

1 DOWNEY BRAND LLP  
2 KEVIN M. O'BRIEN (Bar No. 122713)  
3 DAVID R.E. ALADJEM (Bar No. 152203)  
4 621 Capitol Mall, 18th Floor  
5 Sacramento, CA 95814-4731  
6 Telephone: (916) 444-1000  
7 Facsimile: (916) 444-2100  
8 kobrien@downeybrand.com  
9 daladjem@downeybrand.com

6 Attorneys for Reclamation District 108, *et al.*  
7 (all clients on attached signature page)

8 [Other attorneys listed on attached signature page]

9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

10 STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

12 In the matter of:  
13 Informational Proceeding to Develop Flow  
14 Criteria for the Delta Ecosystem

**SACRAMENTO VALLEY WATER  
USERS' WRITTEN SUMMARY OF  
RESPONSES TO KEY ISSUE AND  
ASSOCIATED QUESTIONS**

16 Pursuant to the Revised Notice of Public Informational Proceeding dated January 29,  
17 2010, the Sacramento Valley Water Users ("SVWU")<sup>1</sup> submit this written summary in response  
18 to the key issue and associated questions identified in the Notice of Informational Proceeding  
19 dated December 16, 2009 ("Notice").<sup>2</sup>

20 <sup>1</sup> The individuals and entities comprising SVWU are identified in Attachment 1.

21 <sup>2</sup> The Notice states: "The key issue for this proceeding is what volume, quality, and timing of Delta outflows are  
22 necessary for the Delta ecosystem under different hydrologic conditions to protect public trust resources pursuant to  
23 the State Water Board's public trust obligations and the requirements of SB 1." (Notice, p. 6). The Notice also  
24 identifies the following questions: (1) What key information, in particular scientific information or portions of  
25 scientific information, should the State Water Board rely upon when determining the volume, quantity, and timing of  
26 water needed for the Delta ecosystem pursuant to the board's public trust obligations? For large reports or  
27 documents, what pages or chapters should be considered? What does this scientific information indicate regarding the  
28 minimum and maximum volume, quality, and timing of flows needed under the existing physical conditions, various  
hydrologic conditions, and biological conditions? With respect to biological conditions, what does the scientific  
information indicate regarding appropriateness of flow to control non-native species? What is the level of scientific  
certainty regarding the foregoing information?; (2) What methodology should the State Water Board use to develop  
flow criteria for the Delta? What does that methodology indicate the needed minimum and maximum volume,  
quality, and timing of flows are for different hydrologic conditions under the current physical conditions of the  
Delta?; (3) When determining Delta outflows necessary to protect public trust resources, how important is the source  
of those flows? How should the State Water Board address this issue when developing Delta outflow criteria?; (4)  
How should the State Water Board address scientific uncertainty when developing the Delta outflow criteria?

1           **I.     IN DEVELOPING NEW FLOW CRITERIA FOR THE DELTA, THE**  
 2           **SWRCB MUST (A) BE MINDFUL OF ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE**  
 3           **PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE, AND (B) RECOGNIZE THAT, AS A**  
 4           **PRACTICAL MATTER, COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC TRUST**  
               **BALANCING AS REQUIRED UNDER *NATIONAL AUDUBON* CANNOT**  
               **OCCUR IN THIS INFORMATIONAL PROCEEDING.**

5           SB 1, enacted on November 12, 2009, adds the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform  
 6 Act of 2009 to the Water Code. Section 39 of SB 1 establishes Water Code section 85086, which  
 7 identifies the parameters of this proceeding. Section 85086(c)(1) provides that the State Water  
 8 Resources Control Board (“SWRCB”) “shall, pursuant to its public trust obligations, develop new  
 9 flow criteria for the Delta ecosystem necessary to protect public trust resources.” There are three  
 10 critical elements of this statutory language. First, the statute indicates that this proceeding shall  
 11 be undertaken “pursuant to” the Board’s “public trust obligations,” thus making clear the  
 12 Legislature’s intent that this proceeding be subject to the requirements of the public trust doctrine  
 13 as established under California case law. Second, the statute does not limit the public trust  
 14 resources to be considered in this proceeding to public trust resources existing in the Delta.  
 15 Rather, the statute refers to the need to “protect public trust resources” generally. Finally, section  
 16 85086(c)(1) states that the outcome of this informational proceeding “shall not be considered  
 17 predecisional with regard to any subsequent board consideration of a permit, including any permit  
 18 in connection with a final BDCP.”

19           Under the public trust doctrine, the SWRCB has an affirmative duty to take public trust  
 20 resources into account when making decisions regarding the allocation of water resources. The  
 21 discharge of this duty, however, does not occur in a vacuum. Instead, the SWRCB considers the  
 22 public trust at the same time it considers other uses of water, including other public trust uses.  
 23 (See *Nat. Audubon Society v. Superior Court (Los Angeles Dept. of Water & Power)* (1983)  
 24 33 Cal.3d 419, 446) The California Supreme Court has stated:

25           The state has an affirmative duty to take the public trust into account in the  
 26 planning and allocation of water resources, and to protect public trust uses  
 27 whenever feasible. . . . As a matter of practical necessity[,] the state may have to  
 28 approve appropriations despite foreseeable harm to public trust uses. In so doing,  
 however, the state must bear in mind its duty as trustee to consider the effect of

---

Specifically, what kind of adaptive management, monitoring, and special studies programs should the State Water Board consider as part of the Delta outflow criteria, if any?; and (5) What can the State Water Board reasonably be expected to accomplish with respect to flow criteria within the nine months following enactment of SB 1? What issues should the State Water Board focus on in order to develop meaningful criteria during this short period of time?

1 the taking on the public trust [citation omitted], and to preserve, so far as  
2 consistent with the public interest, the uses protected by the trust.

3 (*Nat. Audubon Society* at pp. 446-47.) The public trust doctrine does not require that  
4 conflicts between public trust values and competing water uses be resolved in favor of protecting  
5 the public trust. (*State Water Resources Control Bd. Cases* (2006) 136 Cal.App.4th 674, 778  
6 (Robie, J.)) Rather, the SWRCB determines which public trust uses are "feasible" to protect; in  
7 resolving whether it is "feasible" to protect certain public trust uses in a particular instance, the  
8 Board must decide whether protection of those uses, or what level of protection, is "consistent  
9 with the public interest." (*Id.*)

10 As a practical matter, the SWRCB must consider whether it would be feasible for the  
11 current water supply system to achieve any Delta flow criteria proposed in this proceeding  
12 because, if the water is not available to meet such criteria, then it would be meaningless for the  
13 SWRCB to adopt them. Section 85086(c)(1), however, does not provide the SWRCB with the  
14 amount of time, or allow for the quasi-adjudicatory procedures, that would be necessary for the  
15 SWRCB to appropriately balance consumptive and non-consumptive uses of water as required  
16 under *National Audubon*, and to adopt regulatory requirements that would bind the parties.  
17 Accordingly, the SWRCB's final report in this proceeding must recognize the foregoing  
18 limitations and the report should clearly indicate that it is not precedential in any future  
19 proceedings in which the SWRCB considers new regulatory standards for the Delta or if the  
20 SWRCB otherwise seeks to discharge its duties under the public trust doctrine.

## 19 II. RESPONSES TO KEY ISSUE AND ASSOCIATED QUESTIONS

20 SVWU responds to the key issue and associated questions identified in the Notice as  
21 follows:

22 ● The relationship between the condition of the Bay-Delta Estuary and Delta outflow  
23 (and its index, X2) is complex. The underlying causal mechanisms between Delta outflow and  
24 fish populations are not well understood.

25 ● Delta outflow is only one of many factors affecting fish populations in the Delta.  
26 The relationships between populations of fish species to Delta outflow have changed over time,  
27 and often have become weaker. Many other factors have been implicated in the decline of the  
28 Delta ecosystem. The relative importance of these other factors should be thoroughly

1 investigated before any new numerical outflow criteria are adopted.

2       • The new federal delta smelt and salmonid Biological Opinions are in the earliest  
3 stages of implementation and the efficacy of the measures contained in these Biological Opinions  
4 has not yet been evaluated. These Biological Opinions effectively include new flow criteria for  
5 the Delta. The SWRCB should allow adequate time for these Biological Opinions to be  
6 implemented and evaluated before any new numeric flow criteria for the Delta are adopted.

7       • The ongoing Delta studies and the intense suite of investigations initiated in  
8 connection with the Pelagic Organism Decline program, and the ongoing evaluation of D-1641  
9 and the federal delta smelt and salmonid Biological Opinions provide a robust opportunity for  
10 understanding the relative importance of various factors in relation to in-Delta public trust  
11 resources and the relationship of outflow to each factor. The studies to date, however, do not  
12 provide a reliable basis for adopting another set of Delta outflow criteria, in the absence of  
13 management actions to address the other factors that may be impacting public trust resources in  
14 the Delta.

15       • Based on the foregoing, the SWRCB should proceed with the understanding that  
16 more modifications to Delta outflow criteria, without other measures to address the various  
17 factors that may affect the Delta ecosystem, are unlikely to substantially improve ecosystem  
18 health.

19       • The proposals to modify Delta outflow advanced by the Bay Institute and certain  
20 faculty of the University of California, Davis, if implemented, would cause severe adverse  
21 impacts on other existing beneficial uses of water (including, potentially, and without limitation,  
22 irrigation, domestic, municipal, industrial and hydroelectric power generation uses) and on public  
23 trust resources outside the Delta. In particular, those proposals would severely limit the amount  
24 of carryover storage available in reservoirs throughout the Sacramento-San Joaquin watershed.  
25 As a result, for example, it would become impossible in many hydrologic scenarios to meet flow  
26 and temperature requirements on the Sacramento River and its tributaries, to the detriment of state  
27 and federally-listed salmonids and other fish species. (SVWU Exhibits 1 through 60)

28       • The SWRCB should treat this proceeding as a first step toward addressing the  
protection of public trust resources in the Delta in a manner consistent with, as Water Code  
section 85086(c)(1) puts it, the SWRCB's "public trust obligations." The existing numeric

1 outflow requirements – including those in the Biological Opinions – represent a reasonable  
2 starting point given the substantial scientific uncertainty that exists about the role of other factors  
3 in the Delta and the effect of outflow on those factors. A matrix showing the current numeric  
4 Delta outflow requirements is set forth in Attachment 2.

5 • In addition to the existing numeric outflow requirements, the SWRCB should  
6 adopt narrative criteria that incorporate the following principles:

7 • Delta outflow requirements must be based on reliable scientific evidence  
8 addressing (i) what flows are needed to support a particular public trust resource; and (ii)  
9 how such flows vary by season or by water-year type.

10 • Delta outflow requirements must be based on reliable scientific evidence  
11 addressing (i) what water quality considerations (e.g., temperature, pH, salinity) are  
12 needed to support this public trust use in the relevant portion of the watershed; and (ii)  
13 how such factors vary by season or by water-year type.

14 • Delta outflow requirements must be based on reliable scientific evidence  
15 addressing (i) how the flows needed to support a particular public trust resource in the  
16 Delta relate to the needs of other public trust uses, both in the Delta and outside the Delta;  
17 and (ii) whether the flows needed to support a particular public trust resource in the Delta  
18 must be balanced with the needs of other public trust resources elsewhere in order to  
19 protect the public trust generally.

20 • Delta outflow requirements must be based on reliable scientific evidence  
21 addressing (i) how the flows needed to support a particular public trust resource in the  
22 Delta relate to the needs of other water users in the Delta or outside the Delta (including,  
23 without limitation, irrigation, domestic, municipal, industrial and hydroelectric power  
24 generation uses); and (ii) whether the flows that would maximize public trust resources in  
25 the Delta and elsewhere would be consistent with the public interest.

26 • In any future proceedings to address the protection of public trust resources in the  
27 Delta, the SWRCB must address how to undertake the comprehensive public trust balancing  
28 required by *National Audubon*.

• The SWRCB should be mindful that any of its actions, including the development  
of Delta flow criteria in this proceeding, are subject to the prohibition against waste and

1 unreasonable use of water in article X, section 2 of the California Constitution.

2 DATED: February 16 2010

DOWNEY BRAND LLP

3  
4 By:   
5 Kevin M. O'Brien, Attorneys for Reclamation  
6 District 108, Calaveras County Water District,  
7 Carter Mutual Water Company, Howald Farms,  
8 Inc., Meridian Farms Water Company, Natomas  
9 Central Mutual Water Company, North Delta  
10 Water Agency, Oji Brothers Farm, Inc. and Oji  
11 Family Partnership, Pelger Mutual Water  
12 Company, Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water  
13 Company, Sacramento Municipal Utility District,  
14 Reclamation District 2060, Reclamation District  
15 2068, Richter Brothers, River Garden Farms  
16 Company, South Sutter Water District, Sutter  
17 Extension Water District, Sutter Mutual Water  
18 Company, Tisdale Irrigation and Drainage  
19 Company, and Windswept Land and Livestock  
20 Company

21 BARTKIEWICZ, KRONICK & SHANAHAN, P.C.

22 Alan Lilly, Attorneys for Browns Valley Irrigation  
23 District, City of Folsom, City of Roseville, San Juan  
24 Water District and Yuba County Water Agency

25 SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN, A  
26 PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

27 Andrew M. Hitchings, Attorneys for Glenn-Colusa  
28 Irrigation District, County of Sacramento, Sacramento  
County Water Agency and County of Yolo

DOWNEY BRAND LLP

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **SACRAMENTO VALLEY WATER USERS**

#### **Downey Brand LLP**

Reclamation District 108, Calaveras County Water District, Carter Mutual Water Company, Howald Farms, Inc., Meridian Farms Water Company, Natomas Central Mutual Water Company, North Delta Water Agency, Oji Brothers Farm, Inc. and Oji Family Partnership, Pelger Mutual Water Company, Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Company, Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Reclamation District 2060, Reclamation District 2068, Richter Brothers, River Garden Farms Company, South Sutter Water District, Sutter Extension Water District, Sutter Mutual Water Company, Tisdale Irrigation and Drainage Company, and Windswept Land and Livestock Company

#### **Bartkiewicz, Kronick & Shanahan, P.C.**

Browns Valley Irrigation District, City of Folsom, City of Roseville, San Juan Water District and Yuba County Water Agency

#### **Somach Simmons & Dunn, a Professional Corporation**

Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, County of Sacramento, Sacramento County Water Agency and County of Yolo

**ATTACHMENT 2**

**X2 OBJECTIVES AND DELTA OUTFLOW STANDARDS**

<b>Document Source(s)</b>	<b>X2 Objective</b>	<b>Minimum Delta Outflows</b>
<p><b>2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary</b></p>	<p>Chippis Island and Port Chicago for a specified number of days each month between February and June based on the previous months Eight River Index, a 14-day running average of 2.64mmhos/cm or 3-day running average of net Delta outflows of 11,400 cfs and 29,200 cfs, respectively. (See attached "Table 4. Number of Days When Maximum Daily Average Electrical Conductivity of 2.54 mmhos/cm Must Be Maintained at Specific Location.")<sup>1</sup></p>	<p><u>Net Delta Outflow Requirement for Fish &amp; Wildlife Beneficial Uses</u></p> <p><u>January:</u> 4,500 cfs (All Years);<sup>2</sup> 6,000 cfs if the Eight River Index for December is greater than 800 TAF<sup>3</sup></p> <p><u>February-June:</u> Minimum daily of net outflow of 7,100 cfs (All Years) based on 3-day running average; or 14-day running average of EC at Collinsville Gauge is less than or equal to 2.64 mmhos/cm.</p>
<p><b>1995 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary</b></p>	<p>Chippis Island is 75 km upstream of the GG Bridge. Port Chicago is 64 km upstream of the GG Bridge. (See attached annotated CCWD photograph.)</p>	<p>If Eight River Index for January is more than 900 TAF, then daily average or 14-day running average EC at station C2 shall be less than or equivalent to 2.64 mmhos/cm at least one day between February 1 and February 14.</p>
<p><b>SWRCB Water Right Decision 1641 (Dec. 29, 1999, revised Mar. 15, 2000) ("D-1641")</b></p>		<p>If Eight River Index for January is 650 TAF-900 TAF, Exec Dir. of SWRCB delegated to decide whether requirement applies.</p> <p>If Eight River Index for February is less than 500 TAF, then standard may be relaxed in March upon recommendation from operations group, with any disputes resolved by CALFED policy group. (Note: In D-1641, this stated that DWR and USBR could request that the March standard be relaxed, subject to the approval of the SWRCB Executive Director.)</p> <p>The standard does not apply in May and June if May estimate of Sacramento River Index is less than 8.1 MAF at the 90% exceedence level. Under this circumstance a minimum 14-day running average flow of 4,000 cfs is required in May and June.</p>

<sup>1</sup> This table appears in the 2006 and 1995 Water Quality Control Plans for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary and D-1641. The information in this table in each document is exactly the same.

<sup>2</sup> Water year-type is based on the Sacramento Valley 40-30-30 Index. This index equation is  $0.4 * X + 0.3 * Y + 0.3 * Z$ , where X is the current year's April-July Sacramento Valley unimpaired runoff, Y is the current October-March Sacramento Valley unimpaired runoff, and Z is the previous year's index (which has a cap of 10.0 MAF). Sacramento Valley unimpaired runoff for the current water year



**ATTACHMENT 2**

**X2 OBJECTIVES AND DELTA OUTFLOW STANDARDS**

Document Source(s)	X2 Objective	Minimum Delta Outflows		
		<u>July:</u> Wet & Above Normal: 8,000 cfs Below Normal: 6,500 cfs Dry: 5,000 cfs Critical: 4,000 cfs	<u>August:</u> Wet-Below Normal: 4,000 cfs Dry: 3,500 cfs Critical – 3,000 cfs	<u>September:</u> All Years: 3,000 cfs
		<u>October:</u> Wet-Dry – 4,000 cfs Critical – 3,000 cfs	<u>Nov-Dec:</u> Wet-Dry – 4,500 cfs Critical – 3,500 cfs (See p.15, t.3.)	

Document Source(s)	X2 Objective	Minimum Delta Outflows		
<b>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service Smelt Biological Opinion (2008)</b>	<p><u>September and October:</u> Wet – X2 no greater than 74 km from GG Bridge Above Normal – X2 no greater than 81 km from GG Bridge<sup>4</sup></p> <p><u>November:</u> Wet – X2 no greater than 74 km Above Normal – X2 no greater than 81 km from GG Bridge</p> <p><u>December:</u> Any increase in storage during November shall be released to augment outflow requirements in D-1641 (See pp. 282-283.)</p>	<p><u>September and October:</u> Wet – approx. 13,000 cfs required Above Normal – approx. 8,000 cfs required</p> <p><u>November:</u> Wet – approx. 13,000 cfs required Above Normal – approx. 8,000 cfs required (See pp. 373-375.)</p>		

is a forecast of the sum of the following locations: (1) Sacramento River above Bend Bridge, near Red Bluff; (2) Feather River, total inflow to Oroville Reservoir; (3) Yuba River at Smartville; (4) American River, total inflow at Folsom Reservoir. (See 2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary, p. 23.)

<sup>3</sup> The Eight-River Index refers to the sum of the unimpaired runoff from: the Sacramento River at Bend Bridge near Red Bluff; Feather River, total inflow to Oroville Reservoir; Yuba River at Smartville; American River, total inflow to Folsom Reservoir; Stanislaus River, total inflow to New Melones Reservoir; Tuolumne River, total inflow to Don Pedro Reservoir; Merced River, total inflow to Exchequer Reservoir; and San Joaquin River total inflow to Millerton Lake.

<sup>4</sup> Water year type is calculated based on the Sacramento Basin 40-30-30 Index. (See Smelt BO at p. 283.)