### LOCAL AGENCIES OF THE NORTH DELTA

1010 F Street, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 455-7300, osha@semlawyers.com

### CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY

235 East Weber Avenue • P.O. Box 1461 • Stockton, CA 95201

Phone (209) 465-5883 • Fax (209) 465-3956

ngmplcs@pacbell.net

August 31, 2015

### SENT VIA EMAIL (tom.howard@waterboards.ca.gov)

Mr. Tom Howard Executive Director State Water Resources Control Board 1001 I Street Sacramento, California 95814

**RE:** Defective Petition for Change Application for Water Fix Submitted by DWR and BOR

Dear Mr. Howard:

It has come to our attention that the California Department of Water Resources ("DWR") and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation ("BOR") have jointly submitted a Petition for a Change of Point of Diversion (Wat. Code, § 1701) and of Rediversion (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 791, subd. (e)). If granted, the Petition would permit the operation of the three massive water diversions on the Sacramento River near the community of Clarksburg, just south of the City of Sacramento. This project is identified as Alternative 4A of the State's "California WaterFix" project. Our letter identifies just a few of our preliminary concerns about the Petition, which we believe is defective and should compel the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") to make a determination that the Petition is incomplete.

A few of the most obvious errors in the Petition are described below:

1. <u>Page 2</u>: The application states that the applicants own the points of diversion/rediversion, which is known to be incorrect by the applicants. In fact, hundreds of parcels of private land must be purchased or taken for the Project to proceed according to the DCE CM 1 Property Acquisition

Tom Howard State Water Resources Control Board August 31, 2015 Page 2 of 4

Management Plan for the California Water Fix/BDCP Alternative 4A, which was recently obtained through a Public Records Act request. (See also Attachment 1: Representative Parcel Maps of private properties needed for diversion points.) The Environmental Information portion of the application also fails to include photographs of the riparian vegetation in each intake area, which are primarily on private property not owned by the Project applicants.

- 2. Page 2: The numbers of impacted water users between the points of diversion/rediversion are not identified and is marked as not applicable ("NA"). As the SWRCB is aware, there are thousands of affected water users and it is patently incorrect that there are no affected water users. (See, e.g., Attachment 2: eWRIMs printouts of Water Rights in Sacramento and San Joaquin Delta Watersheds.) Though the applicants are well aware of the affected intakes, they have deliberately failed to identify them. The truncated and vague discussion of injury to legal users of water buried in the Supplemental Information section (pp. 19-21) does not correct this deficiency. Moreover the RDEIR/EIS does not provide sufficient analysis to support a "no injury" determination.
- 3. Pages 2-6: The application repeatedly references the Water Fix RDEIR/EIS for the Project description and impacts. The sections referenced do not clearly provide the information needed to assess the direct and indirect impacts on the environment and specific water users. This is a key part of the SWRCB legal analysis, yet has been deliberately misconstrued in the application.

The Petition references the purported benefits of the Project without mentioning any of the Project's environmental impacts of inducing or amplifying reverse flows in the North Delta, the massive and untested size of the screens, and the new injury to other listed fish, and birds. Indeed the project description even fails to identify that through-Delta conveyance would still be required for approximately half the time under the proposal.

The Petition further asserts that there would be no change to the rest of the State or Federal Water Projects, contrary to the Project's modifications at

\_

Available at:

https://www.dropbox.com/s/hf0r9bwg8h72wno/DCE%20CM%201%20Property%20Acquisition%20Plan.pdf?dl=0.

Tom Howard State Water Resources Control Board August 31, 2015 Page 3 of 4

Clifton Court, and reoperations that are required to implement the Project (See Supplemental Information, p. 13.) Yet, the water quality modeling discussed in the RDEIR/EIS specifically states that it can only be used to compare impacts between alternatives, and that it does not provide a water quality analysis that can be used to determine actual impacts from the Project and Project impacts on reservoir operations. Thus, the potential impacts to water users and fish and wildlife from the construction and operation of the Project are unknown at this time; while the RDEIR/EIS provides some information pertaining to these issues, the RDEIR/EIS does not support a no injury analysis.

The Petition also makes clear that additional studies regarding the operation and design of the Project are also required that are not yet complete. (See p. 14 of the Supplemental Information attachment.) These additional studies would need to be completed in order to inform the SWRCB's Petition process.

4. Page 5: The need for a Waste Discharge Requirement ("WDR") is simply ignored, despite the obvious needs for both a WDR as well as a 401 Certification. Moreover, no federal and state permits are identified as needed, despite the applicants' full knowledge of the host of federal and state permits that are required.

While there are many other defects, the examples enumerated above show that the Petition for Change is incomplete if not deliberately erroneous. (Wat. Code, §§ 1701, 1701.2.) Among other deficiencies, the Petition: (1) does not adequately describe the changes sought; (2) fails to attempt to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood that the change will not injure any other legal user of water; and (3) fails to describe the extent of impacts to fish and wildlife. Thus, the Petition is incomplete and must be rejected.

Please also be advised that, due to the numerous grievous factual misstatements in the Petition, we are requesting that the Office of the Sacramento County District Attorney review the Petition and associated documents to assess whether perjury has occurred. (Penal Code, §§ 118, 118a.) It is shocking that after nine years of planning this Project, that the applicants would provide such a deficient and misleading Petition to the SWRCB. The cavalier manner in which some of the most senior water rights in the state are dismissed as nonexistent (e.g., "N/A") is disturbing given the major changes to Delta waterways being proposed.

Tom Howard State Water Resources Control Board August 31, 2015 Page 4 of 4

We appreciate your attention to this urgent matter and respectfully request that you direct DWR and BOR to correct and complete their Petition prior to the SWRCB taking any action to begin processing of the Petition.

Very truly yours,

Osha R. Meserve Counsel for LAND

Yours very truly,

Dante John Nomellini

Manager and Co-counsel CDWA

cc: Felicia Marcus Chair, State Water Resources Control Board (Felicia.Marcus@waterboards.ca.gov)

Frances Spivey-Weber, Vice-Chair, State Water Resources Control Board (Frances.Spivey-Weber@waterboards.ca.gov)

Dorene D'Adamo, State Water Resources Control Board

(Dorene. Dadamo@waterboards.ca.gov)

Tam M. Doduc, State Water Resources Control Board (Tam.Doduc@waterboards.ca.gov)

Steven Moore, Board Member, State Water Resources Control Board (Steven.Moore@waterboards.ca.gov)

Michael Lauffer, Chief Counsel, State Water Resources Control Board (mlauffer@waterboards.ca.gov)

Michael George, Delta Watermaster


(deltawatermaster@waterboards.ca.gov)


Mark Cowin, Director DWR


(mark.cowin@ca.water.gov)


David Murillo, Regional Director Bureau of Reclamation (dmurillo@usbr.gov)


# **ATTACHMENT 1**















# **ATTACHMENT 2**

#### Water Rights in Sacramento Watershed



#### Water Rights in San Joaquin Watershed

