trust”), Petitioners elected to assure the SWRCB that Petition Facilities
would be “reasonably protective” of fisheries, a public trust resource. (See the citations
to the Greenwood and Wilder Testimony, above, at pp. 4-5 herein.)

THE HIGHER STANDARD OF PUBLIC TRUST PROTECTION

The most relevant of Petitioners’ exhibits concerning public trust resources is the
fifth exhibit, DWR-1120, a 1996 California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) report
on statewide steelhead trout restoration and management which briefly discusses public
trust resources and obligations. This report acknowledged DFG’s public trust obligations
as “argu[ing] for early implementation of the Steelhead Plan,” which included provisions
for, among other regions, the Central Valley (DWR-1120, p. v); that despite “several
favorable court decisions affirming fish and wildlife under the Public Trust Doctrine,
those resources held in trust in many areas of the State continue to decline” and that
“DFG needs a more effective means to identify, maintain, and achieve adequate flows
for steelhead throughout their range.” (ld., p. 3.) Moreover, the report states that the
public trust doctrine “requires the SWRCB to ‘balance’ the potential value of a proposed
or existing diversion with the impact on the trust resources. Fish and wildlife are public
trust resources in the custodial care of DFG.” (ld., p. 71.) DWR-1120 underscores the
obligations of the State of California to protect fish and wildlife as public trust resources.

The SWRCB’s own interpretation of its Delta flow criteria charge articulates a
higher standard of public trust resource protection, including for fisheries:

In determining the extent of protection to be afforded public trust
resources through the development of the flow criteria, the State Water
Board considered the broad goals of the planning efforts the criteria are
intended to inform, including restoring and promoting viable, self-sustaining populations of aquatic species.

(SWRCB-25, p. 2.)

The 2010 DFC report was informational and non-binding. (Id., p. 12.) But it explained further the SWRCB’s scope for its public trust considerations this way:

The State Water Board intends that the flow criteria developed in this proceeding should meet the following general goal regarding the protection of public trust resources:

• Halt the population decline and increase populations of native species as well as species of commercial and recreational importance by providing sufficient flow and water quality at appropriate times to promote viable life stages of these species.

To meet this goal, the State Water Board also sought to develop criteria that are comprehensive and that can be implemented without undue complexity. This report is limited to consideration of flow criteria needed under the existing physical conditions, so therefore does not consider or anticipate changes in habitat or modification of water conveyance facilities. The State Water Board does, however, identify other measures that should be considered in conjunction with, and to complement, the flow criteria.

(Id., p. 14.)

The standard of public trust protection is, as the SWRCB has stated, to protect public trust resources to a point where such resources can be restored to viable, self-sustaining populations by providing sufficient flow and water quality at appropriate times to promote viable life stages of Delta aquatic species.

MAINTENANCE OF AND INCREASE IN DELTA DIVERSIONS AND SWP DELIVERIES SOUTH OF DELTA

**Expected Increase in Diversions with Petition Facilities.** As noted above, Petitioner DWR witnesses Buchholz and Reyes stated in their written testimony that they expect an increase in deliveries to south of Delta contractors relative to the No Action Alternative under Petition Facilities scenario H3+. (DWR-1010; DWR-1016.) An important part of this increase, undisclosed by these witnesses, is Petitioner DWR’s
expectation for increased demand for water transfers from north of the Delta. In my Part 2 testimony for Restore the Delta, I summarized what water transfers are and how state and federal water projects accommodate them.² (RTD-12, p. 8-12.)

Reflecting existing conditions, Petitioner DWR issues a biannual SWP delivery capability report that, among other things, compares total Table A contractual demand of its 29 water service contractors with its record of deliveries over the previous ten years (in the 2017 report, 2007-2016). (SJC-338.) Current maximum Table A amount for the SWP is 4,133 thousand acre-feet (TAF) per year, and SWP long-term average Table A deliveries are 2,571 TAF per year. (Id., p. 21, Table 5-3.) Compared with the long-term hydrology (1921-2003), this level of Table A delivery can occur in about 62 percent of years. (Id., p. 25, Table 5-5.) Article 21 “surplus” water in the SWP system has an 84 percent chance of delivery of 20 TAF or less annually, according to this report. (Id., p. 27, Figure 5-6.) These reliability estimates are based on present SWP facilities and do not include Petition Facilities, nor do they reflect adjustments for future climate change.

Transfers represent the state and federal water system’s adaptation to over-appropriated water. Petitioner DWR’s SWP water rights are junior to those of a large number of senior water right holders north of and in the Delta. The present level of water supply reliability of the SWP results from its junior water rights coming up against other senior rights and overall declining snowpack and runoff hydrology. California

² In summary, I argued at that time that the expectations for water transfers violate Water Code section 85021 which requires reduced reliance on the Delta for California’s future water needs, because water transfers represent a continuation of reliance on the Delta at similar or increased levels, depending on future water transfer market activity. I do not reiterate that argument in this rebuttal testimony.
Water Impact Network documented through a watershed-wide analysis that there are over five acre-feet of water rights claims for each acre-foot of historical average annual flow in the Sacramento River Basin, without accounting for public trust or other in-stream flows. (RTD-131, p. 12, Table 2.)

Water transfers between willing sellers and willing buyers are employed to overcome allocation limits imposed on SWP contractors. Buyers offer compensation to sellers willing to part with some or all of their senior surface water rights so that buyers—who are typically south of the Delta—may receive water delivered currently through the Delta. In the event that Petition Facilities are constructed and operated, such transfers would be routed under, rather than through, the Delta. In addition, the north Delta location of Petition Facilities’ intakes would ensure that better quality Sacramento River water would be diverted, since that water would no longer mix with Delta waters in western and central Delta channels.

Petition Facilities are expected to provide separate, cross-Delta tunnels with a longer transfer window than currently allowed under current regulatory constraints. (SWRCB-102, Chapter 5, p. 5-177:22-29; RTD-12, pp. 8:20-27, 9:24-10:15.) Relative to the No Action Alternative, the Final EIR/EIS anticipates more Table A allocations and fewer transfers, yet the CEQA conclusion for existing conditions anticipates that Petition Facilities would increase water transfer demand relative to existing conditions. (Id., Chapter 5, p. 5-177:30-41.) No numerical or modeled analysis is provided in the Final EIR/EIS for these conclusions. The NEPA conclusion agrees with Petitioners’ witnesses Buchholz and Reyes that overall deliveries would increase with operation of Petition Facilities. The CEQA conclusion concerning increased transfer remains relevant,
however, since existing conditions are presently known and relatively certain, while No Action Alternative future conditions are based on assumptions about future water contractor behavior and hydrologic conditions affected by climate change.

In recent months, Petitioner DWR and its SWP contractors have acted independently of this Change Petition proceeding to increase water transfer activity in the existing SWP system. Former DWR director, Grant Davis, issued Notice 17-11 on December 18, 2017 to “pursue water management actions that ensure supplies from the [SWP] are used effectively.” (SJC-339, p. 1.) These included greater flexibility for “how SWP supplies are transferred, exchanged, and managed over extended periods of time.” (Id.) This notice addressed bona fide exchanges of water and multi-year transfers of Table A water. (Id., pp. 2-3.) Such changes in approach by Petitioner DWR are independent of contractors’ supplemental demand conditions and climate change effects.

Petitioner DWR’s director, Karla Nemeth, announced in early 2018 that DWR and SWP contractors (calling themselves “public water agencies” or “PWAs”) would begin SWP contract amendment negotiations in early February 2018 concerning allocation of California WaterFix costs and water management tools. (SJC-340.) The provisions of Notice 17-11 shaped the initial talking points and objective statements of the negotiating parties. (SJC-341; SJC-342; SJC-343.) They concluded a Draft Agreement in Principle on June 27, 2018 that addresses water transfers, exchanges, transfers and exchanges, carryover storage, California WaterFix cost allocation, transparency amongst PWAs to ensure no harm to other PWAs, and setting of water delivery priorities. (SJC-344; SJC-345; SJC-346; SJC-347.) DWR and its PWAs agreed on June 27, 2018 that they would
soon issue a notice of preparation for an environmental impact report on these and
other related SWP contract amendments. The speed with which these parties
completed California WaterFix and other water management tools contract amendment
negotiations for the SWP indicates the importance they attach to increasing water
transfer and exchange opportunities in the SWP now and with Petition Facilities. They
intend the amendments to maximize flexibility of Petition Facilities’ operations and
capacity utilization independent of supplemental demand conditions and climate
change.

**Public trust analysis.** Public trust analysis, broadly, is the array of practical
professional methods and scientific methods employed to arrive at a balanced and
feasible level of public trust protection.

Justice Ronald B. Robie has written that, “Simply put, in administering water
rights, the [State Water] Board must consider public trust values.” (SJC-360, p. 1162.)
Such consideration must be undertaken with a method. Public trust analytic methods
reasonably include an analysis to determine whether sufficient water exists in the
affected water system to both support a proposed project or action and, at the same
time, protect public trust resources.

Justice Robie points out that SWRCB must consider public trust values in the
context of currently held water rights, including the CVP and the SWP; determination of
rights to a stream system, whether appropriative, riparian or other basis of right;
undertaking all appropriate proceedings concerning prevention of waste, unreasonable
use, unreasonable method of use, or unreasonable method of diversion of water; and
when acting under its statutory power to serve as a referee investigating “any or all of
the physical facts involved” in state or federal courts. In fulfilling its public trust
obligation, SWRCB must avail itself of information on water rights and stream flows in a
comprehensive fashion in a number of administrative contexts, not just new water right
appropriations. (SJC-360, pp. 1162-1165.)

SWRCB nears a point in this Change Petition proceeding where it will need to
conduct and provide a public trust analysis in its order. Petitioners have not provided or
conducted such an analysis, as reflected in their stated reliance on a reasonable
protection standard avoiding extinction of fishery resources. (SJC-348, SJC-349.) As
noted, there is no reference to “public trust” in Petitioners’ witness testimony.

In its 2010 DFC Report, SWRCB acknowledged that a future use of this report
would arise when Petitioners would “request the State Water Board to amend the water
rights permits for the [SWP] and/or [CVP] to move the authorized points of diversion for
the projects from the southern Delta to the Sacramento River,...” conditioned with
appropriate Delta flow criteria. SWRCB added:

That decision will be informed by the analysis in this report, but will also take into
account many other factors into consideration, including any newly-developed
scientific information, habitat conditions at the time, and other policies of the
State, including the relative benefit to be derived from all beneficial uses of water.
The flow criteria in this report are not predecisional in regard to any State Water
Board action. [citation]

The information in this report illustrates to the State Water Board the need for an
integrated approach to management of the Delta.

(SWRCB-25, pp. 3-4.)

Law professor Brian E. Gray summarizes an “integrated approach” to public trust
analysis as weighing and accommodating

public trust and extractive uses in a careful sequence that (1) identifies public
trust needs, (2) analyzes the effects of the extractive uses (usually water
impoundments, diversions, and alterations of flows) on the public trust, (3)
evaluates the uses that are served by the diversions of water, and (4) determines
the feasibility of altering or limiting the extractive uses to provide reasonable protection for public trust requirements.

(SJC-361, p. 1016.)

In my opinion, Gray’s analytic point (2) would reasonably and necessarily require—at a minimum—a determination as to whether sufficient water exists in the Delta system to both protect the public trust and allow for construction and operation of Petition Facilities.

The 2010 DFC Report (and Water Code § 85086) recognizes the need for flow criteria to be developed for Petition Facilities prior to issuance of a permit that would allow new diversions on the Sacramento River, as currently proposed by Petitioners. Appropriate permit terms and conditions to implement such flow criteria can only be developed in the context of detailed information regarding the availability of water in the locations proposed for new diversions. Thus, a critical step in any public trust analysis, particularly with respect to Delta fisheries, is to determine whether there is sufficient water in the Delta system to both approve Petition Facilities, as proposed, and adequately protect Delta fisheries, a critical public trust resource.

CONCLUSION

Key sources of water for the Petitioner DWR and the PWAs in the negotiation process are the senior water rights holders north of the Delta. Their contribution both to public trust protective flows and to water supply for water transfer market activities remains unexamined and needs to be examined through public trust analysis as part of SWRCB action on this Change Petition.

Without a determination as to whether sufficient surplus water exists in the north of Delta watershed system to both protect Delta public trust resources and allow construction and operation of Petition Facilities to proceed as proposed, the SWRCB
will not be in a position to accurately assess future water transfer market activity for the purposes of protecting Delta public trust values. Ignoring its own public trust obligations, Petitioner DWR neglected to prepare such an analysis, preferring instead to mask the crucial role played by the water transfer market in advancing the Change Petition. Further, the absence of such an analysis masks the proposed project’s reliance on senior water right holders north of the Delta to maintain or increase Delta exports.

For the reasons discussed above, Petitioners’ failure to establish the existence of sufficient water in the Delta system to assure adequate protection of the public trust if the proposed project is approved renders the Petition incomplete and inadequate. Granting the Petition in the absence of such an analysis would run counter to California law governing the public trust obligations of this Board, imperil constitutionally protected public trust resources, and, for the same reason, undermine the public interest.

Dated: July 12, 2018

Tim Stroshane