

State of California  
State Water Resources Control Board  
**DIVISION OF WATER RIGHTS**  
**P. O. Box 2000, Sacramento, CA 95812-2000**  
Info: (916)341-5300, FAX (916)341-5400, Web: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights>

## **PROTEST – PETITION**

**This form may also be used for objections**

### **PETITION FOR TIME EXTENSION, CHANGE, TEMPORARY URGENT CHANGE OR TRANSFER ON**

**APPLICATION \_\_\_\_ PERMIT \_\_\_\_ LICENSE \_\_\_\_ (see Attachment Item 1)**

**of the California Department of Water Resources (“DWR”) and the United States  
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (“Reclamation”)**

I (We) have carefully read the NOTICE OF PETITION, REQUESTING CHANGES IN WATER RIGHTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION FOR THE CALIFORNIA WATERFIX PROJECT, dated October 30, 2015

Address, email address and phone number of protestant or authorized agent:

Ryan Bezerra and Alan Lilly  
Attorneys for the City of Folsom  
Bartkiewicz, Kronick & Shanahan  
1011 22<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
(916) 446-4254  
[rsb@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:rsb@bkslawfirm.com) and [abl@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:abl@bkslawfirm.com)

Supplemental sheets are attached. To simplify this form, all references herein are to protests and protestants although this form may be used to file comments on temporary urgent changes and transfers.

#### **Protest based on ENVIRONMENTAL OR PUBLIC INTEREST CONSIDERATIONS (Prior right protests should be completed in the section below):**

- the proposed action would not best serve the public interest
- the proposed action would be contrary to law
- the proposed action would have adverse environmental impacts

State facts which support the foregoing allegations: **see Attachment Item 2**

Under what conditions may this protest be disregarded and dismissed? (Conditions should be of a nature that the petitioner can address and may include mitigation measures.) **see Attachment Item 3**

**Protest based on INJURY TO PRIOR RIGHTS:**

To the best of my (our) information and belief the proposed change or transfer would result in injury as follows: **see Attachment Item 4**

Protestant claims a right to the use of water from the source from which petitioners are diverting, or propose to divert, which right is based on (identify type of right protestant claims, such as permit, license, pre-1914 appropriative right or riparian right): **see Attachment 5**

List permit or license or statement of diversion and use numbers, which cover your use of water (if adjudicated right, list decree): **see Attachment Item 5**

Where is your diversion point located? **see Attachment Item 5**


If new point of diversion is being requested, is your point of diversion downstream from petitioners' proposed point of diversion? **see Attachment Item 5**

The extent of present and past use of water by protestant or its predecessors in interest is as follows: **see Attachment Item 5**

Under what conditions may this protest be disregarded and dismissed? **see Attachment Item 3**

**All protests must be signed by the protestant or authorized representative:**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: January 4, 2016

  
Ryan Bezerra  
Attorney for the City of Folsom

**All protests must be served on the petitioner.** Provide the date served and method of service used: **see Attachment Item 6**

# ATTACHMENT TO THE CITY OF FOLSOM'S PROTEST TO WATER RIGHTS CHANGE PETITION OF DWR AND RECLAMATION FOR CALIFORNIA WATERFIX PROJECT

## Introduction

Protestant is a direct diverter from Folsom Reservoir and a member of the North State Water Alliance (NSWA) group of water users and the American River Water Agencies (ARWA) group and previously has coordinated and collaborated with the other water users in those groups in preparing and submitting detailed comments on the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan Draft EIR/EIS (DEIR/EIS), and the California Water Fix Recirculated DEIR/Supplemental DEIS (RDEIR/SDEIS). Protestant similarly will be coordinating with the other NSWA and ARWA parties to present consolidated cases during the SWRCB's hearing on certain common issues, including issues regarding whether the requested changes would operate to the injury of any legal user of the water involved and whether the requested changes would unreasonably affect fish and wildlife. Consistent with this approach, Protestant and the other NSWA and ARWA parties have identified in their respective Notices of Intent to Appear both witnesses who will be providing testimony to support their individual protests and witnesses who will be providing testimony on certain common issues.

## Item 1 (Petitioners' Permits)

DWR: Permits 16478, 16479, 16481 and 16482 (Applications 5630, 14443, 14445A, 17512)

Reclamation: Permits 11315, 11316, 11967, 11968, 11969, 11971, 11973, 12364, 12721, 12722 and 12723 (Applications 13370, 13371, 5628, 15374, 15375, 16767, 17374, 17376, 5626, 9363 and 9364)

**Item 2 (facts supporting protest based on environmental or public interest considerations)**

Water Code section 1701.2, subdivision (c), requires a water rights change petition to include “all information reasonably available to the petitioner, or that can be obtained from the Department of Fish and Game, concerning the extent, if any, to which fish and wildlife would be affected by the change, and a statement of any measures proposed to be taken for the protection of fish and wildlife in connection with the change.”

Although the supplement to DWR’s and Reclamation’s August 25, 2015 Petition (the “Petition”) contains some general statements about the California WaterFix Project’s alleged benefits to fish and wildlife (see Petition Supplement, pp. 14-15), the Petition does not contain sufficient information to satisfy the requirements of Water Code section 1701.2, subdivision (c).

The Petition does not discuss any of the evidence presented in NSWA’s July 28, 2014 comments or in ARWA’s July 21, 2014 comments on the DEIR/EIS, or in NSWA’s October 30, 2015 comments or in ARWA’s October 30, 2015 comments on the RDEIR/SDEIS. That evidence describes in great detail the adverse effects that the proposed California WaterFix Project would have on fish and wildlife.

Among other things, NSWA’s comments include detailed comments by fisheries expert Dave Vogel, which concluded that the California WaterFix Project would cause catastrophic adverse impacts on anadromous salmonids. Most notably, because of the proposed Project intakes’ locations on the Sacramento River, there would not be sufficient sweeping velocities to avoid impingement of fish against the intake screens and associated injuries. The estimated fish exposure times in front of the proposed intakes (which is a measure of the threat to migrating salmonids) are very long, especially in comparison to exposure times for other fish screens in California.

NSWA’s comments also include expert analyses by Professor Robert Latour, which describes how operation of the proposed new California Water Fix diversion facilities would have adverse impacts on Delta smelt life stages, including survival, growth, maturation schedules, and reproductive success over short, medium and long time periods. The Petition does not discuss any of this information and instead simply states that the proposed new points of diversion would be located outside of the primary habitat of Delta smelt and longfin smelt. (Petition Supp., at pp. 7-8.)

NSWA’s comments also state that operation of the California WaterFix Project’s proposed north Delta diversion could adversely affect Sacramento Valley waterfowl and the Pacific Flyway by reducing diversions of water in the Sacramento Valley that support avian habitat values on both irrigated cropland and wetlands. Mark Petrie of Ducks Unlimited described these impacts in detail in his comments submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board in 2012. (See [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/bay\\_delta/docs/comments111312/mark\\_petrie.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/docs/comments111312/mark_petrie.pdf).)

ARWA's comments reflect many of the same concerns as NSWA's comments and identify further serious impacts in the American River region that the DEIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS inadequately analyze or do not identify. ARWA's comments identified, among other problems, the fact that the hydrologic modeling supporting the DEIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS assumed that, in future without-project conditions, the Bureau of Reclamation would be allowed to operate Folsom Reservoir and the lower American River to create seriously adverse conditions for salmon and steelhead in the river. ARWA's comments also demonstrated that the DEIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS failed to adequately analyze the impacts to the American River region's groundwater resources that would result from operation of Folsom Reservoir as projected by the modeling supporting the DEIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS.

**Item 3 (conditions under which this protest may be dismissed)**

Protestant is working with the other NSWA and ARWA parties to develop proposed conditions for DWR's and Reclamation's water right permits that would be sufficient to allow protestant to dismiss its protest. Protestant and the NSWA and ARWA parties plan to submit those proposed conditions for or during the SWRCB's hearing on DWR's and Reclamation's Petition. In general, those conditions would require DWR and Reclamation to operate the State Water Project and the Central Valley Project in a manner that would eliminate the potential impacts described in Items 2 and 4 of this protest.

#### **Item 4 (facts supporting protest based on injury to prior rights)**

NSWA and ARWA parties divert and use water under various water right permits and licenses, pre-1914 appropriative and riparian rights, and contracts. Protestant's specific rights are described in Attachment Item 5.

If the SWRCB were to grant DWR's and Reclamation's water rights change petition, and if DWR and Reclamation then were to operate the State Water Project ("SWP") and Central Valley Project ("CVP") to divert and re-divert water at the proposed new points of diversion, then NSWA and ARWA parties could be injured in several ways, including the following: (a) the new operations of the SWP and CVP could result in lower SWP and CVP settlement contract and water service contract water supplies being available for diversion and use by NSWA and ARWA parties than would occur without the California WaterFix project; (b) these new operations could change the amounts of storage in SWP and CVP reservoirs and the flows in rivers controlled by the SWP and CVP, and as a result, could create physical limitations on the abilities of NSWA and ARWA parties to divert water under their SWP and CVP contracts, their Warren Act and other contracts or their water rights; and (c) the new Delta flow criteria required by Water Code section 85086, subdivision (c)(2) could be incorporated into a revised Bay/Delta Water Quality Control Plan, and NSWA and ARWA members could be required to contribute to the implementation of those new requirements.<sup>1</sup> If the SWRCB issues an order approving DWR's and Reclamation's petition, then the order should include sufficient conditions on DWR's and Reclamation's operations of the SWP and CVP to assure that such potential injuries to NSWA and ARWA parties will not occur.

Water Code section 1702 provides that, before the SWRCB may issue an order granting a water rights change petition, "the petitioner must establish, to the satisfaction of the board, and it shall find, that the change will not operate to the injury of any legal user of the water involved." To meet the requirements in section 1702 that apply to petitioners, and to assist the SWRCB in meeting its obligations under Water Code section 1702, the SWRCB's regulations, California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 794, subdivision (a), require each water rights change petition to provide various types of information, including the following:

- (1) The amount(s) of water which would have been diverted, consumptively used, or stored under the water right in the absence of the proposed

---

<sup>1</sup> Water Code section 85086, subdivision (c)(2), provides that any SWRCB order approving the California WaterFix petition "shall include appropriate Delta flow criteria." Water Code section 85086, subdivision (c)(1) provides that these criteria "shall include the volume, quality, and timing of water necessary for the Delta ecosystem under different conditions." Parts I and II of the SWRCB's hearing on the California WaterFix petition will need to address the issue of ensuring that the appropriate flow criteria contained in any SWRCB order on the petition are capable of being implemented without causing injury to other legal users of water and without causing any unreasonable effects on fish and wildlife.

change(s), (a) during the period for which the change is requested, or (b) in a maximum year if the change is permanent;

(2) The amount(s) of water proposed for change, transfer or exchange;

...

(6) The existing and the proposed diversion, release and return flow schedules if stored water is involved or if the streamflow regime will be changed.

...

(9) Information identifying any effects of the proposed change(s) on other known users of water, including identification in quantitative terms of any projected change in water quantity, water quality, timing of diversion or use, consumptive use of the water, reduction in return flows, or reduction in the availability of water within the streams affected by the proposed change(s).

DWR's and Reclamation's Petition for the California WaterFix Project does not contain this required information. Instead, the Petition simply states that it is "limited in scope" and "proposes only to add points of diversion and rediversion" and not to change "any other aspect of existing SWP/CVP permits." (Petition Supp., at p. 1.)

The Petition goes on to state that "operations both now and in the future will not impact the quantity of water available for water users in the watershed because these demands are accounted for prior to diversions to storage or export." (Petition Supp., at p. 19.) The Petition, however, does not demonstrate that the proposed changes would not operate to the injury of any legal user of the water involved because: (i) the Petition does not describe any definite operation plan for the CVP and the SWP with the proposed new points of diversion, and (ii) the modeling conducted by DWR and Reclamation during the CEQA/NEPA process was flawed (see NSWA's July 28, 2014 comments on the DEIR/EIS and NSWA's Oct. 30, 2015 comments on the RDEIR/SDEIS.) As discussed in the MBK Engineers technical memoranda that were included in NSWA's and ARWA's comments, the modeling that DWR and Reclamation conducted for the DEIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS has the following flaws:

1. The incorporation of climate change into the model improperly relies on only one climate change projection when many climate change scenarios are possible, and improperly ignores reasonably foreseeable adaptation measures.
2. The model was built on a benchmark study that had numerous inaccuracies.
3. The model coding and data issues significantly skew the analysis and conflict with actual real-time operational objectives and constraints.
4. The "high outflow scenario" is not sufficiently defined for analysis.
5. Delta Cross-Channel operational assumptions overestimate October outflow.



6. San Luis Reservoir operational assumptions produce results inconsistent with real-world operations.
7. The proposed change pattern of reservoir releases for the California WaterFix project would increase in the summer and decrease in the fall, but the effects of these altered release patterns are muted or masked by the overarching effects of simulated climate change and sea level rise.

The Petition refers to the analysis of Alternative 4A in the California WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS. (Petition Supp., at pp. 12, 13.) However, neither the Petition nor the RDEIR/SDEIS contains sufficient information regarding the details of how the CVP and SWP would be operated if the SWRCB were to grant the Petition, particularly with respect to the amounts of spring outflow and the quantity and timing of water diverted at the proposed new points of diversion and re-diversion. For example, the RDEIR/SDEIS and the Petition state that additional outflow may be required in order to meet the needs of threatened and endangered fish species (RDEIR/SDEIS at p. 4.1-13; Petition Supp., at p. 13), but neither the Petition nor the RDEIR/SDEIS describes the quantity, the timing or the source of water for this additional outflow. In addition, the Petition does not state when water would be diverted at each of the various existing and proposed points of diversion or what the quantities of diversions at each point of diversion would be. The Petition does not even state how DWR and Reclamation would make the decisions about where and when to divert water. As a result, neither interested parties nor the SWRCB can evaluate the potential effect of proposed Project operations.

Moreover, the modeling runs used for the environmental analysis in the RDEIR/SDEIS: (i) do not comport with the proposed flows in Alternative 4A, and (ii) overestimate Delta outflow and underestimate exports by several hundred thousand acre-feet per year. For example, the model calculates compliance with salinity water quality objectives mandated by State Water Resources Control Board Revised Decision 1641 ("RD-1641") at Three Mile Slough. In contrast, Alternative 4A contemplates compliance with the same salinity requirement at Emmaton, which is located substantially downstream from Three Mile Slough. Compliance with this requirement at Three Mile Slough would require less outflow than would be required for compliance with the same requirement at Emmaton. Because the modeling analysis assumed compliance with this requirement would occur at Three Mile Slough while the proposed Alternative 4A now contemplates compliance with this requirement at Emmaton, the estimates of the outflows needed to meet salinity standards that were used in the modeling are too low.

Moreover, the flawed modeling that was used for the DEIR/S and not corrected for the RDEIR/SDEIS overestimated Delta outflows by about 200,000 acre-feet/year and underestimated exports to the CVP South of Delta and SWP contractors by about the same amount. That flawed modeling further underestimated diversions at the North Delta Diversion by about 500,000 acre-feet/year, thereby overestimating flows into the Delta and concluding that Project operations in the Delta would be much more benign than they actually would be.

Operations of the SWP and CVP using the proposed points of diversion and redirection must preserve water right priorities. (*El Dorado Irrigation Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Board* (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 937, 966.) Petitioners must demonstrate how future operations of the CVP and SWP would avoid requiring upstream senior diverters and CVP and SWP contractors that would not be benefitted by the proposed changes to forego diversions so that the CVP and SWP can meet their operational requirements.

For example, in dry years such as those experienced in the last two years, DWR and Reclamation have not been able to meet the D-1641 flow and salinity requirements and have had to file several temporary urgency change petitions, which asked to SWRCB to reduce these requirements. Meeting existing flow and salinity requirement therefore could require additional flows in the interior Delta during future dry years. However, the proposed new diversion of water north of the Delta would reduce freshwater inflows into the Delta. To meet even existing standards while reducing Delta inflows, the CVP and SWP would need some new source of water, but no new source of water is described in the Petition.

The RDEIR/SDEIS states that such water would be obtained through water transfers, project reoperation or other sources. (RDEIR/SDEIS at 4.1-6.) However, this general statement does not meet the requirement that the petitioners demonstrate that the proposed California WaterFix Project would not injure other legal users of water. Petitioners must submit sufficient evidence and an adequate operational plan to establish that they would not operate facilities at the proposed points of diversion and re-diversion in a manner that would injure other legal users of water.

Finally, DWR and Reclamation must demonstrate that the future CVP and SWP operations with the proposed changes in points of diversion would not injure the ability of users within the area of origin to meet area of origin demands in the future. Protestants divert and use water within areas where water currently being exported originates. California law expressly recognizes the prior right of communities in these areas of origin to the water that is currently being exported, to the extent that water will be needed in the future to adequately supply the beneficial needs of those areas. (Water Code §§ 10505, 10505.5, 11460, 11463, and 11128; see also §§ 12200-12220.) Demand for water in counties of origin is expected to increase in the future and the likelihood that less water will be available for export is reasonably foreseeable.

As demonstrated in ARWA's comments on the DEIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS, rather than complying with the area of origin laws and water right priorities, the hydrologic modeling supporting the DEIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS assumed that, in a substantial percentage of future conditions, the Bureau of Reclamation would be able to draw Folsom Reservoir down to levels where it would not be able to comply with settlement contracts with American River water users, including the City of Folsom.

**Item 5 (specific information regarding Protestant's water rights)**

Protestant claims a right to the use of water from the source from which petitioners are diverting, or propose to divert, which right is based on (identify type of right protestant claims, such as permit, license, pre-1914 appropriative right or riparian right): Pre-1914 appropriative right, settlement contracts with the United States and Central Valley Project (CVP) water-service contract.

List permit or license or statement of diversion and use numbers, which cover your use of water (if adjudicated right, list decree):

Statement of Water Diversion and Use S017323 (pre-1914 appropriative right based on Notice recorded on December 27, 1851, in El Dorado County, Book "A" of Mining Locations at Page 144)

Statement of Water Diversion and Use S017326 (pre-1914 appropriative right based on Notice recorded on December 27, 1851, in El Dorado County, Book "A" of Mining Locations at Page 144)

Statement of Water Diversion and Use S017490 (pre-1914 appropriative right based on Notice recorded on December 27, 1851, in El Dorado County, Book "A" of Mining Locations at Page 144)

Statement of Water Diversion and Use S017491 (pre-1914 appropriative right based on Notice recorded on December 27, 1851, in El Dorado County, Book "A" of Mining Locations at Page 144)

Contract For Relocation, Rearrangement, Or Alteration Of Facilities, dated June 18, 1951, between Natomas Water Company and the United States of America, Contract No. DA-04-167-eng-330

Contract Between The United States Of America And The City Of Folsom For Conveyance Of Water Rights Water, dated June 23, 1971, Contract No. 14-06-200-5515A

Contract Between The United States Of America And Southern California Water Company For Conveyance Of Water Rights Water, dated May 20, 1970, Contract No. 14-06-200-4816A (the City of Folsom is a partial successor in this contract through contracts with Southern California Water Company)

Subcontract Between The Sacramento County Water Agency And The City Of Folsom Providing For Resale Of Water Under Contract Between The United States Of America And The Sacramento County Water Agency, dated April 25, 2000, under Contract Between The United States And Sacramento County Water Agency Providing For Project Water Service, dated April 8, 1999, Contract No. 6-07-20-W1372 – based on Bureau of Reclamation permits for CVP, including Permits 11315 and 11316 (Applications 13370 and 13371)

Where is your diversion point located? Folsom Dam on the American River; point of diversion on Folsom South Canal also authorized.

If new point of diversion is being requested, is your point of diversion downstream from petitioners' proposed point of diversion? No

The extent of present and past use of water by protestant or its predecessors in interest is as follows:

Total surface water use under the above-referenced rights and contracts by the City of Folsom has been as follows in the last 10 years:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Water Use (in acre-feet)*</u>
2006	26,826
2007	26,759
2008	26,827
2009	25,503
2010	24,838
2011	25,123
2012	23,983
2013	22,990
2014	19,611
2015	16,899

\*Water use in 2014 and 2015 reflects implementation of conservation measures pursuant to the Governor's drought proclamations and the State Water Resources Control Board's urban conservation regulations.

**Item 6 (proof of service)**

This is to certify that I am an attorney for the City of Folsom and that I served the following parties by e-mail at the e-mail addresses listed below:

California Department of Water Resources  
c/o James Mizell  
[James.Mizell@water.ca.gov](mailto:James.Mizell@water.ca.gov)

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
c/o Amy Aufdemberge  
[Amy.Aufdemberge@sol.doi.gov](mailto:Amy.Aufdemberge@sol.doi.gov)

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Sacramento, California on January 4, 2016.



---

Ryan S. Bezerra

