

**MINASIAN, MEITH,
SOARES, SEXTON &
COOPER, LLP**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
A Partnership Including Professional Corporations

1681 BIRD STREET
P.O. BOX 1679
OROVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95965-1679

Writer's email: dcooper@minasianlaw.com

PAUL R. MINASIAN, INC.
JEFFREY A. MEITH
M. ANTHONY SOARES
DUSTIN C. COOPER
EMILY E. LaMOE
PETER C. HARMAN

WILLIAM H. SPRUANCE,
Retired

MICHAEL V. SEXTON,
Retired

TELEPHONE:
(530) 533-2885

FACSIMILE:
(530) 533-0197



June 30, 2014

Felicia Marcus, Chair
State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov

Re: **July 1, 2014, State Water Board Meeting; Comments on Agenda Item 5 (Draft Curtailment Emergency Regulations)**

Dear Board Members:

These comments are respectfully submitted on behalf of Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District, Butte Water District, Cordua Irrigation District, Joint Water Districts Board, Los Molinos Mutual Water Company, Nevada Irrigation District, Paradise Irrigation District, Plumas Mutual Water Company, South Feather Water & Power Agency, South Yuba Water District, Stanford-Vina Ranch Irrigation Company, and Western Canal Water District (collectively "Commenters").

1. **The Proposed Emergency Regulations Should Not Apply to Pre-1914 or Riparian Water Rights**

a. *The State Water Board Has Not Ensured Full Compliance with Prior Curtailment Orders Applicable to Junior Post-1914 Water Right Holders*

On May 27 and 29, 2014, the State Water Board curtailed all post-1914 water rights in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River watersheds to protect senior pre-1914 and riparian water right holders. Despite these curtailments, the Digest in support of the proposed emergency regulations states that it is likely that there will be a "high degree of noncompliance during the drought that will impact senior water right holders" and notes that of the 9,528 post-1914 curtailment notices issued, only 2,036 (21.4%) have filed a curtailment certification form. (Digest, pp. 7-8).

In this severe drought, Commenters fully appreciate the need to restrict diversions, and are supportive of the State Water Board's efforts to restrict the exercise of water rights on the basis of the priority system. However, before considering additional curtailments, the State

Felicia Marcus, Chair
State Water Resources Control Board
June 30, 2014

Re: **July 1, 2014, State Water Board Meeting; Comments on Agenda Item 5 (Draft Curtailment Emergency Regulations)**

Page 2.

Water Board should ensure full compliance with previous curtailment orders, including in this case actual cessation of diversions under curtailed post-1914 water rights.

b. It is Improper to Regulate Curtailment of Pre-1914 and Riparian Water Rights In the Manner Proposed

Commenters contend that it is improper for the State Water Board to curtail pre-1914 and riparian water rights for the reasons explained by Northern California Water Association in its comment letter dated June 27, 2014, incorporated herein by this reference.

2. The Emergency Regulations and Curtailment Process Utilized by the State Water Board Should Provide Fundamental Constitutional Guarantees of Due Process and Just Compensation for Takings

a. *Pre-Curtailment Notice and Prompt Reconsideration of Disputes Post-Curtailment Should Be Provided to Affected Water Right Holders*

It is “axiomatic that once rights to use water are acquired, they become vested property rights. As such, they cannot be infringed by others or taken by governmental action without due process and just compensation.” (*United States v. State Water Resources Control Board* (1986) 182 Cal.App.3d 82, 101 [citing *Ivanhoe Irr. Dist. v. All Parties* (1957) 42 Cal.2d 597, 623, revd. on other grounds in *Ivanhoe Irrig. Dist. v. McCracken* (1958) 357 U.S. 275; *U.S. v. Gerlach Live Stock Co.* (1950) 339 U.S. 725, 752-754].)

The current draft emergency regulations do not adequately recognize reasonable and beneficial use of water as a property right entitled to such protections. The emergency regulations would permit curtailment at the stroke of a pen by the Deputy Director of the Division of Water Rights (or her designee) without any advance notice to the affected owners of the water rights. Without notice, water right holders will be unable, before the effective date of the curtailment, to plan and mitigate for impending curtailment. They will be accorded not even a minimal time to understand the basis for the curtailment, nor to protest the underlying factual basis for curtailment, such as whether there is actually a senior water right holder with unmet demands that justifies such curtailment. The curtailment orders will apparently demand immediate response and will immediately trigger enhanced penalties of \$1,000 per day plus \$2,500 per acre foot unlawfully diverted plus \$500 per day for violating an emergency regulation plus \$10,000 per day for violating a cease and desist order.

In the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, State Water Board staff seems almost giddy in describing the punitive measures that can be brought to bear under the curtailment process described in the proposed regulations:

Felicia Marcus, Chair
State Water Resources Control Board
June 30, 2014

Re: **July 1, 2014, State Water Board Meeting; Comments on Agenda Item 5 (Draft Curtailment Emergency Regulations)**

Page 3.

In the event that the Board has adopted a regulation under section 1058.5, the Board may immediately issue an enforceable curtailment order based on lack of water availability rather than individualized evidence of unlawful diversion, instead of a notice that water is unavailable, and may immediately issue a draft cease and desist order and simultaneously issue an administrative civil liability complaint in response to violations of the regulation. (Wat. Code §§ 1058.5, subd. (d), 1845, subd. (d)(4), 1846.) Penalties for violations under the regulations would carry an additional penalty over those for unlawful diversion absent the regulations. (Wat. Code § 1845, 1846).

(Notice, p. N-2, underlining added). Regulation is more than deriving means to bring the most punitive firepower to bear in the least amount of time. It demands assurance that the immense power of such measures are being wielded with due respect for the rights that are being infringed. Providing pre-curtailment constitutional guarantees are designed, in part, to ensure that the State Water Board hears and considers the best available evidence from all interested parties before taking action. This respects the vested nature of water rights while at the same time implementing the priority system in times of shortage. The proposed regulations sacrifice these checks and balances for expediency.

No pre-curtailment notice or opportunity for hearing is provided; however, once curtailments are in effect, the regulations would require petitions for reconsideration under a non-expedited timeline. The proposed regulations at § 875(f) states that all curtailment orders “shall” be subject to reconsideration under Water Code section 1122. Section 1122 provides that the petition for reconsideration must be filed not later than 30 days from the date of the curtailment order and the Board has 90 days from the curtailment order to order or deny reconsideration.

It is a sad day for regulation when judicious regard for protecting water rights is being thrust aside in favor of facilitating the more rapid unleashing of an arsenal of punitive measures. As drafted, the proposed regulations appear to be a scheme to coerce water right holders into immediate and indefinite compliance with orders drafted by State Water Board staff. Not providing any pre-curtailment notice and opportunity to present evidence will foster unchecked, improper curtailments. The potential for astronomical financial penalties will coerce water right holders into compliance with even arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise improper curtailment orders. Finally, requiring post-curtailment petitions for reconsideration on a delayed timeline ensures that curtailment continues until this Board intervenes by granting reconsideration or an action can be filed in superior court. If the State Water Board wished to encourage costly and inefficient adjudications of water rights, no better inducement than the proposed regulations can be imagined.

Felicia Marcus, Chair
State Water Resources Control Board
June 30, 2014

Re: **July 1, 2014, State Water Board Meeting; Comments on Agenda Item 5 (Draft
Curtailment Emergency Regulations)**

Page 4.

Commenters understand the severity of the current drought and the desire and need to promptly act, but expediency does not justify a failure to provide minimum levels of constitutional protections owed to constitutionally protected rights to reasonably and beneficially use water. The proposed regulations should be modified to only apply to post-1914 water rights. If the Board believes conditions justify curtailment of pre-1914 or riparian water rights, notice of the proposed curtailment should be provided along with an expedited opportunity to object and present evidence before curtailment takes effect. At that review, State Water Board staff should be expected to set out its evidence to support the proposed curtailment. Finally, the State Water Board should either not require reconsideration before permitting interested parties to seek redress from the courts or should expedite its action on petitions for reconsideration.

b. *The Proposed Regulations Create Unconstitutional Bias by Having the State Water Board Adjudicate Hearings and Petitions for Reconsideration While it is Also a Beneficiary of Unauthorized Diversion Penalties*

The proposed regulations incorporate unconstitutional institutional bias by allowing the State Water Board to serve as the adjudicator in penalty proceedings while enjoying a direct benefit from the proceeds of the very penalties it imposes. This bias is enhanced due to the fact that no pre-curtailment due process is provided to affected water right holders.

When the Board imposes fines and penalties under the guise of administrative civil liability, violations of cease and desist orders, or for violations of emergency regulations, the money is routed directly to the Board, via the Water Rights Fund. (See Water Code §§ 1052(e), 1552(c)-(e), 1845(d), 1846(f).) Under section 1552, the Board is given direct authority to spend the fines and penalties that the Board itself imposes and collects in adjudicatory proceedings.¹ (Water Code § 1552(c)-(e).) This creates impermissible bias by giving the adjudicator (the Board) a strong motivation to find that violations have occurred, including denying petitions for reconsideration and predetermining the outcome of CDO hearings, in order to raise money for its own use. The proposed regulations would greatly expand the reach of section 1846(a)(2) (imposing fines for violations of emergency regulations) and expedite the collection of fines under sections 1052(c) and 1845(d) (administrative civil liability and cease and desist orders), bringing this problem to a head.

The U.S. Supreme Court unequivocally rejected as unconstitutionally biased situations in which an adjudicator has a direct financial interest in the fines and penalties derived

¹ That the legislature must perform the ministerial duty of appropriating the funds to the Board from the Water Rights Fund (Water Code § 1552) does not reduce the creation of bias. Section 1552 mandates that the Water Rights fund be used for specific purposes, each of which benefit the Board and most of which are for expenditures made directly by the Board.

Felicia Marcus, Chair
State Water Resources Control Board
June 30, 2014

Re: **July 1, 2014, State Water Board Meeting; Comments on Agenda Item 5 (Draft Curtailment Emergency Regulations)**

Page 5.

from the adjudications. (*Ward v. City of Monroeville* (1972) 409 U.S. 57; see also *Tumey v. Ohio* (1927) 273 U.S. 510, 532, 534; *Haas v. County of San Bernadino* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1017, 1025-26.) These courts concluded that the existence of such temptation created a bias that violated the Constitutional requirements of due process.

By expanding the types of conduct mandated and prohibited by emergency regulations and expediting administrative civil liability and cease and desist orders, while scaling back due process protections for the diverter whose diversions the Board finds are curtailed or wasteful and unreasonable, the Board only exacerbates the institutional bias inherent in its dual roles as both adjudicator of violations and as beneficiary of the proceeds of the fines and penalties imposed.

3. The State Water Board Must Develop Criteria and Protocols for Lifting Curtailments and Conduct a Workshop to Allow Public Input and Comment on the Topic Before Finalizing Its Plans to Allow Resumption of Diversions When Water Is Available to Divert This Fall.

We enclose a joint letter of Nevada Irrigation District, South Feather Water & Power Agency and Paradise Irrigation District highlighting this very important and significant issue. The State Water Board's failure to address this issue constitutes a continuing deficiency in its rush to curtail diversions. While this issue is significant to all Commenters, it is of particular concern to those districts that operate limited rim water storage facilities for the benefit of their respective customers and the stream reaches that are maintained by such storage. Given the unpredictability of fall and winter precipitation, localized fall storms may be the only significant precipitation events to augment depleted reservoir storage. As is typical of such agencies, these districts do not have access to ground water, nor do they do not operate large storage reservoirs with surplus capacity. Water lost due to an error in regulating diversions to storage cannot be retrieved. The Board does not have the luxury of time in defining the rules for resumption of diversions to storage by such agencies.

We also enclose estimates of potential loss of supply for each of the three districts we represent, making various assumptions with respect to hydrology and the date curtailments are ultimately lifted. The importance of this issue demands that it be resolved now, as opposed to when fall storms are already approaching or after some storm events have passed. Commenters and all other water right holders need a predictable, transparent, and dynamic methodology for lifting curtailments that respects the water right priority system and accounts for unpredictable nature of storms and the highly disparate impacts they have among and between different watersheds in the State.

Felicia Marcus, Chair
State Water Resources Control Board
June 30, 2014

Re: **July 1, 2014, State Water Board Meeting; Comments on Agenda Item 5 (Draft
Curtailment Emergency Regulations)**

Page 6.

4. The State Water Board Should Strictly Enforce the Water Right Priority System And Avoid Creating a “Health and Safety” Super Priority.

Section 875 of the proposed emergency regulations should not be subject to the minimum health and safety exemption from curtailments and water right seniority under section 878.1. As a preliminary matter, Commenters are not aware of any current or projected health and safety water needs that remain unmet, in which case the exemption is unnecessary. Even if health and safety demands arise, existing authorities of the State Water Board, including expedited processing of water transfers or the power of condemnation, are adequate to supply such needs. Condemnation, however, requires due process and an evidentiary hearing to determine a more necessary public use (Code Civ. Proc. § 1255.010), a deposit of the damages from the taking (Cal. Const., Art. I, §§ 7, 19), and payment of all direct and indirect damages caused by the taking of water for municipal or domestic use (Water Code § 1245). The courts, not the State Water Board, is the appropriate venue for such actions.

5. Proposed Section 878.3, Alternative Water Sharing Agreements, Should Be Clarified or Stricken; Existing Authority Allows for Expedited Processing of Temporary Water Transfers.

In lieu of strict conformance with the priority system, Section 878.3 of the proposed regulations would permit alternative water sharing agreements, provided there is no legal injury to other users of water and the agreements do not impose an unreasonable impact on fish and wildlife. If the State Water Board wishes to further expedite temporary transfers of water under Water Code section 1725 et seq. (as modified by the Governor’s April 25, 2014, Emergency Proclamation), the regulation should be clarified to specifically state that purpose. If the regulation is not intended to further expedite temporary transfers, then it should be stricken as unnecessary because existing authority allows for State Water Board consideration and approval of temporary water transfers.

Very truly yours,

**MINASIAN, MEITH, SOARES,
SEXTON & COOPER, LLP**

By: _____
DUSTIN C. COOPER

DCC:aw
Encls.



NEVADA IRRIGATION DISTRICT

1036 W. Main Street, Grass Valley, CA 95945-5424 • www.nidwater.com
(530) 273-4165 • FAX: (530) 477-2646 • Toll Free: (800) 222-4102



PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

6332 Clark Road • Paradise, California 95969-4146 • 530.877.4971 • Fax 530.876.0483

SOUTH FEATHER WATER & POWER AGENCY

2310 ORO-QUINCY HIGHWAY
OROVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95966
530-533-4624
530-533-3968 (FAX)



June 17, 2014

Thomas Howard, Executive Director
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: **End of Curtailment Process**

Dear Mr. Howard:

With water rights curtailments in effect across the state, and with more on the horizon, now is the time for the State Water Resources Control Board to address a significant omission in the curtailment orders—the consideration and development of criteria and protocols for lifting curtailment orders when water becomes available to divert this fall. An orderly and predictable process for authorizing resumption of diversions must be established before fall rains. Delays in reauthorizing diversions will result in lost opportunities to replenish badly depleted reservoirs, further injuring water rights holders and exacerbating their already precarious positions. Having imposed the prohibition on direct diversion and collection to storage, the Board must now develop the protocol for resuming diversions.

The curtailments of post-1914 water rights in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Bay-Delta watershed were issued *en masse*, without analyzing or considering issues of relative seniority among the class of curtailed rights. Instead, the Board waited until after it had decided that *all* post-1914 water rights in the basin were due to be curtailed and then curtailed the entire class at once. The May 27, 2014, curtailment letters sent to all post-1914 water rights in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River watershed state only that (1) the curtailments “will continue until water conditions improve”; (2) water right holders may not resume diverting until the State Board notifies them that they may do so; and (3) permission to resume diversions during or following rainfall events “may be” posted on the State Board’s website.

Lifting the curtailments cannot be accomplished using the same *en masse* approach that was used to impose them. For one thing, the effects of fall and winter storms cannot be accurately predicted very far in advance, if at all. Second, the storms will affect different watersheds differently, and some not at all. While it may be possible to model and forecast the availability of spring and

Thomas Howard
June 17, 2014
Re: End of Curtailment Process
Page 2.

summer supplies based on existing snowpack, storage, and hydrological information, the same is not true for anticipating precipitation events. As rain storms commence, the curtailment of each individual water right must be lifted as soon as water is available under the individual water right's priority. The Board's interest in convenient administration of water rights does not allow it to wait until there is sufficient water for all post-1914 rights before it lifts curtailments for the entire group.

Diversions must be authorized at the earliest time water is available under each individual water right. To delay senior diverters' exercise of their diversion rights could have catastrophic and irreversible effects, particularly if the drought continues into next year or beyond. Because storms do not uniformly impact the entire Bay-Delta watershed simultaneously, curtailments must be ended based on a dynamic model that accounts for priority of right as well as real-time precipitation and flow conditions within and among the watershed's individual creeks and tributaries. Water may be available for diversion in certain areas of the watershed or its sub-basins long before it becomes available in others, even when water rights in another basin may predate those in the basin receiving the rainfall.

Given the complexities in determining when diversions may resume under each individual right, the State Board must immediately begin developing criteria and protocols for lifting curtailments. Any storm that reaches California this fall or winter could be the last significant storm of the season, and thus could be the only opportunity to augment dangerously depleted storage. Even if additional storms follow, diverters rely on early storms to recover a significant amount of storage.

The exigency of this issue cannot be stressed enough. Any delay in lifting curtailments and authorizing water right holders to resume diversion after rain commences—even a couple of days—would be a lost opportunity to mitigate continuing effects of the drought. The water right holders need to be ready and in position to resume diversions *before* water reaches the points of diversion.

California's water right holders need a predictable, transparent, and dynamic methodology for lifting curtailments that respects the water right priority system and accounts for the unpredictable nature of storms and the highly disparate impacts they have among and between different parts of the watershed. The Board will not have sufficient time to act after a storm is already approaching. The undersigned therefore request an opportunity to comment on the process the Board's staff may already be working on and that the Board convene a workshop to consider and establish criteria and protocols for the rescission of individual curtailments as they apply to specific individual water rights.

NEVADA IRRIGATION DISTRICT


Remleh Scherzinger,
General Manager

PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT



George Barber,
General Manager

SOUTH FEATHER WATER &
POWER AGENCY



Michael Glaze,
General Manager

Thomas Howard

June 17, 2014

Re: End of Curtailment Process

Page 2.

summer supplies based on existing snowpack, storage, and hydrological information, the same is not true for anticipating precipitation events. As rain storms commence, the curtailment of each individual water right must be lifted as soon as water is available under the individual water right's priority. The Board's interest in convenient administration of water rights does not allow it to wait until there is sufficient water for all post-1914 rights before it lifts curtailments for the entire group.

Diversions must be authorized at the earliest time water is available under each individual water right. To delay senior diverters' exercise of their diversion rights could have catastrophic and irreversible effects, particularly if the drought continues into next year or beyond. Because storms do not uniformly impact the entire Bay-Delta watershed simultaneously, curtailments must be ended based on a dynamic model that accounts for priority of right as well as real-time precipitation and flow conditions within and among the watershed's individual creeks and tributaries. Water may be available for diversion in certain areas of the watershed or its sub-basins long before it becomes available in others, even when water rights in another basin may predate those in the basin receiving the rainfall.

Given the complexities in determining when diversions may resume under each individual right, the State Board must immediately begin developing criteria and protocols for lifting curtailments. Any storm that reaches California this fall or winter could be the last significant storm of the season, and thus could be the only opportunity to augment dangerously depleted storage. Even if additional storms follow, diverters rely on early storms to recover a significant amount of storage.


The exigency of this issue cannot be stressed enough. Any delay in lifting curtailments and authorizing water right holders to resume diversion after rain commences—even a couple of days—would be a lost opportunity to mitigate continuing effects of the drought. The water right holders need to be ready and in position to resume diversions *before* water reaches the points of diversion.

California's water right holders need a predictable, transparent, and dynamic methodology for lifting curtailments that respects the water right priority system and accounts for the unpredictable nature of storms and the highly disparate impacts they have among and between different parts of the watershed. The Board will not have sufficient time to act after a storm is already approaching. The undersigned therefore request an opportunity to comment on the process the Board's staff may already be working on and that the Board convene a workshop to consider and establish criteria and protocols for the rescission of individual curtailments as they apply to specific individual water rights.

NEVADA IRRIGATION DISTRICT

PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

SOUTH FEATHER WATER &
POWER AGENCY


Remleh Scherzinger,
General Manager

George Barber,
General Manager

Michael Glaze,
General Manager

NEVADA IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Three Year Average (2011-2013) - Acre Feet					
Direct					
Diversion plus			Direct		
Month	Storage	Storage	Diversion	Total	
Oct	11778	540	9516	21834	
Nov	16087	4982	8195	29264	
Dec	29900	10369	11282	51551	
					102649

2011 - Acre Feet					
Direct					
Diversion plus			Direct		
Month	Storage	Storage	Diversion	Total	
Oct	6653	130	2880	9663	
Nov	7787	605	3361	11753	
Dec	24126	4173	6895	35194	
					56610

2012 - Acre Feet					
Direct					
Diversion plus			Direct		
Month	Storage	Storage	Diversion	Total	
Oct	12794	546	14908	28248	
Nov	25458	13532	12852	51842	
Dec	44463	26502	8781	79746	
					159836

2013 - Acre Feet					
Direct					
Diversion plus			Direct		
Month	Storage	Storage	Diversion	Total	
Oct	15886	945	10759	27590	
Nov	15017	808	8371	24196	
Dec	21110	432	18171	39713	
					91499

SOUTH FEATHER WATER & POWER AGENCY
 Evaluation of 2014 Curtailment Order impacts to Fall operations

Right now we have no impacts from the curtailment orders because consumption is fed from prior storage and there is no natural runoff to store. What impacts will occur if the order stays into fall and effects ability to divert/use the instream water? Post 14 Consumptive demand in the fall (Oct-Dec) is 3000 af which could be continued to be met from prior stored water (no impact). Direct diversions for power are not effected by this order (no impact). Therefore the significant impact is the diversion to storage for power.

Total of all water rights for Diversion to Storage Component


	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	AVG
Oct	1229	1369	455	2075	1338	1293
Nov	694	488	340	6605	792	1784
Dec	572	6500	319	6920	755	3013
	Total					6090

Evaluation of individual water rights for Diversion to Storage

Water Right #		2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
1267	Oct	950	1013	0	0	1064
	Nov	694	488	0	0	792
	Dec	572	0	0	0	597
1268	Oct	168	356	0	149	0
	Nov	0	0	0	0	0
	Dec	0	0	0	0	0
2492	Oct	111	0	0	0	274
	Nov	0	0	0	0	0
	Dec	0	0	0	0	0
1271	Direct Diversion only					
10939	Oct	na	0	455	1926	0
	Nov	na	0	340	6605	0
	Dec	na	6500	319	6920	158
10940	Oct	na	0	0	0	0
	Nov	na	0	0	0	0
	Dec	na	0	0	0	0
10941	Direct Diversion only					


PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Effects of Potential Water Rights Curtailments on Reservoir Storage
Dry Conditions



PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT


Effects of Potential Water Rights Curtailments on Reservoir Storage
Dry Summer and Median Autumn



PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Effects of Potential Water Rights Curtailments on Reservoir Storage


Dry Summer and Wet Autumn



PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Effects of Potential Water Rights Curtailments on Reservoir Storage


Median Autumn Followed by Another Dry Year



PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Effects of Potential Water Rights Curtailments on Reservoir Storage

Dry Conditions Continue



PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Effects of Potential Water Rights Curtailments on Reservoir Storage

Dry Conditions and Curtailments Continue

