

EXHIBIT 6

Electronically Filed
Jun 03 2022 10:24 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

EXHIBIT 6

2020 JUL 13 PM 12:06

LISA C. LESTER
LINCOLN COUNTY CLERK

Case No. CV0702520

Dept. No. _____

IN THE SEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LINCOLN

LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT,
a political subdivision of the State of Nevada,
and VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC.,
a Nevada corporation,

Petitioners,

vs.

TIM WILSON, P.E., NEVADA STATE ENGINEER,
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
NATURAL RESOURCES,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW
(Exempt from Arbitration: Judicial
Review of Administrative Decision)

Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, a political subdivision of the State of Nevada, by and through its attorney, DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ., LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, and VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC., a Nevada corporation, by and through its attorneys, ALLISON, MacKENZIE, LTD., petition and allege as follows:

1. Petitioner, LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT ("LINCOLN"), is a political subdivision of the State of Nevada, created for the purpose of providing adequate and efficient water service within Lincoln County, Nevada.

2. Petitioner, VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC. ("VIDLER"), is a Nevada corporation authorized to conduct business in the state of Nevada.

3. Petitioners, LINCOLN and VIDLER own groundwater permits with a priority date of February 14, 2005 and jointly own groundwater right applications filed on April 10, 2006 to

1 appropriate water in the Kane Springs Valley Hydrographic Basin (206) ("Kane Springs") for
2 municipal use purposes with a place of use in the Coyote Spring Valley Hydrographic Basin (210).
3 The permits and pending applications are more specifically described below. The Kane Springs
4 hydrographic basin and the points of diversion in the permits and applications are located entirely in
5 Lincoln County, Nevada. Petitioners, LINCOLN and VIDLER are senior water right permit holders
6 and jointly hold senior groundwater right applications in Kane Springs.

7 4. Respondent, TIM WILSON P.E., NEVADA STATE ENGINEER, DIVISION
8 OF WATER RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL
9 RESOURCES ("STATE ENGINEER"), is empowered to act pursuant to the provisions of Chapters
10 533 and 534 of the Nevada Revised Statutes. The Nevada Legislature has provided that, subject to
11 existing rights, all underground waters within the boundaries of the state of Nevada are subject to
12 appropriation for beneficial use under the laws of the state and it is the charge of the STATE
13 ENGINEER to put water to beneficial use for the economic benefit of the state of Nevada. The
14 Office of the State Engineer is a creature of statute; it has no inherent power and its powers and
15 jurisdiction are limited as provided by statute.

16 5. This Petition is brought pursuant to the procedures authorized and provided in
17 NRS 533.450. Specifically, Petitioners are aggrieved by an order of the STATE ENGINEER that
18 affects Petitioners' interests and Petitioners may obtain judicial review in the proper court of the
19 county in which the matters affected are situated. Petitioners' interests and the matters affected by
20 the STATE ENGINEER's Order 1309, including the Kane Springs basin, are situated entirely in
21 Lincoln County, Nevada. Jurisdiction and venue of Petitioners' Petition for Judicial Review are
22 properly before this Court pursuant to NRS 533.450. A true and correct of Order 1309 is attached
23 hereto as **Exhibit "1"**.

24 6. A Notice of this Petition has been served on the STATE ENGINEER and all
25 persons affected by Order 1309 of the STATE ENGINEER as required by NRS 533.450(3).

26 7. The STATE ENGINEER's administration of the Lower White River Flow
27 System Basins started with Order 1169 issued in March 2002. Order 1169 required all pending
28 applications in certain basins be held in abeyance pending an aquifer test of the carbonate-rock

1 aquifer system to better determine whether the pending applications and future applications could be
2 developed from the carbonate-rock aquifer. Kane Springs was not included in Order 1169 in March
3 2002 as part of the administration of the Lower White River Flow System Basins.

4 8. On February 14, 2005, LINCOLN/VIDLER filed Applications 72218, 72219,
5 72220 and 72221 to appropriate groundwater in Kane Springs.

6 9. On August 1, 2006, LINCOLN/VIDLER and the UNITED STATES
7 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE ("USFWS") entered into
8 an Amended Stipulation for Withdrawal of Protests for Applications 72218, 72219, 72220 and
9 72221 ("Amended Stipulation for Withdrawal of Protests"). The Amended Stipulation for
10 Withdrawal of Protests contains among other things, triggers acceptable to USFWS to reduce
11 Petitioners' groundwater pumping for protection of the Moapa dace. From 2006 to date, Petitioners
12 and USFWS have performed and continue to perform under the terms of the Amended Stipulation
13 for Withdrawal of Protests.

14 10. On February 2, 2007, the STATE ENGINEER issued Ruling 5712, which
15 partially approved Applications 72218, 72219, 72220 and 72221, granting LINCOLN/VIDLER
16 1,000 acre feet annually ("afa") of water rights in Kane Springs. In Ruling 5712, the STATE
17 ENGINEER specifically determined Kane Springs would not be included in the Order 1169 study
18 area because there was no substantial evidence that the appropriation of a limited quantity of water
19 in Kane Springs will have any measurable impact on the Muddy River Springs that warrants the
20 inclusion of Kane Springs in Order 1169. The STATE ENGINEER denied the request to hold the
21 LINCOLN/VIDLER applications in abeyance and include Kane Springs within the provisions of
22 Order 1169. The STATE ENGINEER specifically rejected the argument that the Kane Springs
23 rights could not be appropriated based upon senior appropriated rights in the down gradient basins.
24 None of the parties to the Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") entered into on April 20, 2006
25 by certain water right holders in the Coyote Spring Valley and California Wash hydrographic basins
26 and none of the Order 1169 study participants objected to or appealed the STATE ENGINEER's
27 determinations that Kane Springs would not be included in Order 1169 and Petitioners could
28

1 appropriate and develop their water rights notwithstanding senior appropriated rights in the down
2 gradient basins.

3 11. LINCOLN/VIDLER filed a Petition for Judicial Review with the Seventh
4 Judicial District Court on March 1, 2007, challenging the validity of the STATE ENGINEER's
5 decision in Ruling 5712.

6 12. Following the filing of the Petition for Judicial Review, LINCOLN/VIDLER
7 met with the STATE ENGINEER on March 15, 2007, regarding their pending Applications 74147,
8 74148, 74149 and 74150. LINCOLN/VIDLER requested that they perform additional data
9 collection, testing and study in Kane Springs to support the pending applications. The STATE
10 ENGINEER informed LINCOLN/VIDLER he would consider granting to LINCOLN/VIDLER
11 additional unappropriated water rights in Kane Springs pursuant to their pending Applications
12 74147, 74148, 74149 and 74150 if LINCOLN/VIDLER collected the additional data upgradient in
13 the Kane Springs basin and performed the testing and additional study to support the pending
14 applications.

15 13. LINCOLN/VIDLER and the STATE ENGINEER thereafter stipulated to the
16 dismissal of the Petition for Judicial Review regarding Applications 72218, 72219, 72220 and 72221
17 and Ruling 5712.

18 14. The rights the STATE ENGINEER granted to LINCOLN/VIDLER in Ruling
19 5712 and now held by LINCOLN/VIDLER were and are rights vested under Nevada law.

20 15. On April 29, 2009, the Acting STATE ENGINEER issued Ruling 5987
21 summarily denying Applications 74147, 74148, 74149 and 74150 without holding a hearing or
22 contacting LINCOLN/VIDLER to get any information about the additional data collection, testing
23 and study the STATE ENGINEER stated he would review.

24 16. LINCOLN/VIDLER filed a Petition for Judicial Review with the Seventh
25 Judicial District Court on May 29, 2009 challenging the validity of the STATE ENGINEER's
26 decision in Ruling 5987.

27 17. On April 27, 2010, LINCOLN/VIDLER and the STATE ENGINEER entered
28 into a settlement agreement to resolve LINCOLN/VIDLER's Petition for Judicial Review

1 challenging Ruling 5987. The settlement agreement required, among other things, the STATE
2 ENGINEER to reinstate 74147, 74148, 74149 and 74150 with the same priority as their original
3 application date.

4 18. LINCOLN/VIDLER and the STATE ENGINEER thereafter stipulated to the
5 dismissal of the Petition for Judicial Review regarding Applications 74147, 74148, 74149 and 74150
6 and Ruling 5987.

7 19. On October 29, 2008, LINCOLN/VIDLER obtained a Biological Opinion
8 from the USFWS that pumping of groundwater pursuant to Applications 72218, 72219, 72220 and
9 72221 for their Kane Springs groundwater project was not likely to jeopardize the continued
10 existence of the endangered Moapa dace; the project could contribute to groundwater level declines
11 and spring flow reductions, however, implementation of the project's conservation actions will
12 minimize these impacts. With regard to incidental take, the Biological Opinion stated the level of
13 anticipated take is not likely to result in jeopardy to the Moapa dace based in part on the
14 implementation of the conservation measures for the project. Since 2008, Petitioners has spent
15 substantial sums, including the direct payment of \$50,000, to the USFWS as part of the project's
16 conservation measures in reliance on the Biological Opinion, Ruling 5712 and the settlement
17 agreements entered into with the STATE ENGINEER to resolve Petitioners' appeals of Rulings
18 5712 and 5987 involving Petitioners' water rights and applications in Kane Springs. None of the
19 parties to the April 20, 2006 Memorandum of Understanding and none of the Order 1169 study
20 participants objected to or appealed the Biological Opinion issued by the USFWS for the
21 LINCOLN/VIDLER groundwater applications in Kane Springs.

22 20. In reliance on the STATE ENGINEER's approval of Applications 72218,
23 72219, 72220 and 72221, Ruling 5712, the issuance of permits to Petitioners and the settlement with
24 the STATE ENGINEER, LINCOLN/VIDLER have expended significant time and money since
25 2005 in furtherance of perfecting their water rights in the Kane Springs basin in the approximate
26 sum of \$4,237,000.

27 21. In reliance upon the STATE ENGINEER's representations regarding the
28 additional data collection, testing and study, and his statements that he would consider any new data

1 and results regarding the basin, LINCOLN/VIDLER have expended significant time and money to
2 collect data, test and study the Kane Springs basin and to prepare the data and information to be
3 presented to the STATE ENGINEER to support pending Applications 74147, 74148, 74149 and
4 74150 in the approximate sum of \$543,000.

5 22. Petitioners were not and have never been an Order 1169 study participant.
6 Petitioners are not and have never been a party to the Memorandum of Understanding entered into
7 on April 20, 2006 by certain water right holders in the Coyote Spring Valley and California Wash
8 hydrographic basins whereby such parties voluntarily agreed to certain groundwater pumping
9 restrictions, among other things, to further their shared common interest in the conservation and
10 recovery of the Moapa dace and its habitat, an endangered species under the Endangered Species
11 Act.

12 23. Between 2010 and 2014, the Order 1169 basins were studied and tested, and
13 the Order 1169 study participants were involved and participated in aquifer tests, the submission of
14 reports, proceedings and actions taken by the STATE ENGINEER pursuant to Order 1169. The
15 basins that were included in the Order 1169 aquifer test were acknowledged to have a unique
16 hydrologic connection and share the same supply of water. The Kane Springs basin was not
17 included in the Order 1169 aquifer testing, monitoring or measurements and Kane Springs basin
18 water right holders, including Petitioners, were not involved and did not participate in the aquifer
19 testing, submission of reports, proceedings and actions taken by the STATE ENGINEER pursuant to
20 Order 1169 from 2010 to 2014. After the aquifer test, no Order 1169 study participants
21 recommended that Kane Springs be included in the Order 1169 study area nor did the STATE
22 ENGINEER make a determination that Kane Springs should be included in the Order 1169 study
23 area based upon the Order 1169 testing and proceedings. One study participant's report (Southern
24 Nevada Water Authority) noted there "was a lack of pumping responses north of the Kane Springs
25 Fault and west of the MX-5 and CSI wells near the eastern front of the Las Vegas Range."

26 24. On January 11, 2019, the STATE ENGINEER issued Interim Order 1303
27 designating the Lower White River Flow System ("LWRFS"), a multi-basin area known to share a
28 close hydrologic connection, as a joint administrative unit for purposes of administration of water

1 rights. Pursuant to Interim Order 1303, all water rights within the LWRFS were to be administered
2 based upon their respective dates of priority in relation to other rights within the regional
3 groundwater unit. Kane Springs was not included as part of the LWRFS multi-basin area in Interim
4 Order 1303.

5 25. After an administrative hearing, the STATE ENGINEER issued Order 1309
6 on June 15, 2020 delineating the Lower White River Flow System Hydrographic Basin to include
7 those certain hydrographic basins subject to Order 1169 and Order 1303 and for the first time
8 included the Kane Springs basin as part of the Lower White River Flow System Hydrographic
9 Basin.

10 26. In Order 1309, the STATE ENGINEER stated it was necessary for spring
11 flow measured at the Warm Springs West gage to flow at a minimum rate in order to maintain
12 habitat for the Moapa dace. The STATE ENGINEER determined in Order 1309 that liability under
13 the Endangered Species Act for a "take" would extend to groundwater users within the LWRFS and
14 would so extend to the State of Nevada through the Division of Water Resources as the government
15 agency responsible for permitting water use. The STATE ENGINEER concluded that it was against
16 the public interest to allow groundwater pumping that will reduce spring flow in the Warm Springs
17 area to a level that would impair habitat necessary for the survival of the Moapa dace and could
18 result in take of the endangered species.

19 27. In Order 1309, the STATE ENGINEER relied upon six criteria from Rulings
20 6254-6261 as the standard of general applicability for inclusion into the geographic boundary of the
21 LWRFS, thereby adopting policies in Order 1309 that the STATE ENGINEER then expanded for
22 general application.

23 28. Order 1309 is in excess of the jurisdiction and statutory authority of the
24 STATE ENGINEER because Nevada law does not authorize the STATE ENGINEER to designate a
25 multi-basin area and effectively reprioritize basin specific water rights by administering them based
26 upon their respective dates of priority in relation to other rights within the multi-basin groundwater
27 area or designate a multi-basin area via an *ad hoc* ruling. By including Kane Springs in the LWRFS
28 in Order 1309 and limiting pumping in the LWRFS to 8,000 afa, the STATE ENGINEER has made

1 exercising Petitioners' water rights impracticable for no legitimate government reason by
2 reprioritizing Petitioners' water rights holding senior status in Kane Springs to the most junior water
3 rights in the multi-basin LWRFS, destroying Petitioners' property rights, denying Petitioners all
4 viable economic use of their property and eviscerating contractual rights related to the water rights,
5 and interfering with Petitioners' investment backed expectations, all in violation of and to the
6 prejudice of Petitioners' constitutional rights.

7 29. Order 1309 is arbitrary and capricious and constitutes an abuse of discretion
8 in violation of Petitioners' rights because in the Ruling 5712 contested proceedings, the STATE
9 ENGINEER denied the request to hold the LINCOLN/VIDLER applications in abeyance and
10 include Kane Springs within the provisions of Order 1169 determining there was no substantial
11 evidence that the appropriation of the water granted to Petitioners in Kane Springs will have any
12 measurable impact on the Muddy River Springs that warranted the inclusion of Kane Springs in
13 Order 1169. The STATE ENGINEER specifically rejected the argument that Petitioners' Kane
14 Springs rights could not be appropriated based upon senior appropriated rights in the down gradient
15 basins. The STATE ENGINEER is precluded from re-adjudicating and relitigating issues already
16 determined in a contested proceeding and resolved by settlement agreements with Petitioners
17 resulting from Petitioners' appeals of Rulings 5712 and 5987. In addition, there was no evidence
18 presented in the proceedings leading up to the issuance of Order 1309 that appropriation of
19 Petitioners' water rights in Kane Springs will have any impact on the Muddy River Springs that
20 warrants inclusion of Kane Springs in the LWRFS as defined in Order 1309.

21 30. Order 1309 is arbitrary and capricious and constitutes an abuse of discretion
22 because the STATE ENGINEER failed to consider or address the Amended Settlement Agreement
23 entered into between Petitioners and USFWS and the Biological Opinion issued by the USFWS that
24 Petitioners' groundwater pumping project in Kane Springs was not likely to jeopardize the continued
25 existence of the endangered Moapa dace and the level of anticipated take is not likely to result in
26 jeopardy to the Moapa dace based in part on the implantation of the conservation measures for
27 Petitioners' project. In issuing Order 1309, the STATE ENGINEER failed to consider the unrefuted
28 expert opinion testimony in the record of the former USFWS Field Supervisor who signed the

1 Biological Opinion and helped negotiate the Amended Stipulation for Withdrawal of Protests that
2 Petitioners, as parties holding a Biological Opinion and the Amended Stipulation for Withdrawal of
3 Protests, are compliant with the Endangered Species Act. The STATE ENGINEER's determination
4 that liability under the Endangered Species Act for a "take" would extend to groundwater users
5 within the LWRFS not parties to the MOU and would so extend to the State of Nevada through the
6 Division of Water Resources as the government agency responsible for permitting water use is not
7 supported by substantial evidence or any evidence in the record, is contrary to the substantial
8 evidence of record and is contrary to law with respect to Petitioners' water rights and groundwater
9 pumping project in Kane Springs.

10 31. Order 1309 is arbitrary, capricious and constitutes an abuse of discretion
11 because it adopts, effects and defines the STATE ENGINEER's policy of general application for
12 creating a multi-area basin and inclusion into the geographic boundary of the LWRFS and
13 constitutes unlawful *ad hoc* rulemaking in violation of the STATE ENGINEER's statutory authority
14 thereby making Order 1309 void.

15 32. Petitioners were not given notice before the STATE ENGINEER applied the
16 *ad hoc* rule developed from Rulings 6255-6261 in Order 1309. LINCOLN/VIDLER were not
17 parties to those rulings and were unable to present evidence or arguments as to why the *ad hoc* rule
18 should not be applied to Petitioners and their water rights in Kane Springs because the *ad hoc* rule of
19 general applicability was announced after the hearing and after Petitioners had the opportunity to
20 present evidence on the issue before the STATE ENGINEER. Rulings from other proceedings
21 cannot be used to bind unrelated parties in later proceedings.

22 33. The STATE ENGINEER abused his discretion by failing to consider the best
23 available science presented to support the continued exclusion of Kane Springs from the boundaries
24 of the LWRFS and applying criteria or standards which intentionally ignore the best available
25 science to include Kane Springs in the boundaries of the LWRFS.

26 34. Order 1309 is arbitrary, capricious and constitutes an abuse of discretion
27 because it applies the *ad hoc* rule criteria subjectively and in an inconsistent manner.
28

1 35. Order 1309 is arbitrary, capricious, unlawful and constitutes an abuse of
2 discretion because the water right holders pumping closest to Warm Springs and impacting the
3 endangered Moapa dace are not affected by Order 1309 and are allowed to continue to pump their
4 water rights, while Petitioners' water rights, located the furthest distance from Warm Springs with
5 no evidence in the record that pumping of their water rights will impact the endangered Moapa dace,
6 are destroyed and rendered useless by Order 1309.

7 36. The STATE ENGINEER, like all administrative officers, is required to
8 provide due process of law to all parties. The STATE ENGINEER violated LINCOLN/VIDLER's
9 due process rights pursuant to both the Nevada and United States Constitutions.

10 37. Order 1309 violated LINCOLN/VIDLER's due process rights by applying the
11 criteria or standards from other contested administrative proceedings before the STATE ENGINEER
12 in which Petitioners were not parties, after the evidentiary hearing held to determine whether Kane
13 Springs and Petitioners' water rights were to be included within the boundaries of the LWRFS.
14 Petitioners received no prior notice the STATE ENGINEER would apply the criteria or standards
15 and were deprived of an opportunity to address the newly developed criteria or standards applied by
16 the STATE ENGINEER in Order 1309 to include Kane Springs and Petitioners' water rights in the
17 boundaries of the LWRFS.

18 38. In Order 1309, the STATE ENGINEER considered and relied upon evidence
19 submitted after the hearing in the parties' simultaneously submitted written closing statements for
20 which Petitioners had no opportunity to address, respond or refute, all in violation of Petitioners' due
21 process rights.

22 39. The Order 1309 proceedings violated Petitioners' due process rights because
23 certain former Division of Water Resource employees who participated in and were decision makers
24 in the STATE ENGINEER's proceedings and determinations resulting in Ruling 5712 and Order
25 1169, which excluded Kane Springs from the LWRFS and appropriated Kane Springs water rights
26 notwithstanding senior appropriated rights in the down gradient basins, testified as private
27 consultants and presented the same evidence relied upon by previous STATE ENGINEERS to
28 exclude Kane Springs from multi-basin joint administration to support the inclusion of Kane Springs

1 in the LWRFS. The STATE ENGINEER erred as a matter of law when he reweighed evidence
2 previously relied upon to exclude Kane Springs from the LWRFS and used the reweighed evidence
3 to include Kane Springs in the LWRFS, all in violation of Petitioners' due process rights.

4 40. The substantial rights of LINCOLN/VIDLER have been prejudiced because
5 Order 1309 violates constitutional and statutory provisions, is in excess of the statutory authority of
6 the STATE ENGINEER, is clearly erroneous in view of the reliable, probative and substantial
7 evidence, and is characterized by an abuse of discretion.

8 41. Order 1309 of the STATE ENGINEER is arbitrary and capricious, contrary to
9 and affected by error of law, without any rational basis, beyond the legitimate exercise of power and
10 authority of the STATE ENGINEER, all to the detriment and damage of Petitioners LINCOLN and
11 VIDLER.

12 42. The determinations in Order 1309 that 8,000 afa is the long terms annual
13 quantity of water that can be pumped and that Kane Springs should be included within the
14 boundaries of the LWRFS, among other determinations, are not supported by substantial evidence in
15 the record before the STATE ENGINEER and are without consideration of all the facts and
16 circumstances.

17 43. Petitioners LINCOLN and VIDLER have exhausted their administrative
18 remedies.

19 44. Petitioners have been required to engage the services of counsel to pursue
20 their rights, and as a proximate and necessary result of the STATE ENGINEER's illegal conduct
21 alleged above, Petitioners are entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs as special and
22 foreseeable damages, or in the alternative, as costs of suit.

23 45. For all the foregoing reasons, the STATE ENGINEER acted improperly as a
24 matter of law and did not and cannot conduct a fair assessment of the scientific evidence presented
25 and the facts and circumstances previously relied upon to exclude Kane Springs from the LWRFS
26 multi-basin area. The STATE ENGINEER's actions are inequitable under all the facts and
27 circumstances and the evidence presented, and equitable relief is warranted in the form of direction
28

1 by this Court to the STATE ENGINEER to exclude Kane Springs from the boundaries of the
2 LWRFS as defined in Order 1309.

3 WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray for judgment as follows:

- 4 1. That the Court vacate Order 1309;
- 5 2. That the Court exclude Kane Springs from the LWRFS;
- 6 3. That the Court restore currently held water right priorities and the perennial
7 yield determined for Kane Springs;
- 8 4. That the Court award Petitioners their attorney's fees and costs; and
- 9 5. That the Court award such other and further relief as seems just and proper in
10 the premises.

11 **AFFIRMATION**

12 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document **DOES NOT**
13 contain the social security number of any person.

14 DATED this 13th day of July, 2020.

15 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
16 Nevada State Bar No. 366
17 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
18 402 North Division Street
19 Carson City, Nevada 89703
20 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
21 Email: kpeterston@allisonmackenzie.com

22 ~ and ~

23 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
24 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
25 P.O. Box 60
26 Pioche, Nevada 89043
27 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
28 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

BY: 

DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020

Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP Rule 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., Attorneys at Law, and that on this date, I caused the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action as follows:

Via Hand-Delivery to:

Tim Wilson, P.E. State Engineer
Nevada Division of Water Resources
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
901 South Stewart Street, Suite 2002
Carson City, NV 89701

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested to:

Robert O. Kurth, Jr. 3420 North Buffalo Drive Las Vegas, NV 89129 <i>Attorney for 3335 Hillside, LLC</i>	Paulina Williams Baker Botts, L.L.P. 98 San Jacinto Boulevard, Suite 1500 Austin, TX 78701 <i>Attorney for Georgia Pacific Corporation</i>
Laura A. Schroeder Therese A. Ure 10615 Double R Blvd., Ste. 100 Reno, NV 89521 <i>Attorneys for City of North Las Vegas and Bedroc Limited, LLC</i>	Sylvia Harrison Sarah Ferguson McDonald Carano LLP 100 West Liberty Street, 10 th Floor Reno, NV 89501 <i>Attorney for Georgia Pacific Corporation and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.</i>
Bradley J. Herrema, Esq. Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck 100 N. City Parkway, Suite 1600 Las Vegas, NV 89106 <i>Attorney for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC</i>	Severin A. Carlson Kaempfer Crowell, Ltd. 50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 700 Reno, NV 89511 <i>Attorney for Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints</i>
Kent R. Robison, Esq. Therese M. Shanks, Esq. Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust 71 Washington Street Reno, NV 89503 <i>Attorney for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC</i>	Paul G. Taggart, Esq. Timothy D. O'Connor, Esq. Taggart & Taggart, Ltd. 109 North Minnesota Street Carson City, NV 89703 <i>Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA</i>
Steven C. Anderson, Esq. Las Vegas Valley Water District 1001 S. Valley View Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89153 <i>Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA</i>	Karen Glasgow Office of the Regional Solicitor San Francisco Field Office U.S. Department of the Interior 333 Bush Street, Suite 775 San Francisco, CA 94104 <i>Attorney for National Park Service</i>

1	Alex Flangas 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700 Reno, NV 89501 <i>Attorney for Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2</i>	Larry Brundy P.O. Box 136 Moapa, NV 89025
4	Beth Baldwin Richard Berley Ziontz Chestnut Fourth And Blanchard Building 2101 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1230 Seattle, WA 98121-2331 <i>Attorneys for Moapa Band of Paiute Indians</i>	Casa De Warm Springs, LLC 1000 N. Green Valley Pkwy, #440-350 Henderson, NV 89074
8	Steve King, Esq. 227 River Road Dayton, NV 89403 <i>Attorney for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company</i>	Clark County 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy, 6th Fl. Las Vegas, NV 89155-1111
11	Greg Morrison 50 W. Liberty St., Suite 750 Reno, NV 89501 <i>Attorney for Moapa Valley Water District</i>	Clark County Coyote Springs Water Resources GID 1001 S. Valley View Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89153
13	Justina Caviglia 6100 Neil Road Reno, NV 89511 <i>Attorney for Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy</i>	Mary K. Cloud P.O. Box 31 Moapa, NV 89025
16	Luke Miller Office of the Regional Solicitor U.S. Department of the Interior 2800 Cottage Way, Suite E1712 Sacramento, CA 95825 <i>Attorney for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</i>	Don J. & Marsha L. Davis P.O. Box 400 Moapa, NV 89025
20	State of Nevada Department of Transportation 1263 S. Stewart Street Carson City, NV 89712	Dry Lake Water, LLC 2470 St. Rose Pkwy., Ste. 107 Henderson, NV 89074
22	State of Nevada, Dept. of Conservation And Natural Resources Division of State Parks 901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5005 Carson City, NV 89701	Kelly Kolhoss P.O. Box 232 Moapa, NV 89025
25	Pacific Coast Building Products, Inc. P.O. Box 364329 Las Vegas, NV 89036	Lake At Las Vegas Joint Venture, Inc. 1600 Lake Las Vegas Parkway Henderson, NV 89011
27	S & R, Inc. 808 Shetland Road Las Vegas, NV 89107	Laker Plaza, Inc. 7181 Noon Rd. Everton, WA 98247-9650

1	Technichrome	William O'Donnell
2	4709 Compass Bow Lane	2780 S. Jones Blvd., Ste. 210
3	Las Vegas, NV 89130	Las Vegas, NV 89146
4	Global Hydrologic Services, Inc.	Patrick Donnelly
5	Mark D. Stock	Center for Biological Diversity
6	561 Keystone Avenue, #200	7345 S. Durango Dr.
7	Reno, NV 89503-4331	B-107, Box 217
8		Las Vegas, NV 89113
9	Lisa Belenky	
10	Center for Biological Diversity	
11	1212 Broadway #800	
12	Oakland, CA 94612	

DATED this 13th day of July, 2020.


NANCY FONTENOT

1		<u>INDEX OF EXHIBITS</u>	
2	<u>Exhibit No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Number of Pages</u>
3	"1"	Order 1309	68
4			
5			
6			
7	4848-8027-8210, v. 1		
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

EXHIBIT 7

EXHIBIT 7

RECEIVED

Electronically Filed
7/13/2020 8:37 AM
Steven D. Grierson
CLERK OF THE COURT

Steven D. Grierson

2020 JUL 13 PM 3:24

STATE ENGINEER

1 PTJR

Julie Cavanaugh-Bill (NV Bar No. 11533)

2 Attorney & Counselor at Law

3 CAVANAUGH-BILL LAW OFFICES, LLC

Henderson Bank Building

4 401 Railroad Street, Suite 307

Elko, Nevada 89801

5 TEL: 775-753-4357

FAX: 775-753-4360

6 julie@cblawoffices.org

7 Lisa T. Belenky (CA Bar No. 203225), *Pro Hac Vice to be submitted*

8 CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

1212 Broadway, Suite 800

9 Oakland, CA 94612

10 TEL: 415-632-5307

FAX: 510-844-7150

11 lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

12 Douglas Wolf (NM Bar No. 7473), *Pro Hac Vice to be submitted*

13 CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

3201 Zafarano Drive

14 Suite C, #149

Santa Fe, NM 87507

15 TEL: 202-510-5604

dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

16 *Attorneys for Petitioner*

18 DISTRICT COURT

19 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

20 CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY,

21 Petitioner,

22 vs.

23 TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State Engineer,
24 DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES,
25 DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
26 NATURAL RESOURCES,

27 Respondents.

Case No. _____

Dept No. _____

PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF
ORDER 1309

1 Petitioner, the CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, by and through its counsel,
2 Julie Cavanaugh-Bill of CAVANAUGH-BILL LAW OFFICES, LLC, hereby requests, pursuant
3 to NRS § 533.450(1), that this Court review Order 1309, issued by Respondents TIM WILSON,
4 P.E., Nevada State Engineer, and DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF
5 CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES on June 15, 2020, and attached hereto as
6 Exhibit 1. Petitioner alleges as follows:

7 **PARTIES**

8 1. Respondent TIM WILSON, P.E. is the State Engineer of the State of Nevada,
9 Division of Water Resources, and is sued in his official capacity.

10 2. Respondent DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF
11 CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES is a governmental division of the State of
12 Nevada.

13 3. Petitioner, the CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY ("the Center"), is a
14 national, non-profit conservation organization incorporated in California and headquartered in
15 Tucson, Arizona. The Center has over 74,000 members including members who reside in Nevada.
16 The Center has offices throughout the United States and Mexico, including in Arizona, California,
17 Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon,
18 Washington, Washington D.C., and La Paz, Baja California Sur, Mexico. Many of the Center's
19 members who reside in Nevada and neighboring states live, visit, or recreate in and near areas
20 directly affected by Order 1309. In particular, the Center and its members have educational,
21 scientific, biological, aesthetic and spiritual interests in the survival and recovery of the Moapa
22 dace, a small fish endemic to the Muddy River Springs Area within the Lower White River Flow
23 System. The Moapa dace is imperiled by diminishing spring flows caused by groundwater
24 pumping in the Lower White River Flow System, and is listed as endangered under the Federal
25 Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1531 *et seq.* To protect its interests in the survival and
26 recovery of the Moapa dace the Center submitted technical reports pursuant to Nevada State
27 Engineer Order 1303 and participated in a public hearing before the State Engineer, held between
28

1 September 23, 2019 and October 4, 2019, the ultimate outcome of which was Order 1309. The
2 Center is aggrieved by the State Engineer's decision because the interests of the Center and its
3 members in the survival and recovery of the Moapa Dace will suffer long-term harmful impacts
4 from the groundwater drawdown and springflow reductions authorized under Order 1309.

5 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6 4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to NRS § 533.450 (Orders and
7 decisions of the State Engineer subject to judicial review).

8 5. The Court has the authority to review the State Engineer's Order, and grant the
9 relief requested, pursuant to NRS § 533.450. All requirements for judicial review have been
10 satisfied.

11 6. Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to NRS § 533.450. Clark County is a
12 "county in which the matters affected or a portion thereof are situated." NRS § 533.450(1).
13 Therefore, the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for Clark County is the
14 proper venue for judicial review.

15 7. In addition, the subject matter of the petition involves decreed waters of the Muddy
16 River Decree. Under NRS § 533.450(1), "on stream systems where a decree of court has been
17 entered, the action must be initiated in the court that entered the decree." This court has proper
18 jurisdiction over the Muddy River Decree, *Muddy Valley Irrigation Company et al., v. Moapa Salt*
19 *Lake Produce Company*, Case No. 377, which was entered in the Tenth Judicial District of the
20 State of Nevada, in and for Clark County, in 1920.¹

21 8. The State Engineer's order and the matters affected by it are the subject of related
22 litigation pending before this Court. *See* Petition for Judicial Review of Order 1309, *Las Vegas*
23 *Valley Water Dist. & S. Nev. Water Auth. v. Nev. State Eng'r*, Case No. A-20-816761-C (June 17,
24 2020).

25
26 ¹ In 1920, the Tenth Judicial District consisted of Clark County and Lincoln County. In 1945, Clark
27 County was designated as the Eighth Judicial District.
28

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I. The Lower White River Flow System

9. The Lower White River Flow System (“LWRFS”) is a geographically vast complex of hydrologically connected groundwater aquifers in Southern Nevada. The groundwater in these aquifers is contained within and flows through a fairly continuous layer of carbonate rock that extends below several geographically distinct basins or valleys in Clark and Lincoln counties, including Coyote Springs valley, the Black Mountains region, Garnet Valley, the California Wash basin, Hidden Valley, Kane Springs Valley,² and the Muddy River Springs Area (“MRSA”).³

10. This carbonate-rock aquifer complex is “highly transmissive,” meaning that pumping from anywhere within the carbonate aquifer system rapidly affects groundwater levels and spring flows throughout the entire Lower White River Flow System.⁴

11. The interconnected, highly transmissive carbonate-rock aquifers of the Lower White River Flow System ultimately discharge (*i.e.*, exit the aquifer) into the Colorado River.⁵ The main points of discharge are the Muddy River Springs, located in the Muddy River Springs Area within and adjacent to the Moapa National Wildlife Refuge in Clark County.⁶ The springs form

² In Order 1309, the State Engineer determined that Kane Springs Valley should be included within the boundary of the Lower White River Flow System due to a “close hydraulic connection.” Exhibit 1 at 52 (CBD000052) (exhibits referenced in this Petition are filed concurrently in a separate Appendix, references to the bates stamped page numbers in the Appendix are provided as “CBD___”). The Center agrees with and supports the State Engineer’s conclusion on this issue as set forth in Order 1309.

³ Exhibit 1 at 46, 51-54 (CBD000046, CBD000051-54).

⁴ Exhibit 7 at 26 (CBD000170).

⁵ *Id.* at 21 (CBD000165).

⁶ *Id.*

1 the headwaters of the Muddy River, which then flows from the Refuge area into the Colorado
2 River at Lake Mead.⁷ Significantly smaller quantities of groundwater may discharge from the
3 Lower White River Flow System through other springs near the shore of Lake Mead, or seep
4 directly into the Colorado River through a hydrologically distinct “basin-fill” aquifer in the Muddy
5 River Springs area.⁸

6 12. The Muddy River springs are thus directly connected to the regional carbonate-rock
7 aquifers of the Lower White River Flow System.⁹ Because of this connection, flows from the
8 springs can change rapidly in direct response to changes in carbonate groundwater levels.¹⁰ Put
9 differently, groundwater withdrawals from anywhere within the carbonate aquifer complex
10 intercept, or “capture,” water that would otherwise flow from the Muddy River springs and into
11
12
13
14

15 ⁷ See generally *id.*

16 ⁸ *Id.* at 25-26 (CBD000169-70). The “basin-fill” and carbonate aquifers in the Lower White River
17 Flow system exist within different geologic layers and are fed by different sources of water.
18 Data on the effects of groundwater pumping indicates that the basin fill aquifers in the Muddy
19 River Springs area are connected to the carbonate aquifer, while the basin fill aquifers in
20 Coyote Springs Valley to the northwest are separate from the carbonate. *Id.* at 13
21 (CBD000157). Consequently, the carbonate aquifer near the Muddy River Springs feeds water
22 into, or “recharges,” the basin fill aquifer, but there is no such connection between the
23 carbonate and basin fill in the Coyote Springs Valley. *Id.* There is no evidence that the basin
24 fill recharges the carbonate anywhere in the Lower White River Flow system. *Id.*

25 ⁹ *Id.* at 15 (CBD000159); Exhibit 8 at 29 (CBD000200).

26 ¹⁰ Exhibit 8 at 29 (CBD000200).
27
28

1 the Muddy River.¹¹ Over the long term, pumping from the carbonate aquifer captures discharge—
2 including spring flow—at nearly a one-to-one ratio.¹²

3 13. Springflows in the Muddy River Springs Area are dependent on the elevation of
4 groundwater within the carbonate aquifer; as carbonate groundwater levels decline, springflows
5 decrease, beginning with the highest-elevation springs.¹³ Over time, as groundwater levels
6 continue to decline, pumping will gradually and increasingly affect lower-elevation discharge as
7 well.¹⁴ The higher-elevation Muddy River springs are therefore more rapidly and more severely
8 affected by carbonate groundwater pumping than lower-elevation springs and other sources of
9 discharge, and the higher-elevation springs—which harbor the vast majority of Moapa dace—will
10 dry up before flows are significantly reduced in the lower-elevation springs or the Muddy River
11 system more generally.¹⁵

12 14. Springflows and groundwater levels in the Muddy River Springs Area began to
13 decline in the 1990s as carbonate groundwater pumping increased.¹⁶ From 2000 to 2010 carbonate
14 pumping rose from about 4,800 to about 7,200 acre-feet per year,¹⁷ while spring flows (as
15 measured at the Warm Springs West gauge in the Moapa National Wildlife Refuge) declined from
16 about 4.0 cubic feet per second (cfs) to as low as 3.4 cfs between the 1990s and mid-2000s.¹⁸ The

19 ¹¹ *Id.*

20 ¹² *Id.*

21 ¹³ *Id.*

22 ¹⁴ *Id.*

23 ¹⁵ *Id.*; Exhibit 4 at 24 (CBD000108).

24 ¹⁶ Exhibit 7 at 24 (CBD000168).

25 ¹⁷ *Id.* at 22 (CBD000166).

26 ¹⁸ *Id.* at 16 (CBD000160).

1 smaller, high-altitude Muddy River springs are currently flowing at little more than half of their
2 1990s average.¹⁹

3 **II. The Moapa Dace**

4 15. The Moapa dace (*Moapa coriacea*) is endemic to the Muddy River Springs Area.²⁰
5 The dace was federally listed as endangered in 1967.²¹

6 16. The Moapa dace is found only in the upper tributaries of the Muddy River.²²
7 Approximately 95 percent of the total population occurs within 1.78 miles of one major tributary
8 that flows from three high-elevation spring complexes within the Muddy River Springs area.²³

9 17. Threats to the Moapa Dace include non-native predatory fishes, habitat loss from
10 water diversions and impoundments, wildfire risk from non-native vegetation, and groundwater
11 development in the Lower White River Flow System which, as noted, decreases spring flows in
12 the Muddy River Springs area.²⁴

13 18. The Moapa Dace is vulnerable to unpredictable catastrophic events due to its
14 limited distribution and small population size.²⁵

15 **III. Order 1169 Pump Test**

16 19. The State Engineer issued Order 1169 in March 2002 after receiving several
17 applications to appropriate groundwater from the Coyote Springs Valley, Black Mountains Area,
18
19

20 ¹⁹ *Id.* at 22-24 (CBD000166-68).

21 ²⁰ Exhibit 1 at 4 (CBD000004).

22 ²¹ *Id.*

23 ²² Exhibit 4 at 24 (CBD000108).

24 ²³ *Id.*

25 ²⁴ *Id.* at 15 (CBD000099).

26 ²⁵ *Id.*

1 Garnet Valley, Hidden Valley, California Wash, and Muddy River Springs Area hydrographic
2 basins.²⁶

3 20. Order 1169 held in abeyance all pending groundwater applications in the Coyote
4 Springs Valley, Black Mountains Area, Garnet Valley, Hidden Valley, Muddy River Springs Area,
5 and Lower Moapa Valley hydrographic basins pending a test of the regional carbonate aquifer
6 system.²⁷ The State Engineer explained that he did not believe it prudent to issue additional
7 groundwater rights in the regional carbonate aquifer complex until a significant portion of then-
8 existing groundwater rights were pumped for a substantial period of time to determine whether
9 development of those water rights would adversely impact senior water rights or the
10 environment.²⁸

11 21. Order 1169 required that at least 50 percent, or 8,050 acre-feet per year, of then-
12 existing water rights in Coyote Spring Valley be pumped for at least two consecutive years.²⁹ In
13 April 2002 the State Engineer added the California Wash basin to the Order 1169 pump test
14 basins.³⁰

15 22. The Order 1169 pump test began in November 2010 and concluded in December
16 2012.³¹ During the test an average of 5,290 acre-feet per year was pumped from carbonate-aquifer
17 wells in Coyote Springs Valley and a cumulative total of 14,535 acre-feet per year was pumped
18 throughout the Order 1169 study basins.³²

20 ²⁶ Exhibit 1 at 3 (CBD000003).

21 ²⁷ *Id.*

22 ²⁸ *Id.*; Exhibit 2 at 7 (CBD0000075).

23 ²⁹ Exhibit 1 at 3 (CBD000003).

24 ³⁰ *Id.*

25 ³¹ *Id.* at 5 (CBD000005).

26 ³² *Id.* at 6 (CBD000006).

1 23. The Order 1169 pump test results demonstrated that there is a “unique” and “direct
2 hydraulic connection” between the regional carbonate aquifer complex and the Muddy River
3 springs, and that pumping from anywhere within the carbonate aquifer complex captures flows
4 that would otherwise ultimately discharge from the Muddy River springs.³³ The pump test caused
5 “sharp declines” in groundwater levels and flows from the highest-elevation Muddy River springs,
6 which are considered the “canary in the coalmine” regarding the impacts of pumping on
7 streamflow and Moapa dace habitat.³⁴

8 24. On January 29, 2014, after reviewing the pump test results, the State Engineer
9 found that “pumping under the Order 1169 test measurably reduced flows in headwater springs of
10 the Muddy River,” and that, “if pending water right applications were permitted and pumped in
11 addition to existing groundwater rights in Coyote Spring Valley and the other Order 1169 basins,
12 headwater spring flows would be reduced in tens of years or less to the point that there would be
13 a conflict with existing rights.”³⁵

14 25. The State Engineer also found that, “to permit the appropriation of additional
15 groundwater resources in the Coyote Spring Valley . . . would impair protection of these springs
16 and the habitat of the Moapa dace and therefore threatens to prove detrimental to the public
17 interest.”³⁶

18 26. Finally, the State Engineer concluded that “only a small portion” of existing water
19 rights, “may be fully developed without negatively affecting the endangered Moapa dace and its
20 habitat or the senior decreed rights on the Muddy River.”³⁷

22 ³³ Exhibit 3 at 7-11 (CBD000086-90); Exhibit 5 at 26 (CBD0000137).

23 ³⁴ Exhibit 3 at 7-11 (CBD000086-90); Exhibit 5 at 25 (CBD0000136).

24 ³⁵ Exhibit 5 at 26 (CBD0000137).

25 ³⁶ *Id.*

26 ³⁷ Exhibit 6 at 2 (CBD000142).

1 27. Carbonate groundwater levels have not recovered since the completion of the Order
2 1169 pump test and continue to decline despite a subsequent decrease in groundwater pumping.³⁸
3 Groundwater levels at the EH-4 monitoring well—a key location for evaluating pumping impacts
4 to the Muddy River springs—reached an all-time low point on November 9, 2018.³⁹ Groundwater
5 levels at other monitoring wells briefly recovered from the pump test but began trending downward
6 again in early 2016.⁴⁰

7 28. Spring flows have also exhibited a declining trend in recent years. Flows at the
8 Warm Springs West gauge briefly recovered after the pump test from 3.3 to 3.6 cfs, but have been
9 declining ever since.⁴¹ As of fall 2019, flows at Warm Springs West were approximately 3.2 cfs.⁴²

10 **IV. Order 1303**

11 29. On January 11, 2019, the State Engineer issued Interim Order 1303 to obtain
12 stakeholder input on four specific factual matters related to information obtained during and after
13 Order 1169 pump test: (1) the geographic boundary of the Lower White River Flow System, (2)
14 aquifer recovery since the Order 1169 pump test, (3) the long-term annual quantity of groundwater
15 that may be pumped from the Lower White River Flow System, and (4) effects on senior water
16 rights of moving water rights between the carbonate and alluvial (or basin-fill) system.⁴³

21 ³⁸ Exhibit 7 at 16 (CBD000160); Exhibit 8 at 3, 23-24 (CBD000174, CBD000194-95).

22 ³⁹ Exhibit 8 at 23 (CBD000194).

23 ⁴⁰ *Id.*

24 ⁴¹ *Id.*

25 ⁴² Exhibit 9 at 1519 (CBD000218).

26 ⁴³ Exhibit 1 at 10 (CBD000010).

1 30. On July 3, 2019, the Center submitted a technical report prepared by Dr. Tom
2 Myers,⁴⁴ outlining responses to the four Order 1303 questions.⁴⁵ On August 16, 2019, the Center
3 submitted a rebuttal report prepared by Dr. Myers, offering rebuttals to positions that other parties
4 to the Order 1303 proceedings put forward in their July reports.⁴⁶ Dr. Myers's analysis of pumping
5 rates, groundwater levels, and springflow demonstrated that current carbonate pumping rates are
6 unsustainable, and that any pumping from the carbonate aquifer would ultimately reduce
7 springflow in the Muddy River Springs Area and harm the Moapa dace.⁴⁷

8 31. Between September 23, 2019, and October 4, 2019, the State Engineer held a
9 hearing on the stakeholder reports submitted pursuant to Order 1303. During the hearing, the
10 Center presented expert testimony from Dr. Myers explaining further the basis for his conclusion
11 that any additional carbonate pumping would reduce both groundwater levels and flows from the
12 Muddy River Springs, thus adversely affecting the Moapa dace and senior decreed water rights.

13 32. Dr. Myers's conclusions are based on the fundamental hydrologic principle that in
14 any groundwater system the amount of discharge (water flowing out of the system) must equal the
15 amount of recharge (water flowing into the system).⁴⁸ Pumping upsets this balance by removing
16 groundwater that would otherwise exit the system as springflow or some other form of discharge.⁴⁹
17 Over time, the system may reach a new equilibrium or "steady state" in which the reduction in
18
19

20 ⁴⁴ Dr. Myers holds Masters and Doctorate degrees in hydrology/hydrogeology and has over thirty-
21 seven years of experience in this field. *See generally* Exhibit 10 (CBD000219-29).

22 ⁴⁵ *See generally* Exhibit 7 (CBD000145-71)

23 ⁴⁶ *See generally* Exhibit 8 (CBD000172-201)

24 ⁴⁷ Exhibit 7 at 25 (CBD000169); Exhibit 8 at 24 (CBD000195).

25 ⁴⁸ *See* Exhibit 7 at 17 (CBD000161); Exhibit 8 at 24-27 (CBD000195-198).

26 ⁴⁹ *See* Exhibit 8 at 24-27 (CBD000195-198).

1 discharge equals the amount being pumped.⁵⁰ But unless and until this occurs pumping will
2 continue to reduce the amount of water that exits the system.⁵¹ In the context of the Lower White
3 River Flow system, the application of this principle is that carbonate groundwater pumping will
4 reduce springflows in the Muddy River Springs Area unless and until the system reaches a steady
5 state.⁵²

6 33. Dr. Myers's reports and testimony explained that the Lower White River Flow
7 System has not reached a steady state because groundwater levels and springflows continue to
8 decline despite recent reductions in pumping and increasing annual precipitation rates.⁵³ After the
9 conclusion of the Order 1169 pump test, and especially since 2014, total pumping has decreased
10 and remained between 7,000 and 8,000 acre-feet per year—roughly equivalent to 1995-97 levels.⁵⁴
11 Precipitation, meanwhile, increased from 2014 through 2018.⁵⁵ Despite this reduction in pumping
12 and increase in precipitation, carbonate groundwater levels and springflows have steadily
13 declined.⁵⁶ As Dr. Myers explained, these decreases indicate that the system has not reached a
14 steady state, and that even with current pumping levels, "it is only a matter of time before the
15 spring flow on which the [Moapa] dace depends decreases significantly or is completely lost."⁵⁷

16 34. Dr. Myers explained that there is very little recharge in the Lower White River Flow
17 System, meaning that very little water enters the carbonate aquifer system from precipitation and
18

19 ⁵⁰ *Id.* at 27 (CBD000198).

20 ⁵¹ *Id.*

21 ⁵² *Id.*

22 ⁵³ *See* Exhibit 9 at 1513-14 (CBD000212-13).

23 ⁵⁴ Exhibit 1 at 55 (CBD000055); Exhibit 8 at 22 (CBD000193).

24 ⁵⁵ Exhibit 8 at 3 (CBD000174).

25 ⁵⁶ *Id.* at 23 (CBD000194).

26 ⁵⁷ Exhibit 7 at 25 (CBD000169); *see also* Exhibit 8 at 27-28 (CBD000198-99).

1 other sources.⁵⁸ Springflows will, therefore, not recover significantly even if pumping is stopped,
2 and any damage done to the Moapa dace and its habitat from excessive pumping rates will be long-
3 term and possibly irreversible.⁵⁹

4 35. Dr. Myers also explained that carbonate pumping impacts Muddy River flows:
5 “carbonate pumping would eventually dry the Muddy River Springs, but carbonate groundwater
6 flow also supports basin fill water through direct discharge from the carbonate to the basin fill and
7 secondary recharge of springflow into the basin fill. The long-term decline of flow in the Muddy
8 River indicates there is a limit to the amount of even basin fill groundwater that can be pumped
9 without affecting Muddy River flows. . . . Because the spring flow is directly responsible for
10 Muddy River flows, preventing any additional carbonate pumpage is also necessary for protecting
11 downstream water rights.”⁶⁰

12 36. Several other stakeholders presented hydrological analyses that agreed with Dr.
13 Myers. The Southern Nevada Water Authority, for instance, stated that “any groundwater
14 production from the carbonate system within the [Lower White River Flow System] will ultimately
15 capture discharge to the [Muddy River Springs Area].”⁶¹ Modeling presented by National Park
16 Service, meanwhile, “confirm[ed] that [groundwater] drawdown will increase and springflow
17 [will] decrease regardless of pumping rate.”⁶²

22 ⁵⁸ Exhibit 7 at 4, 17 (CBD000148, CBD000161).

23 ⁵⁹ Exhibit 8 at 28 (CBD000199).

24 ⁶⁰ Exhibit 7 at 26 (CBD000170).

25 ⁶¹ *Id.*

26 ⁶² Exhibit 8 at 27 (CBD000198).

1 **V. Order 1309**

2 37. On June 15, 2020, the State Engineer issued Order 1309, which set forth the State
3 Engineer's conclusions regarding the four factual matters on which the State Engineer sought
4 stakeholder input.⁶³

5 38. Order 1309 acknowledged that groundwater levels in the regional carbonate aquifer
6 have "not recovered to pre-Order 1169 test levels," and that insufficient data exist to determine
7 whether groundwater levels were approaching a "steady state."⁶⁴ Nevertheless, the State Engineer
8 "agreed" with a minority of stakeholders who argued that water levels in the Muddy River Springs
9 Area "may be approaching steady state."⁶⁵

10 39. In order 1309, the State Engineer also acknowledged that current pumping is
11 capturing Muddy River flows, noting that Muddy River flows in headwaters at the Moapa Gage
12 have declined by over 3,000 afy.⁶⁶ The State Engineer made a finding that "capture or potential
13 capture of the waters of a decreed system does not constitute a conflict with decreed right holders
14 if the flow of the source is sufficient to serve decreed rights."⁶⁷ The State Engineer provided a
15 discussion of how those rights could potentially be met even with reduced headwater flows and
16 then concluded that up to 8,000 acre-feet per year could continue to be pumped from the regional
17

18 ⁶³ The Center agrees with and supports the State Engineer's conclusions on criteria 1 (the
19 geographic boundary of the Lower White River System). The Center takes no position on the
20 State Engineer's conclusions regarding criteria 4 (movement of water rights).

21 ⁶⁴ Exhibit I at 57 (CBD000057).

22 ⁶⁵ *Id.*

23 ⁶⁶ Exhibit I at 61 (CBD000061) ("Flow in the Muddy River at the Moapa Gage has averaged
24 approximately 30,600 afa since 2015, which is less than the predevelopment baseflow of about
25 33,900." (Footnotes omitted).

26 ⁶⁷ *Id.* at 60 (CBD000060).
27
28

1 carbonate aquifer without impacting the fully decreed water rights in the Muddy River, stating
2 “reductions in flow that have occurred because of groundwater pumping in the headwaters basins
3 is not conflicting with Decreed rights.”⁶⁸

4 40. The state engineer’s decision does not consider the impacts of 8,000 acre-feet/yr of
5 pumping on the Moapa dace or its habitat.

6 **GROUNDS FOR THE PETITION**

7 41. The State Engineer’s determination that up to 8,000 acre-feet per year (afy) may be
8 sustainably pumped from the Lower White River Flow System is arbitrary, capricious, irrational
9 and not supported by substantial evidence.⁶⁹ As noted, the 8,000 afy figure is based on the
10 assumption that groundwater levels in the Muddy River Springs Area are approaching a “steady
11 state” after the Order 1169 pump test.⁷⁰ However, the State Engineer acknowledged that
12 insufficient data currently exist to determine whether this “steady-state” hypothesis is in fact
13 accurate.⁷¹ Moreover, the State Engineer’s determination ignored and/or arbitrarily dismissed
14 compelling expert evidence proffered by multiple other stakeholders that groundwater levels
15 continue to decline despite recent decreases in pumping, and thus indicating that the aquifer is not
16 approaching equilibrium.⁷²

17 42. The State Engineer failed to properly consider the environmental consequences of
18 groundwater pumping in the Lower White River Flow System when determining the amount of
19 groundwater that could be sustainably pumped. In Order 1309, the State Engineer acknowledged
20

21 ⁶⁸ Exhibit I at 61 (CBD000061).

22 ⁶⁹ *Id.*

23 ⁷⁰ *Id.* at 57 (CBD000057).

24 ⁷¹ *See id.*

25 ⁷² *See id.* at 62 (CBD000062); Exhibit 7 at 24 (CBD000168); Exhibit 8 at 25, 28 (CBD000196,
26 CBD000199).

1 that “issuing a permit to withdraw groundwater that reduces the flow” of the Muddy River Springs
2 would harm the Moapa dace and violate the ESA.⁷³ The State Engineer further determined that a
3 minimum spring flow of 3.2 cfs is necessary to maintain adequate habitat for the Moapa dace, and
4 that more than 3.2 cfs may be required to support the recovery of the species.⁷⁴ However, in
5 determining the amount of groundwater that could be sustainably pumped, the State Engineer
6 failed to adequately consider how pumping would affect Moapa dace populations and habitat.⁷⁵
7 The State engineer’s determination regarding the long-term annual quantity of water that can be
8 sustainably pumped is based on two conclusions: first, that “reductions in flow that have occurred
9 because of groundwater pumping . . . [are] not conflicting with Decreed rights,”⁷⁶ and second, that
10 “spring discharge may be approaching a steady state.”⁷⁷ As noted, the “steady-state” hypothesis is
11 not consistent with the available data, which show a continuing decline in groundwater levels and
12 springflow.⁷⁸ And neither the alleged “steady state” of the carbonate aquifer, nor the alleged
13 absence of conflicts with senior decreed rights relate to whether the level of groundwater pumping
14 ultimately selected (or any particular level of groundwater pumping) will provide sufficient flow
15 from the Muddy River springs to ensure the long-term survival and recovery of the Moapa dace.
16 Thus, the State Engineer failed to explain the basis for his conclusion that pumping at current
17 levels will adequately protect the Moapa dace, and failed to comply with Nevada water law, which
18 requires him to consider environmental impacts as a component of the public interest.

20 ⁷³ Exhibit 1 at 45 (CBD000045). The Center agrees with and supports the State Engineer’s analysis
21 of potential ESA liability.

22 ⁷⁴ *Id.*

23 ⁷⁵ *See id.* at 59-61 (CBD000059-61).

24 ⁷⁶ *Id.* at 61 (CBD000061).

25 ⁷⁷ *Id.* at 63 (CBD000063).

26 ⁷⁸ *See, e.g.,* Exhibit 7 at 24 (CBD000168); Exhibit 8 at 25, 28 (CBD000196, CBD000199).

1 43. The State Engineer also failed to properly consider the public interest because,
2 based on the evidence in the record, the 8,000 afy permitted under Order 1309 is excessive and
3 allows too much pumping to adequately protect the Moapa dace. As explained above, spring flows
4 at the Muddy River springs continue to decline, even though groundwater pumping from the
5 carbonate aquifer in the Lower White River Flow System has averaged 7,000-8,000 afy since the
6 Order 1169 pump test.⁷⁹ Allowing this level of pumping to continue will result in additional and
7 sustained spring flow declines and associated reductions in Moapa dace habitat. Even though the
8 Order requires that additional data be obtained and commits to reassessing the pumping limit in
9 the future, that approach poses unacceptable risks for the Moapa dace because declines in spring
10 flows are not easily restored. Experience from the pump test and other evidence provided at the
11 Order 1303 hearing show that even if pumping is reduced in the future, recovery of spring flows
12 can take many years or even decades.⁸⁰ Accordingly, the State Engineer's conclusion that
13 maintaining pumping at current levels will adequately protect the Moapa dace is arbitrary,
14 capricious, irrational, and not supported by substantial evidence.

15 44. The evidence in the record also shows that groundwater development anywhere
16 within Lower White River Flow System ultimately captures a portion of fully-decreed Muddy
17 River Flow and that since groundwater development began, Muddy River flows in the headwaters
18 at the Moapa Gage have declined by over 3,000 afy.⁸¹ Therefore, the State Engineer's conclusion
19 that pumping up to 8,000 afy from the regional carbonate aquifer does not constitute a conflict
20 with decreed right holders is unsupported.

23 ⁷⁹ Exhibit 1 at 55 (CBD000055).

24 ⁸⁰ See, e.g., Exhibit 7 at 23-24 (CBD000167-68); Exhibit 8 at 28 (CBD000199).

25 ⁸¹ Exhibit 1 at 61 (CBD000061) ("Flow in the Muddy River at the Moapa Gage has averaged
26 approximately 30,600 afa since 2015, which is less than the predevelopment baseflow of about
27 33,900." (Footnotes omitted).

1 CONCLUSION

2 For the reasons stated above, and for others that may be raised during the pendency of this
3 appeal, Petitioner respectfully requests judgment as follows:

- 4 a. For an Order amending Order 1309 to remove or strike findings made therein
5 regarding the amount of water that can be sustainably pumped from the Lower
6 White River Flow System; amending Order 1309 to remove or strike the findings
7 and conclusions therein that pumping in the Lower White River Flow System will
8 not conflict with Muddy River decreed rights; directing the State Engineer to fully
9 consider the environmental consequences of groundwater pumping within the
10 Lower White River Flow System; and directing the State Engineer to prohibit all
11 carbonate groundwater pumping within the geographic boundary of the Lower
12 White River Flow System, including Kane Springs Valley, until a new sustainable
13 limit is determined by the State Engineer after remand.
- 14 b. For costs of suit and reasonable attorney's fees; and
- 15 c. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and equitable.

16 Respectfully Submitted this 13th day of July, 2020.

17
18
19 /s/ Julie Cavanaugh-Bill

20 Julie Cavanaugh-Bill (NV Bar No. 11533)
21 401 Railroad Street, Suite 307
22 Elko, Nevada 89801
23 775-753-4357

24 /s/ Lisa T. Belenky

25 Lisa T. Belenky (CA Bar No. 203225) (*Pro Hac Vice to be submitted*)
26 Center for Biological Diversity
27 1212 Broadway, Suite 800
28 Oakland, CA 94612
415-632-5307

1 /s/ Douglas Wolf

2 Douglas Wolf (NM Bar No. 7473) (*Pro Hac Vice to be submitted*)

3 Center for Biological Diversity

4 3201 Zafarano Drive

5 Suite C, #149

6 Santa Fe, NM 87507

7 202-510-5604

LIST OF EXHIBITS-FILED AS A SEPARATE APPENDIX

<u>Exhibit Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page Count</u>
1	Nevada State Engineer, Order No. 1309 (June 15, 2020)	68
2	Nevada State Engineer, Order No. 1169 (March 8, 2002)	11
3	Nevada State Engineer, Interim Order No. 1303 and Addendum (May 15, 2019)	17
4	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Intra-Service Programmatic Biological Opinion for the Proposed Muddy River Memorandum of Agreement, File No. 1-5-05-FW-536 (Excerpt) (Jan. 30, 2016)	15
5	Nevada State Engineer, Ruling No. 6254 (Jan. 29, 2014)	29
6	State of Nevada, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Water Resources, Notice Re: Public Workshop Regarding Existing Water Right Use and Groundwater Pumping in the Lower White River Flow System (June 14, 2018)	4
7	Tom Myers, Ph.D., Technical Memorandum Re: Groundwater Management and the Muddy River Springs, Report in Response to State Engineer Order 1303 (June 1, 2019)	27
8	Tom Myers, Ph.D., Technical Memorandum Re: Groundwater Management and the Muddy River Springs, Rebuttal in Response to Stakeholder Reports Filed with Respect to Nevada State Engineer Order 1309 (August 16, 2019)	30
9	Transcript of Proceedings, Public Hearing Regarding Existing Water Right Use and Groundwater Pumping in the Lower White River Flow System (Excerpt) (Oct. 2, 2019)	17
10	Curriculum Vitae of Tom Myers, Ph.D	11

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I, an employee of the Center for Biological Diversity, hereby
3 certify that on July 13, 2020, I served complete copies of the foregoing NOTICE OF AND
4 PETITION FOR JUDICAL REVIEW and the separate APPENDIX WITH EXHIBITS 1-10 by
5 personally delivering true copies thereof to the following addresses:

6 Tim Wilson, P.E.
7 Nevada State Engineer
8 Division of Water Resources
9 901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 2002
10 Carson City, NV 89701

Tori N. Sundheim, Esq.
Deputy Attorney General
Nevada Attorney General's Office
100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701

11 By: /s/ Scott Lake
12 Scott Lake
13 Nevada Legal Advocate
14 Center for Biological Diversity
15 PO Box 6205
16 Reno, NV 89513-6205
17 Ph: (802) 299-7495

18 Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I, an employee of the Center for Biological Diversity, hereby
19 certify that on July 13, 2020, I served complete copies of the foregoing NOTICE OF AND
20 PETITION FOR JUDICAL REVIEW and the separate APPENDIX WITH EXHIBITS 1-10 by
21 placing true copies thereof in the United States mail, Certified Mail – Return Receipt Requested,
22 postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

23 Robert O. Kurth, Jr.
24 3420 North Buffalo Drive
25 Las Vegas, NV 89129
26 *Attorney for 3335 Hillside, LLC*

27 Laura A. Schroeder
28 Therese A. Ure
10615 Double R Blvd., Ste. 100
Reno, Nevada 89521
Attorneys for City of North Las Vegas and Bedroc

Paulina Williams
Baker Botts, L.L.P.
98 San Jacinto Boulevard, Suite 1500
Austin, TX 78701
Attorney for Georgia Pacific Corporation

1 Bradley J. Herrema, Esq.
2 Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck
3 100 N. City Parkway, Suite 1600
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
5 *Attorneys for Coyote Springs*
6 *Investment, LLC*

7 Kent R. Robison, Esq.
8 Therese M. Shanks, Esq
9 Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust
10 71 Washington Street
11 Reno, Nevada 89503
12 *Attorneys for Coyote Springs*
13 *Investment, LLC*

14 Dylan V. Frehner, Esq.
15 Lincoln County District Attorney
16 P.O. Box 60
17 Pioche, NV 89043
18 *Attorney for Lincoln County Water*
19 *District*

20 Alex Flangas
21 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700
22 Reno, NV 89501
23 *Attorney for Nevada Cogeneration*
24 *Associates Nos. 1 and 2*

25 Beth Baldwin
26 Richard Berley
27 ZIONTZ CHESTNUT
28 Fourth And Blanchard Building
2101 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1230
Seattle, Washington 98121-2331
Attorneys for Moapa Band of Paiute
Indians

Steve King, Esq.
227 River Road
Dayton, NV 89403
Attorney for Muddy Valley
Irrigation Company

Sylvia Harrison
Sarah Ferguson
McDONALD CARANO LLP
100 West Liberty Street, 10th Floor
Reno, Nevada 89501
Attorneys for Georgia Pacific
Corporation and Republic
Environmental Technologies, Inc.

Severin A. Carlson
Kaempfer Crowell, Ltd.
50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 700
Reno, Nevada 89511
Attorney for Church of Jesus Christ of
the Latter-Day Saints

Karen Peterson
ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703
Attorney for Vidler Water Company,
Inc. and Lincoln County Water
District

Karen Glasgow
Office of the Regional Solicitor
San Francisco Field Office
U.S. Department of the Interior
333 Bush Street, Suite 775
San Francisco, CA 94104
Attorney for National Park Service

Paul G. Taggart, Esq.
Timothy D. O'Connor, Esq.
TAGGART & TAGGART, LTD.
108 North Minnesota Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703
Attorneys for Las Vegas Valley Water
District and Southern Nevada Water
Authority

1 Greg Morrison
2 50 W. Liberty St., Suite 750
3 Reno, NV 89501
4 *Attorney for Moapa Valley Water*
5 *District*

6 Justina Caviglia
7 6100 Neil Road
8 Reno, NV 89511
9 *Attorney for Nevada Power*
10 *Company d/b/a NV Energy*

11 State of Nevada, Dept. of
12 Conservation and Natural Resources
13 Division of State Parks
14 901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5005
15 Carson City, NV 89701
16 Pacific Coast Building Products
17 P.O. Box 364329
18 Las Vegas, NV 89036

19 S & R, Inc.
20 808 Shetland Road
21 Las Vegas, NV 89107

22 Technichrome
23 4709 Compass Bow Lane
24 Las Vegas, NV 89130

25 William O'Donnell
26 2780 S. Jones Blvd. Ste. 210
27 Las Vegas, NV 89146

28 Global Hydrologic Services, Inc.
Mark D. Stock
561 Keystone Avenue, #200
Reno, NV 89503-4331

Laker Plaza, Inc.
7181 Noon Rd.
Everson, WA 98247-9650

State of Nevada
Department of Transportation
1263 South Stewart Way
Carson City, NV 89030

Steven C. Anderson, Esq.
LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER
DISTRICT
1001 S. Valley View Blvd.,
Las Vegas, NV 89153
Attorney for Las Vegas Valley Water
District and Southern Nevada Water
Authority

LUKE MILLER
Office of the Regional Solicitor
U.S. Department of the Interior
2800 Cottage Way, Suite E1712
Sacramento, CA 95825
Attorney for US. Fish and Wildlife
Service

Larry Brundy
P.O. Box 136
Moapa, NV 89025

Casa De Warm Springs, LLC
1000 N. Green Valley Pkwy
Ste. Nos. 440-350
Henderson, NV 89074

Clark County
500 S. Grand Central Pkwy, 6th Fl.
Las Vegas, NV 89155-1111

Clark County Coyote Springs Water
Resources GID
1001 S. Valley View Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89153

Mary K. Cloud
P.O. Box 31
Moapa, NV 89025

Don J. & Marsha L. Davis
P.O. Box 400
Moapa, NV 89025

1 Dan & Latrice Whitmore
2 P.O Box 23
3 Moapa, Nevada 89025

4 Ascar Egtegar
5 1410 East Lake Mead Blvd.
6 North Las Vegas, NV 89030

7 Ute Leavitt
8 P.O. Box 64
9 Overton, NV 89040

Dry Lake Water, LLC
2470 St. Rose Pkwy., Ste. 107
Henderson, NV 89074


Kelly Kolhoss
P.O. Box 232
Moapa, NV 89025

Lake At Las Vegas Joint Venture, Inc.
1600 Lake Las Vegas Parkway
Henderson, NV 89011

10 By: /s/ Elise Ferguson
11 Elise Ferguson
12 Public Lands Paralegal
13 Center for Biological Diversity
14 1212 Broadway St., Suite 800
15 Oakland, CA 94612
16 Ph: 510-844-7106
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 8

EXHIBIT 8

CASE NO: A-20-817840-P
Department 28

Marquis Aurbach Coffing
Christian T. Balducci, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 12688
10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
Telephone: (702) 382-0711
Facsimile: (702) 382-5816
cbalducci@maclaw.com
Attorneys for Petitioners
Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake
Water, LLC

DISTRICT COURT**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

APEX HOLDING COMPANY, LLC, a Nevada
limited liability company; DRY LAKE WATER,
LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,

Case No.:
Dept. No.:

Petitioners,

vs.

**PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF
ORDER 1309**

TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State Engineer,
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
NATURAL RESOURCES

Respondent.

Petitioners, APEX HOLDING COMPANY, LLC ("APEX"), and its wholly owned subsidiary, DRY LAKE WATER, LLC ("DRY LAKE"), by and through the law firm of Marquis Aurbach Coffing, hereby file this Petition for Judicial Review of Order 1309 issued on June 15, 2020, by Respondent, TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State Engineer, DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES. The full text of Order 1309 is attached hereto and incorporated herein. This Petition for Judicial Review of Nevada State Engineer ("NSE") Order 1309 is filed pursuant to NRS 533.450.

///

1 **I. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT**

2 Under NRS 533.450, any order or decision of the State Engineer is subject to judicial
3 review “in the proper court of the county in which the matters affected or a portion thereof are
4 situated.” The real property to which the water at issue in this appeal is appurtenant lies within
5 Clark County, Nevada; therefore, the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and
6 for Clark County is the proper venue for judicial review.

7 Further, the subject matter of the appeal involves decreed waters of the Muddy River
8 Decree. Under NRS 533.450(I), “on stream systems where a decree of court has been entered,
9 the action must be initiated in the court that entered the decree.” This court has proper
10 jurisdiction of the Muddy River Decree, *Muddy Valley Irrigation Company, et al, vs. Moapa Salt*
11 *Lake Produce Company, et al*, Case No. 377, which was entered in the Tenth Judicial District of
12 the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Clark in 1920.¹

13 The NSE Order 1309 was entered on June 15, 2020, based in whole or part on prior NSE
14 Orders 1169, 1169A, 1303, and the evidence and law offered at hearing upon each Order.

15 This Petition is timely filed and will be timely served as required under NRS 533.450.

16 Petitioners, APEX and DRY LAKE, have standing to file this Petition as APEX is one of
17 the land owners, and DRY LAKE is one of the water rights owners and beneficial users of the
18 groundwater for providing the beneficial use of water by service to those lands, which are subject
19 of, adversely impacted by, and which were a party to the proceedings which resulted in NSE
20 Order 1309, and participating in those proceedings for the purpose of developing a
21 comprehensive water management program agreed to by all water rights owners in the Garnet
22 Valley and Black Mountain aquifers, and as necessary the Lower White River Flow System
23
24
25
26

27 ¹ In 1920, the Tenth Judicial District consisted of Clark County and Lincoln County. In 1945, Clark
28 County was designated as the Eighth Judicial District.

1 (“LWRFS”).²

2 Apex and Dry Water acknowledge that another Petition concerning the same order was
3 filed on or around June 17, 2020, by LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT (“LVVWD”)
4 and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER AUTHORITY (“SNWA”). Apex and Dry Water are
5 informed and believe that other petitions challenging that same order have been or will be filed
6 as well. However, this Petition raises for judicial review different parts of NSE Order 1309 and
7 substantial different and additional matters of law and evidence than that prior Petition by
8 LVVWD and SNWA.
9

10 Other Parties to the proceedings which have resulted in NSE Order 1309 have been
11 notified of this Petition as required by law as evidenced by the certificate of service attached
12 hereto.

13 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

14 **A. SUBSTANTIAL INTERESTS IN THE LWRFS BY PETITIONERS APEX 15 AND DRY LAKE.**

16 APEX is the owner of lands in the LWRFS groundwater basin area, which is the subject
17 of NSE Order 1309, and for that reason APEX formed DRY LAKE to be the owner of water
18 rights in the Garnet Valley and Black Mountain aquifers of the LWRFS, which are critical and
19 essential for the service of water supply to those APEX lands.

20 The APEX lands were carved out of the sovereign lands of the United States of America

21 ² DRY LAKE owns 178 acre feet of Garnet Basin water rights, base permit numbers 66784 (131.16 AF) and 66785
22 (46.84 AF). These base permits have designated points of diversion in various locations within Apex Industrial Park
23 under some or all of the Permit Numbers 66784 for 156.84 AF with Priority date 3/6/1987, 66785 for 46.84 AF with
24 Priority date 8/25/2000, 72098 for 13.16 AF with Priority date 8/25/2000, 77389 for 80 AF with Priority date
25 8/25/2000, 79948 for 30 AF with Priority date 8/25/2000, 81344 for 8 AF with Priority date 8/25/2000, 84041 for 40
26 AF with Priority date 7/21/2014. Permit number 72098 for 13.17 acre feet has been moved to the Loves Well,
27 79948 for 30.00 acre feet moved to Loves Well, 81344 for 8.00 acre feet moved to Loves Well, 84041 for
28 40.00 acre feet moved to Loves Well, 77389 for 80.00 acre feet moved to Solo Mountain, and
Straggler 6.83 acre feet. DRY LAKE owns 1,392.06 acre feet of Black Mountain water rights, base permit
numbers 68350 (119.44 AF), 68351 (542.98 AF), 68352 (137.58 AF) and 68353 (592.06 AF). The Black Mountain
water rights were successfully moved by the NSE into the Garnet Basin to three different locations within the Apex
Industrial Park under Permit Numbers 88873T, 88874T, 88875T, 88876T, and 88877T for Permits No. 68350 for
119.44 Acre Feet with Priority Date 10/18/88, 68351 for 542.98 Acre Feet with Priority Date 6/21/88, 68352 for
137.58 Acre Feet with Priority Date 10/18/88 and 68353 for 592.06 Acre Feet with Priority Date 10/10/90.

1 and managed by the Bureau of Land Management (“BLM”), to fulfill the purposes of the “Apex
2 Project, Nevada Land Transfer and Authorization Act of 1989,” Public Law 101-67, 101st
3 Congress, 103 STAT 168 (“Act of Congress”).³

4 The lands owned by APEX, and by necessary implication the water rights owned by
5 DRY LAKE required to serve those lands, were impressed with a public trust, and carved out of
6 the USA public domain, and sold to APEX by the authority of the Act of Congress for the
7 specific intent and purpose of serving the crucial national security interest, and the public health,
8 safety, and welfare interests of the citizens of the United States of America, Clark County and
9 the State of Nevada.

10 The specific intent and purpose of the Act of Congress would be totally frustrated and
11 defeated without the water supply by DRY LAKE provided to APEX.

12 The Act of Congress occurred during the same contemporaneous time that the NSE
13 issued Order 1309 and the predecessor orders leading up to Order 1309, Orders 1169, 1169A,
14 1303, and other relevant proceedings, studies and hearings relating thereto, and also referred to
15 herein below.

16 The NSE, SNWA and LVVWD and other relevant governmental and private parties were
17 knowledgeable of, and at all relevant times informed participants in the process leading up to the
18 Act of Congress, acquisition of the lands by APEX, and formation of DRY LAKE and its
19 acquisition of water rights to serve APEX, and commencement of DRY LAKE service of water
20 to those APEX lands.

21 The NSE by Order 1309, and the other orders resulting in Order 1309, and to some
22 demonstrable extent SNWA, LVVWD and other relevant governmental and private parties, have
23 repeatedly taken actions which have had the deleterious effect of interfering with the intent and
24 purpose of the Act of Congress, and otherwise defeat, frustrate, delay, prevent or avoid any water
25

26
27 ³ See <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-103/pdf/STATUTE-103-Pg168.pdf>.

1 supply being provided to APEX by DRY LAKE.

2 The NSE has taken the proper statutory and factual action granting temporary permit
3 transfer status of Black Mountain water rights to the Garnet Valley of the LWRFS owned by
4 DRY LAKE to serve APEX and fulfill the intent and purpose of the Act of Congress. That
5 proper action by the NSE has been opposed by the SNWA and other relevant governmental and
6 private parties that own senior water rights in the LWRFS and the Muddy River Flow System
7 (“MRFS”), or which have an interest in the protection of the habitat for the Moapa Dace.
8

9 This Petition raises for consideration by the Court the following factual evidence and
10 legal issues: first, fully implementing the intent and purpose of the Act of Congress. Second, this
11 Petition also raises for the Court the factual evidence and law disputing Order 1309 evidence that
12 there is an interrelationship and tributary nature of the groundwater pumping in the LWRFS by,
13 *inter alios*, APEX and DRY LAKE with the MRFS. Third, this Petition also raises for the Court
14 the LWRFS tributary or non-tributary interconnection to the natural springs, surface water and
15 groundwater of the MRFS which would have the effect of subjecting LWRFS water rights to
16 regulation and curtailment under the laws, rules and regulations governing the Colorado River
17 Flow System pursuant to the Colorado River Compact 1922 and Boulder Canyon Project Act
18 1928, and *et. seq.* eleven or more laws, rules, treaties, regulations, or minutes (“Law of the
19 River”).⁴ Fourth, this Petition also raises to the Court the resulting facts alleged by NSE Order
20 1309 requiring a limitation on groundwater pumping and permission to maintain and utilize
21 temporary permits of transfer groundwater rights from Black Mountain Basin to Garnet Valley
22 Basin of the LWRFS, by, *inter alios*, APEX and DRY LAKE. Fifth, this Petition raises the legal
23 and factual issues arising from the NSE limiting and preventing evidence and facts at the hearing
24 resulting in NSE Order 1309. Finally, this Petition also may relate to the other factual or legal
25 positions which may be developed in the hearing conducted by the Court.
26

27
28 ⁴ See, for example, <https://www.usbr.gov/lc/region/pao/lawofrvr.html>.

B. ORDER 1303.

On January 11, 2019, the State Engineer issued Interim Order 1303 to obtain stakeholder input on four specific factual matters: 1) the geographic boundary of the LWRFS, 2) aquifer recovery since the 1169 pump test, 3) long-term annual quantity that may be pumped from the LWRFS, and 4) effects of moving water rights between the carbonate and alluvial system to senior water rights on the Muddy River.⁵ After factual findings were made on those questions, the State Engineer was to evaluate groundwater management options for the LWRFS.

On May 13, 2019, the State Engineer amended Order 1303 and modified certain deadlines for filing reports. On July 25, 2019, the State Engineer issued a Notice of Pre-Hearing Conference. On August 23, 2019, the State Engineer held a prehearing conference. At the prehearing conference, Hearing Officer Fairbank unequivocally stated that “the purpose of the hearing is not to resolve or address allegations of conflict between groundwater pumping within the LWRFS and Muddy River decreed rights.”⁶ On August 23, 2019, the State Engineer issued a Notice of Hearing, and again clarified the limited scope of the hearing.

In July and August 2019, reports and rebuttal reports were submitted discussing the four matters set forth in Order 1303. Several parties filed objections to witnesses and evidence. Most of the objections were related to the scope of the topics in the submitted evidence. On August 23, 2019, the State Engineer issued an Order on Objections to Witnesses and Evidence. The State Engineer agreed that “the evidence presented in the hearing is to be limited to the four issues identified in the Notice of Hearing.” The State Engineer allowed all evidence to be presented, but again warned that the “scope of the testimony shall be limited to the four issues

⁵ Exhibit 3 at 2 (“The State Engineer directed the participants to limit the offer of evidence and testimony to the salient conclusions, including directing the State Engineer and his staff to the relevant data, evidence and other information supporting those conclusions. The State Engineer further noted that the hearing on the Order 1303 reports was the first step in determining to what extent, if any, and in what manner the State Engineer would address future management decisions, including policy decisions relating to the [LWRFS] basins.”)

⁶ Exhibit 4, at 12:6-15.

1 identified in Order 1301” and cautioned that while some evidence could be submitted outside the
2 specific scope but that the State Engineer “may order a line of questioning to cease or to remain
3 limited to the relevant issues that are the subject of the hearing.”⁷

4 **C. NSE ORDER 1309 FACTS SUPPORTING THIS PETITION.**

5 On June 15, 2020, the NSE Order 1309 determined that “reductions in flow that have occurred
6 because of groundwater pumping in the headwaters basins (i.e., LWRFS) is not conflicting with
7 the Decreed rights (i.e., the senior rights of SNWA, LVVWD and others).”⁸

8 A study by the United States Department of the Interior, Geologic Survey (“USGS”) in
9 1989, which is contemporaneous with the Act of Congress referred to above,⁹ concluded at page
10 2 of that 1989 report by the USGS as follows:

11
12 Large-scale development (sustained withdrawals) of water from the carbonate-
13 rock aquifers would result in water-level declines and cause the depletion of large
14 quantities of stored water. Ultimately, these declines would cause reductions in
15 the flow of warm-water springs that discharge from the regional aquifers. Storage
16 in other nearly aquifers also might be depleted, and water levels in those other
17 aquifers could decline. In contrast, isolated smaller ground-water developments,
18 or developments that withdraw ground water for only a short time, may result in
19 water-level declines and springflow reductions of manageable or acceptable
20 magnitude.

21 Confidence in predictions of the effects of development, however, is low; and it
22 will remain low until observations of the initial hydrologic results of development
23 are analyzed. A strategy of staging developments gradually and adequately
24 monitoring the resulting hydrologic conditions would provide information that
25 eventually could be used to improve confidence in the predictions.

26 The NSE confirmed the statement above that “Confidence in predictions of the effects of
27 development, however, is low;” unless there were additional studies, and as cited in NSE Order
28 1309 at pages 7-10 the evidence submitted by parties to the hearings and studies on Order 1303
and 1309 was conflicting and inconsistent with the finding of adverse impact of pumping in the

24
25 ⁷ August 23, 2019, Order on Objections.

26 ⁸ Exhibit 1 at 61.

27 ⁹ Memorandum dated August 3, 1984, from Terry Katzer, Nevada Office Chief, Water Resources
28 Division, United States Department of Interior Geologic Survey, Carson City, Nevada to Members of the
Carbonate Terrane Study.

1 LWRFS to the natural springs, and surface water of the MRFS.

2 By its terms, the 2006 Memorandum of Agreement (“MOA”) between SNWA and other
3 parties¹⁰ and all actions, evidence and resulting NSE Order 1169 and its subsequent Orders
4 1169A, 1303, and 1309 developed by or because of such MOA, are binding only upon and
5 enforceable against the parties to the MOA, and to the NSE to the extent adopted by the NSE,
6 and are not binding upon or enforceable against APEX or DRY LAKE, *inter alios*.

7
8 There is a factual admission against interest by the NSE, SNWA and LVVWD, and the
9 other parties to the MOA, that they deliberately designed and started a study process with the
10 NSE entitled Southern Nevada Water Authority Order 1169 Report (“Study”),¹¹ which actually
11 reached a conclusion directly and immediately beneficial to the interests of senior water rights
12 owners in the LWRFS and MRFS, and the Moapa Dace, and directly and immediately
13 detrimental to the interests of APEX, DRY LAKE, and *inter alios*.

14 Some water rights owners (i.e., SNWA and LVVWD, and the other parties to the MOA)
15 with water rights interests in both the LWRFS and MRFS, entered into the MOA which resulted
16 in NSE Order 1169, and its subsequent Orders 1169A, 1303, and 1309. Then, some water rights
17 owners, which are parties to the MOA, developed the Study¹² of the LWRFS and MRFS, in such
18 a way that NSE Order 1309 now seeks to apply limitations developed by the MOA and Study to
19 all water rights owners in the LWRFS. That application of the MOA and Study to all water
20 rights owners in the LWRFS restricts all water rights owners of their beneficial use of water
21 rights in the LWRFS to, and for, the benefit and protection of the natural springs, streams and
22

23 ¹⁰ NSE Ex. 236, 2006 Memorandum of Agreement between the Southern Nevada Water Authority,
24 United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Coyote Springs Investment LLC, Moapa Band of Paiute Indians,
25 and Moapa Valley Water District, Hearings on Interim Order 1303, official records of the Division of
26 Water Resources.

27 ¹¹ NSE Ex. 245, Hearing on Interim Order 1303, official records of the Division of Water Resources.

28 ¹² See MOA Pumping Study performed by the parties to the MOA pursuant to Order 1169,
http://water.nv.gov/mapping/order1169/Order_1169_Final_Reports/SNWA%20Order%201169%20Report.pdf.

1 groundwater tributary to the MRFS. That action started by NSE Order 1169, implemented by the
2 MOA and Study, and culminated in NSE Order 1309, which exclusively benefits some water
3 rights owners, which are the parties to the MOA, and specifically and exclusively damages all
4 water rights owners in the LWRFS, all without protections of due process, equal protection, and
5 other Constitutional and legal rights accorded for all water rights owners in the LWRFS;
6 especially damaging APEX, DRY LAKE, and *inter alios*.

7
8 Some water rights owners, as parties to the MOA and Study, admit that some water rights
9 owners as Petitioners now seek court orders modifying NSE Order 1309 in such a way as to
10 grant them more rights to water in the LWRFS and MRFS, at the expense of and direct and
11 immediate damage to all water rights owners in the LWRFS; especially damaging APEX, DRY
12 LAKE, and *inter alios*.

13 APEX and DRY LAKE do not support any conclusion of fact or law, which due to the
14 MOA and Study, and all actions, evidence and resulting NSE Order 1169, and its subsequent
15 Orders 1169A, 1303, and 1309 developed by or because of such MOA and Study, which would
16 have the effect of: first, that thereby subjects the DRY LAKE water rights to the adverse
17 restriction or limitation on beneficial use of groundwater due to the alleged tributary nature of
18 such groundwater pumping in the LWRFS to the natural springs, streams and groundwater
19 tributary to the MRFS, and thus, second, because of that tributary Order 1309, finds that the
20 LWRFS is tributary to the Colorado River Flow System, and thus, third, subjects the LWRFS to
21 severe restrictions imposed by the allocation methods of water use between states by restrictions
22 and limitations pursuant to the Law of the River.¹³

24 APEX and DRY LAKE take the factual and legal position that if any restrictions or
25 limitations on the use of ground or surface water in the LWRFS is determined to be necessary for
26 meeting the requirements of the Moapa Dace or senior surface or ground water rights in the

27
28 ¹³ See, for example, <https://www.usbr.gov/lc/region/pao/lawofrvr.html>.

1 MRFS or the Colorado River Flow System, it is the sole and exclusive obligation and
2 responsibility of some water rights owners, who are the parties to the MOA, Study and NSE,
3 who agreed between themselves to the exclusion of all water rights owners, that there was a
4 detrimental impact on existing water rights and the environment by pumping of groundwater in
5 the LWRFS.¹⁴

6 The NSE issued Order 1303, based upon the MOA, and Order 1169, which started a
7 hearing process resulting in Order 1309 before the Court today, where only four factual issues
8 (and no legal issues) could be addressed. This is based upon the factual assumption and
9 conclusion of the MOA and resulting Study pumping tests of the LWRFS that groundwater use
10 in the LWRFS was tributary to the MRFS, and, thus, the LWRFS had to be limited and restricted
11 on beneficial use of water rights to protect the Moapa Dace and the senior water rights of the
12 parties to the MOA; which is thereby detrimental to the property rights in water by all water
13 rights owners in the LWRFS; especially damaging APEX, DRY LAKE, and *inter alios*..

14 By written admission of the NSE and parties to the MOA, the limitation against APEX
15 and DRY LAKE to submit additional evidence and law other than to the four factual issues, was
16 and is arbitrary and capricious, and a denial of the protections of due process, equal protection,
17 and other Nevada Constitutional and legal rights for the APEX and DRY LAKE water rights,
18 and also, incidentally, all water rights owners in the LWRFS.

19 To the extent that APEX and/or DRY LAKE did or did not participate in the process by
20 the NSE and MOA parties resulting in Order 1309, APEX and/or DRY LAKE so acted to avoid
21 being complicit in, or a party to, the denial of the protections of due process, equal protection,
22 and other Constitutional and legal rights for the APEX and DRY LAKE water rights, and also,
23 incidentally, all water rights owners in the LWRFS. APEX and DRY LAKE only participated to
24 the extent necessary to be a part of any comprehensive or conjunctive use management plan
25

26
27
28 ¹⁴ Petition at lines 8-15, page 3.

1 voluntarily developed by 100% of all water rights owners of the LWRFS and MRFS as stated in
2 NSE Order 1303.¹⁵

3 The NSE and parties to the MOA knew, and have known at all relevant times, that neither
4 the NSE or MOA parties have the right, duty, power or responsibility to impose a comprehensive
5 or conjunctive use management plan or any other management plan, which thereby would erase
6 the protection of prior appropriation for all water rights owners in the LWRFS, in favor of the
7 prior rights of appropriation of some water rights owners, SNWA, and the parties to the MOA.¹⁶

8 As stated in Order 1309, all factual calculations of groundwater water usage and the
9 resulting impact of that groundwater usage on LWRFS or MRFS water rights or the Moapa Dace
10 were “estimates,” “assumptions,” “considered to be,” and other words connoting approximation
11 and guess to the extent that the range of values testified to were between 4,000 acre feet per year
12 (“AFY”) or less and 10,000 AFY or more.¹⁷

13 The NSE stated that the hearings which resulted in Order 1309 were “... not to resolve or
14 address allegations of conflict between groundwater pumping within the LWRFS and ... MRFS
15 ... decreed rights.” However, by Order 1309, the NSE then went forward and found and ordered
16 upon that finding in Order 1309 that LWRFS groundwater pumping did, in fact, capture MRFS
17 flows and therefore must be limited to 8,000 AFY, pending further investigations.¹⁸

18
19
20
21
22 ¹⁵ Petition, lines 18-19, page 4. See, for example, the guidance of the reasoning in the contemporaneous
23 *Diamond Valley Aquifer* case striking down as arbitrary and capricious, pursuant to NRS 533.325 and
24 NRS 533.345, the NSE Order 1302, (*Bailey vs. Wilson*, Case No. CV-1902-348 consolidated with case
25 nos. CV-1902-349 and CV-1902-350, Seventh Judicial District, April 27, 2020 [*Bailey vs. Wilson*].)

26 ¹⁶ See *Bailey vs. Wilson*, and see also, *Ormsby County v. Kearny*, 37 Nev. 314, 142 P. 803, 820 (1914).

27 ¹⁷ Order 1309 at pages 57 and 61. See also, for example, the MOA Pumping Study performed by the
28 parties to the MOA pursuant to Order 1169,
[http://water.nv.gov/mapping/order1169/Order_1169_Final_Reports/SNWA%
20Order%201169%20Report.pdf](http://water.nv.gov/mapping/order1169/Order_1169_Final_Reports/SNWA%20Order%201169%20Report.pdf).

¹⁸ Petition, at lines 11-24, page 6, and Order 1309.

1 **III. GROUNDS FOR THE PETITION**

2 **A. ISSUES FOR RESOLUTION.**

3 This matter involves resolving fundamental issues of the State of Nevada Constitutional
4 law, statutory law, facts, findings and orders by the NSE, rights, duties and responsibilities of the
5 NSE, and conforming NSE Order 1309 to the Constitution of the United States of America and
6 Constitution of Nevada, and related acts of Congress and Nevada, statutes, treaties, laws, and
7 regulations of America and Nevada.

8 **B. ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS, AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL**
9 **VIOLATION OF NEVADA CONSTITUTION AND LAW NRS 533.025.**

10 The NSE determined and issued Order 1309 upon a frail reed of evidence, which is
11 highly controverted, directly conflicting, internally inconsistent, unsupported in many contexts
12 and inconsistent with prior orders of the NSE, and evidence submitted by all parties to the
13 hearings and proceeding resulting in Order 1309, that the LWRFS is tributary to the natural
14 sources of springs, surface water and groundwater tributary to the MRFS. Thus, NSE Order
15 1309 directly and immediately caused the water rights and water supply of the entire LWRFS
16 (and ultimately potentially the entire White River Flow System [“WRFS”]) to be subject to
17 curtailment for the benefit of the other states and other states’ water rights holders under the Law
18 of the River. By Order 1309, finding the waters of the LWRFS to be tributary to the Colorado
19 River Flow System, the NSE thereby deprived the public of the State of Nevada of the beneficial
20 use of the surface and groundwaters of the State of Nevada, which surface and underground
21 waters belong to the public, subject to prior appropriation for beneficial use, and which waters
22 have been awarded and owners thereof are requesting the award of a decree of appropriation, and
23 permit to utilize the appropriated waters. The Order 1309 finding is beyond the rights, duties,
24 and responsibilities of the NSE and is an arbitrary, capricious, and unconstitutional violation of
25 Nevada Constitution and law.

26 **C. ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS AND DIRECT UNENFORCEABLE**
27 **VIOLATION OF THE ACT OF CONGRESS.**

28 The land owned by APEX, and by necessary implication the water rights owned by DRY
 LAKE required to serve those lands, were carved out of the USA public domain by an Act of

1 Congress for the purpose of serving the crucial national interest, and the public health, safety,
2 and welfare interests of Clark County and the State of Nevada. As such, to the extent that NSE
3 Order 1309 defeats or interferes with achieving the intent and purposes of the Act of Congress,
4 NSE Order 1309 is invalid and unenforceable.

5 **D. THE NSE ORDER 1309 CONFLICTS WITH A PRIOR CONTROLLING**
6 **DECISION AND REGULATION AND IS VIOLATIVE OF NEVADA**
7 **CONSTITUTION AND LAW.**

8 The LWRFS previously has been declared as water eligible for “Intentionally Created
9 Surplus Credits” for the Colorado River System, as being not tributary to the MRFS, except by
10 importation. Thus, the findings of the tributary nature of the LWRFS to the MRFS, and thence
11 to the Colorado River Flow System in NSE Order 1309, is contrary to prior studies and
12 regulations under the Law of the River.

13 **E. THE SEO HAS NO AUTHORITY TO REGULATE OR RESTRICT**
14 **LWRFS WATER USE FOR PROTECTION OF THE MOAPA DACE AS**
15 **PARTIES TO NSE ORDER 1169 AND THE MOA VOLUNTARILY HAVE**
16 **ALREADY ADDRESSED AND RESOLVED THE ISSUE.**

17 See, for example the following quote from the MOA Study conducted under Order 1169:

18 “SNWA conducts biological resource monitoring and habitat restoration in
19 accordance with a 2006 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and associated
20 Biological Opinion to conserve the endangered Moapa dace during development
21 of its permitted groundwater rights Coyote Spring Valley. In April 2006, the
22 MOA was entered into by the following five parties: SNWA, USFWS, CSI,
23 MBPI, and MVWD, to conserve and recover the Moapa dace while developing
24 and using permitted water rights.” Paragraph N of the MOA states: “... the
25 Parties have identified certain conservation measures with the objective of making
26 measurable progress toward the conservation and recovery of the Moapa dace,
27 and have agreed to coordinate the monitoring, management, and mitigation
28 measures” As of 2013, all efforts associated with the MOA have been or are
being implemented. In addition to the trigger elevations established under the
MOA at the USGS 09415920 Warm Springs West near Moapa, Nevada (Warm
Springs West) gage, under which groundwater development by the section
3.0203.0 Order 1169 Monitoring and Related Studies Parties would be
incrementally curtailed if flows declined to specific levels, the MOA Parties
agreed to a series of conservation measures for the Moapa dace. These measures
included contributions of roughly \$1.275 million for Moapa dace habitat
restoration, the development of an ecological model of Moapa dace habitat,
installation of fish barriers, and eradication of non-native fish. To date, the
Parties have provided the identified funds; completed habitat restoration specified
under the MOA with additional restoration ongoing; substantially completed the
ecological model; installed one fish barrier with another planned; and efforts to

1 eradicate non-native fish have been implemented and are continuing as needed.
2 In 2007, SNWA purchased the 1,220-acre parcel formally known as the "Warm
3 Springs Ranch," which was the largest tract of private property along the Muddy
4 River and contains the majority of the historical habitat for the endangered Moapa
5 dace. SNWA renamed the property the Warm Springs Natural Area (WSNA) and
6 is managing it as a natural area for the benefit of native species and for the
7 recovery of the endangered Moapa dace, as described in the WSNA Stewardship
8 Plan dated June 2011. Stream restoration activities on the WSNA began in late
9 2008 and continued through 2012, resulting in improvements to habitat where the
10 Moapa dace currently are present. The population count of the Moapa dace is a
11 key indicator of species well-being in the headwaters of the Muddy River. Recent
12 population counts indicate the Moapa dace population began to rise during 2010
13 and 2011 and nearly doubled in 2012. Thus, the MOA conservation actions have
14 resulted in measurable progress towards conservation and recovery of the Moapa
15 dace, during which groundwater development for beneficial use and to meet the
16 objectives of the Order 1169 Study has occurred. Figure10 shows the population
17 of the Moapa dace from 1994 to the present."¹⁹

11 **F. THE DUTIES OF THE NSE DO NOT EXTEND TO THE ACTIONS**
12 **TAKEN UNDER NSE ORDER 1309, AND THEREFORE NSE ORDER**
13 **1309 IS ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS AND CONTRARY TO**
14 **NEVADA CONSTITUTION AND LAW.**

15 "The mission of the Nevada Division of Water Resources (NDWR) is to
16 conserve, protect, manage and enhance the State's water resources for Nevada's
17 citizens through the appropriation and reallocation of the public waters. In
18 addition, the Division is responsible for quantifying existing water rights;
19 monitoring water use; distributing water in accordance with court decrees;
20 reviewing water availability for new subdivisions and condominiums; reviewing
21 the construction and operation of dams; appropriating geothermal water; licensing
22 and regulating well drillers and water rights surveyors; reviewing flood control
23 projects; monitoring water resource data and records; and providing technical
24 assistance to the public and governmental agencies."²⁰

25 Nothing said therein permits the NSE to make a determination of tributary connection,
26 which would have the immediate effect of making waters of the public of Nevada and water
27 rights of the LWRFS subject to the Law of the River, and, thus, subject to curtailment for the
28 benefit of other states in the Colorado River Flow System.

25 ¹⁹ See

26 [http://water.nv.gov/mapping/order1169/Order_1169_Final_Reports/SNWA%20Order%201169%20Repo](http://water.nv.gov/mapping/order1169/Order_1169_Final_Reports/SNWA%20Order%201169%20Report.pdf)
27 [rt. pdf](http://water.nv.gov/mapping/order1169/Order_1169_Final_Reports/SNWA%20Order%201169%20Report.pdf) at Section 3.4.2, page 19.

28 ²⁰ See <http://water.nv.gov/> and see also <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/NRS-532.html>.

1 **G. THE NSE ORDER 1309 WAS ISSUED ON A FLAWED FACTUAL BASIS**
2 **OF THE CONNECTION BETWEEN LWRFS PUMPING AND MRFS**
3 **SENIOR WATER RIGHTS, WHICH IS DIRECTLY CONTRARY TO THE**
4 **FINDINGS OF THE MOA PUMPING STUDY.**

5 “This clearly demonstrates that nearby carbonate pumping is not influencing
6 Muddy River flows at the Moapa gage and is therefore not influencing senior
7 Muddy River surface-water rights.” “Thus, the conclusions drawn in the previous
8 section regarding the lack of influence of carbonate pumping on flows in the
9 Muddy River are supported, as is the conclusion that NVE alluvial pumping is
10 capturing water that would have otherwise constituted Muddy River water
11 apportioned under the 1920 Muddy River decree.”

12 **H. DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION, DEPRIVATION AND**
13 **VIOLATION.**

14 The SEO restricted the presentation of all forms of evidence by APEX and DRY LAKE,
15 inter alios, including facts and law, as evidence in arriving at NSE Order 1309. NSE Order 1309
16 was based solely upon four factual issues, which already had presumed that the waters of the
17 LWRFS were tributary to the MRFS.

18 **I. VIOLATION OF THE PRECEDENTIAL RULING AGAINST THE NSE**
19 **IN THE DIAMOND VALLEY CASE (BAILEY VS. WILSON).**

20 The well-reasoned and substantial contemporaneous District Court case of *Bailey vs.*
21 *Wilson* is instructive regarding the exercise of powers by the NSE. Simply, what Order 1309
22 does is subvert the priority of the appropriation system of Nevada, which the case of *Bailey vs.*
23 *Wilson* holds as arbitrary and capricious and contrary to Nevada law. There is no law authorizing
24 the NSE to voluntarily give to the other Colorado Basin States non-tributary waters of the
25 LWRFS in Nevada, which belongs to the people of Nevada subject to the doctrine of prior
26 appropriation. Instead by Order 1309, the NSE adopts the words and arguments of the
27 Department of the Interior (USFWS, NPS, Bu Rec and etc. federal agencies), which are in
28 charge of administering the Law of the River, and, thus, have adverse interests to the public of
Nevada, who otherwise would enjoy the sole and exclusive use of the waters of the LWRFS. As
Bailey vs. Wilson holds, the sole right, duty and responsibility of the NSE is to work toward the
jointly created comprehensive and conjunctive management plan by all water rights owners in
the LWRFS or have the Legislature of Nevada create the basis for the NSE to declare a Critical
Management Area, pursuant to NRS 534.037.100. And even then, no law can be passed which

1 would make the LWRFS tributary to the MRFS and, thus, subject to curtailment for the benefit
2 of other states of the Colorado River Flow System under the Law of the River. The NSE cannot
3 be heard to state that Nevada would suffer liability for failure to protect the Moapa Dace because
4 the case of *Strahan vs. Coxe*, 127 F.3rd 155 (1st Circuit, 1997), cert. den. 525 U.S. 830 (1998)
5 holds that no such liability attaches due to the NSE issuing permits which withdraw water that
6 reduces the flow of springs that form the habitat of the Moapa Dace or otherwise cause harm to
7 the Moapa Dace.

8 **IV. CONCLUSION**

9 For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons that may be discovered and raised during
10 the pendency of the hearing on the original Petition, this Petition for Judicial Review, and other
11 similar Petition or Cross-Petition filed in this proceeding or consolidated with this proceeding,
12 APEX and DRY LAKE request that the Court order the NSE to withdraw, amend or otherwise
13 strike findings made in NSE Order 1309, regarding the tributary connection and nature of the
14 LWRFS to the natural springs, headwaters and water supplies for, and to, the MRFS, so as to not
15 deprive APEX and DRY LAKE of its land use, water rights, duties and responsibilities to
16 comply with the national interest and interests of Clark County and the State of Nevada provided
17 for in the Act of Congress, and also seek a Court order such that APEX and DRY LAKE may
18 exercise their Black Mountain Basin and Garnet Basin groundwater rights and temporary permits
19 in the LWRFS as non-tributary groundwater to the MRFS without limitation, interference,
20 restrictions or delay, and specifically exempting those water rights from reductions due to the
21 Moapa Dace, MRFS senior water rights, or the Law of the River.

22 Dated this 10th day of July, 2020.

23 MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

24
25 By /s/ Christian T. Balducci
26 Christian T. Balducci, Esq.
27 Nevada Bar No. 12688
28 10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
*Attorneys for Petitioners Apex Holding
Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I served foregoing **PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDER 1309** with a copy of this document by mailing via US Postal Service, Certified, on the 10th day of July, 2020, addressed to:

Paul G. Taggart, Esq.
Timothy D. O'Connor, Esq.
TAGGART & TAGGART, LTD.
108 North Minnesota Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703
Email: paul@legaltnt.com
Email: tim@legaltnt.com
Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA

Steven C. Anderson, Esq.
Las Vegas Valley Water District
1001 S. Valley View Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89153
Email: sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA

Justina Caviglia, Esq.
6100 Neil Road
Reno, NV 89511
Email: jcaviglia@nvenergy.com
*Attorney for Nevada Power Company
d/b/a NV Energy*

Severin A. Carlson, Esq.
KAEMPFER CROWELL, LTD.
50 W. Liberty Street, Ste. 700
Reno, NV 89511
*Attorney for Church of Jesus Christ of the
Latter-Day Saints*

Tim Wilson P.E., State Engineer
Nevada Division of Water Resources Dept. of
Conservation and Natural Resources
901 South Stewart St., Ste. 2002
Carson City, NV 89701

Robert O. Kurth, Jr., Esq..
3420 North Buffalo Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89129
Attorney for 3335 Hillside, LLC

Paulina Williams, Esq.
BAKER BOTTS, LLP
98 San Jacinto Blvd., Ste. 1500
Austin, TX 78701
Attorney for Georgia Pacific Corporation

Laura A. Shroeder, Esq.
Therese A. Ure, Esq.
10615 Double R Blvd., Ste. 100
Reno, NV 89521
*Attorneys for City of North Las Vegas
and Bedroc*

Sylvia Harrison, Esq.
Sarah Ferguson, Esq.
McDONALD CARANO LLP
100 West Liberty Street, 10th Floor
Reno, NV 89501
*Attorney for Georgia Pacific Corporation and
Republic Environmental Technologies Inc.*

Bradley J. Herrema, Esq.
BROWNSTEIN HYATT
FARBER SCHRECK
100 N. City Parkway, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Attorney for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

Kent R. Robinson, Esq.
Therese M. Shanks, Esq.
ROBINSON SHARP SULLIVAN & BRUST

Karen Peterson, Esq.
ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

71 Washington Street
Reno, NV 89503
Attorney for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

Dylan V. Frehner, Esq.
Lincoln County District Attorney
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, NV 89043
Attorney for Lincoln County Water District

Alex Flangas, Esq.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700
Reno, NV 89501
Attorney for Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2

Beth Baldwin, Esq.
Richard Berley, Esq.
ZIONTZ CHESTNUT
Fourth And Blanchard Building
2101 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1230
Seattle, Washington 98121-2331
Attorneys for Moapa Band of Paiute Indians

Steve King, Esq.
227 River Road
Dayton, NV 89403
Attorney for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company

Greg Morrison, Esq.
50 W. Liberty St., Suite 750
Reno, NV 89501
Attorney for Moapa Valley Water District

Mary K. Cloud
P.O. Box 31
Moapa, NV 89025

Kelly Kolhoss
P.O. Box 232
Moapa, NV 89025

Carson City, Nevada 89703
Attorney for Vidler Water Company, Inc. and Lincoln County Water District

Karen Glasgow, Esq.
Office of the Regional Solicitor
San Francisco Field Office
U.S. Department of the Interior
333 Bush Street, Suite 775
San Francisco, CA 94104
Attorney for National Park Service

Larry Brundy
P.O. Box 136
Moapa, NV 89025

Casa De Warm Springs, LLC
1000 N. Green Valley Pkwy, #440-350
Henderson, NV 89074

Clark County
500 S. Grand Central Pkwy, 6th Fl.
Las Vegas, NV 89155-1111

Clark County Coyote Springs Water Resources GID
1001 S. Valley View Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89153

Don J. & Marsha L. Davis
P.O. Box 400
Moapa, NV 89025

Luke Miller, Esq.
Office of the Regional Solicitor
U.S. Department of the Interior
2800 Cottage Way, Suite E1712
Sacramento, CA 95825
Attorney for U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service

Lake At Las Vegas Joint Venture, Inc. 1600
Lake Las Vegas Parkway
Henderson, NV 89011

Laker Plaza, Inc.
7181 Noon Rd.
Everson, WA 98247-9650

State of Nevada Department of
Transportation
1263 S. Stewart Street
Carson City, NV 89712

Global Hydrologic Services, Inc.
Mark D. Stock
561 Keystone Avenue, #200
Reno, NV 89503-4331

Patrick Donnelly
Center for Biological Diversity
7345 S. Durango Dr.
B-107, Box 217
Las Vegas, NV 89113

Lisa Belenky
Center for Biological Diversity
1212 Broadway #800
Oakland, CA 94612

William O'Donnell
2780 S. Jones Blvd. Ste. 210
Las Vegas, NV 89146

State of Nevada, Dept. of Conservation
and Natural Resources
Division of State Parks
901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5005
Carson City, NV 89701

Pacific Coast Building Products, Inc.
P.O. Box 364329
Las Vegas, NV 89036

S & R, Inc.
808 Shetland Road
Las Vegas, NV 89107

Technichrome
4709 Compass Bow Lane
Las Vegas, NV 89130


I hereby further certify that I issued and caused to be served the foregoing **PETITION**
FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDER 1309 with a copy of this document via process server
on the 13th day of July, 2020:

Tim Wilson P.E., State Engineer
Nevada Division of Water Resources Dept. of Conservation and Natural Resources
901 South Stewart St., Ste. 2002
Carson City, NV 89701

/s/ Cheryl Becnel
An employee of Marquis Aurbach Coffing

EXHIBIT 9

EXHIBIT 9



CASE NO: A-20-818069-P
Department 18

PTJR

Sylvia Harrison NV Bar No. 4106
Lucas Foletta NV Bar No. 12154
Sarah Ferguson NV Bar No. 14515
McDONALD CARANO LLP
100 W. Liberty St., Suite 1000
Reno, NV 89501
Telephone: (775) 788-2000
Facsimile: (775) 788-2020
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

*Attorneys for Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC
and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.*

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

GEORGIA-PACIFIC GYPSUM LLC,
AND REPUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Petitioners,

vs.

TIM WILSON, P.E. Nevada State Engineer,
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES, and the
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
NATURAL RESOURCES,

Respondent.

CASE NO.:

DEPT. NO.:

**PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF
ORDER 1309**

1. Petitioners Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC (“Georgia-Pacific”) and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc. (“Republic”) (collectively, “Petitioners”), by and through counsel Sylvia Harrison, Esq., Lucas Foletta, Esq., and Sarah Ferguson, Esq. of the law firm of McDonald Carano LLP, hereby submit this Petition for Judicial Review of Order 1309 (“Petition”) issued by Respondent Tim Wilson, P.E. Nevada State Engineer, Division of Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources on June 15, 2020, Ex. 1 (“Order 1309”). This Petition is filed pursuant to NRS 533.450(1).

///

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

2. Pursuant to NRS 533.450(1), any order or decision of the State Engineer is subject to judicial review “in the proper court of the county in which the matters affected or a portion thereof are situated.” NRS 533.450(1). As described below, the real property to which the water at issue in this appeal is appurtenant is situated within Clark County, Nevada, making the Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada in and for Clark County the proper venue for judicial review.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioners’ Interests Affected by Order 1309

3. Both Georgia-Pacific and Republic are long-established businesses located in Garnet Valley that use and rely on certificated, proven or otherwise fully used groundwater rights to support their operations. Both Georgia-Pacific and Republic participated in the proceedings before the State Engineer that resulted in the issuance of the Order 1309.

4. Georgia-Pacific has gypsum wallboard, gypsum plaster and polymer extrusion manufacturing operations located twenty miles north of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, along U.S. Highway 91, in Apex, Nevada (the “Facility”), which has been in operation for four decades. The Facility currently employs approximately 150 people. The Facility has one permitted on-site well which is the only source of water available for production and domestic water usage. The Facility is permitted to withdraw 47 million gallons per year. The majority of the permitted water is used in wallboard production with the remainder being used in the polymer extrusion process as well as the site’s domestic water uses.

5. Republic’s Apex Regional Landfill complex (“Apex Landfill”) is located at 13550 N Highway 93, Las Vegas, Nevada and encompasses over 2,200 acres. Apex Landfill performs the critical task of providing environmentally safe and reliable daily waste disposal services for nearly 3 million residents and hundreds of businesses in the cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, and Henderson, as well as Clark County. Additionally, the Apex Landfill site includes a sand and gravel operation operated by Las Vegas Paving Corp. which is Nevada’s top heavy civil construction company. To perform the daily operations, the site utilizes approximately 150 million gallons of water per year from its six permitted wells. A predictable and stable water

1 supply is critical to allow Apex Landfill to continue to provide uninterrupted service for its
2 millions of customers, as well as plan for meeting the increasing demand for future disposal
3 capacity.

4 6. As discussed below, the State Engineer's issuance of Order 1309 will
5 impermissibly limit Petitioners' right to appropriate water, long established under Nevada law,
6 immediately deprives Petitioners' of the relative priority of their water rights, and will seriously
7 jeopardize the viability of their operations and threaten the loss of the significant benefits they
8 provide to the State and local economies. Petitioners are therefore aggrieved by the Order.

9 **Background to Issuance of Order 1309**

10 7. The general rule in Nevada is that one acquires a water right by filing an application
11 to appropriate water with the Nevada Division of Water Resources ("DWR"). If DWR approves
12 the application, a "Permit to Appropriate" issues. Nevada has adopted the principle of "first in
13 time, first in right," also known as "priority." The priority of a water right is determined by the
14 date a permit is applied for (the "Application Date"). If there is not enough water to serve all
15 water right holders in a particular hydrographic unit, "senior" appropriators are satisfied first in
16 order of priority: the rights of "junior" appropriators may be curtailed. The amount of
17 groundwater available for appropriation historically has been administered in Nevada based upon
18 "hydrographic basins," which are generally defined by topography, more or less reflecting
19 boundaries between watersheds. The priority of groundwater rights is determined relative to the
20 water rights holder within the individual basins.

21 8. At issue in the instant matter is the administration of several hydrographic basins
22 which lie roughly along the southern (lower) course of the White River. The White River is a
23 small, partially ephemeral stream in Eastern Nevada. It is part of a hydrologic system generally
24 referred to as the Lower White River Flow System ("LWRFS"). Water resources in this area
25 include groundwater in alluvial valley-fill sediments, the so-called Carbonate Aquifer, and the
26 Muddy River.

27 9. Significant pumping of the Carbonate Aquifer in the LWRFS began in the 1980s
28 and 1990s. Initial assessments of the water available in the Carbonate Aquifer suggested it would

provide a new abundant source of water for Southern Nevada. By 2001, the State Engineer had granted more than 40,000 acre feet of applications in the LWRFS. However, concerned over the lack of information regarding the sustainability of water resources from the Carbonate Aquifer, the State Engineer began hearings in July and August 2001 on water rights applications, leading to the issuance of Order 1169 on November 15, 2010. Order 1169 held water rights applications in abeyance in the LWRFS pending further studies and set up an ambitious test to “stress” the Carbonate Aquifer through two years of aggressive pumping, combined with examination of water levels in monitoring wells located throughout the LWRFS. The State Engineer’s conclusions from the pump test found an “unprecedented decline” in high-altitude springs, an “unprecedented decline” in water levels, and that additional pumping in the central part of Coyote Spring Valley or the Muddy River Spring Area could not occur without conflict with existing senior rights, including decreed surface water rights on the Muddy River, or potential impact to the habitat of the Moapa Dace.

Interim Order 1303 Proceedings

10. Faced with the problem of resolving the competing interests for water resources in the over-allocated basins, then-State Engineer Jason King issued Interim Order 1303 on January 11, 2019, Ex. 2. The ordering provisions in Interim Order 1303 provide in pertinent part:

1. The Lower White River Flow System consisting of the Coyote Spring Valley, Muddy River Springs Area, California Wash, Hidden Valley, Garnet Valley, and the portion of the Black Mountains Area as described in this Order, is herewith designated as a joint administrative unit for purposes of administration of water rights. *All water rights within the Lower White River Flow System will be administered based upon their respective date of priorities in relation to other rights within the regional groundwater unit.*

Any stakeholder with interests that may be affected by water right development within the Lower White River Flow System may file a report in the Office of the State Engineer in Carson City, Nevada, no later than the close of business on Monday, June 3, 2019.

Reports filed with the Office of the State Engineer should address the following matters:

- a. The geographic boundary of the hydrologically connected groundwater and surface water systems comprising the Lower White River Flow System;
- b. The information obtained from the Order 1169 aquifer test and subsequent to the aquifer test and Muddy River headwater spring flow as it relates to aquifer recovery since the completion of the aquifer test;

c. The long-term annual quantity of groundwater that may be pumped from the Lower White River Flow System, including the relationships between the location of pumping on discharge to the Muddy River Springs, and the capture of Muddy River flow;

d. The effects of movement of water rights between alluvial wells and carbonate wells on deliveries of senior decreed rights to the Muddy River; and,

e. Any other matter believed to be relevant to the State Engineer's analysis.

Interim Ord. 1303 at 13-14, Ex. 2.

11. In July and August 2019, reports and rebuttal reports were submitted discussing the four matters set forth in Interim Order 1303. On July 25, 2019, the State Engineer issued a Notice of Pre-Hearing Conference. On August 9, 2019, the State Engineer held a prehearing conference. On August 23, 2019, the State Engineer issued a Notice of Hearing (amended on August 26, 2019), which included the following summary:

On August 9, 2019, the State Engineer held a pre-hearing conference regarding the hearing on the submission of reports and evidence as solicited in Order 1303.... The State Engineer established that the purpose of the hearing on the Order 1303 reports was to provide the participants an opportunity to explain the positions and conclusions expressed in the reports and/or rebuttal reports submitted in response to the Order 1303 solicitation. The State Engineer directed the participants to limit the offer of evidence and testimony to the salient conclusions, including directing the State Engineer and his staff to the relevant data, evidence and other information supporting those conclusions. ***The State Engineer further noted that the hearing on the Order 1303 reports was the first step in determining to what extent, if any, and in what manner the State Engineer would address future management decisions, including policy decisions, relating to the Lower White River Flow System basins.*** On that basis, the State Engineer then addressed other related matters pertaining to the hearing on the Order 1303 reports, including addressing the date and sequence of the hearing, as set forth in this Notice of Hr'g. Not. Of Hearing and Am. Notice of Hr'g, Ex. 3 (emphasis added).

The State Engineer conducted a hearing on the reports submitted under Order 1303 between September 23, 2019 and October 4, 2019.

12. As the Hearing Officer advised during the August 9, 2019 Pre-Hearing Conference, the Hearing was to be limited to the four questions "solicited in the Order 1303 report. This larger substantive policy determination is not part of the particular proceeding. ***That's part of later***

1 **proceedings....”** August 9, 2019 Pre-Hr’g. Conf. Trans. at 10:18-20, Ex.4. This was reiterated in
2 the Hearing Officer’s opening remarks at the hearing:

3 I want to just reiterate, and we've been trying to make this clear, that this is
4 not a contested or adversarial proceeding. **The scope of this proceeding is for the**
5 **limited purpose of addressing those four issues plus the fifth.**

6 And while that fifth issue is [] not intended to expand the scope of this
7 hearing into making policy determinations with respect to management of the
8 Lower White River Flow System basin’s individual water rights, those different
9 types of things, **because those are going to be decisions that would have to be**
10 **made in subsequent proceedings** should they be necessary. Sept. 23, 2019 Hr’g.
11 Trans. Excerpt at 6:4-15, Ex. 5.

12 Participants submitted closing statements due on December 3, 2019.

13 Order 1309

14 13. The State Engineer issued Order 1309 on June 15, 2020. See Ord. 1309, Ex. 1.
15 Notably, following the submission by the participating stakeholders of closing statements at the
16 beginning of December, 2019, the State Engineer engaged in no additional public process
17 whatsoever and solicited no additional input regarding “future management decisions, including
18 policy decisions, relating to the Lower White River Flow System basins.” See Not. Of Hearing,
19 Ex. 3. Thus, the Order 1303 Hearing was not just the first step in the State Engineer’s decisions
20 concerning the LWRFS basin management set forth in Order 1309, it was the *only* step.

21 The first three ordering paragraphs state as follows:

22 1. The Lower White River Flow System consisting of the Kane Springs Valley,
23 Coyote Spring Valley, Muddy River Springs Area, California Wash, Hidden
24 Valley, Garnet Valley, and the northwest portion of the Black Mountains Area as
25 described in this Order, is hereby delineated as a single hydrographic basin. The
26 Kane Springs Valley, Coyote Spring Valley, Muddy River Springs Area,
27 California Wash, Hidden Valley, Garnet Valley and the northwest portion of the
28 Black Mountains Area are hereby established as sub-basins within the Lower
White River Flow System Hydrographic Basin.

2. The maximum quantity of groundwater that may be pumped from the Lower
White River Flow System Hydrographic Basin on an average annual basis without
causing further declines in Warm Springs area spring flow and flow in the Muddy
River cannot exceed 8,000 afa and may be less.

3. The maximum quantity of water that may be pumped from the Lower White
River Flow System Hydrographic Basin may be reduced if it is determined that
pumping will adversely impact the endangered Moapa dace. Ord. 1309 at 65, Ex
1.

14. The Order provides no guidance whatsoever as to how the new “single hydrographic basin” will be administered and no clear analysis as to the basis for the 8000 afa number for the maximum sustainable yield.

15. As a result of the consolidation of the basins, the relative priority of all water rights within the seven affected basins will be reordered and the priorities considered in relation to all water rights holders in the consolidated basins, rather than in relation only to the other users within the original separate basins. Petitioners’ water rights are some of the earliest priority rights relative to other users within the Garnet Valley hydrographic basin – a priority that would have protected their right to use water for the foreseeable life of their facilities.¹ Order 1309 results in the immediate loss of Petitioners’ priority relative to other water users in the consolidated administrative basins and significantly affects their security in this critical resource. Taken together with the arbitrary determination of the maximum pumping volume ordered in Paragraph 2, the reordering of priorities will subject any water rights with a priority date of March 31, 1983 or later to possible curtailment, based upon the volume of prior “senior” rights. This cutoff date would subject the Georgia Pacific water right (with a priority date of October 28, 1986) to curtailment, as well as all of Republic’s rights, other than two 1981 priority permits.

GROUND FOR THE PETITION

16. Petitioners specifically seek judicial review of Order 1309 pursuant to NRS 533.450(1) and request that this Court set aside the Order because the State Engineer’s substantive findings, conclusions, and decisions prejudice Petitioners substantial rights and are:

- (a) In violation of constitutional or statutory provisions;
- (b) In excess of statutory authority of the State Engineer;
- (c) Made upon unlawful procedure;
- (d) Affected by other error of law;

¹ Republic’s water rights have priorities of October 20, 1981 (194 afa) and October 3, 1988 (274 afa). Georgia Pacific’s water rights have a priority of October 28, 1986 (144 afa).

- (e) Clearly erroneous in view of the reliable, probative and substantial evidence on the whole record; and
- (f) Arbitrary and capricious or characterized by abuse of discretion.

More specifically, and as will be articulated in more detail in Petitioners' Memorandum of Points and Authorities supporting this Petition, the Order should be set aside for the following reasons:

The State Engineer Has Not Provided Appropriate Statutory Authority To Support Consolidation Of The LWRFS Into A Single Hydrographic Basin.

17. The State Engineer found authority to delineate the LWRFS as a single hydrographic basin in NRS 533.024(1)(e). Ord. 1309 at 42. However, because NRS 533.024(1)(e) is a statement of policy and not a grant of authority, it does not support the action taken by the State Engineer to completely upend the priority of certificated and proven water rights whose priorities have been in place for up to nearly 39 years.

18. NRS 533.024(1)(e) declares that it is the policy of the state to "[t]o manage conjunctively the appropriation, use and administration of all waters of this State, regardless of the source of the water." NRS 533.024(1)(e). As a statement of policy, NRS 533.024(1)(e) does not constitute a grant of authority to the State Engineer. Statements of policy from the Legislature do not serve as a basis for government action, but rather inform the interpretation of specific statutes that authorize specific action. *See e.g., Pawlik v. Deng*, 412 P.3d 68, 71 (2018) quoting *J.E. Dunn Nw., Inc. v. Corus Constr. Venture, LLC*, 127 Nev. 72, 79, 249 P.3d 501, 505 (2011) (noting that "if the statutory language is subject to two or more reasonable interpretations, the statute is ambiguous, and we then look beyond the statute to the legislative history and interpret the statute in a reasonable manner 'in light of the policy and the spirit of the law.'"). And while such statements of policy are accorded deference, the Nevada Supreme court has specifically held that they are not binding. *See e.g., McLaughlin v. Housing Authority of the City of Las Vegas*, 227 P.2d 206, 93 (1951) ("It has often been said that the declaration of policy by the legislature, though not necessarily binding or conclusive upon the courts, is entitled to great weight, and that

1 it is neither the duty nor prerogative of the courts to interfere in such legislative finding unless it
2 clearly appears to be erroneous and without reasonable foundation.”).

3 19. Thus, because NRS 533.024(1)(e) is a statement of policy and not a statutory grant
4 of authority, it does not confer upon the State Engineer the authority to delineate the LWRFS as a
5 single hydrographic basin. The authority to take that action must be rooted in a specific statutory
6 grant. However, in this case the State Engineer failed to identify any such grant, and there is no
7 such authority in Nevada’s water law. Consequently, it is unclear to Petitioners where authority
8 has been granted to the State Engineer to support the consolidation of the LWRFS into a single
9 hydrographic basin.

10 **The State Engineer’s Order Provides No Policies For Management Of LWRFS Nor Were**
11 **Petitioners’ Provided Opportunity To Provide Comment on Such Policies, Violating**
12 **Petitioners’ Due Process Rights**

13 20. In addition, the State Engineer’s decision in Order 1309 included no policies,
14 regulations, or administrative procedures to address the effects of the reordering of priorities that
15 will be the consequence of the administrative consolidation of the basin. *See* Ord. 1309, Ex. 1.

16 21. The hearing, guided by the Hearing Officer, focused on factual findings regarding
17 the LWRFS hydrographic basin. The Hearing Officer explicitly said that there would be further
18 proceedings to address the administration of the LWRFS. *See* August 9, 2019 Pre-Hr’g. Trans.,
19 10:18-20, Ex. 4; Sept. 23, 2019 Hr’g. Trans. Excerpt, Ex. 5. Consequently, participants and
20 experts did not have the opportunity to, and were actively discouraged from addressing policy
21 issues critical to the management of the LWRFS, including, but not limited to: whether Nevada
22 law allows the State Engineer to conjunctively manage multiple hydrographic basins in a manner
23 that modifies the relative priority of water rights due to the administration consolidation of basins;
24 whether the State Engineer would establish a “critical management area” pursuant to NRS 534.110
25 and, if so, whether he would develop a groundwater management plan or defer to the stakeholders
26 to develop one; whether Nevada law gives the State Engineer authority to designate a management
27 area that encompasses more than one basin; whether “safe-yield” discrete management areas
28 should be established within the proposed administrative unit; whether water rights holders enjoy
a “property right” in the relative priority of their water rights such that impairing that right may

constitute a “taking”; whether unused (or only sporadically used) senior water rights take precedence over certificated or fully used junior rights, particularly where these junior rights are in continuous use to support economically significant enterprises; whether States compel quantification of federal reserved rights by a date certain; and whether the State Engineer should approach the legislature to seek different or additional management tools or authority. *See* Dec. 2, 2019, Closing Arg. of Georgia Pacific and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc., Ex. 6 (outlining policy questions for consideration by the State Engineer at later proceedings, proceedings that never took place).

22. Then, without notice or providing additional proceedings for the participants, including Petitioners, to address these critical questions, the State Engineer issued Order 1309. In it, the State Engineer acknowledged Petitioners’ concerns:

Georgia-Pacific and Republic asserted that boundaries are premature without additional data and without a legally defensible policy and management tools in place. They expressed concern that creating an administrative unit at this time inherently directs policy without providing for due process. The State Engineer has considered these concerns and agrees that additional data and improved understanding of the hydrologic system is critical to the process. He also believes that the data currently available provide enough information to delineate LWRFS boundaries, and that an ***effective management scheme*** will provide for the flexibility to adjust boundaries based on additional information, retain the ability to address unique management issues on a sub-basin scale, and maintain partnership with water users who may be affected by management actions throughout the LWRFS. Ord. 1309 at 53, Ex. 1.

23. Yet, despite the far-reaching impact of the consolidation of the basin and the State Engineer’s admission that an “effective management scheme” is necessary for the administration of the LWRFS, Order 1309 included no such scheme. *Id.* It implicates, but does not meaningfully address, complex policy questions, nor were Petitioners’ given the opportunity to address these issues, as promised. This is in clear violation of Petitioners’ procedural due process rights. *See e.g., Dutchess Business Services Inc. v. Nevada State Bd. of Pharmacy*, 124 Nev. 701, 711, 191 P.3d 1159, 1166 (2008) (“Although proceedings before administrative agencies may be subject to more relaxed procedural and evidentiary rules, due process guarantees of fundamental fairness

1 still apply. Administrative bodies must follow their established procedural guidelines and give
2 notice to the defending party of ‘the issues on which decision will turn and . . . the factual material
3 on which the agency relies for decision so that he may rebut it.’”) (internal citations omitted)
4 quoting *Bowman Transp. v. Ark.-Best Freight System*, 419 U.S. 281, 288–89 n. 4, 95 S.Ct. 438,
5 42 L.Ed.2d 447 (1974).

6 **The State Engineer Provided Inadequate Analysis and Factual Support for his**
7 **Determination of the Maximum Sustainable Pumping from the LWRFS, And Therefore,**
8 **The Factual Underpinning Of The Order Is Arbitrary, Capricious, And The Order Was**
9 **Made Upon Unlawful, Unconstitutional Procedure.**

10 24. Order 1309 includes no clear analysis as to the basis for the 8000 afa number for
11 the maximum sustainable yield set forth in Ordering Paragraph 2. As the Order acknowledges,
12 “the evidence and testimony presented at the 2019 hearing did not result in a consensus among
13 experts of the long-term annual quantity of groundwater that can be pumped. Recommendations
14 range from zero to over 30,000 afa.... There is a near consensus that the exact amount that can
15 be continually pumped for the long term-term cannot be absolutely determined with the data
16 available and that to make that determination will require monitoring of spring flow, water levels,
17 and pumping over time” Ord. 1309 at 57,Ex. 1.

18 25. The Order repeats this acknowledgement: ...“there is almost unanimous
19 agreement among experts that data collection is needed to further refine with certainty the extent
20 of groundwater development that can continually pumped over the long term.” Ord. 1309 at 62,
21 Ex. 1. However, the State Engineer discounts this uncertainty and finds “that the current data are
22 adequate to establish an approximate limit on the amounts of pumping that can occur within the
23 system, but [further data are] essential to refine and validate this limit.” *Id.* But Order 1309 does
24 not present the 8000 afa limitation as a temporary “approximation” subject to validation, but as
25 an absolute limitation with immediate weighty consequences and, further, keeps the Petitioners
26 and all other stakeholders in suspense as to what exactly those weighty consequences might be.
27 As discussed above, the Order is devoid of any direction or guidance as to any future refinement
28 or modification of this limitation. See Ord. 1309 Ex. 1.

26. Equally troubling is the cursory support for the 8000 afa limitation. Most of the Order consists of selective and imprecise summaries of the participants' presentations. There is no technical analysis, no detailed consideration of the weight of evidence, nor discussion of the numerous models proposed or challenged by the participants relevant to this issue. As to the basis for the sustainable supply, the Order cites a number of estimations from other participants that exceed this number, a few that are less, and then simply lands on 8000 afa, apparently based on amounts of current pumping from the carbonate aquifer and the possibility that the spring flow "may be approaching steady state." Ord. 1309 at 63, Ex. 1.

27. Underscoring the arbitrariness of the conclusion in Ordering Paragraph 2, the Order (Ex. 1) adds the Kane Springs Valley hydrographic basin to the joint administrative unit but fails to acknowledge the additional water resources available from the Kane Springs basin. Since Interim Order 1303 did not include the Kane Springs Valley hydrographic basin, the participants' assessment of the sustainable water resources of the LWRFS generally did not consider Kane Springs water resources and the State Engineer made no effort to collect evidence on this issue. According to the Division's Hydrographic Basin Abstract, the Kane Springs Valley Hydrographic Basin (Basin 206) has a perennial yield of 1000 afa (Nevada Division of Water Resources, Hydrographic Area Summary, <http://water.nv.gov/DisplayHydrographicGeneralReport.aspx?basin=206> (last visited July 14, 2020)); the contribution to the LWRFS may be more than 4000 afa.² Nothing in the Order indicates that the State Engineer considered this resource in determining the LWRFS limitation.

28. Given the immediate and far-reaching consequences of Order 1309, the public deserves a careful and considered analysis of the limitation imposed supported by substantial

² "SNWA (2007) assessed local and regional flow in southeastern Nevada and found regional inflow to Coyote Spring Valley was 50,700AFY of which ... Kane Springs Valley contributes 4,190 AFY....SNWA estimated local recharge to be 2,130 AFY..." Coyote Springs Investment, LLC *Report Submitted Pursuant to Nevada State Engineer Interim Order 1303* (July 2019) at 44 (citing Southern Nevada Water Authority, *Water-Resources Assessment and Hydrologic Report for Cave, Dry Lake, and Delmar Valleys* (June 2007)).

evidence and not an arbitrary “guestimate,” or, in the alternative, the State Engineer should provide a process for determining a limitation that can be adequately supported by empirical evidence.

The State Engineer Does Not Have Authority To Make A Ruling On The Endangered Species Act and Failed to Provide Adequate Notice; Therefore, The Factual Underpinning Of The Order Is Arbitrary, Capricious, And The Order Was Made Upon Unlawful, Unconstitutional Procedure.

29. Ordering Paragraph 3 states “The maximum quantity of water that may be pumped from the Lower White River Flow System Hydrographic Basin may be reduced if it is determined that pumping will adversely impact the endangered Moapa dace.” Ord. 1309 at 64, Ex. 1. This portion of the Order is underpinned by the following specific findings:

WHEREAS, based upon the testimony and evidence offered in response to Interim Order 1303, it is clear that it is necessary for spring flow measured at the Warm Springs West gage to flow at a minimum rate of 3.2 cfs in order to maintain habitat for the Moapa dace.²⁶¹ A reduction of flow below this rate may result in a decline in the dace population. This minimum flow rate is not necessarily sufficient to support the rehabilitation of the Moapa dace.

WHEREAS, the ESA prohibits any loss of Moapa dace resulting from actions that would impair habitat necessary for its survival. Some groundwater users are signatories to an MOA that authorizes incidental take of the Moapa dace; however, the State Engineer and many other groundwater users are not covered by the terms of the MOA.²⁶³ Not only would liability under the ESA for a “take” extend to groundwater users within the LWRFS, but would so extend to the State of Nevada through the Division as the government agency responsible for permitting water use.

WHEREAS, the State Engineer concludes that it is against the public interest to allow groundwater pumping from the LWRFS that will reduce spring flow in the Warm Springs area to a level that would impair habitat necessary for the survival of the Moapa dace and could result in take of the endangered species. Ord. 1309 at 45-46, Ex. 1.

30. In other words, Ordering Paragraph 3 is based upon the State Engineer’s unauthorized and unsupported conclusion that groundwater users, the State Engineer, and the State of Nevada would be liable for a take under the Endangered Species Act (“ESA”) if flow levels at the Warm Springs West gage to flow fall below a minimum rate of 3.2 cfs. The ESA, of course, is a federal law, administered by the U.S. Fish Wildlife Service (“USFWS”). *See* ESA 16 USC § 1537a. The State Engineer has not provided (and could not provide) the basis for his authority to

determine when and under what circumstances a “take” of the Moapa dace would occur.³ Notably, during the hearing, the USFWS expressly *declined* to endorse the conclusions stated in the State Engineer’s findings quoted above. Sept. 24, 2019, Hr’g Tr. Vol. II at 483:10-484:15. Ex 7.

31. Moreover, the State Engineer’s “factual” conclusion that “it is necessary to maintain flow at minimum rate of 3.2 cfs in order to maintain habitat for the Moapa dace” is far from “clear.” The USFWS has reached agreements with several parties for implementation of mitigation measures triggered by much lower flow rates at the Warm Springs West gage, Order 1303 Hearing Documents, NSE Ex 244, MOA triggers, Ex. 8, and evidence was introduced at the Hearing of factors such as temperature and presence of predators that may be more determinative of dace success. It has certainly not been conclusively established that groundwater pumping anywhere in the LWRFS will impact Warm Springs flows, particularly pumping in the far distal locations of Petitioners’ wells.

32. Including these findings and order in Order 1309 is a completely *ultra vires* act; nothing empowers the State Engineer to make a determination when a “take” has occurred under the ESA.

33. In addition to the State Engineer’s lack of authority under the ESA, no notice was provided to the public or to the Interim Order 1303 Hearing participants that the State Engineer intended to determine the flow levels at the springs purportedly necessary to maintain the dace, that this would be a purpose of the proceeding, or that the State Engineer intended to prioritize protection of the dace over other competing uses of water resources with the LWRFS. Moreover, as discussed above, all questions of policy or procedure were off-limits during the Hearing according to the State Engineer’s and Hearing Examiner’s ground rules, and no opportunity has been afforded the participants to comment on such findings.

³ 16 U.S.C.A. §1536, cited by the State Engineer as authority for “shared [ESA] responsibility” with the federal government, confers no authority or responsibility to States whatsoever, except in the context of consideration of *exemptions* from application of the ESA. The “shared responsibility” cited by the State Engineer is expressly referred to in the code as required cooperation between federal agencies to enforce the ESA.

34. As a result of the lack of notice, the State Engineer failed to gather factual evidence or develop an adequate record to support his findings. Notably, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has not issued a biological opinion based on analysis of the effects on Moapa dace from groundwater pumping by users within the Garnet Valley hydrographic basin or other portions of the LWRFS beyond three specific users in Coyote Spring Valley and California Wash, and in the Muddy River Spring Area. SNWA Ex 008, SNWA 2019 Assessment of Moapa Dace. Ex. 9. The State Engineer, however, made no distinction regarding the location of groundwater pumping within the new administrative unit as it relates to his findings of potential take or curtailment. Yet his own findings require consideration of this factor:

The State Engineer finds that data support the conclusion that pumping from locations within the LWRFS that are distal from the Warm Springs area can have a lesser impact on spring flow than pumping from locations more proximal to the springs. The LWRFS system has structural complexity and heterogeneity, and some areas have more immediate and more complete connections than others. ... [T]here remains some uncertainty as to the extent that distance and location relative to other capturable sources of discharge either delay, attenuate, or reduce capture from the springs. Ord. 1309 at 59.

35. In short, the State Engineer has no authority to determine when and whether a “take” could occur under the ESA, failed to provide due process regarding this issue and regarding factual findings affecting the dace, and arbitrarily applied those findings to all groundwater use and users within the consolidated basin, regardless of location.

The Order substantially Prejudices Petitioners’ Rights

36. The defects in Order 1309 substantially prejudice Petitioners’ rights. As stated above, the delineation of the LWRFS as a single hydrographic basin will result in the relative priority of all water rights within the seven affected basins being reordered and the priorities considered in relation to of all water rights holders in the consolidated basins (as proposed by Interim Order 1303), rather than in relation only to the other users within the original separate basins. This reordering immediately deprives Petitioners’ of the secure priority position they enjoyed within the Garnet Valley Hydrographic Basin for between 32 and 39 years. This loss of priority taken together with the State Engineer’s arbitrary determination of the maximum pumping

1 volume in the LWRFS will subject Georgia-Pacific's water rights and a majority of Republic's
2 water rights to curtailment, jeopardizing the viability of their business operations and the
3 significant benefits they provide to the State and local economies. Accordingly, that the State
4 Engineer acted without authority, failed to afford due process, abused his discretion, acted
5 contrary to law and arbitrarily and capriciously, substantially prejudices Petitioners' rights.

6 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

7 WHEREFORE, Petitioner requests that this Court review the Order, the underlying
8 administrative record and other evidence, and prays for the following relief:

- 9 A. That the Order be set aside in its entirety;
- 10 B. That, in the event any portion of the Order stands, Ordering Paragraph 2 and the
11 supporting findings be stricken:
- 12 C. That, in the event any portion of the Order stands, Ordering Paragraph 3 and the
13 supporting findings be stricken;
- 14 D. That the Court issue such other relief as it deems necessary and proper; and
- 15 E. That the Court enter judgment in favor of Petitioners and against the State
16 Engineer, the Division of Water Resources and the Department of Conservation and Natural
17 Resources.

18 DATED: July 15, 2020.

19 McDONALD CARANO LLP

20 /s/ Sylvia Harrison
21 Sylvia Harrison NV Bar No. 4106
22 Lucas Foletta NV Bar No. 12154
23 Sarah Ferguson NV Bar No. 14515
24 100 W. Liberty St., Suite 1000
25 Reno, NV 89501
26 Telephone: (775) 788-2000
27 Facsimile: (775) 788-2020
28 sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

*Attorneys for Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC
and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury, that I am an employee of McDonald Carano LLP and that on July 15, 2020, a true and correct copy of PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW was electronically served with the Clerk of the Court by using CM/ECF and served on the following parties on the same date via the manner indicated below:

VIA HAND DELIVERY:

Tim Wilson, P.E., State Engineer
Nevada Division of Water Resources
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
901 South Stewart Street, Suite 2002
Carson City, NV 89701

Aaron Ford
Nevada Attorney General
100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701

VIA U.S. MAIL, POSTAGE PRE-PAID

Robert O. Kurth, Jr. 3420 North Buffalo Drive Las Vegas, NV 89129 <i>Attorneys for 3335 Hillside, LLC</i>	Laura A. Schroeder Theresa A. Ure Schroeder Law Offices 10615 Double R Blvd., Suite 100 Reno, NV 89521 <i>Attorneys for City of North Las Vegas and Bedroc</i>
Kent R. Robison Therese M. Shanks Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust 71 Washington Street Reno, NV 89503 <i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investments</i>	Bradley Herrema Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck 100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600 Las Vegas, NV 89106 <i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investments</i>
William Coulthard Coulthard Law 840 South Rancho Drive, #4-627 Las Vegas, NV 89106 <i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investments</i>	Emilia Cargill 3100 State Route 168 P.O. Box 37010 Coyote Springs, NV 89037 <i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investments</i>

Severin A. Carlson Kaempfer Crowell, Ltd. 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700 Reno, NV 89502 <i>Attorneys for Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints</i>	Dylan V. Frehner Lincoln County District Attorney P.O. Box 60 Pioche, NV 89043 <i>Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District</i>
Karen Peterson ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD. 402 North Division Street Carson City, NV 89703 <i>Attorneys for Vidler Water Company and Lincoln County Water District</i>	Alex Flangas Kaempfer Crowell 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700 Reno, NV 89501 <i>Attorneys for Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2</i>
Beth Baldwin Richard Berley ZIONTZ CHESTNUT Fourth and Blanchard Building 2101 Fourth Ave., Suite 1230 Seattle, WA 98121-2331 <i>Attorneys for Moapa Band of Paiute Indians</i>	Steve King, Esq. 227 River Road Dayton, NV 89403 <i>Attorney for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company</i>
Justina Caviglia NV Energy 6100 Neil Road Reno, NV 89511 <i>Attorneys for NV Energy</i>	Karen Glasgow Office of the Regional Solicitor U.S. Dept. of the Interior 333 Bush Street, Suite 775 San Francisco, CA 94104 <i>Attorneys for National Park Service</i>
Casa De Warm Springs, LLC 1000 N. Green Valley Pkwy., #440-350 Henderson, NV 89074	Don J. and Marsha L. Davis P.O. Box 400 Moapa, NV 89025
Clark County Coyote Springs Water Resources GID 1001 S. Valley View Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89153	Kelly Kolhoss P.O. Box 232 Moapa, NV 89025
State of Nevada Dept. of Conservation and Natural Res. 901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5005 Carson City, NV 89701	Laker Plaza, Inc. 7181 Noon Rd. Everson, WA 98247-9650

S & R, Inc. 808 Shetland Road Las Vegas, NV 89107	Greg Morrison Parson Behle & Latimer 50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 750 Reno, NV 89501 <i>Attorneys for Moapa Valley Water District</i>
Luke Miller Office of Regional Solicitor U.S. Dept. of the Interior 2800 Cottage Way, Suite E1712 Sacramento, CA 95825 <i>Attorneys for U.S. Fish and Wildlife</i>	Larry Brundy P.O. Box 136 Moapa, NV 89025
Clark County 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy. Sixth Floor Las Vegas, NV 89155-1111	Mary K. Cloud P.O. Box 31 Moapa, NV 89025
Dry Lake Water, LLC 2470 St. Rose Pkwy., Suite 107 Henderson, NV 89074	Lake at Las Vegas Joint Venture 1600 Lake Las Vegas Parkway Henderson, NV 89011
State of Nevada Dept. of Transportation 1263 S. Stewart Street Carson City, NV 89712	Pacific Coast Building Products, Inc. P.O. Box 364329 Las Vegas, NV 89036
William O'Donnell 2780 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 210 Las Vegas, NV 89146	Technichrome 4709 Compass Bow Lane Las Vegas, NV 89130 Patrick Donnelly
Global Hydrologic Services, Inc. Mark D. Stock 561 Keystone Avenue, #200 Reno, NV 89503-4331	Lisa Belenky Center for Biological Diversity 1212 Broadway, #800 Oakland, CA 94612
Patrick Donnelly Center for Biological Diversity 7345 S. Durango Dr. B-107, Box 217 Las Vegas, NV 89113	Paul Taggart Timothy O'Connor Taggart & Taggart, Ltd. 108 North Minnesota Street Carson City, NV 89703 <i>Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA</i>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


Steven C. Anderson Las Vegas Valley Water District 1001 S. Valley View Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89153 <i>Attorneys for LVVWD</i>	
---	--

/s/ Andrea Black
An Employee of McDonald Carano LLP

4819-3183-8915, v. 1
4819-3183-8915, v. 1

EXHIBIT 10

EXHIBIT 10



1 **PTJR**

2 ALEX J. FLANGAS

3 Nevada Bar No. 664

4 KAEMPFER CROWELL

5 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700

6 Reno, NV 89501

7 Telephone: (775) 852-3900

8 Fax: (775) 327-2011

9 aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

10 *Attorney for Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2*

CASE NO: A-20-818015-P
Department 8

11 **DISTRICT COURT**

12 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

13 NEVADA COGENERATION ASSOCIATES
14 NOS. 1 AND 2,

Case No.:

15 Petitioner,

Dept. No.:

16 vs.

17 Tim Wilson, P.E., Nevada State
18 Engineer, DIVISION OF WATER
19 RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF
20 CONSERVATION AND NATURAL
21 RESOURCES,

PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

22 Respondent.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Petitioner, NEVADA COGENERATION ASSOCIATES NOS. 1 AND 2, (hereinafter collectively “NCA” and separately “NCA 1” and “NCA 2”), by and through its attorney of record, ALEX J. FLANGAS, ESQ., of the law firm of KAEMPFER CROWELL, hereby petitions the Court pursuant to NRS 533.450(1) to reverse or remand a portion of “Order #1309” issued by Respondent TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State Engineer, dated June 15, 2020, (hereinafter the “Order #1309”).¹ A copy of Order #1309 is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

¹ Order #1309 is fully entitled, “Order Delineating the Lower White River Flow System Hydrographic Basin with the Kane Springs Valley Basin (206), Coyote Spring Valley Basin (210), a Portion of the Black Mountains Area Basin (215), Garnet Valley Basin (216), Hidden Valley Basin (217), California Wash Basin (218), and Muddy River Springs Area (aka Upper Moapa Valley) Basin (219) Established as Sub-Basins, Establishing a Maximum

1 Among other things, Order #1309 identifies a new boundary for the recognition of an
2 area that the Nevada State Engineer has designated as the Lower White River Flow System
3 (“LWRFS”), which is essentially a carbonate-rock underlain area that the State Engineer
4 contends requires “joint management” essentially as one, single *super basin*. Following the
5 entry of Order #1309, the LWRFS is now comprised of seven previously identified, previously
6 separate, hydrographic basins that have been determined to share a “close hydrologic
7 connection” that now requires joint management of those basins rather than individual basin
8 management. The LWRFS, as it is now designated following the entry of Order #1309, purports
9 to set a new limit on the amount of groundwater pumping that will be allowed on an annual
10 basis from the larger area that is the LRWFS without regard to the cumulative totals of the
11 various individual basins because, in the State Engineer’s opinion following a lengthy hearing
12 process, each of these various basins is “interconnected” hydrologically.

13 This Petition for Judicial Review is taken in the nature of an appeal pursuant to NRS
14 533.450 and specifically challenges that portion of Order #1309 that intends to move the
15 southern boundary of the LWRFS even further south and east to a new, arbitrarily-identified
16 location in order to maintain the inclusion of NCA’s production water wells *within* the boundary
17 of the LWRFS. Order #1309, by its terms, intends to maintain the inclusion of NCA’s
18 certificated water rights and the pumping of groundwater made pursuant to those water rights as
19 being *inside* the LWRFS boundary, rather than excluding NCA from the LWRFS entirely as
20 was the position taken by NCA during the hearing and in the filing of NCA’s post-hearing
21 brief/argument (and which is most consistent with the evidence adduced at the hearing).

22 //

23 //

24 Allowable Pumping in the Lower White River Flor System Within Clark and Lincoln Counties, Nevada, and
Rescinding Interim Order 1303.” Order #1309 may also be referred to as the “Final Order.”

1 **I. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT**

2 Pursuant to NRS 533.450(1), “any person feeling aggrieved by any order or decision of
3 the State Engineer ... affecting the person’s interests, when the order or decision related to the
4 administration of determined rights or is made pursuant to NRS 533.270 to 533.455, inclusive,
5 or NRS 533.481, 534.193, 535.200, or 536.200, may have the same reviewed by a proceeding
6 for that purpose, insofar as may be in the nature of an appeal, which must be initiated in the
7 proper court of the county in which the matters affected or a portion thereof are situated....”
8 Pursuant to Subsection 2 of NRS 533.450, the proceedings in every case must be heard by the
9 court and must be informal and summary, “but full opportunity to be heard must be had before
10 judgment is pronounced.” Subsection 8 further explains that “[t]he practice in civil cases applies
11 to the informal and summary character of such proceedings, as provided in this section.”²

12 The real property to which the water at issue in this Petition is appurtenant lies within
13 Clark County, and both the points of diversion for the water rights of NCA and the places of use
14 of those water rights is located in a hydrographic basin in Clark County. Therefore, the Eighth
15 Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for Clark County is the proper venue for
16 judicial review of this Petition involving Order #1309.

17
18 ² Notably, petitions for judicial review pursuant to NRS 533.450 taken from orders or decisions
19 of the Nevada State Engineer are *not* governed by Chapter 233B, the Nevada Administrative
20 Procedures Act, as many other administrative agency appeals might be. NRS 233B.039(1)(j)
 provides as follows: “The following agencies are entirely exempted from the requirements of
 this chapter: ... (j) Except as otherwise provided in NRS 533.365, the Office of the State
 Engineer.”

21 Consequently, it is likely that a Senior Attorney General assigned to represent the Nevada State
22 Engineer in this matter will confer with the undersigned and submit a proposed, stipulated
 briefing schedule for this Court’s consideration, as that is typical in virtually every water rights
 petition for judicial review taken in which the undersigned has participated over the last 30 years.

23 It is likely the parties will submit timing and briefing recommendations to this Court for
24 consideration and approval similar to those outlined in the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure
 governing civil appeals. Briefing would necessarily follow after the submission of the transcript
 of the record that is required to be made pursuant to NRS 533.450(4).

1 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

2 **1. Nevada Cogeneration’s water rights and interest in this proceeding.**

3 Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2 operate combined cycle gas-fired
4 cogeneration facilities located near the southern boundary of the LWRFS. The points of
5 diversion for the *permitted* and *certificated* water rights owned and utilized by NCA are located
6 entirely within a narrow part of the Black Mountains Area in hydrographic Basin 215, which
7 location was originally identified by the State Engineer as being very near the southern
8 boundary of the LWRFS as that boundary existed prior to the hearings that led to the issuance of
the Final Order.³

9 NCA 1 and NCA 2 began commercial operations in June 1992 and February 1993,
10 respectively. Collectively, the two plants account for 170 MW in baseload generation capacity.
11 NCA sells 100% of its electric output to NV Energy under the terms of a long-term Power
12 Purchase Agreement, and both facilities supply hot exhaust gas and chilled water (via a closed
13 loop system) to Georgia Pacific and Pacific Coast Building Products’ gypsum facilities under
14 the terms of an Energy Purchase Agreement. **Reference:** *Rebuttal Report Pertaining to Interim*
15 *Order 1303*, prepared on behalf of Nevada Cogeneration Associates, August 16, 2019,
“Overview” at p. 1.

16 The NCA facilities have played an integral role in economic output in the region for
17 more than 25 years. NCA’s water rights have been placed to continuous use since construction
18 of facilities in 1992 and 1993. The continued access of their certificated water rights is critical
19 for NCA’s sustained operations.

20 Notably, a permitted water right holder obtains a “certificate” only after that permitted
21 holder has proven to the State Engineer that it has complied with the terms of its permit and has

22 ³ NCA holds the following water rights: Permit 55269/Certificate 17123; Permit
23 58031/Certificate 17124; Permit 58032/Certificate 17125, all of which have a point of diversion
24 within the Black Mountains Area, Basin 215. NCA 1 does hold one Permit, that being Permit
76862, for the storage of effluent in Garnet Valley Basin, which is Basin 216, but that Permit
was not the focus of Order #1309 as that Order relates to the inclusion of the “production wells”
of NCA within the newly-identified southern boundary of the LWRFS and was not concerned
with the storage permit.

1 actually put water obtained pursuant to the permit to a “beneficial use” consistent with NRS
2 533.035. The permit holder must file *proof* of its beneficial use with the State Engineer
3 sufficient to “perfect” the appropriation of the water right, and must do so demonstrating that it
4 has proceeded in good faith and with reasonable diligence to perfect the appropriation; failure to
5 do so will result in the cancellation of the permit rather than the issuance of a certificate. *NRS*
6 *533.395(1)*. In this situation, NCA has long-since demonstrated its use of the permitted water
7 rights, sufficiently so that it was granted certificates establishing that it had already placed the
8 water appropriated under those permits to a beneficial use consistent with those permits.

2. Order 1169 Pumping Tests.

9 On March 8, 2002, a prior State Engineer, Hugh Ricci, believing there may be a
10 hydrologic connection between hydrographic basins located in the area that is now identified as
11 the LWRFS, issued Order 1169 holding pending groundwater applications in abeyance and
12 requiring an aquifer test of the carbonate-rock aquifer system to better determine whether the
13 pending applications and future appropriations could be safely developed from the carbonate-
14 rock aquifer. The express purpose of 1169 was to determine, to the extent possible, the
15 hydrologic connection between the basins such that groundwater pumping in one basin would
16 have a direct effect on the level of groundwater on adjacent basins; as explained in Order #1309
17 at p. 3, the State Engineer “did not believe that it was prudent to issue additional water rights to
18 be pumped from the carbonate-rock aquifer until a significant portion of the then existing water
19 rights were pumped [tested] for a substantial period of time to determine whether the pumping
20 of those water rights would have a detrimental impact on existing water rights or the
21 environment.”

22 Because of certain concerns of various parties involved with the flows of water that
23 might affect a particular spring and the potential effect on an endangered species of fish, several
24 years passed before the pump tests were actually conducted. On November 15, 2010, the Order
1169 aquifer test began, and, pursuant to the direction of the Nevada State Engineer, the
pumping continued from the MX-5 well for a period of slightly more than two years. That
pumping provided both the State Engineer and the affected water right holders with data for use

1 in assessing the effects of groundwater withdrawals from the LWRFS; the tests allowed the
2 affected water right holders in the hydrographic basins identified as potentially interconnected
3 to obtain and provide data to their respective experts from which those experts then could
4 prepare reports analyzing the effects and present those reports and comments to the State
5 Engineer for consideration on how best to manage the LWRFS moving forward.

6 **3. Interim Rulings and the Interim Order #1303.**

7 Following the conclusion of the pump tests, the State Engineer issued additional rulings
8 that continued to restrict the appropriation of new groundwater within the LWRFS, but allowed
9 existing water right holders such as NCA to continue to use their water rights consistent with
10 their existing permits and certificates. Beginning in 2018, the State Engineer conducted several
11 public workshops to review and discuss the results of the pump tests and to review the status of
12 groundwater use within the LWRFS. The State Engineer elicited comments from the
13 participants at those workshops regarding how to best develop the water resources involved in
14 the LWRFS, acknowledging the apparent close, hydrologic connection between the various
15 basins involved in the pump tests.

16 In the summer of 2018, the State Engineer drafted and made public a proposed order
17 directed to address several issues involved in the future management of the LWRFS, and
18 conducted public workshops between July and the end of the year, taking “comments” verbally
19 during those meetings and in writing following each such meeting from interested participants.
20 The last such meeting was conducted on December 14, 2018, when the State Engineer
21 conducted a hearing and received comments from participants regarding that proposed order.

22 Then, on January 11, 2019, the State Engineer at that time, Jason King, P.E., issued
23 Interim Order #1303⁴ (the “Interim Order”) which identified specific elements for which the
24

⁴ The full title of Order #1303, the “Interim Order,” is “Interim Order Designating the Administration of All Water Rights Within Coyote Spring Valley Hydrographic Basin (210), a Portion of Black Mountains Area Basin (215), Garnet Valley Basin (216), Hidden Valley Basin (217), California Wash Basin (218), and Muddy River Springs Area (aka Upper Moapa Valley) Basin (219) as a Joint Administrative Unit, Holding in Abeyance Applications to Change Existing Groundwater Rights, and Establishing a Temporary Moratorium on the Review of Final Subdivision Maps.”

1 State Engineer was seeking input from the affected water right holders and interested parties.
2 Order #1303 identified four, specific elements, and one catch-all element, about which it sought
3 expert “reports” from the various interested parties and participants:

- 4 a. The geographic boundary of the hydrologically connected groundwater and surface
water systems comprising the Lower White River Flow System;
- 5 b. The information obtained from the Order 1169 aquifer test and Muddy River
6 headwater spring flow as it relates to aquifer recovery since the completion of the
aquifer test;
- 7 c. The long-term annual quantity of groundwater that may be pumped from the Lower
White River Flow System, including the relationships between the location of
8 pumping on discharge to the Muddy River Springs, and the capture of Muddy River
flow;
- 9 d. The effects of movement of water rights between alluvial wells and carbonate wells
on deliveries of senior decreed rights to the Muddy River; and
- 10 e. Any other matter believed to be relevant to the State Engineer’s analysis.

11 The State Engineer further indicated that following the submission of such expert reports, a
12 hearing would be conducted wherein evidence would be taken by the State Engineer in
13 connection with the reports, cross-examination would likely be allowed by the interested
14 parties, and the State Engineer would then render a final determination on the four, specific
15 points identified. Importantly, it was repeatedly stressed that this was only “Stage 1” of the
16 LWRFS process – the hydrologic analysis – and that this was *not* the policy analysis that will
17 identify which water rights are allowed by the State Engineer to be actually put to use in each
18 individual basin; that proceeding, which will be a “Stage 2” proceeding, will follow the
completion of the determinations rendered in the Final Order (#1309).

19 In response to Order #1303, many of the participants submitted initial reports. NCA,
20 however, chose to wait and submit only a Rebuttal Report, which it did on the required deadline
21 for submission of Rebuttal Reports, August 16, 2019, a bit more than a month before the
22 hearings commenced in September of 2019. Parties were also required to file lists of witnesses
23 and exhibits, and were required to identify objections to those witnesses and exhibits of others,
24 which they did in August of 2019. The State Engineer conducted hearings concerning those

1 witness and evidentiary objections prior to commencement of the hearing, and the hearings
2 commenced in September of 2019, lasting approximately two weeks.

3 During the hearing, the State Engineer restricted questioning significantly for time
4 constraints, and further restricted questioning for anything that was beyond the scope of the
5 four, specifically identified issues outlined in the conclusion of the Interim Order, #1303.

6 **The Final Order, #1309.**

7 The hearings: Hearings commenced on September 23, 2019, and were conducted for
8 two weeks before Nevada State Engineer Tim Wilson, P.E., and members of his staff at the
9 Division of Water Resources to consider the comments, objections and recommendations
10 lodged by several affected and interested parties, including NCA, outlined in the initial and
11 rebuttal expert reports. The various reports and the testimony during the two weeks of hearings
12 focused on the four, specific elements outlined for determination in the Interim Order, #1303,
13 and in the Addendum issued by the State Engineer on May 13, 2019 (hereinafter the
14 “Addendum”)⁵ clarifying the Interim Order. Importantly, the hearing officer who was managing
15 the hearing, Deputy Administrator Micheline Fairbank, emphasized repeatedly before and
16 during the hearings that the scope of the September, 2019, hearings and the presentations made
17 by the various participants therein would be limited to the hydrologic examination of the four,
18 specific elements identified in the Interim Order and in the Addendum and would *not* be
19 extended to include policy determinations regarding which water right holders were entitled to
20 the use of groundwater or surface water in the individual basins.⁶

21 ⁵ The full title of the Addendum is “Addendum to Interim Order 1303 Designating the
22 Administration of All Water Rights Within Coyote Spring Valley Hydrographic Basin (210), a
23 Portion of Black Mountains Area Basin (215), Garnet Valley Basin (216), Hidden Valley Basin
24 (217), California Wash Basin (218), and Muddy River Springs Area (aka Upper Moapa Valley)
Basin (219) as a Joint Administrative Unit, Holding in Abeyance Applications to Change
Existing Groundwater Rights, and Establishing a Temporary Moratorium on the Review of Final
Subdivision Maps.”

⁶ It was made clear to the participants that the policy determinations, including determinations of
which water right holders have priority to use groundwater within the LWRFS once any revised
boundary has been firmly established, will not be made until after this first phase of the
proceedings has been completed.

1 NCA was allowed only a few hours during the two-week hearing period to make its
2 presentation. NCA focused a significant portion of its presentation on evidence and analysis
3 actually found in the Rebuttal Report of the Southern Nevada Water Authority (“SNWA”)
4 which identified a specific hydrologic finding that strongly supported the factual conclusion that
5 the production wells owned and operated by NCA in the southern portion of the Black
6 Mountains Area, Basin 215, do *not* share a “close hydrologic connection” with the other wells
7 located inside the LWRFS. The analysis and conclusion independently conducted and reached
8 by SNWA found that the production wells belonging to NCA – which are the water wells from
9 which NCA pumps its certificated water rights -- should *not* be included within the boundary of
the LWRFS. *See Order #1309, Exhibit 1*, at pp. 50 and 51.

10 Prior to the September 2019 hearings, the State Engineer’s office issued rulings on
11 objections raised by interested parties regarding the exclusion of witnesses and evidence. One
12 such objection was raised as to the credentials of one of NCA’s expert witnesses who had
13 worked on NCA’s Rebuttal Report, former State Engineer Hugh Ricci, P.E., who had been
14 instrumental in beginning the entire LWRFS process by issuing Order 1169 in 2002 as the State
15 Engineer at that time. Order 1169 held pending water right applications in abeyance until further
16 information was obtained by stressing the aquifer; it also ordered the pump tests from which all
17 of the conclusions now reached regarding the inter-connectivity of the various hydrographic
18 basins included within the boundary of the LWRFS could be made. As a result of that objection,
19 and even though former State Engineer Ricci clearly exhibited the hydrologic understanding of
20 the LWRFS system sufficiently to exercise the requisite caution in regard to pending
21 applications and to order the pump tests that form the basis for determinations made by the
22 current State Engineer, Tim Wilson, P.E., to support Order #1309 (the Final Order), the hearing
23 officers from the State Engineer’s office who were authorized on behalf of Mr. Wilson with
24 ruling on Mr. Ricci’s qualifications as an expert declared – surprisingly, at least to NCA -- that
Mr. Ricci was “not qualified” to testify as an expert in hydrology during the presentation of
NCA’s case in chief.

1 Notably, however, though Mr. Ricci, P.E., was disqualified by the present State
2 Engineer to testify as a hydrologist and to provide any direct testimony for NCA's case, Mr.
3 Ricci was allowed to provide some answers to questions presented on cross examination,
4 though not specifically on his opinions on hydrology as would relate to the four, specific areas
5 in question raised in the Interim Order and in the Addendum. Most importantly, Mr. Ricci was
6 not allowed to testify regarding his opinion regarding the establishment of the boundary of the
7 LWRFS in the Black Mountains Area as it pertains to NCA's production wells, nor was he
8 allowed to present his opinions regarding his analysis of and his consideration, if any, of
9 SNWA's evidence and conclusions regarding whether NCA's production wells should be
10 considered as *included within* the LWRFS boundary or excluded therefrom.⁷ Also during the
11 hearing it was established that Hugh Ricci, P.E., was the State Engineer who made the
12 determinations for the purposes of the issuance of Order 1169 which basins were subject to and
13 which were not subject to Order 1169 (which governed, essentially, inclusion in the newly
14 identified LWRFS) *based on his understanding and his application of hydrologic principles*
15 *affecting those basins which would in turn affect the water rights in those basins*. Despite this
16 understanding, Mr. Ricci, P.E., was not allowed to opine as to the boundary condition affecting
17 NCA's rights or their production wells.

18 On June 15, 2020, the current State Engineer, Tim Wilson, P.E., issued the Order #1309
19 -- the Final Order -- addressing the four, specific hydrologic elements identified as the focus of
20 the hearing in Order #1303 and the Addendum. In that Order at pages 50 and 51, the State
21 Engineer concluded that NCA's production wells should be included in the boundary of the
22 LWRFS despite the fact that "the State Engineer finds logic in NCA's position" to exclude
23 those wells from the boundary. Heading into the hearings, NCA had criticized the prior LWRFS
24 boundary identified as the southern boundary in the Black Mountains Area that the State
Engineer used in Interim Order #1303 which incorporated the NCA production wells, in part
because it was drawn as a straight line. NCA maintained a straight-line boundary was arbitrary

1 as no such hydrologic boundaries occur in nature; water does not follow a perfectly straight line
2 on a map, but instead would follow a naturally occurring geologic structure. During the
3 hearings, NCA provided testimony about a very nearby geologic structure and the different
4 hydrologic response in reported NCA monitoring wells (when compared to other wells in the
5 LWRFS) that explained why NCA's production wells were located where they were, why
6 SNWA's experts reached their conclusion regarding NCA's production wells, and why it made
7 hydrologic sense that NCA's wells would be *disconnected* from the remaining wells in the
8 LWRFS.

9 Nonetheless, at page 51 of Order #1309, even though the State Engineer stated
10 expressly that he "finds logic in NCA's position" to exclude the NCA wells from the LWRFS,
11 the State Engineer for the first time identified a new boundary for the southern portion of the
12 LWRFS *right in the area where NCA's production wells are located*. The State Engineer
13 explained that this new boundary, "better honors the State Engineer's criteria by acknowledging
14 uncertainty in the data while reflecting a recognized physical boundary in the carbonate-rock
15 aquifer." See **Ex. 1**, at p. 51. As such, the State Engineer recognized NCA's criticism that the
16 prior "straight-line" boundary of the LWRFS that was utilized heading into the hearings was
17 likely arbitrary and unsupportable, but rather than accept NCA's identified, natural structure
18 that was nearest to the production wells and conformed with the evidence actually presented at
19 the hearing, the State Engineer simply looked on a geologic map in an attempt to identify a new,
20 unverified physical boundary and – arbitrarily – *moved the straight-line boundary further south*
21 to more-assuredly include NCA's production wells. The new boundary is, again, a straight line,
22 merely relocated further south and east, with no more support than the initial straight-line
23 boundary.

24 Moreover, the State Engineer made this move despite the fact that no testimony or
expert witness discussion had been made, and no questions had been raised, about this new,
arbitrary straight-line boundary during the two weeks of hearings conducted. No one even
attempted to establish – during the hearing - a technical reason why this newly identified
southern boundary for the LWRFS better explained the available data involving NCA's

1 production wells and the apparent disconnect with well EH-4 than the analysis provided by both
2 NCA and SNWA – which was that the NCA wells were actually outside the LWRFS boundary.

3 Order #1309 goes further to identify “the maximum amount of groundwater that can
4 continue to be developed over the long term in the LWRFS is 8,000 afa [acre feet annually].”
5 As such, this could impact the certificated water rights held by NCA because if NCA’s water
6 rights are, in fact, *within the LWRFS boundary*, then NCA’s pumping from its production wells
7 may be impacted through potential curtailment by the State Engineer as a result of the limit on
8 total pumping within the LWRFS that may be imposed within that 8,000 afa figure.⁸ The final
9 effect on NCA is, at Stage 1 of these proceedings, still uncertain, but the potential exists that
10 NCA’s pumping could be limited because of the limits proposed by the State Engineer on the
11 total amount of groundwater use allowed within the LWRFS identified in Order #1309.

11 **III. GROUNDS FOR PETITION**

12 NRS 5 33.450(3) requires, for the filing of the Petition, only that the Petition contain a
13 “statement of the substance of the order or decision complained of, and the manner in which the
14 same injuriously affects the petitioner’s interests”

15 Here, NCA has identified the “substance of the order or decision complained of”
16 occurring at page 51 of Order #1309: the Final Order included NCA within a modified
17 boundary of the LWRFS by replacing the recognized-as-unsupportable straight-line boundary
18 previously utilized by the State Engineer for the southern boundary of the LWRFS (that
19 improperly included NCA’s production wells as within the LWRFS with an arbitrary, straight
20 line) by simply finding a somewhat nearby, unverified geologic structure that might serve as a
21 boundary coupled with another unsupportable straight-line boundary and identifying *that* as the
22 new, southern boundary of the LWRFS in such a fashion as to include NCA within the LWRFS.
23 The State Engineer did so despite the fact that no evidence of the consideration of such a
24

⁸ NCA’s Certificated water rights indicate that NCA’s total pumping on an annual basis shall not exceed 1,665 afa. If NCA’s water rights are, indeed, within the LWRFS, then this pumping must be considered within the 8,000 afa figure established in Order #1309, and NCA’s total duty could potentially be impacted during the Stage 2 proceedings.

1 boundary was made evident to NCA for its consideration in the Interim Order (#1303) or the
2 Addendum that formed the basis for the retention of experts and the creation of expert reports
3 about which the two-weeks of hearings would be conducted, and despite the fact that there was
4 no discussion of this newly identified boundary during the hearings themselves.

5 As such, NCA was not given sufficient notice and an opportunity to be heard before the
6 State Engineer to satisfy general principles of due process and fairness in any manner sufficient
7 to prepare and present evidence, analysis or conclusions regarding this apparently newly
8 claimed “boundary” that the State Engineer has somehow magically divined in the interim
between the close of the hearings and the issuance of Order #1309.

9 Additionally, the State Engineer recognized the logic in NCA’s position, yet chose to
10 suggest that other testimony questioning SNWA’s analysis, which made no factual or scientific
11 reference to the arbitrary boundary (or any boundary for that matter), justified a contrary
12 conclusion despite an acknowledged lack of information and in the face of uncertainty. *See Ex.*
13 *1*, p. 51. In Order #1309, the State Engineer does not identify an alternate theory explaining the
14 factual and scientific findings described by both SNWA or NCA and does not point to any other
15 expert whose testimony explained the anomalies identified by NCA’s and SNWA’s experts
16 relative to NCA’s production wells. Instead, Order #1309 suggests that it is better to err on the
17 side of “a more inclusive approach that places the boundary to the south of the NCA production
18 wells to a geological location that coincides with the projection of the Muddy Mountain
Thrust,” without an explanation of why this is not an arbitrary determination.

19 The State Engineer’s decision to identify a boundary to include NCA in the LWRFS,
20 knowing that the inclusion could result in the potential restriction of NCA’s use of its full
21 allocation of water rights and despite also knowing that there is at least significant uncertainty
22 as to whether NCA should be included, is arbitrary – not unlike the establishment of the original
23 straight-line boundary that now appears to have been created for the same reason: to include
24 NCA’s production wells within the LWRFS, regardless whether the evidence, analysis or logic
compels a different conclusion.

1 And, by making NCA subject to the LWRFS, Order #1309 injuriously affects NCA in
2 that NCA's certificated water rights could well be impacted by the limitation imposed by the
3 overall development figure of 8,000 afa for the entirety of the LWRFS. While it is currently
4 uncertain how the State Engineer will implement his decisions moving forward regarding who
5 will be allowed to pump and who will not among the various stakeholders, the real possibility
6 exists that NCA's full use of its water rights could be limited. Thus, the "injury" to NCA is real
7 and could be substantial, and NCA is entitled under NRS 533.450(1) and (3) to have this matter
8 considered and heard by this Court now, prior to the implementation of any Stage 2 proceedings
involving the LWRFS.

9 **IV. CONCLUSION**

10 For the reasons explained above, and others that may be discovered and raised during
11 the pendency of this appeal, NCA respectfully requests that this Court reverse the decision of the
12 Nevada State Engineer to move the boundary to an area even further south in the Black
13 Mountains Area to arbitrarily include NCA's production wells within the LWRFS when the
14 evidence and analysis suggests that such wells should have been excluded. Alternatively, NCA
15 requests that this Court remand this matter back to the Nevada State Engineer for further
16 proceedings to allow NCA to present evidence and analysis regarding this newly identified
17 boundary – "the boundary to the south of the NCA production wells to a geological location that
18 coincides with the Muddy Mountain Thrust" – because NCA has not yet been afforded due
process to make such presentation to the State Engineer for his consideration in this matter.

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

Procedure: As explained above at footnote 2, NRS 533.450(8) notes that these proceedings are in the nature of a civil appeal, and NCA will likely request that this Court consider allowing counsel for NCA and the State Engineer to stipulate to a briefing schedule for the presentation of briefing of this appeal and the argument of this Petition for Judicial Review to the Court.

DATED: July 15, 2020.

KAEMPFER CROWELL

By: /s/ Alex J. Flangas
ALEX J. FLANGAS
Nevada Bar No. 664
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700
Reno, Nevada 89501
Telephone: (775) 852-3900
Facsimile: (775) 327-2011
Email: aflangas@kcnvnlaw.com

1 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

2 I certify that I am an employee of Kaempfer Crowell, and that on July 15, 2020, I
3 electronically filed the **PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW** with the Clerk of the Court by
4 using the Eighth Judicial District Court's Electronic Filing system and a true and correct copy
5 was served on the following persons:

6 **VIA HAND DELIVERY BY MESSENGER SERVICE:**

7 Tim Wilson, P.E., State Engineer
8 Nevada Division of Water Resources
9 Dept. of Conservation and Natural resources
901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 2002
Carson City, NV 89702

10 **VIA U.S. POSTAL SERVICE CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT**

11 **REQUESTED:**

12 Christian T. Balducci 13 Marquis Aurbach Coffing 10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, NV 89145 14 <i>Attorneys for Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC</i>	Robert O. Kurth, Jr. 3420 North Buffalo Drive Las Vegas, NV 89129 <i>Attorneys for 3335 Hillside, LLC</i>
16 Tim O'Connor Paul G. Taggart Taggart & Taggart 108 North Minnesota Street Carson City, NV 89703 18 <i>Attorneys for Southern Nevada Water Authority and Las Vegas Valley Water District</i>	Steven C. Anderson Las Vegas Valley Water District 1001 South Valley View Boulevard Las Vegas, NV 89153 <i>Attorneys for Southern Nevada Water Authority and Las Vegas Valley Water District</i>
20 Severin A. Carlson Kaempfer Crowell 50 W. Liberty Street, Suite &00 Reno, NV 89501 22 <i>Attorney for Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints</i>	Kent R. Robison Therese M. Shanks Robison, Sharp, Sullivan and Brust 71 Washington Street Reno, NV 89503 <i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC</i>

1	Bradley J. Herrema Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck 100 N. City Parkway, Suite 1600 Las Vegas, NV 89106 <i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC</i>	William L. Coulthard Coulthard Law 840 South Rancho Drive, #4-627 Las Vegas, NV 89106 <i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC</i>
4	Emilia K. Cargill COO, Senior Vice President-General Counsel Coyote Springs Investment, LLC P.O. Box 37010 Coyote Springs, NV 89037 <i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC</i>	Steve King 227 River Road Dayton, NV 89403 <i>Attorney for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company</i>
8	Karen A. Peterson Allison MacKenzie, Ltd. P.O. Box 646 Carson City, NV 89702 <i>Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District and Vidler Water Company, Inc.</i>	Dylan V. Frehner Lincoln County District Attorney P.O. Box 60 Pioche, NV 89043 <i>Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District and Vidler Water Company, Inc.</i>
11	Debbie Leonard Leonard Law, PC 955 S. Virginia Street, Suite 220 Reno, NV 89502 <i>Attorneys for Moapa Band of Paiutes</i>	Carolyn Tanner Tanner Law & Strategy Group, Ltd. 216 E. Liberty Street Reno, NV 89501 <i>Attorneys for Moapa Band of Paiutes</i>
14	Beth A. Baldwin (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Richard Berley (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Ziontz Chestnut 2101 – 4 th Avenue, Suite 1230 Seattle, WA 98121 <i>Attorneys for Moapa Band of Paiutes</i>	Sylvia Harrison Sarah Ferguson McDonald Carano 100 West Liberty Street, 10 th Floor Reno, NV 89501 <i>Attorney for Georgia Pacific Corporation and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.</i>
18	Paulina Williams Baker Botts, LLP 98 San Jacinto Blvd., Suite 1500 Austin, TX 78701 <i>Attorney for Georgia Pacific Corporation</i>	Greg Morrison Parsons Behle & Latimer 50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 750 Reno, NV 89501 <i>Attorney for Moapa Valley Water District</i>
21	Laura A. Schroeder Therese A. Ure 10615 Double R Blvd., Suite 100 Reno, NV 89521 <i>Attorneys for City of North Las Vegas and Bedroc Limited, LLC</i>	Justina A. Caviglia Michael Knox 6100 Neil Road Reno, NV 89511 <i>Attorney for Sierra Pacific Power Company dba NV Energy and Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy</i>

1	Luke Miller Office of the Regional Solicitor U.S. Dept. of the Interior 2800 Cottage Way, Suite E1712 Sacramento, CA 95825 <i>Attorney for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</i>	Karen Glasgow Office of the Regional Solicitor U.S. Dept. of the Interior 333 Bush Street, #775 San Francisco, CA 94104 <i>Attorney for National Park Service</i>
2		
3		
4		
5	Kathryn Brinton Office of the Regional Solicitor U.S. Dept. of the Interior 1340 Financial Blvd. Reno, NV 89502	State of Nevada, Dept. of Conservation and Natural Resources Division of State Parks 901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5005 Carson City, NV 89701
6		
7		
8	State of Nevada Department of Transportation 1263 S. Stewart Street Carson City, NV 89712	Clark County 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, 6 th Floor Las Vegas, NV 89155
9		
10	Patrick Donnelly Center for Biological Diversity 7345 S. Durango Drive B-107, Box 217 Las Vegas, NV 89116	Lisa Belenky Center for Biological Diversity 1212 Broadway, Suite 800 Oakland, CA 94612
11		
12		
13	Lincoln County Commissioners P.O. Box 90 Pioche, NV 89043	Clark County Coyote Springs Water Resources GID 1001 S. Valley View Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89153
14		
15	Mark D. Stock Global Hydrologic Services, Inc. 561 Keystone Avenue, #200 Reno, NV 89503-4331	Kyle Roerink Great Basin Water Network P.O. Box 75 Baker, NV 89311
16		
17		
18	Dry Lake Water, LLC 2470 St. Rose Parkway, Suite 107 Henderson, NV 89074	Lake At Las Vegas Joint Venture, Inc. 1600 Lake Las Vegas Parkway Henderson, NV 89011
19		
20	Casa De Warm Springs, LLC 1000 North Green Valley Parkway, #440-350 Henderson, NV 89074	Laker Plaza, Inc. 7181 Noon Road Everson, WA 98247-9650
21		
22	William O'Donnell 2780 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 210 Las Vegas, NV 89146	Pacific Coast Building Products, Inc. P.O. Box 364329 Las Vegas, NV 89036
23		
24	S & R, Inc. 808 Shetland Road Las Vegas, NV 89107	Technichrome 4709 Compass Bow Lane Las Vegas, NV 89130

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Kelly Kolhoss P.O. Box 232 Moapa, NV 89025	Larry Brundy P.O. Box 136 Moapa, NV 89025
Don J. & Marsha L. Davis P.O. Box 400 Moapa, NV 89025	Mary K. Cloud P.O. Box 31 Moapa, NV 89025

/s/ Sharon Stice
An employee of Kaempfer Crowell

EXHIBIT 11

EXHIBIT 11

ORDG

BRADLEY J. HERREMA #10368
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
TELEPHONE (702) 382-2101
FAX NUMBER (702) 382-8135
BHERREMA@BHFS.COM

KENT R. ROBISON #1167
KROBISON@RSSBLAW.COM
THERESE M. SHANKS #12890
TSHANKS@RSSBLAW.COM
ROBISON, SHARP, SULLIVAN & BRUST
71 Washington Street
Reno, Nevada 89503
TELEPHONE (775) 329-3151
FAX NUMBER (775) 329-7941

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD #3927
COULTHARD LAW
840 South Ranch Drive, #4-627
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
WLC@COULTHARDLAW.COM
TELEPHONE: (702) 898-9944

EMILIA K. CARGILL #6493
3100 State Route 168
P.O. Box 37010
Coyote Springs, Nevada 89037
TELEPHONE: (725) 210-5433
EMILIA.CARGILL@COYOTESPRINGS.COM

Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
AUTHORITY

Petitioners,

v.

TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State
Engineer, DIVISION OF WATER
RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF
CONSERVATION AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Respondent.


Case No.: A-20-816761-C

Dept. No.: 19

ORDER GRANTING CONSOLIDATION

EXHIBIT 12

EXHIBIT 12



ORDA
BRADLEY J. HERREMA #10368
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
TELEPHONE (702) 382-2101
FAX NUMBER (702) 382-8135
BHERREMA@BHFS.COM

KENT R. ROBISON #1167
KROBISON@RSSBLAW.COM
THERESE M. SHANKS #12890
TSHANKS@RSSBLAW.COM
ROBISON, SHARP, SULLIVAN & BRUST
71 Washington Street
Reno, Nevada 89503
TELEPHONE (775) 329-3151
FAX NUMBER (775) 329-7941

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD #3927
COULTHARD LAW
840 South Ranch Drive, #4-627
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
WLC@COULTHARDLAW.COM
TELEPHONE: (702) 898-9944

EMILIA K. CARGILL #6493
3100 State Route 168
P.O. Box 37010
Coyote Springs, Nevada 89037
TELEPHONE: (725) 210-5433
EMILIA.CARGILL@COYOTESPRINGS.COM
Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
AUTHORITY

Petitioners,
v.

TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State Engineer,
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
NATURAL RESOURCES

Respondent.

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
COYOTE SPRINGS INVESTMENT, LLC

Case No.: A-20-816761-C (Lead Case)
Dept. No.: 19

**ORDER APPROVING JOINT
STIPULATION FOR JOINT
INTERVENTION**

CONSOLIDATED WITH:

Case No.: A-20-817765-P (Sub Case)
Dept. No.: 19

1 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
2 APEX HOLDING COMPANY, LLC

Case No.: A-20-817840-P (Sub Case)
Dept. No.: 19

3 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
4 CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Case No.: A-20-817876-P (Sub Case)
Dept. No.: 19

5 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
6 MUDDY VALLEY IRRIGATION COMPANY

Case No.: A-20-817977-P (Sub Case)
Dept. No.: 19

7 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
8 NEVADA COGENERATION ASSOCIATES
9 NOS. 1 AND 2

Case No.: A-20-818015-P (Sub Case)
Dept. No.: 19

10 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
11 GEORGIA-PACIFIC GYPSUM, LLC AND
12 REPUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL
13 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Case No.: A-20-818069-P (Sub Case)
Dept. No.: 19

14
15 **ORDER APPROVING JOINT STIPULATION FOR JOINT INTERVENTION**

16 The parties to the consolidated actions (Case Nos. A-20-816761-C (lead case),
17 A-20-817765-P, A-20-817840-P, A-20-817876-P, A-20-817977-P, A-20-818015-P, and
18 A-20-818069-P) have stipulated that each party can be an intervener in each of the
19 other parties' actions pursuant to NRCP 24(a) and NRCP 24(b).

20 Good cause appearing, IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated this 14th day of Sept, 2020.

22
23 
24 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

25 Respectfully submitted by:

26 ROBISON, SHARP, SULLIVAN & BRUST
27 71 Washington Street
28 Reno, Nevada 89503

/s/ Kent R. Robison
KENT R. ROBISON #1167
THERESE M. SHANKS #12890

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:

BRADLEY J. HERREMA #10368
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106


WILLIAM L. COULTHARD #3927
COULTHARD LAW
840 South Ranch Drive, #4-627
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

EMILIA K. CARGILL #6493
3100 State Route 168
P.O. Box 37010
Coyote Springs, Nevada 89037

Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

EXHIBIT 13

EXHIBIT 13


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **ORDR**

2 **DISTRICT COURT**

3 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

4
5 **LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER**
6 **DISTRICT, and) SOUTHERN NEVADA**
7 **WATER AUTHORITY**

8 **Petitioner,**

9 **vs.**

10 **TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State**
11 **Engineer,) DIVISION OF WATER**
12 **RESOURCES,) DEPARTMENT OF**
13 **CONSERVATION NATURAL**
14 **RESOURCES,**

15 **Respondent.**

Case No. A-20-816761-C
Dept. No. I

Consolidated with Cases:

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P


A-20-817876-P

16 **ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO INTERVENE**

17 This case coming on for hearing on November 17, 2020 on Motions to Intervene before the
18 Honorable William D. Kephart. The Court being fully advised in the premises, orders as follows:

19 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that the Motions to Intervene is
20 GRANTED.

Dated this 26th day of February, 2021



21
22 **6D8 3D7 8641 92B1**
23 **Bita Yeager**
24 **District Court Judge**

25
26
27
28
BITA YEAGER
DISTRICT JUDGE
DEPARTMENT I

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5
6 Southern Nevada Water
7 Authority, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-816761-C

8 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

9 Nevada State Engineer, Division
10 of Water Resources,
11 Defendant(s)

12 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
14 Court. The foregoing Order Granting Motion was served via the court's electronic eFile
15 system to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

16 Service Date: 2/26/2021

17 Merrilyn Marsh	mmarsh@kcnvlaw.com
18 Sev Carlson	scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
19 Dorene Wright	dwright@ag.nv.gov
20 James Bolotin	jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
21 Mike Knox	mknox@nvenergy.com
22 Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
23 Justina Caviglia	jcaviglia@nvenergy.com
24 Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
25 Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
26 Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com


27
28

1	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
2	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
3	Kathleen Wilde	kwilde@maclaw.com
4	Laena St-Jules	lstjules@ag.nv.gov
5	Karen Easton	keaston@ag.nv.gov
6	Therese Ure	counsel@water-law.com
7	Sharon Stice	sstice@kcnvlaw.com
8	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
9	Derek Muaina	DerekM@WesternElite.com
10	Andy Moore	moorea@cityofnorthvegas.com
11	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
12	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
13	Lisa Belenky	lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
14	Julie Cavanaugh-Bill	julie@cblawoffices.org
15	Douglas Wolf	dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
16	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
17	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
18	Steven King	kingmont@charter.net
19	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
22	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
23	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
2	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
3	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
4	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
6	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
7	Gregory Morrison	gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
8	Paul Taggart	paul@legaltnt.com
9	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
10	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
11	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
12	Andrew Moore	moorea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com
13	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
14	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
15	Steve King	kingmont@charter.net
16	Emily Woods	ewoods@kcnvlaw.com
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EXHIBIT 14

EXHIBIT 14



STIP

BRADLEY J. HERREMA #10368
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
TELEPHONE (702) 382-2101
FAX NUMBER (702) 382-8135
BHERREMA@BHFS.COM

KENT R. ROBISON #1167
KROBISON@RSSBLAW.COM
THERESE M. SHANKS #12890
TSHANKS@RSSBLAW.COM
ROBISON, SHARP, SULLIVAN & BRUST
71 Washington Street
Reno, Nevada 89503
TELEPHONE (775) 329-3151
FAX NUMBER (775) 329-7941

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD #3927
COULTHARD LAW
840 South Ranch Drive, #4-627
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
WLC@COULTHARDLAW.COM
TELEPHONE: (702) 898-9944

EMILIA K. CARGILL #6493
3100 State Route 168
P.O. Box 37010
Coyote Springs, Nevada 89037
TELEPHONE: (725) 210-5433
EMILIA.CARGILL@COYOTESPRINGS.COM
Attorneys for Petitioner Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
AUTHORITY

Petitioners,
v.

TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State Engineer,
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
NATURAL RESOURCES

Respondent.

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
COYOTE SPRINGS INVESTMENT, LLC

Case No.: A-20-816761-C (Lead Case)

Dept. No.: 1

STIPULATION FOR CONSOLIDATION

CONSOLIDATED WITH:

Case No.: A-20-817765-P (Sub Case)

1 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
2 APEX HOLDING COMPANY, LLC

Case No.: A-20-817840-P (Sub Case)

3 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
4 CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Case No.: A-20-817876-P (Sub Case)

5 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
6 MUDDY VALLEY IRRIGATION COMPANY

Case No.: A-20-817977-P (Sub Case)

7 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
8 NEVADA COGENERATION ASSOCIATES
9 NOS. 1 AND 2

Case No.: A-20-818015-P (Sub Case)

10 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
11 GEORGIA-PACIFIC GYPSUM, LLC AND
12 REPUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL
13 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Case No.: A-20-818069-P (Sub Case)

14 **STIPULATION FOR CONSOLIDATION**

15 The Nevada State Engineer, Division of Water Resources, Department of
16 Conservation and Natural Resources, and all Petitioners and Intervenors in these
17 consolidated matters, do hereby jointly move for and stipulate to the consolidation of
18 Case No. A-21-833572-J (Lincoln County Water District and Vidler Water Company,
19 Inc.'s ("LCWD/Vidler") recently transferred Petition for Judicial Review) for joint
20 administration. It is further agreed that the LCWD/Vidler Petition for Judicial Review,
21 like the other Petitions for Judicial Review consolidated in this matter for joint
22 administration, will retain its distinct legal and factual characteristics.

23 **AFFIRMATION:** The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding
24 document and/or attachments do not contain the social security number of any person.

25 DATED this 26th day of May, 2021.

26 ROBISON, SHARP, SULLIVAN & BRUST
27 71 Washington Street
28 Reno, Nevada 89503

/s/ Kent R. Robison

KENT R. ROBISON #1167
THERESE M. SHANKS #12890

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:

BRADLEY J. HERREMA #10368
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD #3927
COULTHARD LAW
840 South Ranch Drive, #4-627
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

EMILIA K. CARGILL #6493
3100 State Route 168
P.O. Box 37010
Coyote Springs, Nevada 89037
Attorneys for Petitioner
Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717

/s/ James N. Bolotin

JAMES N. BOLOTIN #13829
LAENA ST-JULES #15156C
Email: jbolotin@ag.nv.gov; lstjules@ag.nv.gov
Attorneys for Respondent State Engineer

Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

TAGGART & TAGGART, LTD.
108 North Minnesota Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

/s/ Paul G. Taggart

PAUL G. TAGGART #6136
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR #14098
Email: paul@legaltnt.com; tim@legaltnt.com

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:

STEVEN C. ANDERSON #11901
Las Vegas Valley Water District
1001 S. Valley View Blvd.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89153
Email: Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA

1 Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

2 MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING
3 10001 Park Run Drive
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145

5 /s/ Christian T. Balducci

6 CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI #12688

7 Email: cbalducci@maclaw.com

8 Attorneys for Apex Holding Company, LLC and
9 Dry Lake Water, LLC

10 Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

11 CAVANAUGH-BILL LAW OFFICES, LLC
12 Henderson Bank Building
13 401 Railroad Street, Suite 307
14 Elko, Nevada 89801

15 /s/ Lisa T. Belenky

16 JULIE CAVANAUGH-BILL #11533

17 Email: julie@cblawoffices.org

18 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**

19 LISA T. BELENKY (*Pro Hac Vice to be submitted*)
20 Center for Biological Diversity
21 1212 Broadway, Suite 800
22 Oakland, California 94612
23 Email: lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

24 DOUGLAS WOLF (*Pro Hac Vice to be submitted*)
25 Center for Biological Diversity
26 3201 Zafarano Drive, Suite C, #149
27 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87507
28 Email: dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
Attorneys for Center for Biological Diversity

Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

KAEMPFER CROWELL
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700
Reno, Nevada 89501

/s/ Alex J. Flangas

ALEX J. FLANGAS #664

Email: aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

Attorneys for Nevada Cogeneration
Associates Nos. 1 and 2

1 Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

2 DOTSON LAW
3 5355 Reno Corporate Drive, Suite #100
4 Reno, Nevada 89511

5 /s/ Robert A. Dotson

6 ROBERT A. DOTSON #5285
7 JUSTIN C. VANCE #11306
8 Email: rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
9 jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

10 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**

11 STEVEN D. KING #4304
12 227 River Road
13 Dayton, Nevada 89403
14 Email: kingmont@charter.net
15 *Attorneys for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company*

16 Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

17 McDONALD CARANO LLP
18 100 W. Liberty Street, Suite 1000
19 Reno, Nevada 89501

20 /s/ Sylvia Harrison

21 SYLVIA HARRISON #4106
22 LUCAS FOLETTA #12154
23 SARAH FERGUSON #14515
24 Emails: sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
25 lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
26 sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
27 *Attorneys for Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC and*
28 *Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.*

1 Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

2 PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
3 50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 750
4 Reno, Nevada 89501

5 /s/ Gregory M. Morrison

6 GREGORY H. MORRISON #12454
7 Emails: gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
8 *Attorneys for Intervenor Moapa Valley Water District*

9 Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

10 KAEMPFER CROWELL
11 50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 700
12 Reno, Nevada 89501

13 /s/ Severin A. Carlson

14 SEVERIN A. CARLSON #9373
15 Email: scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
16 *Attorneys for Intervenor*
17 *The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

NEVADA ENERGY
6100 Neil Road
Reno, Nevada 89510

/s/ Justina A. Caviglia
JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA #9999
MICHAEL D. KNOX #8143
Emails: jcaviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com
*Attorneys for Intervenors Sierra Pacific Power
Company, dba NV Energy and Nevada Power
Company, dba NV Energy*

Dated this 26th day of May, 2021.

SCHROEDER LAW OFFICES, P.C.
10615 Double R Blvd., Suite 100
Reno, Nevada 89521

/s/ Therese A. Ure Stix
THERESE A. URE STIX #10255
LAURA A. SCHROEDER #3595
Email: counsel@water-law.com
*Attorneys for Intervenors Bedroc and
City of North Las Vegas*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
--

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust, and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **STIPULATION FOR CONSOLIDATION** to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Reno, Nevada, addressed to:

 X emailing an attached Adobe Acrobat PDF version of the document to the email addresses below/facsimile (fax) and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

PAUL G. TAGGART, ESQ.
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR, ESQ.
Taggart & Taggart, Ltd.
108 North Minnesota Street
Carson City, NV 89703
Email: paul@legaltnt.com; tim@legaltnt.com
Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA

STEVEN C. ANDERSON, ESQ.
Las Vegas Valley Water District
1001 S. Valley View Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89153
Email: Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA

JAMES N. BOLOTIN, ESQ.
LAENA ST-JULES, ESQ.
Office of the Attorney General
100 North Carson
Carson City, NV 89701
Email: jbolotin@ag.nv.gov; lstjules@ag.nv.gov
Attorneys for Respondent State Engineer

BRADLEY J. HERREMA, ESQ.
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, NV 89106
Email: bherrema@bhfs.com
Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD, ESQ.
COULTHARD LAW
840 South Ranch Drive, #4-627
Las Vegas, NV 89106
Email: wlc@coulthardlaw.com
Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

EMILIA K. CARGILL, ESQ.
3100 State Route 168
P.O. Box 37010
Coyote Springs, NV 89037
Email: emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

1 GREGORY H. MORRISON, ESQ.

Parson Behle & Latimer

2 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750

Reno, NV 89501

3 Email: gmorrison@parsonsbhle.com

Attorneys for Moapa Valley Water District

4 CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI, ESQ.

Marquis Aurbach Coffing

10001 Park Run Drive

6 Las Vegas, NV 89145

Email: cbalducci@maclaw.com

7 *Attorneys for Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC*

8 SYLVIA HARRISON, ESQ.

LUCAS FOLETTA, ESQ.

9 SARAH FERGUSON, ESQ.

McDonald Carano LLP

10 100 W. Liberty Street, 10th Floor

Reno, NV 89501

11 Email: sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com

lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com

sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

12 *Attorneys for Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC*

13 *and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.*

14 LISA BELENKY, ESQ.

Center for Biological Diversity

1212 Broadway, #800

16 Oakland, CA 94612

Email: lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

17 *Attorneys for Center for Biological Diversity (pro hac vice)*

18 JULIE CAVANAUGH-BILL, ESQ.

Cavanaugh-Bill Law Offices, LLC

19 Henderson Bank Building

401 Railroad Street, Suite 307

20 Elko, NV 89801

Email: julie@cblawoffices.org

21 *Attorneys for Center for Biological Diversity*

22 DOUGLAS WOLF, ESQ.

Center for Biological Diversity

23 3201 Zafarano Drive, Suite C, #149

Santa Fe, NM 87507

24 Email: dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

25 *Attorneys for Center for Biological Diversity*

26 ROBERT A. DOTSON, ESQ.

JUSTIN C. VANCE, ESQ.

Dotson Law

-- 5355 Reno Corporate Drive, Suite #100

Reno, NV 89511

Email: rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal / jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

Attorneys for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company

1 STEVEN D. KING, ESQ.
2 227 River Road
3 Dayton, NV 89403
4 Email: kingmont@charter.net
5 *Attorneys for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company*

6 ALEX FLANGAS, ESQ.
7 Kaempfer Crowell
8 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700
9 Reno, NV 89501
10 Email: aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
11 *Attorneys for Nevada Cogeneration Association Nos. 1 and 2*


12 SEVERIN A. CARLSON, ESQ.
13 Kaempfer Crowell
14 50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 700
15 Reno, NV 89501
16 Email: scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
17 *Attorneys for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints*

18 JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA, ESQ.
19 MICHAEL D. KNOX, ESQ.
20 Nevada Energy
21 6100 Neil Road
22 Reno, NV 89510
23 Email: jcaviglia@nvenergy.com; mknox@nvenergy.com
24 *Attorneys for Sierra Pacific Power Company, dba NV Energy*
25 *Nevada Power Company, dba NV Energy*

26 THERESE A. URE STIX, ESQ.
27 LAURA A. SCHROEDER, ESQ.
28 Schroeder Law Offices, P.C.
29 10615 Double R Blvd., Suite 100
30 Reno, NV 89521
31 Email: counsel@water-law.com
32 *Attorneys for Bedroc and City of North Las Vegas*

33 **COURTESY COPY:**
34 Honorable Bitia Yeager – Dept. 1
35 District Court Judge
36 c/o Joel Rivas, Judicial Executive Assistant
37 Email: rivasj@clarkcountycourts.us

38 DATED: This 26th day of May, 2021.

39 
40 V. Jayne Ferretto


41 An Employee of Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust

EXHIBIT 15

EXHIBIT 15

EXHIBIT 15A

EXHIBIT 15A



1 NTSO

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
12 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
17 AUTHORITY, et al.,

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

18 Petitioners,

Consolidated with Cases:

19 vs.

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

21 Respondent.

A-21-833572-J

22 _____/
23 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER**
24 **COMPANY, INC. AND CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS, WESTERN ELITE**
25 **ENVIRONMENTAL, INC. AND BEDROC LIMITED, LLC**
26 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
27 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

28 **YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the *Lincoln County***
Water District, Vidler Water Company, Inc. and City of North Las Vegas, Western Elite

Environmental, Inc. and Bedroc Limited, LLC Stipulation and Order Regarding Intervention and Briefing Schedule was entered on the 24th day of June, 2021, a copy of which is attached hereto.

DATED this 25th day of June, 2021.

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

/s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

—✓— emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com


JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 25th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **SAO**

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
12 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, a
political subdivision of the State of Nevada,
17 and VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC., a
Nevada Corporation,

Case No. A-21-833572-J

Dept. No. 1

18 Petitioners,

19 vs.

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting Nevada
21 State Engineer, DIVISION OF WATER
22 RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF
CONSERVATION AND NATURAL
23 RESOURCES,

**LINCOLN COUNTY WATER
DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC. AND CITY OF
NORTH LAS VEGAS, WESTERN
ELITE ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
AND BEDROC LIMITED, LLC
STIPULATION AND ORDER
REGARDING INTERVENTION
AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

24 Respondent.

25 On June 15, 2020, Tim Wilson, P.E., Nevada State Engineer¹, on behalf of the Division of
26 Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, issued Order 1309. Petitioners,
27
28

¹ Tim Wilson, P.E. retired as the Nevada State Engineer effective November 30, 2020. Adam Sullivan, P.E. is the Acting Nevada State Engineer and has been automatically substituted pursuant to NRCP 25(d).

1 Lincoln County Water District (“LCWD”) and Vidler Water Company, Inc. (“Vidler”) (collectively
2 “Petitioners”), timely filed their Petition for Judicial Review pursuant to NRS 533.450 challenging
3 State Engineer Order 1309 in the Seventh Judicial District Court, In and For the County of Lincoln,
4 State of Nevada, identified as Case No. CV-0702520. LCWD and Vidler’s Petition for Judicial
5 Review was transferred to the Clark County District Court for adjudication in the above captioned
6 matter, Case No. A-21-833572-J.

7 The City of North Las Vegas, Western Elite Environmental, Inc. and Bedroc Limited, LLC
8 desire to intervene in LCWD and Vidler’s action, Case No. A-21-833572-J.

9 LCWD, Vidler and the City of North Las Vegas, Western Elite Environmental, Inc. and Bedroc
10 Limited, LLC stipulate and agree as follows:

11 **Stipulation to Intervention.**

12 1. The City of North Las Vegas, Western Elite Environmental, Inc. and Bedroc Limited,
13 LLC shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-21-833572-J.

14 2. As an Intervenor in LCWD/Vidler’s case, the City of North Las Vegas, Western Elite
15 Environmental, Inc. and Bedroc Limited, LLC may file an answering brief in LCWD/Vidler’s case.
16 Leave from the Court will be required, as set forth below, if LCWD, Vidler and/or the City of North
17 Las Vegas, Western Elite Environmental, Inc. and Bedroc Limited, LLC seek to file a reply brief as
18 an Intervenor or sur-reply brief in response to an Intervenor’s reply brief.

19 **Briefing Schedule.**

20 3. Petitioners’ opening briefs shall be due **August 27, 2021.**

21 4. The answering briefs of Petitioners/Intervenors shall be due 90 days after the date the
22 opening briefs are due, or **November 24, 2021.**

23 5. Petitioners’ reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date answering briefs are due, or
24 **January 7, 2022.**

25 6. As Intervenors, the City of North Las Vegas, Western Elite Environmental, Inc. and
26 Bedroc Limited, LLC may only file a reply brief in LCWD/Vidler’s case with leave from the Court
27 based on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in another’s answering
28

1 brief. Said Intervenor reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date the answering briefs are filed, or
2 **January 7, 2022.**

3 7. Petitioners may only file a sur-reply brief with leave from the Court based on a showing
4 that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in an Intervenor's reply brief filed with
5 leave of Court.

6 The parties agree this Stipulation and Order shall be filed in consolidated Case No. A-20-
7 816761-C and Case No. A-21-833572-J and the parties request the Court issue an order approving this
8 Stipulation as appropriate.

9 **Affirmation:** The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document and/or
10 attachments do not contain the social security number of any person.

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

11
12
13 Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

14 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
15 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
16 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

17 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
18 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
19 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
20 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
21 Reno, Nevada 89501
22 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

23 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
24 402 North Division Street
25 Carson City, Nevada 89703

26 Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

27 /s/ Karen A. Peterson
28 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

SCHROEDER LAW OFFICES, P.C.
10615 Double R Blvd., Ste. 100
Reno, Nevada 89521

Dated this 22nd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Therese A. Ure Stix
LAURA A. SCHROEDER #3595
THERESE A. URE STIX #10255
Email: counsel@water-law.com


*Attorneys for City of North Las Vegas, Western Elite
Environmental, Inc. and Bedroc Limited, LLC*

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021.
Dated this 24th day of June, 2021


DISTRICT JUDGE

**3D9 9BD 9CEF 6106
Brita Yeager
District Court Judge**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

___✓___ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com

JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Lincoln County Water District,
Petitioner(s)

CASE NO: A-21-833572-J

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Tim Wilson, Respondent(s)

10
11 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

12 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
13 Court. The foregoing Stipulation and Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system
to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

14 Service Date: 6/24/2021

15 Wayne Klomp wklomp@swlaw.com

16 Lara Taylor ljttaylor@swlaw.com

17 Docket Docket docket_las@swlaw.com

18 Karen Peterson kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

19
20 If indicated below, a copy of the above mentioned filings were also served by mail
21 via United States Postal Service, postage prepaid, to the parties listed below at their last
22 known addresses on 6/25/2021


23 Christian Balducci Marquis Aurbach Coffing
24 Attn: Christian Balducci
25 10001 Park Run Drive
26 Las Vegas, NV, 89145
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

James Bolotin	Bureau of Litigation - Public Safety Division
	Adam Paul Laxalt
	100 N. Carson St.
	Carson City, NV, 89701
Steven King	1525 Rancho Rd
	Fernley, NV, 89408-0000

EXHIBIT 15B

EXHIBIT 15B



1 NTSO

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
12 COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
17 AUTHORITY, et al.,

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

18 Petitioners,

Consolidated with Cases:

19 vs.

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

21 Respondent.

A-21-833572-J

22 _____/
23 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER**
24 **COMPANY, INC. AND THE CHURCH OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS**
25 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
26 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

27 **YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the *Lincoln County***
28 ***Water District, Vidler Water Company, Inc. and The Church of Latter-day Saints Stipulation and***

1 **Order Regarding Intervention and Briefing Schedule** was entered on the 24th day of June, 2021, a
2 copy of which is attached hereto.

3 DATED this 25th day of June, 2021.

4 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043

8 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
9 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
10 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

11 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
12 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
13 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
14 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
15 Reno, Nevada 89501
16 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

17 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

18 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
19 402 North Division Street
20 Carson City, Nevada 89703

21 /s/ Karen A. Peterson
22 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
23 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

24 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

___✓___ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com


JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 25th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **SAO**

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
12 COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, a
political subdivision of the State of Nevada,
17 and VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC., a
Nevada Corporation,

Case No. A-21-833572-J

Dept. No. 1

18
19 Petitioners,

20 vs.

21 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting Nevada
State Engineer, DIVISION OF WATER
22 RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF
CONSERVATION AND NATURAL
23 RESOURCES,

**LINCOLN COUNTY WATER
DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC. AND THE
CHURCH OF LATTER-DAY
SAINTS STIPULATION AND
ORDER REGARDING
INTERVENTION AND
BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

24 Respondent.
25 _____/

26 On June 15, 2020, Tim Wilson, P.E., Nevada State Engineer¹, on behalf of the Division of
Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, issued Order 1309. Petitioners,
27
28 _____

¹ Tim Wilson, P.E. retired as the Nevada State Engineer effective November 30, 2020. Adam Sullivan, P.E. is the Acting Nevada State Engineer and has been automatically substituted pursuant to NRCP 25(d).

1 Lincoln County Water District (“LCWD”) and Vidler Water Company, Inc. (“Vidler”) (collectively
2 “Petitioners”), timely filed their Petition for Judicial Review pursuant to NRS 533.450 challenging
3 State Engineer Order 1309 in the Seventh Judicial District Court, In and For the County of Lincoln,
4 State of Nevada, identified as Case No. CV-0702520. LCWD and Vidler’s Petition for Judicial
5 Review was transferred to the Clark County District Court for adjudication in the above captioned
6 matter, Case No. A-21-833572-J.

7 The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints filed a motion to intervene in LCWD and
8 Vidler’s action in the Seventh Judicial District Court, which is now pending in Case No. A-21-833572-
9 J.

10 LCWD, Vidler and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints desire to resolve The
11 Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints’ motion to intervene upon the following terms and stipulate
12 and agree as follows:

13 **Stipulation to Intervention.**

14 1. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints shall be granted the right to intervene
15 in Case No. A-21-833572-J.

16 2. As an Intervenor in LCWD/Vidler’s case, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day
17 Saints may file an answering brief in LCWD/Vidler’s case. Leave from the Court will be required, as
18 set forth below, if LCWD, Vidler and/or The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints seek to file
19 a reply brief as an Intervenor or sur-reply brief in response to an Intervenor’s reply brief.

20 **Briefing Schedule.**

21 3. Petitioners’ opening briefs shall be due **August 27, 2021.**

22 4. The answering briefs of Petitioners/Intervenors shall be due 90 days after the date the
23 opening briefs are due, or **November 24, 2021.**

24 5. Petitioners’ reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date answering briefs are due, or
25 **January 7, 2022.**

26 6. As an Intervenor, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints may only file a reply
27 brief in LCWD/Vidler’s case with leave from the Court based on a showing that its unique interests
28

are impacted by arguments made in another's answering brief. Said Intervenor reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date the answering briefs are filed, or **January 7, 2022**.

7. Petitioners may only file a sur-reply brief with leave from the Court based on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in an Intervenor's reply brief filed with leave of Court.

The parties agree this Stipulation and Order shall be filed in consolidated Case No. A-20-816761-C and Case No. A-21-833572-J and the parties request the Court issue an order approving this Stipulation as appropriate.

Affirmation: The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document and/or attachments do not contain the social security number of any person.

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

///

///

///

KAEMPFER CROWELL
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700
Reno, Nevada 89501

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.


/s/ Severin A. Carlson
SEVERIN A. CARLSON #9373
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES #13239
Email: scarlson@kcnvlaw.com

*Attorneys for The Church of Jesus Christ of
Latter-day Saints*

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing therefore,
IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021
Dated this 24th day of June, 2021



DISTRICT JUDGE

**E1A 812 C925 9B85
Bita Yeager
District Court Judge**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

___✓___ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com

JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Lincoln County Water District,
Petitioner(s)

CASE NO: A-21-833572-J

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Tim Wilson, Respondent(s)

10
11 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

12 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
13 Court. The foregoing Stipulation and Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system
to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

14 Service Date: 6/24/2021

15 Wayne Klomp wklomp@swlaw.com

16 Lara Taylor ljttaylor@swlaw.com

17 Docket Docket docket_las@swlaw.com

18 Karen Peterson kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

19
20 If indicated below, a copy of the above mentioned filings were also served by mail
21 via United States Postal Service, postage prepaid, to the parties listed below at their last
22 known addresses on 6/25/2021


23 Christian Balducci Marquis Aurbach Coffing
24 Attn: Christian Balducci
25 10001 Park Run Drive
26 Las Vegas, NV, 89145
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

James Bolotin	Bureau of Litigation - Public Safety Division
	Adam Paul Laxalt
	100 N. Carson St.
	Carson City, NV, 89701
Steven King	1525 Rancho Rd
	Fernley, NV, 89408-0000

EXHIBIT 15C

EXHIBIT 15C



1 NTSO

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
12 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
17 AUTHORITY, et al.,

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

18 Petitioners,

Consolidated with Cases:

19 vs.

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

21 Respondent.

A-21-833572-J

22 _____/
23 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER**
24 **COMPANY, INC. AND GEORGIA-PACIFIC GYPSUM LLC AND REPUBLIC**
25 **ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.**
26 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
27 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

28 **YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the *Lincoln County***
Water District, Vidler Water Company, Inc. and Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC and Republic

Environmental Technologies, Inc. Stipulation and Order Regarding Intervention and Briefing Schedule was entered on the 24th day of June, 2021, a copy of which is attached hereto.

DATED this 25th day of June, 2021.

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

/s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

__✓__ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com


JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 25th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **SAO**

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
12 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**

14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, a
political subdivision of the State of Nevada,
17 and VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC., a
Nevada Corporation,

Case No. A-21-833572-J

Dept. No. 1

18 Petitioners,

19 vs.

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting Nevada
21 State Engineer, DIVISION OF WATER
22 RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF
CONSERVATION AND NATURAL
23 RESOURCES,

**LINCOLN COUNTY WATER
DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC. AND GEORGIA-
PACIFIC GYPSUM LLC AND
REPUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
STIPULATION AND ORDER
REGARDING INTERVENTION
AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

24 Respondent.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 GEORGIA-PACIFIC GYPSUM LLC,
2 and REPUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL
3 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Case No. A-20-818069-P

Dept. No. 1

4 Petitioners,

5 vs.

6 TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State Engineer,
7 DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES,
8 DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
9 NATURAL RESOURCES,

10 Respondent.

11 On June 15, 2020, Tim Wilson, P.E., Nevada State Engineer¹, on behalf of the Division of
12 Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, issued Order 1309. Petitioners,
13 Lincoln County Water District ("LCWD") and Vidler Water Company, Inc. ("Vidler") timely filed
14 their Petition for Judicial Review pursuant to NRS 533.450 challenging State Engineer Order 1309 in
15 the Seventh Judicial District Court, In and For the County of Lincoln, State of Nevada, identified as
16 Case No. CV-0702520. LCWD and Vidler's Petition for Judicial Review was transferred to the Clark
17 County District Court for adjudication in the above captioned matter, Case No. A-21-833572-J.

18 Pursuant to NRS 533.450, Order 1309 was also timely challenged by Petitioners, Georgia-
19 Pacific Gypsum LLC and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc. in a Petition for Judicial Review
20 filed with the District Court of Clark County, Nevada, Case No. A-20-818069-P.

21 LCWD and Vidler's action, Case No. A-21-833572-J has been consolidated with Case No. A-
22 20-816761-C and related actions, including A-20-818069-P.

23 LCWD, Vidler and Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC and Republic Environmental Technologies,
24 Inc. stipulate and agree as follows:

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ¹ Tim Wilson, P.E. retired as the Nevada State Engineer effective November 30, 2020. Adam Sullivan, P.E. is the Acting Nevada State Engineer and has been automatically substituted pursuant to NRCP 25(d).

1 **Stipulation to Intervention.**

2 1. LCWD and Vidler shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-20-818069-P,
3 and Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc. shall be granted
4 the right to intervene in Case No. A-21-833572-J.

5 2. As an Intervenor in each respective case, LCWD, Vidler and Georgia-Pacific Gypsum
6 LLC and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc. may file an answering brief in each other's
7 respective case. Leave from the Court will be required, as set forth below, if LCWD, Vidler and/or
8 Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc. seek to file a reply
9 brief as an Intervenor or sur-reply brief in response to an Intervenor's reply brief.

10 **Briefing Schedule.**

11 3. Petitioners' opening briefs shall be due **August 27, 2021.**

12 4. The answering briefs of Petitioners/Intervenors shall be due 90 days after the date the
13 opening briefs are due, or **November 24, 2021.**

14 5. Petitioners' reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date answering briefs are due, or
15 **January 7, 2022.**

16 6. As Intervenors, LCWD, Vidler or Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC and Republic
17 Environmental Technologies, Inc., may only file reply briefs in each other's cases with leave from the
18 Court based on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in the other's
19 answering briefs. Said Intervenor reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date the answering briefs
20 are filed, or **January 7, 2022.**

21 7. Petitioners in each action may only file sur-reply briefs with leave from the Court based
22 on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in an Intervenor's reply brief
23 filed with leave of Court.

24 The parties agree this Stipulation and Order shall be filed in consolidated Case No. A-20-
25 818069-P and Case No. A-21-833572-J and the parties request the Court issue an order approving this
26 Stipulation as appropriate.

27 ///

28 ///

Affirmation: The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document and/or attachments do not contain the social security number of any person.

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

McDONALD CARANO LLP
100 W. Liberty St., Suite 1000
Reno, Nevada 89501

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Sylvia Harrison
SYLVIA HARRISON #4106
LUCAS FOLETTA #12154
SARAH FERGUSON #14515
Email: sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
Email: lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
Email: sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

*Attorneys for Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC
and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.*

///

///


///

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street, P.O. Box 646, Carson City, NV 89702
Telephone: (775) 687-0202 Fax: (775) 882-7918
E-Mail Address: law@allisonmackenzie.com

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing therefore,
IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021.
Dated this 24th day of June, 2021



DISTRICT JUDGE

19B 559 575A 299F
Bita Yeager
District Court Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

___✓___ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com

JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Lincoln County Water District,
Petitioner(s)

CASE NO: A-21-833572-J

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Tim Wilson, Respondent(s)

10
11 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

12 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
13 Court. The foregoing Stipulation and Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system
to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

14 Service Date: 6/24/2021

15 Wayne Klomp wklomp@swlaw.com

16 Lara Taylor ljttaylor@swlaw.com

17 Docket Docket docket_las@swlaw.com

18 Karen Peterson kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

19
20 If indicated below, a copy of the above mentioned filings were also served by mail
21 via United States Postal Service, postage prepaid, to the parties listed below at their last
22 known addresses on 6/25/2021


23 Christian Balducci Marquis Aurbach Coffing
24 Attn: Christian Balducci
25 10001 Park Run Drive
26 Las Vegas, NV, 89145
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

James Bolotin	Bureau of Litigation - Public Safety Division
	Adam Paul Laxalt
	100 N. Carson St.
	Carson City, NV, 89701
Steven King	1525 Rancho Rd
	Fernley, NV, 89408-0000

EXHIBIT 15D

EXHIBIT 15D



1 NTSO

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
12 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
17 AUTHORITY, et al.,

18 Petitioners,

19 vs.

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

21 Respondent.
22 _____/

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

Consolidated with Cases:
A-20-817765-P
A-20-818015-P
A-20-817977-P
A-20-818069-P
A-20-817840-P
A-20-817876-P
A-21-833572-J

23 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER**
24 **COMPANY, INC. AND CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**
25 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
26 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

27 **YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that the *Lincoln County*
28 *Water District, Vidler Water Company, Inc. and Center For Biological Diversity Stipulation and*

1 **Order Regarding Intervention and Briefing Schedule** was entered on the 24th day of June, 2021, a
2 copy of which is attached hereto.

3 DATED this 25th day of June, 2021.

4 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043

8 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
9 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
10 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

11 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
12 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
13 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
14 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
15 Reno, Nevada 89501
16 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

17 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

18 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
19 402 North Division Street
20 Carson City, Nevada 89703

21 /s/ Karen A. Peterson
22 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
23 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

24 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

___✓___ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com


JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 25th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **SAO**

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
3 Nevada State Bar No. 9020
4 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043
8 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
9 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

10 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
11 Nevada State Bar No. 0366
12 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
13 402 North Division Street
14 Carson City, Nevada 89703
15 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
16 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

17 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
18 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
19 COMPANY, INC.

20 **DISTRICT COURT**
21 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

22 LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, a
23 political subdivision of the State of Nevada,
24 and VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC., a
25 Nevada Corporation,

Case No. A-21-833572-J

Dept. No. 1

Petitioners,

vs.

ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting Nevada
State Engineer, DIVISION OF WATER
RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF
CONSERVATION AND NATURAL
RESOURCES,

**LINCOLN COUNTY WATER
DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC. AND CENTER
FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
STIPULATION AND ORDER
REGARDING INTERVENTION
AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

Respondent.

///

///

///

///

1 CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY,
2
3 vs.
4

Case No. A-20-817876-P
Dept. No. 1

5 TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State Engineer,
6 DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES,
7 DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
8 NATURAL RESOURCES,
9 Respondent.
10
11 _____/

12 On June 15, 2020, Tim Wilson, P.E., Nevada State Engineer¹, on behalf of the Division of
13 Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, issued Order 1309. Lincoln
14 County Water District (“LCWD”) and Vidler Water Company, Inc. (“Vidler”) timely filed their
15 Petition for Judicial Review pursuant to NRS 533.450 challenging State Engineer Order 1309 in the
16 Seventh Judicial District Court, In and For the County of Lincoln, State of Nevada, identified as Case
17 No. CV-0702520. LCWD and Vidler’s Petition for Judicial Review was transferred to the Clark
18 County District Court for adjudication in the above captioned matter, Case No. A-21-833572-J.

19 Pursuant to NRS 533.450, Order 1309 was also timely challenged by the Center for Biological
20 Diversity in a Petition for Judicial Review filed with the District Court of Clark County, Nevada, Case
21 No. A-20-817876-P.

22 LCWD and Vidler’s action, Case No. A-21-833572-J has been consolidated with Case No. A-
23 20-816761-C and related actions, including A-20-817876-P.

24 LCWD, Vidler and the Center for Biological Diversity stipulate and agree as follows:

25 **Stipulation to Intervention.**

26 1. LCWD and Vidler shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-20-817876-P,
27 and the Center for Biological Diversity shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-21-
28 833572-J.

¹ Tim Wilson, P.E. retired as the Nevada State Engineer effective November 30, 2020. Adam Sullivan, P.E. is the Acting Nevada State Engineer and has been automatically substituted pursuant to NRCP 25(d).

2. As an Intervenor in each respective case, LCWD, Vidler and the Center for Biological Diversity may file an answering brief in each other's respective case. Leave from the Court will be required, as set forth below, if LCWD, Vidler and/or the Center for Biological Diversity seek to file a reply brief as an Intervenor or sur-reply brief in response to an Intervenor's reply brief.

Briefing Schedule.

3. Petitioners' opening briefs shall be due **August 27, 2021**.

4. The answering briefs of Petitioners/Intervenors shall be due 90 days after the date the opening briefs are due, or **November 24, 2021**.

5. Petitioners' reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date answering briefs are due, or **January 7, 2022**.

6. As Intervenors, LCWD, Vidler or the Center for Biological Diversity, may only file reply briefs in each other's cases with leave from the Court based on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in the other's answering briefs. Said Intervenor reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date the answering briefs are filed, or **January 7, 2022**.

7. Petitioners in each action may only file sur-reply briefs with leave from the Court based on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in an Intervenor's reply brief filed with leave of Court.

The parties agree this Stipulation and Order shall be filed in consolidated Case No. A-20-817876-P and Case No. A-21-833572-J and the parties request the Court issue an order approving this Stipulation as appropriate.

Affirmation: The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document and/or attachments do not contain the social security number of any person.

///

///

///

///

///

///

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
P.O. Box 6205
Reno, Nevada 89513

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Scott R. Lake
SCOTT R. LAKE #15765
Email: slake@biologicaldiversity.org

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
LISA T. BELENKY (Pro Hac Vice to be submitted)
Center for Biological Diversity
1212 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, California 94612
Email: lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF (Pro Hac Vice to be submitted)
Center for Biological Diversity
3201 Zafarano Drive, Suite C, #149
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87507
Email: dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org


Attorneys for Center for Biological Diversity

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street, P.O. Box 646, Carson City, NV 89702
Telephone: (775) 687-0202 Fax: (775) 882-7918
E-Mail Address: law@allisonmackenzie.com

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing therefore,
IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021.
Dated this 24th day of June, 2021



DISTRICT JUDGE

**F28 54E AE9E CB7D
Bita Yeager
District Court Judge**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

___✓___ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com

JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Lincoln County Water District,
Petitioner(s)

CASE NO: A-21-833572-J

7
8 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

9 Tim Wilson, Respondent(s)

10
11 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

12 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
13 Court. The foregoing Stipulation and Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system
to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

14 Service Date: 6/24/2021

15 Wayne Klomp wklomp@swlaw.com

16 Lara Taylor ljttaylor@swlaw.com

17 Docket Docket docket_las@swlaw.com

18 Karen Peterson kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

19
20 If indicated below, a copy of the above mentioned filings were also served by mail
21 via United States Postal Service, postage prepaid, to the parties listed below at their last
22 known addresses on 6/25/2021


23 Christian Balducci Marquis Aurbach Coffing
24 Attn: Christian Balducci
25 10001 Park Run Drive
26 Las Vegas, NV, 89145
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

James Bolotin	Bureau of Litigation - Public Safety Division
	Adam Paul Laxalt
	100 N. Carson St.
	Carson City, NV, 89701
Steven King	1525 Rancho Rd
	Fernley, NV, 89408-0000

EXHIBIT 15E

EXHIBIT 15E



1 NTSO

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
12 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
17 and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
AUTHORITY, et al.,

18 Petitioners,

19 vs.

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

21 Respondent.
22 _____/

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

Consolidated with Cases:
A-20-817765-P
A-20-818015-P
A-20-817977-P
A-20-818069-P
A-20-817840-P
A-20-817876-P
A-21-833572-J

23 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER**
24 **COMPANY, INC. AND NEVADA COGENERATION ASSOCIATES NOS. 1 AND 2**
25 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
26 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

27 **YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the *Lincoln County***
28 ***Water District, Vidler Water Company, Inc. and Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2***

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street, P.O. Box 646, Carson City, NV 89702
Telephone: (775) 687-0202 Fax: (775) 882-7918
E-Mail Address: law@allisonmackenzie.com

1 ***Stipulation and Order Regarding Intervention and Briefing Schedule*** was entered on the 25th day of
2 June, 2021, a copy of which is attached hereto.

3 DATED this 29th day of June, 2021.

4 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043

8 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
9 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
10 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

11 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
12 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
13 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
14 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
15 Reno, Nevada 89501
16 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

17 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

18 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
19 402 North Division Street
20 Carson City, Nevada 89703

21 /s/ Karen A. Peterson
22 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
23 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

24 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

___✓___ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com


JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 29th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **SAO**

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
3 Nevada State Bar No. 9020
4 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043
8 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
9 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

10 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
11 Nevada State Bar No. 0366
12 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
13 402 North Division Street
14 Carson City, Nevada 89703
15 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
16 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

17 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
18 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
19 COMPANY, INC.

20 **DISTRICT COURT**
21 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

22 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
23 and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
24 AUTHORITY, et al.,

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

25 Petitioners,

Consolidated with Cases:

26 vs.

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

27 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
28 Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

Respondent.

A-21-833572-J

29 **LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC.**
30 **AND NEVADA COGENERATION ASSOCIATES NOS. 1 AND 2**
31 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
32 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

33 ///

34 ///

35 ///

On June 15, 2020, Tim Wilson, P.E., Nevada State Engineer¹, on behalf of the Division of Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, issued Order 1309. Petitioners, Lincoln County Water District (“LCWD”) and Vidler Water Company, Inc. (“Vidler”) timely filed their Petition for Judicial Review pursuant to NRS 533.450 challenging State Engineer Order 1309 in the Seventh Judicial District Court, In and For the County of Lincoln, State of Nevada, identified as Case No. CV-0702520. LCWD and Vidler’s Petition for Judicial Review was transferred to the Clark County District Court for adjudication in the above captioned matter, Case No. A-21-833572-J.

Pursuant to NRS 533.450, Order 1309 was also timely challenged by Petitioner, Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2 in a Petition for Judicial Review filed with the District Court of Clark County, Nevada, Case No. A-20-818015-P.

LCWD and Vidler’s action, Case No. A-21-833572-J has been consolidated with Case No. A-20-816761-C and related actions, including A-20-818015-P.

LCWD, Vidler and Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2 stipulate and agree as follows:

Stipulation to Intervention.

1. LCWD and Vidler shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-20-818015-P, and Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2 shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-21-833572-J.

2. As an Intervenor in each respective case, LCWD, Vidler and Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2 may file an answering brief in each other’s respective case. Leave from the Court will be required, as set forth below, if LCWD, Vidler and/or Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2 seek to file a reply brief as an Intervenor or sur-reply brief in response to an Intervenor’s reply brief.

Briefing Schedule.

3. Petitioners’ opening briefs shall be due 90 days from the May 27, 2021 status conference, or **August 27, 2021**.

¹ Tim Wilson, P.E. retired as the Nevada State Engineer effective November 30, 2020. Adam Sullivan, P.E. is the Acting Nevada State Engineer and has been automatically substituted pursuant to NRCP 25(d).

1 4. The answering briefs of Petitioners/Intervenors shall be due 90 days after the date the
2 opening briefs are due, or **November 24, 2021**.

3 5. Petitioners' reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date answering briefs are due,
4 or **January 7, 2022**.

5 6. As Intervenors, LCWD, Vidler or Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2, may
6 only file reply briefs in each other's cases with leave from the Court based on a showing that their
7 unique interests are impacted by arguments made in the other's answering briefs. Said Intervenor
8 reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date the answering briefs are filed, or **January 7, 2022**.

9 7. Petitioners in each action may only file sur-reply briefs with leave from the Court
10 based on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in an Intervenor's
11 reply brief filed with leave of Court.

12 The parties agree this Stipulation and Order shall be filed in consolidated Case No. A-20-
13 818015-P and Case No. A-21-833572-J and the parties request the Court issue an order approving
14 this Stipulation as appropriate.

15 **Affirmation:** The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document and/or
16 attachments do not contain the social security number of any person.

17 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
18 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
19 P.O. Box 60
20 Pioche, Nevada 89043

21 Dated this 25th day of June, 2021.

22 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
23 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
24 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

25 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
26 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
27 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
28 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
 Reno, Nevada 89501
 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

 Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

///

///

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

Dated this 25th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

KAEMPFER CROWELL
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700
Reno, Nevada 89501

Dated this 25th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Alex J. Flangas
ALEX J. FLANGAS #664
Email: aflangas@kcnvlaw.com


*Attorneys for Nevada Cogeneration Associates
Nos. 1 and 2*

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021.
Dated this 25th day of June, 2021



DISTRICT JUDGE

**5D8 E58 FB67 B046
Bitia Yeager
District Court Judge**

Respectfully submitted by:

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

/s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

///

///

///

1 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**

2 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
3 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
4 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
5 Reno, Nevada 89501
6 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

7 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

8 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
9 402 North Division Street
10 Carson City, Nevada 89703

11 /s/ Karen A. Peterson

12 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
13 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

14 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

15 4814-7820-6448, v. 1

Nancy Fontenot

Subject: FW: Stipulation to Intervene - RE: Order 1309

From: Alex Flangas <AFlangas@kcnvlaw.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2021 10:14 AM
To: Karen Peterson <kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com>
Cc: Sharon Stice <SStice@kcnvlaw.com>
Subject: Stipulation to Intervene - RE: Order 1309

Karen:

I modified the Stipulation to correct the dates pursuant to the Court's minutes. Otherwise, it is unchanged and is acceptable and may be filed. Since it was set up for Nancy to serve it, I did not file it. You have my authority to include my e-signature and file ASAP. Thanks.

AJF

Alex J. Flangas

Kaempfer Crowell
50 W. Liberty St., Suite 700
Reno, NV 89501
Direct: 775-393-1783
Mobile: 775-219-9163

This e-mail communication is a confidential attorney-client communication intended only for the person named above. If you are not the person named above, or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of the following information, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (702) 792-7000. Also, please e-mail the sender that you have received the communication in error.

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Southern Nevada Water
Authority, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-816761-C

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Nevada State Engineer, Division
of Water Resources,
10 Defendant(s)

11
12 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
14 Court. The foregoing Stipulation and Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system
15 to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

16 Service Date: 6/25/2021

17 Merrilyn Marsh	mmarsh@kcnvlaw.com
18 Sev Carlson	scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
19 Dorene Wright	dwright@ag.nv.gov
20 James Bolotin	jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
21 Mike Knox	mknox@nvenergy.com
22 Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
23 Kathleen Wilde	kwilde@maclaw.com
24 Laena St-Jules	lstjules@ag.nv.gov
25 Justina Caviglia	jcaviglia@nvenergy.com
26 Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com


27
28

1	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
2	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
3	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
4	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
5	Derek Muaina	DerekM@WesternElite.com
6	Andy Moore	moorea@cityofnorthvegas.com
7	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
8	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
9	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
10	Karen Easton	keaston@ag.nv.gov
11	Therese Ure	counsel@water-law.com
12	Sharon Stice	sstice@kcnvlaw.com
13	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
14	Gregory Morrison	gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
15	Paul Taggart	paul@legaltnt.com
16	Lisa Belenky	lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
17	Julie Cavanaugh-Bill	julie@cblawoffices.org
18	Douglas Wolf	dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
19	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
22	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
23	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
24	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
25	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
26	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
27	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
28		

1	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
4	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@wingfieldnevadagroup.com
5	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
6	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
7	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
8	Andrew Moore	moorea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com
9	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
10	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
11	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
12	Steve King	kingmont@charter.net
13	Tammey Carpitcher	tcarpitcher@kcnvlaw.com
14	Karen Peterson	kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com
15	Wayne Klomp	wklomp@swlaw.com
16	Dylan Frehner	dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov
17	Scott Lake	slake@biologicaldiversity.org
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EXHIBIT 15F

EXHIBIT 15F



1 NTSO

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
12 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
17 and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
AUTHORITY, et al.,

18 Petitioners,

19 vs.

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

21 Respondent.
22 _____/

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

Consolidated with Cases:
A-20-817765-P
A-20-818015-P
A-20-817977-P
A-20-818069-P
A-20-817840-P
A-20-817876-P
A-21-833572-J

23 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER**
24 **COMPANY, INC. AND MOAPA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT**
25 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
26 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

27 **YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that the *Lincoln County*
28 *Water District, Vidler Water Company, Inc. and Moapa Valley Water District Stipulation and Order*

1 **Regarding Intervention and Briefing Schedule** was entered on the 25th day of June, 2021, a copy of
2 which is attached hereto.

3 DATED this 29th day of June, 2021.

4 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043

8 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
9 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
10 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

11 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
12 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
13 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
14 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
15 Reno, Nevada 89501
16 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

17 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

18 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
19 402 North Division Street
20 Carson City, Nevada 89703

21 /s/ Karen A. Peterson
22 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
23 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

24 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

___✓___ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com


JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 29th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **SAO**

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
12 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
17 and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
18 AUTHORITY, et al.,

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

19 Petitioners,

Consolidated with Cases:

20 vs.

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

A-21-833572-J

21 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

22 Respondent.

23 _____/
24 **LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC.**
25 **AND MOAPA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT**
26 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE

27 ///

28 ///

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street, P.O. Box 646, Carson City, NV 89702
Telephone: (775) 687-0202 Fax: (775) 882-7918
E-Mail Address: law@allisonmackenzie.com

On June 15, 2020, Tim Wilson, P.E., Nevada State Engineer¹, on behalf of the Division of Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, issued Order 1309. Petitioners, Lincoln County Water District (“LCWD”) and Vidler Water Company, Inc. (“Vidler”) (collectively “Petitioners”), timely filed their Petition for Judicial Review pursuant to NRS 533.450 challenging State Engineer Order 1309 in the Seventh Judicial District Court, In and For the County of Lincoln, State of Nevada, identified as Case No. CV-0702520. LCWD and Vidler’s Petition for Judicial Review was transferred to the Clark County District Court for adjudication in the above captioned matter, Case No. A-21-833572-J.

Moapa Valley Water District filed a motion to intervene in LCWD and Vidler’s action in the Seventh Judicial District Court, and is now pending in Case No. A-21-833572-J.

LCWD, Vidler and Moapa Valley Water District desire to resolve Moapa Valley Water District’s motion to intervene upon the following terms and stipulate and agree as follows:

Stipulation to Intervention.

1. Moapa Valley Water District shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-21-833572-J.

2. As an Intervenor in LCWD/Vidler’s case, Moapa Valley Water District may file an answering brief in LCWD/Vidler’s case. Leave from the Court will be required, as set forth below, if LCWD, Vidler and/or Moapa Valley Water District seek to file a reply brief as an Intervenor or sur-reply brief in response to an Intervenor’s reply brief.

Briefing Schedule.

3. Petitioners’ opening briefs shall be due **August 27, 2021.**

4. The answering briefs of Petitioners/Intervenors shall be due 90 days after the date the opening briefs are due, or **November 24, 2021.**

5. Petitioners’ reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date answering briefs are due, or **January 7, 2022.**

¹ Tim Wilson, P.E. retired as the Nevada State Engineer effective November 30, 2020. Adam Sullivan, P.E. is the Acting Nevada State Engineer and has been automatically substituted pursuant to NRCP 25(d).

6. As an Intervenor, Moapa Valley Water District may only file a reply brief in LCWD/Vidler's case with leave from the Court based on a showing that its unique interests are impacted by arguments made in another's answering brief. Said Intervenor reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date the answering briefs are filed, or **January 7, 2022**.

7. Petitioners may only file a sur-reply brief with leave from the Court based on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in an Intervenor's reply brief filed with leave of Court.

The parties agree this Stipulation and Order shall be filed in consolidated Case No. A-20-816761-C and Case No. A-21-833572-J and the parties request the Court issue an order approving this Stipulation as appropriate.

Affirmation: The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document and/or attachments do not contain the social security number of any person.

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

Dated this 25th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

Dated this 25th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

///

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750
Reno, Nevada 89501

Dated this 25th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Gregory H. Morrison
GREGORY H. MORRISON #12454
Email: GMorrison@parsonsbehle.com


Attorneys for Moapa Valley Water District

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____ day of _____ ~~Dated this 25th day of June, 2021~~



DISTRICT JUDGE

Respectfully submitted by:

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

389 AF9 1220 CB94
Brita Yeager
District Court Judge

/s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

4822-5172-7856, v. 1

Nancy Fontenot

Subject: FW: Order 1309

From: Greg Morrison <GMorrison@parsonsbehle.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 5:20 PM
To: Karen Peterson <kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com>
Cc: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov; wklomp@swlaw.com
Subject: RE: Order 1309

Karen,

Apologies for the delayed response. This stipulation looks fine. I can authorize you to e-sign, or I can sign and scan back to you. Which do you prefer?



A Professional
Law Corporation

Greg Morrison • Attorney at Law
Parsons Behle & Latimer
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750 • Reno, Nevada 89501
Main +1 775.323.1601 • Direct +1 775.789.6547 • Fax +1 775.789.7250

parsonsbehle.com • GMorrison@parsonsbehle.com • [vCard](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic mail message and any attachment(s) are confidential and may also contain privileged attorney-client information or work product. The message is intended only for the use of the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, or the person responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you may not use, distribute, or copy this communication. If you have received the message in error, please immediately notify us by reply electronic mail or by telephone at 801.532.1234, and

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Southern Nevada Water
Authority, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-816761-C

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Nevada State Engineer, Division
of Water Resources,
10 Defendant(s)

11
12 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
14 Court. The foregoing Stipulation and Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system
15 to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

16 Service Date: 6/25/2021

17 Merrilyn Marsh	mmarsh@kcnvlaw.com
18 Sev Carlson	scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
19 Dorene Wright	dwright@ag.nv.gov
20 James Bolotin	jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
21 Mike Knox	mknox@nvenergy.com
22 Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
23 Kathleen Wilde	kwilde@maclaw.com
24 Laena St-Jules	lstjules@ag.nv.gov
25 Justina Caviglia	jcaviglia@nvenergy.com
26 Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com


27
28

1	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
2	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
3	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
4	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
5	Derek Muaina	DerekM@WesternElite.com
6	Andy Moore	moorea@cityofnorthvegas.com
7	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
8	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
9	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
10	Karen Easton	keaston@ag.nv.gov
11	Therese Ure	counsel@water-law.com
12	Sharon Stice	sstice@kcnvlaw.com
13	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
14	Gregory Morrison	gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
15	Paul Taggart	paul@legaltnt.com
16	Lisa Belenky	lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
17	Julie Cavanaugh-Bill	julie@cblawoffices.org
18	Douglas Wolf	dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
19	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
22	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
23	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
24	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
25	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
26	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
27	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
28		

1	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
4	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@wingfieldnevadagroup.com
5	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
6	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
7	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
8	Andrew Moore	moorea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com
9	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
10	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
11	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
12	Steve King	kingmont@charter.net
13	Tammey Carpitcher	tcarpitcher@kcnvlaw.com
14	Karen Peterson	kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com
15	Wayne Klomp	wklomp@swlaw.com
16	Dylan Frehner	dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov
17	Scott Lake	slake@biologicaldiversity.org
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EXHIBIT 15G

EXHIBIT 15G



1 NTSO

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
12 COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
17 AUTHORITY, et al.,

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

18 Petitioners,

Consolidated with Cases:

19 vs.

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

21 Respondent.

A-21-833572-J

22 _____/
23 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER**
24 **COMPANY, INC., STATE ENGINEER AND APEX HOLDING COMPANY, LLC**
25 **AND DRY LAKE WATER, LLC**
26 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
27 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

28 **YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the *Lincoln County***
Water District, Vidler Water Company, Inc., State Engineer and Apex Holding Company, LLC and

1 ***Dry Lake Water, LLC Stipulation and Order Regarding Intervention and Briefing Schedule*** was
2 entered on the 1st day of July, 2021, a copy of which is attached hereto.

3 DATED this 1st day of July, 2021.

4 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043

8 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
9 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
10 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

11 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
12 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
13 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
14 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
15 Reno, Nevada 89501
16 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

17 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

18 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
19 402 North Division Street
20 Carson City, Nevada 89703

21 /s/ Karen A. Peterson
22 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
23 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

24 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

___✓___ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com


JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 1st day of July, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **SAO**

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
12 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
17 AUTHORITY, et al.,

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

18 Petitioners,

Consolidated with Cases:

19 vs.

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

21 Respondent.

A-21-833572-J

22 _____/
23 **LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC.,**
24 **STATE ENGINEER AND APEX HOLDING COMPANY, LLC AND**
25 **DRY LAKE WATER, LLC**
26 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
27 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

28 ///

///

///

On June 15, 2020, Tim Wilson, P.E., Nevada State Engineer¹, on behalf of the Division of Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, issued Order 1309. Petitioners, Lincoln County Water District (“LCWD”) and Vidler Water Company, Inc. (“Vidler”) timely filed their Petition for Judicial Review pursuant to NRS 533.450 challenging State Engineer Order 1309 in the Seventh Judicial District Court, In and For the County of Lincoln, State of Nevada, identified as Case No. CV-0702520. Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC filed a Notice of Intent to Participate in Case No. CV-0702520. LCWD and Vidler’s Petition for Judicial Review was transferred to the Clark County District Court for adjudication in the above captioned matter, Case No. A-21-833572-J.

Pursuant to NRS 533.450, Order 1309 was also timely challenged by Petitioners, Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC in a Petition for Judicial Review filed with the District Court of Clark County, Nevada, Case No. A-20-817840-P.

LCWD and Vidler’s action, Case No. A-21-833572-J has been consolidated with Case No. A-20-816761-C and related actions, including A-20-817840-P.

Adam Sullivan, P.E., Acting Nevada State Engineer (“State Engineer”) is a Respondent in Case No. A-21-833572-J and Case No. A-20-817840-P.

LCWD, Vidler, Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC and State Engineer stipulate and agree as follows:

Stipulation to Intervention.

1. LCWD and Vidler shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-20-817840-P, and Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-21-833572-J.

2. As an Intervenor in each respective case, LCWD, Vidler and Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC may file an answering brief in each other’s respective case. Leave from the Court will be required, as set forth below, if LCWD, Vidler and/or Apex Holding Company,

¹ Tim Wilson, P.E. retired as the Nevada State Engineer effective November 30, 2020. Adam Sullivan, P.E. is the Acting Nevada State Engineer and has been automatically substituted pursuant to NRCP 25(d).

1 LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC seek to file a reply brief as an Intervenor or sur-reply brief in response
2 to an Intervenor's reply brief.

3 **Briefing Schedule.**

4 3. Petitioners' opening briefs shall be due **August 27, 2021.**

5 4. The answering briefs of Petitioners/Intervenors and Respondent shall be due 90 days
6 after the date the opening briefs are due, or **November 24, 2021.**

7 5. Petitioners' reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date answering briefs are due, or
8 **January 7, 2022.**

9 6. As Intervenors, LCWD, Vidler or Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water,
10 LLC, may only file reply briefs in each other's cases with leave from the Court based on a showing
11 that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in the other's answering briefs. Said
12 Intervenor reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date the answering briefs are filed, or **January**
13 **7, 2022.**

14 7. Petitioners in each action may only file sur-reply briefs with leave from the Court based
15 on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in an Intervenor's reply brief
16 filed with leave of Court.

17 The parties agree this Stipulation and Order shall be filed in consolidated Case No. A-20-
18 817840-P and Case No. A-21-833572-J and the parties request the Court issue an order approving this
19 Stipulation as appropriate.

20 **Affirmation:** The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document and/or
21 attachments do not contain the social security number of any person.

22 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
23 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
24 P.O. Box 60
25 Pioche, Nevada 89043

26 Dated this 1st day of July, 2021.

27 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
28 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

///

///

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

Dated this 1st day of July, 2021.

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Dated this 1st day of July, 2021.

/s/ James N. Bolotin
JAMES N. BOLOTIN #13829
LAENA ST-JULES # 15156
Email: jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
Email: lstjules@ag.nv.gov

Attorneys for State Engineer

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING
10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 98145

Dated this 1st day of July, 2021.

/s/ Christian T. Balducci
CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI #12688
Email: cbalducci@maclaw.com

*Attorneys for Apex Holding Company, LLC
and Dry Lake Water, LLC*

///

///

///


///

///

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing therefore,
IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021
Dated this 1st day of July, 2021



DISTRICT JUDGE

CCA E41 4C29 DEFA
Bita Yeager
District Court Judge

Respectfully submitted by:

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

/s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

Nancy Fontenot

Subject: FW: [External] LCWD.Vidler / Draft Stipulation with Apex Holding Company & Dry Lake Water

From: "Christian T. Balducci" <ctb@maclaw.com>

Date: July 1, 2021 at 7:24:53 AM PDT

To: "James N. Bolotin" <jbolotin@ag.nv.gov>, Karen Peterson <kpeterston@allisonmackenzie.com>, "Christian T. Balducci" <ctb@maclaw.com>

Cc: "Dorene A. Wright" <DWright@ag.nv.gov>

Subject: Re: [External] LCWD.Vidler / Draft Stipulation with Apex Holding Company & Dry Lake Water

I approve

-ctb

Sent from [Outlook](#) on MyPhone

From: James N. Bolotin <JBolotin@ag.nv.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 2:20:55 PM

To: Karen Peterson <kpeterston@allisonmackenzie.com>; Christian T. Balducci <ctb@maclaw.com>

Cc: Dorene A. Wright <DWright@ag.nv.gov>

Subject: RE: [External] LCWD.Vidler / Draft Stipulation with Apex Holding Company & Dry Lake Water

Karen and Christian,

The State Engineer approves of this stipulation and you may sign on my behalf.

Best,
James

James Bolotin, Esq.
Senior Deputy Attorney General
State of Nevada
Bureau of Government Affairs
Government and Natural Resources Division
(775) 684-1231

**** CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE****

The preceding e-mail message (including attachments) contains information that may be confidential, be protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges, or constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Southern Nevada Water
Authority, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-816761-C

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Nevada State Engineer, Division
of Water Resources,
10 Defendant(s)

11
12 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
14 Court. The foregoing Stipulation and Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system
15 to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

16 Service Date: 7/1/2021

17 Merrilyn Marsh	mmarsh@kcnvlaw.com
18 Sev Carlson	scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
19 Dorene Wright	dwright@ag.nv.gov
20 James Bolotin	jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
21 Mike Knox	mknox@nvenergy.com
22 Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
23 Kathleen Wilde	kwilde@maclaw.com
24 Laena St-Jules	lstjules@ag.nv.gov
25 Karen Easton	keaston@ag.nv.gov
26 Justina Caviglia	jcaviglia@nvenergy.com


27
28

1	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
6	Therese Ure	counsel@water-law.com
7	Sharon Stice	sstice@kcnvlaw.com
8	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
9	Gregory Morrison	gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
10	Paul Taggart	paul@legaltnt.com
11	Derek Muaina	DerekM@WesternElite.com
12	Andy Moore	moorea@cityofnorthvegas.com
13	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
14	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
15	Lisa Belenky	lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
16	Julie Cavanaugh-Bill	julie@cblawoffices.org
17	Douglas Wolf	dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
18	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
19	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
22	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
23	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@wingfieldnevadagroup.com
6	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
7	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
8	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
9	Andrew Moore	moorea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com
10	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
11	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
12	Steve King	kingmont@charter.net
13	Tammey Carpitcher	tcarpitcher@kcnvlaw.com
14	Karen Peterson	kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com
15	Wayne Klomp	wklomp@swlaw.com
16	Dylan Frehner	dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov
17	Scott Lake	slake@biologicaldiversity.org
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EXHIBIT 15H

EXHIBIT 15H



1 NTSO

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
12 COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
17 AUTHORITY, et al.,

18 Petitioners,

19 vs.

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

21 Respondent.
22 _____/

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

Consolidated with Cases:
A-20-817765-P
A-20-818015-P
A-20-817977-P
A-20-818069-P
A-20-817840-P
A-20-817876-P
A-21-833572-J

23 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER**
24 **COMPANY, INC., STATE ENGINEER AND COYOTE SPRINGS INVESTMENT LLC**
25 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
26 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

27 **YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that the *Lincoln County*
28 *Water District, Vidler Water Company, Inc., State Engineer and Coyote Springs Investment LLC*

1 ***Stipulation and Order Regarding Intervention and Briefing Schedule*** was entered on the 1st day of
2 July, 2021, a copy of which is attached hereto.

3 DATED this 1st day of July, 2021.

4 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043

8 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
9 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
10 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

11 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
12 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
13 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
14 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
15 Reno, Nevada 89501
16 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

17 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

18 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
19 402 North Division Street
20 Carson City, Nevada 89703

21 /s/ Karen A. Peterson
22 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
23 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

24 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

___✓___ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com


JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 1st day of July, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **SAO**

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
3 Nevada State Bar No. 9020
4 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043
8 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
9 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

10 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
11 Nevada State Bar No. 0366
12 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
13 402 North Division Street
14 Carson City, Nevada 89703
15 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
16 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

17 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
18 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
19 COMPANY, INC.

20 **DISTRICT COURT**
21 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

22 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
23 and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
24 AUTHORITY, et al.,

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

25 Petitioners,

Consolidated with Cases:

26 vs.

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

27 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
28 Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

Respondent.

A-21-833572-J

29 **LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC.,**
30 **STATE ENGINEER AND COYOTE SPRINGS INVESTMENT LLC**
31 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
32 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

33 ///

34 ///

On June 15, 2020, Tim Wilson, P.E., Nevada State Engineer¹, on behalf of the Division of Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, issued Order 1309. Petitioners, Lincoln County Water District (“LCWD”) and Vidler Water Company, Inc. (“Vidler”) timely filed their Petition for Judicial Review pursuant to NRS 533.450 challenging State Engineer Order 1309 in the Seventh Judicial District Court, In and For the County of Lincoln, State of Nevada, identified as Case No. CV-0702520. LCWD and Vidler’s Petition for Judicial Review was transferred to the Clark County District Court for adjudication in the above captioned matter, Case No. A-21-833572-J.

Pursuant to NRS 533.450, Order 1309 was also timely challenged by Petitioner, Coyote Springs Investment LLC (“CSI”) in a Petition for Judicial Review filed with the District Court of Clark County, Nevada, Case No. A-20-817765-P.

Adam Sullivan, P.E., Acting Nevada State Engineer (“State Engineer”) is a Respondent in Case No. A-21-833572-J and Case No. A-20-817765-P.

LCWD and Vidler’s action, Case No. A-21-833572-J has been consolidated with Case No. A-20-816761-C and related actions, including A-20-817765-P.

LCWD, Vidler, CSI and State Engineer stipulate and agree as follows:

Stipulation to Intervention.

1. LCWD and Vidler shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-20-817765-P, and CSI shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-21-833572-J.

2. As an Intervenor in each respective case, LCWD, Vidler and CSI may file an answering brief in each other’s respective case. Leave from the Court will be required, as set forth below, if LCWD, Vidler and/or CSI seek to file a reply brief as an Intervenor or sur-reply brief in response to an Intervenor’s reply brief.

Briefing Schedule.

3. Petitioners’ opening briefs shall be due **August 27, 2021.**

4. The answering briefs of Petitioners/Intervenors and Respondent shall be due 90 days after the date the opening briefs are due, or **November 24, 2021.**

¹ Tim Wilson, P.E. retired as the Nevada State Engineer effective November 30, 2020. Adam Sullivan, P.E. is the Acting Nevada State Engineer and has been automatically substituted pursuant to NRCP 25(d).

1 5. Petitioners' reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date answering briefs are due, or
2 **January 7, 2022.**

3 6. As Intervenor, LCWD, Vidler or CSI, may only file reply briefs in each other's cases
4 with leave from the Court based on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments
5 made in the other's answering briefs. Said Intervenor reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date
6 the answering briefs are filed, or **January 7, 2022.**

7 7. Petitioners in each action may only file sur-reply briefs with leave from the Court based
8 on a showing that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in an Intervenor's reply brief
9 filed with leave of Court.

10 The parties agree this Stipulation and Order shall be filed in consolidated Case No. A-20-
11 818069-P and Case No. A-21-833572-J and the parties request the Court issue an order approving this
12 Stipulation as appropriate.

13 **Affirmation:** The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document and/or
14 attachments do not contain the social security number of any person.

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

15 Dated this 30th day of June, 2021.

16 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
17 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
18 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

19 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
20 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
21 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
22 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
23 Reno, Nevada 89501
24 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

Dated this 30th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Dated this 30th day of June, 2021.

/s/ James N. Bolotin
JAMES N. BOLOTIN #13829
LAENA ST-JULES # 15156
Email: jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
Email: lstjules@ag.nv.gov

Attorneys for State Engineer

ROBISON, SHARP, SULLIVAN & BRUST
71 Washington Street
Reno, Nevada 89593

Dated this 30th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Kent R. Robison
KENT R. ROBISON #1167
THERESE M. SHANKS #12890
Email: krobison@rssblaw.com
Email: tshanks@rssblaw.com

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
BRADLEY J. HERREMA #10368
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Email: bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD #3927
COULTHARD LAW
840 South Ranch Drive, #4-627
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Email: wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL #6493
3100 State Route 168
P.O. Box 37010
Coyote Springs, Nevada 89037
Email: emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment LLC

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing therefore,
IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____ day of _____ ~~Dated this 1st day of July, 2021~~

Bita Yeager

DISTRICT JUDGE

Respectfully submitted by:

5FA A11 E310 34ED
Bita Yeager
District Court Judge

LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043

/s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

4843-0793-4448, v. 1

Nancy Fontenot

Subject: FW: LCWD.Vidler / Draft Stipulation with Coyote Springs Investment LLC

From: James N. Bolotin <JBolotin@ag.nv.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 2:17 PM

To: Karen Peterson <kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com>; Kent Robison <KRobison@rssblaw.com>

Cc: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov; Klomp, Wayne <wklomp@swlaw.com>; Dorene A. Wright <DWright@ag.nv.gov>

Subject: RE: LCWD.Vidler / Draft Stipulation with Coyote Springs Investment LLC

Karen and Kent,

The State Engineer approves of this stipulation and you may sign on my behalf.

Best,
James

James Bolotin, Esq.
Senior Deputy Attorney General
State of Nevada
Bureau of Government Affairs
Government and Natural Resources Division
(775) 684-1231

**** CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE****

The preceding e-mail message (including attachments) contains information that may be confidential, be protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges, or constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

Nancy Fontenot

Subject: FW: LCWD.Vidler / Draft Stipulation with Coyote Springs Investment LLC

From: Jayne Ferretto <jferretto@rssblaw.com> **On Behalf Of** Kent Robison

Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 5:58 PM

To: Karen Peterson <kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com>; Kent Robison <krobison@rssblaw.com>; James N. Bolotin <JBolotin@ag.nv.gov>

Cc: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov; Klomp, Wayne <wklomp@swlaw.com>

Subject: RE: LCWD.Vidler / Draft Stipulation with Coyote Springs Investment LLC

Hello Ms. Peterson:

You have Mr. Robison's permission to e-sign on his behalf.

Thank you. Have a nice evening!

Jayne Ferretto
Legal Assistant to Kent Robison



Robison | Sharp | Sullivan | Brust

71 Washington Street
Reno, NV 89503
Phone - 775.329.3151
Fax - 775.329.7169
www.rssblaw.com

CONFIDENTIALITY: This email (including attachments) is intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, copy, or re-transmit this communication. If you are the intended recipient, this communication may only be copied or transmitted with the consent of the sender. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately by return email and delete the original message and any attachments from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 DISCLAIMER: Any tax advice contained in this email is not intended to be used, and cannot be used by any taxpayer, for the purpose of avoiding Federal tax penalties that may be imposed on the taxpayer. Further, to the extent any tax advice contained in this email may have been written to support the promotion or marketing of the transactions or matters discussed in this email, every taxpayer should seek advice based on such taxpayer's particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Southern Nevada Water
Authority, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-816761-C

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Nevada State Engineer, Division
of Water Resources,
10 Defendant(s)

11
12 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
14 Court. The foregoing Stipulation and Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system
15 to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

16 Service Date: 7/1/2021

17 Merrilyn Marsh	mmarsh@kcnvlaw.com
18 Sev Carlson	scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
19 Dorene Wright	dwright@ag.nv.gov
20 James Bolotin	jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
21 Mike Knox	mknox@nvenergy.com
22 Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
23 Kathleen Wilde	kwilde@maclaw.com
24 Laena St-Jules	lstjules@ag.nv.gov
25 Karen Easton	keaston@ag.nv.gov
26 Justina Caviglia	jcaviglia@nvenergy.com


27
28

1	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
6	Therese Ure	counsel@water-law.com
7	Sharon Stice	sstice@kcnvlaw.com
8	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
9	Gregory Morrison	gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
10	Paul Taggart	paul@legaltnt.com
11	Derek Muaina	DerekM@WesternElite.com
12	Andy Moore	moorea@cityofnorthvegas.com
13	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
14	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
15	Lisa Belenky	lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
16	Julie Cavanaugh-Bill	julie@cblawoffices.org
17	Douglas Wolf	dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
18	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
19	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
22	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
23	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@wingfieldnevadagroup.com
6	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
7	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
8	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
9	Andrew Moore	moorea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com
10	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
11	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
12	Steve King	kingmont@charter.net
13	Tammey Carpitcher	tcarpitcher@kcnvlaw.com
14	Karen Peterson	kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com
15	Wayne Klomp	wklomp@swlaw.com
16	Dylan Frehner	dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov
17	Scott Lake	slake@biologicaldiversity.org
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EXHIBIT 15I

EXHIBIT 15I



1 NTSO

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
3 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
5 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

6 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 0366
7 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
402 North Division Street
8 Carson City, Nevada 89703
9 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

10
11 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
12 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

13 **DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15
16 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
17 and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
AUTHORITY, et al.,

18 Petitioners,

19 vs.

20 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

21 Respondent.
22 _____/

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

Consolidated with Cases:
A-20-817765-P
A-20-818015-P
A-20-817977-P
A-20-818069-P
A-20-817840-P
A-20-817876-P
A-21-833572-J

23 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER**
24 **COMPANY, INC., STATE ENGINEER AND NEVADA POWER COMPANY**
25 **dba NV ENERGY STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
26 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

27 **YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that the *Lincoln County*
28 *Water District, Vidler Water Company, Inc., State Engineer and Nevada Power Company dba NV*

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street, P.O. Box 646, Carson City, NV 89702
Telephone: (775) 687-0202 Fax: (775) 882-7918
E-Mail Address: law@allisonmackenzie.com

1 **Energy Stipulation and Order Regarding Intervention and Briefing Schedule** was entered on the 1st
2 day of July, 2021, a copy of which is attached hereto.

3 DATED this 1st day of July, 2021.

4 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043

8 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
9 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
10 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

11 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
12 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
13 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
14 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
15 Reno, Nevada 89501
16 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

17 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

18 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
19 402 North Division Street
20 Carson City, Nevada 89703

21 /s/ Karen A. Peterson
22 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
23 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

24 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., and that I served, or caused to be served, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by:

_____ placing a true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to:

__✓__ emailing an attached PDF version of the document to the email addresses below and/or E-Filing pursuant to Section IV of the District of Nevada Electronic Filing Procedures:

KENT R. ROBISON
THERESE M. SHANKS
krobison@rssblaw.com
tshanks@rssblaw.com

BRADLEY J. HERREMA
bherrema@bhfs.com

WILLIAM L. COULTHARD
wlc@coulthardlaw.com

EMILIA K. CARGILL
emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com

JAMES N. BOLOTIN
LAENA ST-JULES
jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
lstjules@ag.nv.gov

PAUL G. TAGGART
TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com

STEVEN C. ANDERSON
sc.anderson@llvwd.com

CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI
cbalducci@maclaw.com

SCOTT R. LAKE
slake@biologicaldiversity.org

LISA T. BELENKY
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

DOUG WOLF
dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org

ALEX J. FLANGAS
aflangas@kcnvlaw.com

ROBERT A. DOTSON
JUSTIN C. VANCE
rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

STEVEN D. KING
kingmont@charter.net

SYLVIA HARRISON
LUCAS FOLETTA
SARAH FERGUSON
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
SIHOMARA L. GRAVES
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
sgraves@kcnvlaw.com


JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA
MICHAEL D. KNOX
justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
mknnox@nvenergy.com

THERESE A. URE STIX
LAURA A. SCHROEDER
t.ure@water-law.com
schroeder@water-law.com

GREGORY H. MORRISON
gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com

Dated this 1st day of July, 2021.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **SAO**

2 DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
3 Nevada State Bar No. 9020
4 **LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
5 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
6 P.O. Box 60
7 Pioche, Nevada 89043
8 Telephone: (775) 962-8073
9 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

10 KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
11 Nevada State Bar No. 0366
12 **ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.**
13 402 North Division Street
14 Carson City, Nevada 89703
15 Telephone: (775) 687-0202
16 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

17 Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
18 WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
19 COMPANY, INC.

20 **DISTRICT COURT**
21 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

22 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
23 and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
24 AUTHORITY, et al.,

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

25 Petitioners,

Consolidated with Cases:

26 vs.

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

27 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
28 Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

Respondent.

A-21-833572-J

29 **LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC.,**
30 **STATE ENGINEER AND NEVADA POWER COMPANY dba NV ENERGY**
31 **STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING INTERVENTION**
32 **AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

33 ///

34 ///

35 ///

On June 15, 2020, Tim Wilson, P.E., Nevada State Engineer¹, on behalf of the Division of Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, issued Order 1309. Petitioners, Lincoln County Water District (“LCWD”) and Vidler Water Company, Inc. (“Vidler”) (collectively “Petitioners”), timely filed their Petition for Judicial Review pursuant to NRS 533.450 challenging State Engineer Order 1309 in the Seventh Judicial District Court, In and For the County of Lincoln, State of Nevada, identified as Case No. CV-0702520. LCWD and Vidler’s Petition for Judicial Review was transferred to the Clark County District Court for adjudication in the above captioned matter, Case No. A-21-833572-J.

Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy (“NV Energy”) filed a Notice of Intent to Participate in LCWD and Vidler’s action in the Seventh Judicial District Court, which is now pending in Case No. A-21-833572-J.

Adam Sullivan, P.E., Acting Nevada State Engineer (“State Engineer”) is a Respondent in Case No. A-21-833572-J.

LCWD and Vidler’s action, Case No. A-21-833572-J has been consolidated with Case No. A-20-816761-C and related actions.

LCWD, Vidler, NV Energy and State Engineer desire to resolve NV Energy’s Notice of Intent to Participate upon the following terms and stipulate and agree as follows:

Stipulation to Intervention.

1. NV Energy shall be granted the right to intervene in Case No. A-21-833572-J.
2. As an Intervenor in LCWD/Vidler’s case, NV Energy may file an answering brief in LCWD/Vidler’s case. Leave from the Court will be required, as set forth below, if LCWD, Vidler and/or NV Energy seek to file a reply brief as an Intervenor or sur-reply brief in response to an Intervenor’s reply brief.

Briefing Schedule.

3. Petitioners’ opening briefs shall be due **August 27, 2021.**

¹ Tim Wilson, P.E. retired as the Nevada State Engineer effective November 30, 2020. Adam Sullivan, P.E. is the Acting Nevada State Engineer and has been automatically substituted pursuant to NRCP 25(d).

1 4. The answering briefs of Petitioners/Intervenors and Respondent shall be due 90 days
2 after the date the opening briefs are due, or **November 24, 2021**.

3 5. Petitioners' reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date answering briefs are due, or
4 **January 7, 2022**.

5 6. As an Intervenor, NV Energy may only file a reply brief in LCWD/Vidler's case with
6 leave from the Court based on a showing that its unique interests are impacted by arguments made in
7 another's answering brief. Said Intervenor reply briefs shall be due 45 days after the date the
8 answering briefs are filed, or **January 7, 2022**.

9 7. Petitioners may only file a sur-reply brief with leave from the Court based on a showing
10 that their unique interests are impacted by arguments made in an Intervenor's reply brief filed with
11 leave of Court.

12 The parties agree this Stipulation and Order shall be filed in consolidated Case No. A-20-
13 816761-C and Case No. A-21-833572-J and the parties request the Court issue an order approving this
14 Stipulation as appropriate.

15 **Affirmation:** The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document and/or
16 attachments do not contain the social security number of any person.

17 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
18 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
19 P.O. Box 60
20 Pioche, Nevada 89043

21 Dated this 30th day of June, 2021.

22 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
23 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
24 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

25 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
26 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
27 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
28 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
 Reno, Nevada 89501
 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District

///

///

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703

Dated this 30th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Karen A. Peterson
KAREN A. PETERSON #366
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Dated this 30th day of June, 2021.

/s/ James N. Bolotin
JAMES N. BOLOTIN #13829
LAENA ST-JULES # 15156
Email: jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
Email: lstjules@ag.nv.gov

Attorneys for State Engineer

NV ENERGY
6100 Neil Road
Reno, Nevada 89511

Dated this 30th day of June, 2021.

/s/ Justina A. Caviglia
JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA #9999
MICHAEL D. KNOX #8143
Email: justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
Email: mknnox@nvenergy.com


Attorneys for Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021
~~Dated this 1st day of July, 2021~~



DISTRICT JUDGE

**1B8 435 C7FC A079
Brita Yeager
District Court Judge**

1 Respectfully submitted by:

2 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
3 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
4 P.O. Box 60
5 Pioche, Nevada 89043

6 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
7 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
8 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

9 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
10 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
11 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
12 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
13 Reno, Nevada 89501
14 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com

15 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

16 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
17 402 North Division Street
18 Carson City, Nevada 89703

19 /s/ Karen A. Peterson
20 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
21 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

22 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

23 4832-0994-1488, v. 1

Nancy Fontenot

Subject: FW: [INTERNET] FW: LCWD/Vidler - Draft Stipulation with Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy

From: James N. Bolotin <JBolotin@ag.nv.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 2:14 PM

To: Caviglia, Justina (NV Energy) <jcaviglia@nvenergy.com>; Karen Peterson <kpeterston@allisonmackenzie.com>

Cc: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov; Klomp, Wayne <wklomp@swlaw.com>; Dorene A. Wright <DWright@ag.nv.gov>

Subject: RE: [INTERNET] FW: LCWD/Vidler - Draft Stipulation with Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy

Karen and Justina,

I just had one suggested addition for clarity and to make it consistent with the other stipulations. See redline attached. Otherwise, the State Engineer approves of the stipulation and, with this change, you would have my approval to sign on my behalf.

Best,
James

James Bolotin, Esq.
Senior Deputy Attorney General
State of Nevada
Bureau of Government Affairs
Government and Natural Resources Division
(775) 684-1231

**** CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE****

The preceding e-mail message (including attachments) contains information that may be confidential, be protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges, or constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

From: Caviglia, Justina (NV Energy) <Justina.Caviglia@nvenergy.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 4:20 PM

To: Karen Peterson <kpeterston@allisonmackenzie.com>; James N. Bolotin <JBolotin@ag.nv.gov>

Cc: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov; Klomp, Wayne <wklomp@swlaw.com>

Subject: RE: [INTERNET] FW: LCWD/Vidler - Draft Stipulation with Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy

No questions. Please sign on my behalf.

Thank you

Justina

Nancy Fontenot

Subject: FW: [INTERNET] FW: LCWD/Vidler - Draft Stipulation with Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy

From: Caviglia, Justina (NV Energy) <Justina.Caviglia@nvenergy.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 2:26 PM

To: 'James N. Bolotin' <JBolotin@ag.nv.gov>; Karen Peterson <kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com>

Cc: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov; Klomp, Wayne <wklomp@swlaw.com>; Dorene A. Wright <DWright@ag.nv.gov>

Subject: RE: [INTERNET] FW: LCWD/Vidler - Draft Stipulation with Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy

I am okay with the change. You have approval to sign on my behalf.

Justina

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Southern Nevada Water
Authority, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-816761-C

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Nevada State Engineer, Division
of Water Resources,
10 Defendant(s)

11
12 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
14 Court. The foregoing Stipulation and Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system
15 to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

16 Service Date: 7/1/2021

17 Merrilyn Marsh	mmarsh@kcnvlaw.com
18 Sev Carlson	scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
19 Dorene Wright	dwright@ag.nv.gov
20 James Bolotin	jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
21 Mike Knox	mknox@nvenergy.com
22 Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
23 Kathleen Wilde	kwilde@maclaw.com
24 Laena St-Jules	lstjules@ag.nv.gov
25 Karen Easton	keaston@ag.nv.gov
26 Justina Caviglia	jcaviglia@nvenergy.com

27
28

1	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
6	Therese Ure	counsel@water-law.com
7	Sharon Stice	sstice@kcnvlaw.com
8	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
9	Gregory Morrison	gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
10	Paul Taggart	paul@legaltnt.com
11	Derek Muaina	DerekM@WesternElite.com
12	Andy Moore	moorea@cityofnorthvegas.com
13	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
14	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
15	Lisa Belenky	lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
16	Julie Cavanaugh-Bill	julie@cblawoffices.org
17	Douglas Wolf	dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
18	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
19	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
22	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
23	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@wingfieldnevadagroup.com
6	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
7	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
8	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
9	Andrew Moore	moorea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com
10	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
11	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
12	Steve King	kingmont@charter.net
13	Tammey Carpitcher	tcarpitcher@kcnvlaw.com
14	Karen Peterson	kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com
15	Wayne Klomp	wklomp@swlaw.com
16	Dylan Frehner	dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov
17	Scott Lake	slake@biologicaldiversity.org
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EXHIBIT 16

EXHIBIT 16

1 **ORDR**

2 **DISTRICT COURT**
3 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

4 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
5 and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
6 AUTHORITY, COYOTE SPRINGS
7 INVESTMENT, LLC, APEX HOLDING
8 COMPANY, LLC, CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL
9 DIVERSITY, MUDDY VALLEY IRRIGATION
10 COMPANY, NEVADA COGENERATION
11 ASSOCIATES NOS. 1 AND 2, LINCOLN
12 COUNTY WATER DISTRICT, VIDLER
13 WATER COMPANY, GEORGIA-PACIFIC
14 GYPSUM, LLC and REPUBLIC
15 ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

16
17 Petitioners,

18 vs.

19 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting Nevada State
20 Engineer, DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES,
21 DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
22 NATURAL RESOURCES,

23 Respondents,

24 CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS, THE CHURCH
25 OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS,
26 MOAPA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT, NV
27 ENERGY, WESTERN ELITE
28 ENVIRONMENTAL, INC. and BEDROC
LIMITED, LLC,

Intervenors.

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

Consolidated with Cases:

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

A-21-833572-J

24 **ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO INTERVENE**

25 On July 27, 2020, the LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT and SOUTHERN
26 NEVADA WATER AUTHORITY (collectively “SNWA”), by and through their counsel, PAUL G.
27 TAGGART, ESQ. and TIMOTHY D. O’CONNOR, ESQ., of the law firm of TAGGART &
28 TAGGART, LTD., and STEVEN C. ANDERSON, ESQ. of SNWA, filed a Motion to Intervene in

1 LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER COMPANY's (collectively
2 "Lincoln/Vidler") Petition for Judicial Review of the Nevada State Engineer's Order 1309 filed in the
3 Seventh Judicial District of Nevada. On August 24, 2020, the MUDDY VALLEY IRRIGATION
4 COMPANY ("MVIC"), by and through their counsel, ROBERT A. DOTSON, ESQ., of the law firm
5 DOTSON LAW, and STEVEN D. KING, ESQ. filed a Motion to Intervene in Lincoln/Vidler's petition
6 in the Seventh Judicial District of Nevada. SNWA and MVIC's motions to intervene were opposed by
7 Lincoln/Vidler and fully briefed in the Seventh Judicial District.

8 In April 2021 Lincoln/Vidler's petition was transferred from the Seventh Judicial District to the
9 Eighth Judicial District in Clark County, Nevada. On May 27, 2021, Lincoln/Vidler's petition was
10 consolidated with the previously consolidated petitions for judicial review of Order 1309 that were
11 already pending in the Eighth Judicial District. On July 1, 2021, this Court heard oral arguments on
12 SNWA and MVIC's motions to intervene.

13 On April 15, 2021, the Nevada Supreme Court issued an order affirming the Seventh Judicial
14 District's order transferring Lincoln/Vidler's petition to the Eighth Judicial District. The Supreme
15 Court recognized that in Order 1309 the State Engineer found that groundwater basins in Lincoln and
16 Clark counties, including Kane Springs, "are inextricably connected" to an extent that they must be
17 managed conjunctively to avoid harm to senior water rights on the Muddy River and the Moapa dace
18 and the State Engineer's Order is presumed correct until the conclusion of the judicial review process.¹
19 The Court further found "resolution of the appellants' petition presumably impacts the rights of other
20 appropriators in the LWRFS because the scope of each LWRFS stakeholder's rights appears, on this
21 record, interconnected with the others."²

22 Based on the Nevada Supreme Court's findings in its Order of Affirmance as to the State
23 Engineer's findings regarding the interconnected nature of the Lower White River Flow System
24 ("LWRFS") basins and the need for collective management of those basins, both SNWA and MVIC
25 are entitled to intervention under NRCP 24(a) and 24(b). SNWA and MVIC have satisfied all the
26 factors established by the Nevada Supreme Court in *American Home Assurance Company v. Eighth*
27

28 ¹ Order of Affirmance at 2, 3 April 15, 2021, NSC Case No. 87192.

² Order of Affirmance at 6-7, April 15, 2021, NSC Case No. 87192.

1 *Judicial District* to determine if a party is entitled to intervention under NRCP 26(a).³ Both SNWA
2 and MVIC have a sufficient interest in the litigation based on their ownership and control of decreed
3 senior surface water rights in the Muddy River that were recognized by this Court in 1920. SNWA
4 and MVIC's decreed water rights could be impacted by a decision regarding the issues and water rights
5 at issue in Lincoln/Vidler's petition. Furthermore, SNWA and MVIC's interest are not adequately
6 represented by a current party in Lincoln/Vidler's petition, and no party has argued that SNWA and
7 MVIC's motions are untimely. Therefore, the intervention is proper.

8 The Court, hereby ORDERS the following and finds as follows:

9 SNWA and MVIC motions to intervene in Lincoln/Vidler's petition for judicial review of Order
10 1309, Case No. A-21-833572-J, are granted.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated this 9th day of July, 2021



12
13
14 Respectfully submitted by:

15 TAGGART & TAGGART, LTD.

16
17 By: /s/ Paul G. Taggart
18 PAUL G. TAGGART, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 6136
19 TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 14098
20 THOMAS P. DUENSING, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 15213
21 108 North Minnesota Street
22 Carson City, Nevada 89703

23 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
24 STEVEN C. ANDERSON, ESQ.,
Nevada State Bar No. 11901
25 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT
1001 S. Valley View Blvd.,
26 Las Vegas, NV 89153
27 *Attorneys for Las Vegas Valley Water District
and Southern Nevada Water Authority*

28
³ *American Home Assur. Co. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court ex rel. County of Clark*, 122 Nev. 1229, 147 P.3d. 1120 (2006).

1 DOTSON LAW

2 By: /s/ Robert A. Dotson

3 ROBERT A. DOTSON

Nevada Bar No. 5285

4 JUSTIN C. VANCE

Nevada Bar No. 11306

5 5355 Reno Corporate Drive, Suite 100

6 Reno, Nevada 89511

7 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**

STEVEN D. KING

8 Nevada Bar No. 4304

227 River Road

9 Dayton, Nevada 89403

10 *Attorneys for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company*

11 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.

12 By: /s/ Karen A. Peterson

13 KAREN A. PETERSON

Nevada Bar No. 366

14 402 North Division Street

15 Carson City, Nevada 89703

16 *Attorney for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

17 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

18 By: /s/ Dylan V. Frehner

19 DYLAN V. FREHNER

Nevada Bar No. 9020

20 181 North Main Street, Suite 205

P.O. Box 60

21 Pioche, Nevada 89043

22 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**

23 WAYNE O. KLOMP

Nevada Bar No. 10109

24 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510

Reno, Nevada 89501

25 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

Emily Woods

From: Robert Dotson <rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal>
Sent: Friday, July 9, 2021 3:20 PM
To: Emily Woods
Cc: Paul Taggart; Tom Duensing
Subject: RE: Proposed Order on Intervention in 1309 Litigation

You have my authority to submit.

Rob

Robert A. Dotson

Dotson Law

5355 Reno Corporate Dr.

Suite # 100

Reno, NV 89511

Office: (775) 501-9400

rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal

Notice: The information in this transmittal is confidential and may be attorney privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or the agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate the information. Although this email and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus or other defect that might affect any computer into which it is received and opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure it is virus free, and no responsibility is accepted by Dotson Law for any loss or damage arising in any way from its use. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender at (775) 501-9400 or by electronic mail (rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal).

From: Emily Woods <Emily@legaltnt.com>
Sent: Friday, July 9, 2021 1:25 PM
To: Robert Dotson <rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal>
Cc: Paul Taggart <Paul@legaltnt.com>; Tom Duensing <Tom@legaltnt.com>
Subject: RE: Proposed Order on Intervention in 1309 Litigation

Hi Rob,

Are we authorized to e-sign the attached proposed order on your behalf?

Thank you,

Emily Woods

Paralegal

TAGGART & TAGGART, LTD.

108 North Minnesota Street

Carson City, Nevada 89703

[\(775\) 882-9900](tel:7758829900) - Telephone

[\(775\) 883-9900](tel:7758839900) - Facsimile

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL: This communication, including any and all attachments, is confidential and may be protected by privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or email, and permanently delete all copies, electronic or other, you may have.

The foregoing applies even if this notice is embedded in a message that is forwarded or attached. Thank you.

From: Karen Peterson <kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com>
Sent: Friday, July 9, 2021 12:14 PM
To: Paul Taggart <Paul@legaltnt.com>; Dylan Frehner <dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov>; wayne@greatbasinlawyer.com
Cc: Robert Dotson <rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal>; Tom Duensing <Tom@legaltnt.com>
Subject: RE: Proposed Order on Intervention in 1309 Litigation

Paul,
LCWD is agreeable to the order with the edits I proposed. You can e-sign for me and Dylan. Wayne will file a notice of change of address with the court next week.

Thank you.

Karen A. Peterson, Esq.
Allison MacKenzie, Ltd.
402 N. Division Street
P.O. Box 646
Carson City, NV 89702
(775) 687-0202 telephone
(775) 882-7918 fax
email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com



From: Paul Taggart <Paul@legaltnt.com>
Sent: Friday, July 9, 2021 11:49 AM
To: Karen Peterson <kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com>; Dylan Frehner <dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov>; wayne@greatbasinlawyer.com
Cc: Robert Dotson <rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal>; Tom Duensing <Tom@legaltnt.com>
Subject: RE: Proposed Order on Intervention in 1309 Litigation

Karen: Your edits are fine with me. We will make those changes and send to the Court at around 5 today. Thanks again.

Paul G. Taggart

Attorney
TAGGART & TAGGART, LTD.
108 North Minnesota Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703
[\(775\) 882-9900](tel:(775)882-9900) - Telephone
[\(775\) 883-9900](tel:(775)883-9900) - Facsimile

From: Karen Peterson <kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com>
Sent: Friday, July 9, 2021 10:54 AM
To: Paul Taggart <Paul@legaltnt.com>; Dylan Frehner <dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov>; wayne@greatbasinlawyer.com
Cc: Robert Dotson <rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal>; Tom Duensing <Tom@legaltnt.com>
Subject: RE: Proposed Order on Intervention in 1309 Litigation

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Southern Nevada Water
Authority, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-816761-C

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Nevada State Engineer, Division
of Water Resources,
10 Defendant(s)

11
12 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
14 Court. The foregoing Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system to all
15 recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

16 Service Date: 7/9/2021

17 Merrilyn Marsh	mmarsh@kcnvlaw.com
18 Sev Carlson	scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
19 Dorene Wright	dwright@ag.nv.gov
20 James Bolotin	jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
21 Mike Knox	mknox@nvenergy.com
22 Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
23 Kathleen Wilde	kwilde@maclaw.com
24 Laena St-Jules	lstjules@ag.nv.gov
25 Karen Easton	keaston@ag.nv.gov
26 Justina Caviglia	jcaviglia@nvenergy.com


27
28

1	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
6	Therese Ure	counsel@water-law.com
7	Sharon Stice	sstice@kcnvlaw.com
8	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
9	Gregory Morrison	gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
10	Paul Taggart	paul@legaltnt.com
11	Derek Muaina	DerekM@WesternElite.com
12	Andy Moore	moorea@cityofnorthvegas.com
13	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
14	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
15	Lisa Belenky	lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
16	Julie Cavanaugh-Bill	julie@cblawoffices.org
17	Douglas Wolf	dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
18	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
19	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
22	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
23	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@wingfieldnevadagroup.com
6	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
7	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
8	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
9	Andrew Moore	moorea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com
10	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
11	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
12	Steve King	kingmont@charter.net
13	Tammey Carpitcher	tcarpitcher@kcnvlaw.com
14	Karen Peterson	kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com
15	Wayne Klomp	wklomp@swlaw.com
16	Dylan Frehner	dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov
17	Scott Lake	slake@biologicaldiversity.org
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EXHIBIT 17

EXHIBIT 17


CLERK OF THE COURT

ORDR

DYLAN V. FREHNER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 9020
LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
181 North Main Street, Suite 205
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
Telephone: (775) 962-8073
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

WAYNE O. KLOMP, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 10109
GREAT BASIN LAW
1783 Trek Trail
Reno, Nevada 89521
Telephone: (775) 770-0386
Email: wayne@greatbasinlawyer.com

KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 366
ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703
Telephone: (775) 687-0202
Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Attorneys for Petitioners, LINCOLN COUNTY
WATER DISTRICT and VIDLER WATER
COMPANY, INC.

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
AUTHORITY, et al.,

Case No. A-20-816761-C

Dept. No. 1

Petitioners,

Consolidated with Cases:

vs.

A-20-817765-P

A-20-818015-P

A-20-817977-P

A-20-818069-P

A-20-817840-P

A-20-817876-P

A-21-833572-J

ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Acting
Nevada State Engineer, et al.,

Respondent.

ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION

At the July 1, 2021 Status Check, counsel for SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER AUTHORITY
("SNWA"), MUDDY VALLEY IRRIGATION COMPANY ("MVIC"), and ADAM SULLIVAN,

ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
402 North Division Street, P.O. Box 646, Carson City, NV 89702
Telephone: (775) 687-0202 Fax: (775) 882-7918
E-Mail Address: law@allisonmackenzie.com

1 P.E., NEVADA STATE ENGINEER ("STATE ENGINEER") stipulated to the intervention of
2 LINCOLN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT ("LCWD") and VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC.
3 ("VIDLER") into SNWA's Case No. A-20-816761-C and MVIC's Case No. A-20-817977-P.

4 Good cause appearing,

5 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

6 1. LCWD and Vidler shall be granted the right to intervene in Case Nos. A-20-816761-C
7 and A-20-817977-P; and

8 2. The Court Minutes from the July 1, 2021 Status Check are hereby supplemented by
9 this Order.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021.

Dated this 13th day of September, 2021



DISTRICT JUDGE

15 Respectfully submitted by:

9EA 235 3826 93E7
Bita Yeager
District Court Judge

16 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
17 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
18 P.O. Box 60
19 Pioche, Nevada 89043

20 /s/ Dylan V. Frehner
DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

21 GREAT BASIN LAW
22 1783 Trek Trail
23 Reno, Nevada 89521
24 Telephone: (775) 770-0386

25 /s/ Wayne O. Klomp
WAYNE O. KLOMP, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 10109
Email: wayne@greatbasinlawyer.com

26 Attorneys for *Lincoln County Water District*

27 ///

28 ///

1 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
2 402 North Division Street
3 Carson City, Nevada 89703

4 /s/ Karen A. Peterson
5 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
6 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

7 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

8 4838-2892-3898, v. 1

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Southern Nevada Water
Authority, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-816761-C

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Nevada State Engineer, Division
of Water Resources,
10 Defendant(s)

11
12 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
14 Court. The foregoing Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system to all
15 recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

16 Service Date: 9/13/2021

17 Merrilyn Marsh	mmarsh@kcnvlaw.com
18 Sev Carlson	scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
19 Dorene Wright	dwright@ag.nv.gov
20 James Bolotin	jbolotin@ag.nv.gov
21 Mike Knox	mknox@nvenergy.com
22 Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
23 Kathleen Wilde	kwilde@maclaw.com
24 Laena St-Jules	lstjules@ag.nv.gov
25 Karen Easton	keaston@ag.nv.gov
26 Justina Caviglia	jcaviglia@nvenergy.com


27
28

1	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
6	Therese Ure	counsel@water-law.com
7	Sharon Stice	sstice@kcnvlaw.com
8	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
9	Gregory Morrison	gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
10	Paul Taggart	paul@legaltnt.com
11	Derek Muaina	DerekM@WesternElite.com
12	Andy Moore	moorea@cityofnorthvegas.com
13	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
14	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
15	Lisa Belenky	lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
16	Julie Cavanaugh-Bill	julie@cblawoffices.org
17	Douglas Wolf	dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
18	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
19	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
22	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
23	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
4	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@wingfieldnevadagroup.com
5	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
6	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
7	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
8	Andrew Moore	moorea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com
9	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
10	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
11	Steve King	kingmont@charter.net
12	Tammey Carpitcher	tcarpitcher@kcnvlaw.com
13	Karen Peterson	kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com
14	Wayne Klomp	wayne@greatbasinlawyer.com
15	Dylan Frehner	dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov
16	Scott Lake	slake@biologicaldiversity.org
17	Hannah Winston	hwinston@rssblaw.com
18	Nancy Hoy	nhoy@mcdonaldcarano.com
19	Carole Davis	cdavis@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Thomas Duensing	tom@legaltnt.com
21	Thomas Duensing	tom@legaltnt.com
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EXHIBIT 18

EXHIBIT 18


CLERK OF THE COURT

FFCO

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
AUTHORITY,

Petitioners,

vs.

TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State Engineer,
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
NATURAL RESOURCES,

Respondent.

And All Consolidated Cases.

Case No. A-20-816761-C
Dept. No. I

Consolidated with Cases:

A-20-817765-P
A-20-818015-P
A-20-817977-P
A-20-818069-P
A-20-817840-P
A-20-817876-P
A-21-833572-J

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER GRANTING PETITIONS
FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW**

This matter comes before this Court on consolidated petitions for judicial review of State
Engineer's Order 1309 filed by Petitioners:

- Southern Nevada Water Authority and Las Vegas Valley Water District
- Coyote Spring Investment, LLC
- Apex Holding Co. and Dry Lake Water, LLC
- The Center for Biological Diversity
- Muddy Valley Irrigation Company
- Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2
- Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.
- Lincoln County Water District and Vidler Water Company.

1 The parties stipulated to permit the following Intervenor into this matter:

- 2 • Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy and Nevada Power Company
- 3 d/b/a NV Energy
- 4 • Moapa Valley Water District
- 5 • The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints
- 6 • City of North Las Vegas
- 7 • Western Elite Environmental, Inc. and Bedroc Limited, LLC.

8 In addition, some Petitioners intervened to respond to other petitions for judicial review. The
9 Parties appeared by and through their respective counsels of record. The Court held oral argument
10 from February 14, 2022 to February 17, 2022.

11 The Court having considered the evidence, the pleadings, together with opening and closing
12 arguments presented at the hearing for these matters, and good cause appearing therefor, makes the
13 following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order:

14 **I.**

15 **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

16 On June 15, 2020, the Nevada State Engineer issued Order No. 1309 as his latest
17 administrative action regarding the Lower White River Flow System (“LWRFS”)¹.

18 On June 17, 2020, the Las Vegas Valley Water District and the Southern Nevada Water
19 Authority (collectively, “SNWA”) filed a petition for judicial review of Order 1309 in the Eighth
20 Judicial District Court in Clark County, Nevada.² Subsequently, the following petitioners filed
21 petitions for judicial review in the Eighth Judicial District Court: Coyote Spring Investments, LLC
22 (“CSI”); Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water LLC (collectively, “Apex”); the
23 Center Biological Diversity (“CBD”); Muddy Valley Irrigation Company (“MVIC”); Nevada
24

25 ¹ SE ROA 2 – 69. The LWRFS refers to an area in southern Nevada made up of several hydrological basins that share
26 the same aquifer as their source of groundwater. The Nevada State Engineer determined that this encompasses the area
27 that includes Coyote Spring Valley, Muddy River Springs Area, California Wash, Hidden Valley, Garnet Valley, Kane
28 Springs Valley and the northwest portion of the Black Mountains Area.

² LVVWD and SNWA Petition for Judicial Review, filed June 17, 2020.

1 Cogeneration Associates Numbers 1 and 2 (“Nevada Cogen”); and Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC,
2 and Republic Technologies, Inc. (collectively, “Georgia-Pacific”). All petitions were consolidated
3 with SNWA’s petition.³

4 Later, Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (“Sierra Pacific”) and Nevada
5 Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (“Nevada Power” and, together with Sierra Pacific, “NV
6 Energy”), Moapa Valley Water District (“MVWD”), the Church of Jesus Christ and of Latter-Day
7 Saints (the “Church”), the City of North Las Vegas (“CNLV”), and Western Elite Environmental,
8 Inc. and Bedroc Limited (collectively, “Bedroc”) ⁴ were granted intervention status in the
9 consolidated petitions for judicial review of Order 1309.

10 On July 13, 2020, Lincoln County Water District and Vidler Water Co. (collectively,
11 “Vidler”) timely filed their Petition for Judicial Review of State Engineer Order 1309 in the
12 Seventh Judicial District Court in Lincoln County, Nevada, identified as Case No. CV-0702520.
13 On August 26, 2020, the Seventh Judicial District Court issued an Order Granting Motion to
14 Change Venue, transferring this matter to the Eighth Judicial District Court in Clark County,
15 Nevada. Vidler appealed the Order Granting Motion to Change Venue to the Nevada Supreme
16 Court, and on April 15, 2021, the Nevada Supreme Court entered its Order of Affirmation. On
17 May 27, 2021, per verbal stipulation by the parties, the Court ordered this matter consolidated into
18 Case No. A-20-816761-C. When transferred to the Eighth Judicial District Court, Vidler’s action
19 was assigned Case No. A-21-833572-J. Notwithstanding the consolidation of all of the cases, each
20 case retained its individual and distinct factual and legal issues.

21 Petitioners in all the consolidated actions filed their Opening Briefs on or about August 27,
22 2021. Respondents State Engineer, Intervenors, and Petitioners who were Respondent-Intervenors
23 filed their Answering Briefs on or about November 24, 2021. Petitioners filed their Reply Briefs on
24 or about January 11, 2022.

25
26 _____
27 ³ Stipulation for Consolidation, A-20-816761-C, May 26, 2021.

28 ⁴ Bedroc and CNLV did not file briefs and did not participate in oral argument.

II.

FACTUAL HISTORY

A. The Carbonate Groundwater Aquifer and the Basins

Much of the bedrock and mountain ranges of Eastern Nevada are formed from a sequence of sedimentary rocks laid down during the Paleozoic Era. These formations are limestones or dolomites, commonly referred to as “carbonates,” due to the chemical composition of the minerals composing the rocks. These formations have been extensively deformed through folding and faulting caused by geologic forces. This deformation has caused extensive fracture and fault systems to form in these carbonate rocks, with permeability enhanced by the gradual solution of minerals. The result is an aquifer system that over time has accumulated large volumes of water with some apparent degree of connection throughout the much of area.⁵ The valley floors in the basins of Eastern Nevada are generally composed of alluvium comprised largely of relatively young (<5 million years) unconsolidated sands, gravels, and clays. This sequence is loosely referred to as the “Alluvial Aquifer,” the aquifer for most shallow wells in the area. Most of the water in the Carbonate Aquifer is present due to infiltration of water thousands of years ago; recent recharge from present day precipitation may represent only a fraction of the water stored.

Approximately 50,000 square miles of Nevada sits atop of this geologic layer of carbonate rock, which contains significant quantities of groundwater.⁶ This carbonate-rock aquifer system contains at least two major “regional flow systems” - continuous, interconnected, and transmissive geologic features through which water flows underground roughly from north to south: the Ash Meadows-Death Valley regional flow system; and the White River-Muddy River Springs system.⁷ These flow systems connect the groundwater beneath dozens of topographic valleys across distances exceeding 200 miles.⁸ The White River-Muddy River Springs flow system, stretching approximately

⁵ State Engineer Record on Appeal (“SE ROA”) 36062-67, Ex. 14; SE ROA 661, Ex. 8.

⁶ SE ROA 659.

⁷ SE ROA 661.

⁸ SE ROA 661.

240 miles from southern Elko County in the north to the Muddy River Springs Area in the south, was identified as early as 1966.⁹ The area designated by Order 1309 as the LWRFS consists generally of the southern portion of the White River-Muddy River Springs flow system.¹⁰

The Muddy River runs through a portion of the LWRFS before cutting southeast and discharging into Lake Mead.¹¹ Many warm-water springs, including the Muddy River Springs at issue in this litigation, discharge from the regional carbonate groundwater aquifer.¹² The series of springs, collectively referred to as the “Muddy River Springs” in the Muddy River Springs Area hydrographic basin form the headwaters of the Muddy River and provide the only known habitat for the endangered Moapa dace.¹³

The Muddy River Springs are directly connected to, and discharge from, the regional carbonate aquifer.¹⁴ Because of this connection, flows from the springs are dependent on the elevation of groundwater within the carbonate aquifer, and can change rapidly in direct response to changes in carbonate groundwater levels.¹⁵ As carbonate groundwater levels decline, spring flows decrease, beginning with the highest-elevation springs.¹⁶

As early as 1989, there were concerns that sustained groundwater pumping from the carbonate-rock aquifer would result in water table declines, substantially deplete the water stored in the aquifer, and ultimately reduce or eliminate flow from the warm-water springs that discharge from the aquifer.¹⁷

⁹ SE ROA 11349-59.

¹⁰ *See* SE ROA 11350.

¹¹ SE ROA 41943.

¹² SE ROA 660-61, 53056, 53062.

¹³ SE ROA 663-664, 41959, 48680.

¹⁴ SE ROA 73-75, 34545, 53062.

¹⁵ SE ROA 60-61, 34545.

¹⁶ SE ROA 46, 34545.

¹⁷ *See* SE ROA 661.

1 The general rule in Nevada is that one acquires a water right by filing an application to
2 appropriate water with the Nevada Division of Water Resources (“DWR”). If the DWR approves
3 the application, a “Permit to Appropriate” issues. Nevada has adopted the principle of “first in
4 time, first in right,” also known as “priority.” The priority of a water right is determined by the
5 date a permit is applied for. Nevada’s water resources are managed through administrative units
6 called “hydrographic basins,” which are generally defined by topography, more or less reflecting
7 boundaries between watersheds. Nevada is divided into 232 hydrographic basins (256
8 hydrographic basins and sub-basins, combined) based upon the surface geography and subsurface
9 flow.

10 The priority of groundwater rights is determined relative to the water rights holder within
11 the individual basins. If there is not enough water to serve all water right holders in a particular
12 basin, “senior” appropriators are satisfied first in order of priority: the rights of “junior”
13 appropriators may be curtailed. Historically, The Nevada State Engineer has managed
14 hydrographic basins in a basin-by-basin manner for decades,¹⁸ and administers and manages each
15 basin as a discrete hydrologic unit.¹⁹ The State Engineer keeps and maintains annual pumping
16 inventories and records on a basin-by-basin basis.²⁰

17 This administrative structure has worked reasonably well for basins where groundwater is
18 pumped from “basin fill” aquifers or alluvium, where the annual recharge of the groundwater
19 historically has been estimated based upon known or estimated precipitation data - establishing the
20 amount of groundwater that is recharged annually and can be extracted sustainably from a basin,
21 known as the “perennial yield.” In reality, many hydrographic basins are severely over-appropriated,
22 due to inaccurate estimates, over pumping, domestic wells, changing climate conditions, etc.

23 Administration of groundwater rights is made particularly complex when the main source of
24

25
26 ¹⁸SE ROA 654, 659, 699, 726, 755.

27 ¹⁹ SE ROA 949-1069.

28 ²⁰ SE ROA 1070-1499.

1 groundwater is not “basin fill” or alluvium, but aquifers found in permeable geologic formations
2 lying beneath the younger basin fill, and which may underlie large regions that are not well defined
3 by the present-day hydrographic basins. This is the case with Nevada’s “Carbonate Aquifer.”

4 When necessary, the State Engineer may manage a basin that has been designated for
5 administration. NRS 534.030 outlines the process by which a particular basin can be designated for
6 administration by the State Engineer. In the instant case, six of the seven basins affected by Order
7 No. 1309 had already been designated for management under NRS 534.030, including:

- 8 a. Coyote Spring Valley Hydrographic Basin (“Coyote Spring Valley”), Basin No. 210, since
9 1985;
- 10 b. Black Mountains Area Hydrographic Basin (“Black Mountains Area”), Basin No. 215, since
11 November 22, 1989;
- 12 c. Garnet Valley Hydrographic Basin (“Garnet Valley”), Basin No. 216, since April 24, 1990;
- 13 d. Hidden Valley Hydrographic Basin (“Hidden Valley”), Basin No. 217, since October 24,
14 1990;
- 15 e. California Wash Hydrographic Basin (“California Wash”), Basin No. 218, since August 24,
16 1990; and
- 17 f. Muddy River Springs Area Hydrographic Basin (“Muddy River Springs Area”), Basin No.
18 219, since July 14, 1971.²¹

19 Kane Springs Valley (“Kane Springs Valley”), Basin 206, which was also affected by
20 Order No. 1309, had not been designated previously for administration.²²
21

22
23 ²¹ See SE ROA 2-3, 71-72.

24 ²² The Court takes judicial notice of Kane Springs Valley Basin’s status of not being designated for administration per
25 NRS 534.030. <http://water.nv.gov/StateEngineersOrdersList.aspx> (available online at the Division of Water Resources.
26 “Mapping& Data” tab, under “Water Rights” tab, “State Engineer’s Orders List and Search”). Facts that are subject to
27 judicial notice “are facts in issue or facts from which they may be inferred.” NRS 47.130(1). To be judicially noticed, a
28 fact must be “[g]enerally known” or “capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy
cannot reasonably be questioned.” NRS 47.130(2); *Andolino v. State*, 99 Nev. 346, 351, 662 P.2d 631, 633-34 (1983)
(courts may take judicial notice of official government publications); *Barron v. Reich*, 13 F.3d 1370, 1377 (9th Cir.
1994) (courts may take judicial notice of documents obtained from administrative agencies); *Greeson v. Imperial Irr.*
Dist., 59 F.2d 529, 531 (9th Cir.1932) (courts may take judicial notice of “public documents”).

1 **B. The Muddy River Decree**

2 Over one hundred years ago, this Court issued the Muddy River Decree of 1920 (sometimes
3 referred to herein as the “Decree” or “Muddy River Decree”), which established water rights on the
4 Muddy River.²³ The Muddy River Decree recognized specific water rights,²⁴ identified each water
5 right holder on the Muddy River, and quantified each water right.²⁵ MVIC specifically owns certain
6 rights “. . . to divert, convey, and use all of said waters of said River, its head waters, sources of
7 supply and tributaries, save and except the several amounts and rights hereinbefore specified and
8 described . . . and to divert said waters, convey and distribute the same to its present stockholders,
9 and future stockholders, and other persons who may have acquired or who may acquire temporary or
10 permanent rights through said Company. . .”²⁶. The Decree appropriates all water of the Muddy
11 River at the time the Decree was entered, which was prior to any other significant development in
12 the area. The predevelopment flow averaged approximately 33,900 acre feet per annum (“afa”).²⁷
13 The rights delineated through The Muddy River Decree are the oldest and most senior rights in the
14 LWRFS.

15 **C. The Moapa Dace**

16 The Moapa dace (*Moapa coriacea*) is a thermophilic minnow endemic to the upper spring-
17 fed reaches Muddy River, and has been federally listed as endangered since 1967.²⁸ Between 1933
18

19
20 ²³ See Judgment and Decree, *Muddy Valley Irrigation Co. v. Moapa and Salt Lake Produce Co.* (the “Muddy River
Decree” or “Decree”) (March 11, 1920) (SE ROA 33770-33816).

21 ²⁴ SE ROA 33770-816. Specifically, the Muddy River Decree finds “[t]hat the aggregate volume of the several
22 amounts and quantities of water awarded and allotted to the parties . . . is the total available flow of the said Muddy
23 River and consumes and exhausts all of the available flow of the said Muddy River, its headwaters, sources of supply
and tributaries.” SE ROA 33792-33793.

24 ²⁵ SE ROA 33798-806.

25 ²⁶ SE ROA 33775.

26 ²⁷ See SNWA Report (June 2019) (SE ROA 41930 – 42072) at § 3.4.1 (SE ROA 41962) describing the predevelopment
27 flows as measured in 1946 as 33,900 afa and the average flow measured from July 1, 1913 to June 30, 1915 and October
1, 1916 to September 30, 1917 as 34,000 afa. The NSE further recognizes 33,900 afa as the predevelopment flow. See
Order 1309 (SE ROA 2-69) at p. 61 (SE ROA 62).

28 ²⁸ SE ROA 5.

1 and 1950, the Moapa dace was abundant in the Muddy River and was estimated to inhabit as many
2 as 25 individual springs and up to 10 miles of stream habitat. However, by 1983, the species only
3 occurred in springs and two miles of spring outflows. Currently, approximately 95 percent of the
4 total Moapa dace population occurs within 1.78 miles of one major tributary system that flows from
5 three high-elevation spring complexes within the Muddy River Springs Area.²⁹

6 Threats to the Moapa Dace include non-native predatory fishes, habitat loss from water
7 diversions and impoundments, wildfire risk from non-native vegetation, and reductions to surface
8 spring-flows resulting from groundwater development.³⁰ Because the Moapa dace is entirely
9 dependent on spring flow, protecting the dace necessarily involves protecting the warm spring
10 sources of the Muddy River.³¹

11 **D. Order 1169**

12 Significant pumping of the Carbonate Aquifer in the LWRFS began in the 1980s and
13 1990s. Initial assessments of the water available in the Aquifer suggested it would provide a new
14 abundant source of water for Southern Nevada. Because the prospective water resources of the
15 LWRFS carbonate appeared to be substantial, nearly 100 water right applications for over 300,000
16 acre feet were filed in State Engineer's office.³²

17 By 2001, the State Engineer had granted more than 40,000 acre feet of applications in the
18 LWRFS. The State Engineer considered additional applications for groundwater in Coyote Spring
19 Valley and adjacent hydrographic basins. However, concerned over the lack of information
20 regarding the sustainability of water resources from the Carbonate Aquifer, the State Engineer
21 began hearings in July and August 2001 on water right applications.³³

22
23
24

²⁹ SE ROA 47169.

25 ³⁰ SE ROA 47160.

26 ³¹ SE ROA 42087.

27 ³² SE ROA 4, Ex. 1.

28 ³³ *Id.*

1 On March 8, 2002, the State Engineer issued Order 1169 to delay consideration of new
2 water right applications and require the pumping of existing groundwater to determine what impact
3 increased groundwater pumping would have on senior water rights and the environment at the
4 Muddy River (“Aquifer Test”).³⁴ Order 1169 held in abeyance all applications for the
5 appropriation of groundwater from the carbonate-rock aquifer system located in the Coyote Spring
6 Valley Basin (Basin 210), Black Mountains Area Basin (Basin 215), Garnet Valley Basin (Basin
7 216), Hidden Valley Basin (Basin 217), Muddy River Springs aka Upper Moapa Valley Basin
8 (Basin 210), and Lower Moapa Valley Basin (Basin 220).³⁵ California Wash (Basin 218) was
9 subsequently added to this Order.³⁶

10 Notably, Kane Springs was not included in the Order 1169 study area. In Ruling 5712, the
11 State Engineer specifically determined Kane Springs would not be included in the Order 1169
12 study area because there was no substantial evidence that the appropriation of a limited quantity of
13 water in Kane Springs would have any measurable impact on the Muddy River Springs that
14 warranted the inclusion of Kane Springs in Order 1169.³⁷ The State Engineer specifically rejected
15 the argument that the Kane Springs rights could not be appropriated based upon senior
16 appropriated rights in the down gradient basins.³⁸

17 Order 1169A, issued December 21, 2012, set up a test to “stress” the Carbonate Aquifer
18 through two years of aggressive pumping, combined with examination of water levels in monitoring
19 wells located throughout the LWRFS.³⁹ Participants in the Aquifer test were Southern Nevada
20 Water Authority (“SNWA”), Las Vegas Valley Water District (“LVVWD”), Moapa Valley Water
21 District, Coyote Springs Investments, LLC (“Coyote Springs”), Moapa Band of Paiutes, and Nevada
22

23 ³⁴ SE ROA 654-669.

24 ³⁵ See SE ROA 659, 665.

25 ³⁶ SE ROA 659-69, Ex. 8; *see also* SE ROA 654, Ex. 7.

26 ³⁷ SE ROA 719.

27 ³⁸ SE ROA 713.

28 ³⁹ SE ROA 654-58, Ex. 7.

1 Power Company. Pumping included 5,300 afa in Coyote Spring Valley, 14,535 afa total carbonate
2 pumping, and 3,840 afa alluvial pumping.⁴⁰ Pumping tests effects were examined at 79 monitoring
3 wells and 11 springs and streamflow monitoring sites.⁴¹ The Kane Springs basin was not included in
4 the Order 1169 aquifer testing, and Kane Springs basin water right holders were not involved, not
5 provided notice, and did not participate in the aquifer testing, monitoring or measurements,
6 submission of reports, proceedings and actions taken by the State Engineer pursuant to Order 1169.⁴²

7 The State Engineer's conclusions from the pump test found an "unprecedented decline" in
8 high-altitude springs, an "unprecedented decline" in water levels, and that additional pumping in
9 the central part of Coyote Spring Valley or the Muddy River Spring Area could not occur without
10 conflict with existing senior rights, including decreed surface water rights on the Muddy River, or
11 the habitat of the Moapa Dace. The State Engineer attributed observed decreases in water levels in
12 other areas of the basins to the pumping during the Order 1169 test and concluded that the test
13 demonstrated connectivity within the Carbonate Aquifer of the LWRFS. On this basis, the State
14 Engineer determined that the five basin LWRFS should be jointly managed.

15 In 2014, and based on the results of the Aquifer Test, the State Engineer issued Rulings
16 6254–6261 on January 29, 2014 denying all the pending groundwater applications in Coyote
17 Springs Valley, Muddy River Springs Area, California Wash, Hidden Valley, Garnet Valley, and
18 certain portions of the Black Mountains Area.⁴³ His rationale in each ruling was the same:
19 "because these basins share a unique and close hydrologic connection and share virtually all of the
20 same source and supply of water, unlike other basins in Nevada, these five basins will be jointly
21 managed."⁴⁴
22

23
24 ⁴⁰ The Order uses the term acre-foot per year (afy), but for consistency with common usage, this Court uses the
equivalent term acre feet per annum.

25 ⁴¹ SE ROA 6, Ex. 1.

26 ⁴² SE ROA 36230 - 36231.

27 ⁴³ SE ROA 726 – 948.

28 ⁴⁴ *See e.g.*, SE ROA 479.

1 **E. Interim Order 1303 and proceedings**

2 On January 11, 2019 -- nearly 17 years after issuing Order 1169, then-State Engineer Jason
3 King issued Interim Order 1303 to start a two-phased administrative process to resolve the
4 competing interests for water resources in the LWRFS.⁴⁵ He created the LWRFS as a joint
5 administrative unit and invited stakeholders to participate in an administrative hearing to address
6 the factual questions of what the boundary of the LWRFS should be, and what amount of
7 groundwater could be sustainably pumped in the LWRFS.⁴⁶ The LWRFS is the first multi-basin
8 area that the Nevada State Engineer has designated in state history. The ordering provisions in
9 Interim Order 1303 provide in pertinent part:

- 10 1. The Lower White River Flow System consisting of the Coyote Spring Valley,
11 Muddy River Springs Area, California Wash, Hidden Valley, Garnet Valley,
12 and the portion of the Black Mountains Area as described in this Order, is
13 herewith designated as a joint administrative unit for purposes of
14 administration of water rights. All water rights within the Lower White River
15 Flow System will be administered based upon their respective date of
16 priorities in relation to other rights within the regional groundwater unit.

17 Any stakeholder with interests that may be affected by water right
18 development within the Lower White River Flow System may file a report in
19 the Office of the State Engineer in Carson City, Nevada, no later than the
20 close of business on Monday, June 3, 2019.

21 Reports filed with the Office of the State Engineer should address the
22 following matters:

- 23 a. The geographic boundary of the hydrologically connected groundwater
24 and surface water systems comprising the Lower White River Flow
25 System;
26 b. The information obtained from the Order 1169 aquifer test and
27 subsequent to the aquifer test and Muddy River headwater spring flow as
28 it relates to aquifer recovery since the completion of the aquifer test;
29 c. The long-term annual quantity of groundwater that may be pumped
30 from the Lower White River Flow System, including the relationships
31 between the location of pumping on discharge to the Muddy River
32 Springs, and the capture of Muddy River flow;

33 ⁴⁵ SE ROA 635-53, Ex. 6.

34 ⁴⁶ SE ROA 82-83.

1 d. The effects of movement of water rights between alluvial wells and
2 carbonate wells on deliveries of senior decreed rights to the Muddy River;
and,

3 e. Any other matter believed to be relevant to the State Engineer's
4 analysis.

5 SE ROA 647-48, Ex. 6.

6 The State Engineer identified the LWRFS as including the following hydrographic basins:
7 Coyote Spring Valley, a portion of Black Mountains Area, Garnet Valley, Hidden Valley,
8 California Wash, and the Muddy River Springs Area.⁴⁷ Kane Springs continued to be excluded as
9 part of the LWRFS multi-basin area in Interim Order 1303.⁴⁸

10 In July and August 2019, reports and rebuttal reports were submitted discussing the four
11 matters set forth in Interim Order 1303. On July 25, 2019, the State Engineer issued a Notice of
12 Pre-Hearing Conference, and on August 9, 2019, the State Engineer held a prehearing conference.
13 On August 23, 2019, the State Engineer issued a Notice of Hearing (which it amended on August
14 26, 2019), noting that the hearing would be “the first step” in determining how to address future
15 management decisions, including policy decisions, relating to the LWRFS.⁴⁹ He also indicated that
16 the legal question of whether groundwater pumping in the LWRFS conflicts with senior water
17 rights would be addressed in Phase 2 of the LWRFS administrative process.⁵⁰

18 The Hearing Officer made it clear that “any other matter believed to be relevant” as
19 specified in ordering paragraph 1(e) of Order 1303 would not include discussion of the
20 administrative impacts of consolidating the basins or any policy matters affected by its decision.
21 The State Engineer conducted a hearing on the reports submitted under Order 1303 between
22 September 23, 2019, and October 4, 2019. At the start of the administrative hearing, the State
23 Engineer reminded the parties the public administrative hearing was not a “trial-type” proceeding,

24 _____
25 ⁴⁷ SE ROA 70-88.

26 ⁴⁸ *Id.*

27 ⁴⁹ SE ROA 263, Ex. 2 (Notice); SE ROA 285, Ex. 3 (Amended Notice).

28 ⁵⁰ SE ROA 522.

not a contested adversarial proceeding.⁵¹ Cross-examination was limited to between 4-17 minutes per participant depending on the length of time given to a participant to present its reports.⁵²

Following the submission by the participating stakeholders of closing statements at the beginning of December 2019, the State Engineer engaged in no additional public process and solicited no additional input regarding “future management decisions, including policy decisions, relating to the Lower White River Flow System basins.”⁵³

F. Order 1309

On June 15, 2020, the State Engineer issued Order 1309.⁵⁴ The first three ordering paragraphs state as follows:

1. The Lower White River Flow System consisting of the Kane Springs Valley, Coyote Spring Valley, Muddy River Springs Area, California Wash, Hidden Valley, Garnet Valley, and the northwest portion of the Black Mountains Area as described in this Order, is hereby delineated as a single hydrographic basin. The Kane Springs Valley, Coyote Spring Valley, Muddy River Springs Area, California Wash, Hidden Valley, Garnet Valley and the northwest portion of the Black Mountains Area are hereby established as sub-basins within the Lower White River Flow System Hydrographic Basin.
2. The maximum quantity of groundwater that may be pumped from the Lower White River Flow System Hydrographic Basin on an average annual basis without causing further declines in Warm Springs area spring flow and flow in the Muddy River cannot exceed 8,000 afa and may be less.
3. The maximum quantity of water that may be pumped from the Lower White River Flow System Hydrographic Basin may be reduced if it is determined that pumping will adversely impact the endangered Moapa dace.

SE ROA 66, Ex. 1.

The Order does not provide guidance about how the new “single hydrographic basin” will be administered and provided no clear analysis as to the basis for the 8000 afa number for the maximum sustainable yield.

⁵¹ SE ROA 52962, Transcript 6:4-6, 24 to 7:1 (Sept. 23, 2019) (Hearing Officer Fairbank).

⁵² SE ROA 52962, Transcript 7:5-7 (Sept. 23, 2019) (Hearing Officer Fairbank).

⁵³ See SE ROA 285, Ex. 3.

⁵⁴ SE ROA 2-69.

1 In its Order, the State Engineer indicated that it “considered this evidence and testimony
2 [regarding basin inclusion and basin boundary] on the basis of a common set of criteria that are
3 consistent with the original characteristics considered critical in demonstrating a close hydrologic
4 connection requiring joint management in Rulings 6254-6261.”⁵⁵ However, the State Engineer did
5 not disclose these criteria to the stakeholders before or during the Order 1303 proceedings.
6 Instead, he disclosed them for the first time in Order 1309, after the stakeholders had engaged in
7 extensive investigations, expert reporting, and factual hearing requested by Order 1303. The
8 criteria are:

- 9 1. Water level observations whose spatial distribution indicates a relatively
10 uniform or flat potentiometric surface are consistent with a close hydrologic
11 connection.
- 12 2. Water level hydrographs that, in well-to-well comparisons, demonstrate a
13 similar temporal pattern, irrespective of whether the pattern is caused by
14 climate, pumping, or other dynamic is consistent with a close hydrologic
15 connection.
- 16 3. Water level hydrographs that demonstrate an observable increase in drawdown
17 that corresponds to an increase in pumping and an observable decrease in
18 drawdown, or a recovery, that corresponds to a decrease in pumping, are
19 consistent with a direct hydraulic connection and close hydrologic connection
20 to the pumping location(s).
- 21 4. Water level observations that demonstrate a relatively steep hydraulic gradient
22 are consistent with a poor hydraulic connection and a potential boundary.
- 23 5. Geological structures that have caused a juxtaposition of the carbonate-rock
24 aquifer with low permeability bedrock are consistent with a boundary.
- 25 6. When hydrogeologic information indicate a close hydraulic connection (based
26 on criteria 1-5), but limited, poor quality, or low resolution water level data
27 obfuscate a determination of the extent of that connection, a boundary should
28 be established such that it extends out to the nearest mapped feature that
juxtaposes the carbonate-rock aquifer with low-permeability bedrock, or in the
absence of that, to the basin boundary.

⁵⁵ SE ROA 48-49, Ex. 1.

After consideration of the above criteria, the State Engineer decided to finalize what was preliminarily determined in Interim Order 1303, and consolidated several administrative units into a single hydrographic basin, designated as the “Lower White River Flow System” or “LWRFS.” The State Engineer also added the previously excluded Kane Springs Hydrographic Basin to the LWRFS,⁵⁶ and modified the portion of the Black Mountains area that is in the LWRFS. Although Order 1309 did not specifically address priorities or conflict of rights, as a result of the consolidation of the basins, the relative priority of all water rights within the seven affected basins will be reordered and the priorities will be considered in relation to all water rights holders in the consolidated basins, rather than in relation only to the other users within the original separate basins.

G. Petitioners and Their Respective Water Rights or Interests

- a. Southern Nevada Water Authority and Las Vegas Valley Water District are government agencies serving Southern Nevada’s water needs, and own water rights in Coyote Springs Valley, Hidden Valley, Garnet Valley, and a significant portion of the Muddy River decreed rights.
- b. Coyote Spring Investments, LLC is a developer who owns water rights in Coyote Spring Valley, Kane Springs Valley, and California Wash;
- c. Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water LLC own real estate and water rights to the area of land commonly referred to as the Apex Industrial Park, in Garnet Valley and Black Mountains Area;
- d. The Center Biological Diversity is a national nonprofit conservation organization which does not hold any water rights, but has educational, scientific, biological, aesthetic and spiritual interests in the survival and recovery of the Moapa Dace;
- e. Muddy Valley Irrigation Company is a private company that owns most of the decreed rights

⁵⁶ The Court notes that the Nevada State Engineer determined that Kane Springs should be included in this joint management area, even though the Kane Springs Basin had not been designated previously for management through the statutory process delineated in under NRS 534.030.

1 in the Muddy River;

- 2 f. Nevada Cogeneration Associates Numbers 1 and 2, who operate gas-fired facilities at the
3 south end of the LWRFS and have water rights in the Black Mountain Area;
- 4 g. Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC, and Republic Technologies, Inc. are industrial companies that
5 have water rights in the Garnet Valley Hydrographic Basin;
- 6 h. Lincoln County Water District and Vidler Water Co. are a public water district and a private
7 company, respectively, and own water rights in Kane Springs Valley.

8 **III.**

9 **DISCUSSION**

10 **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

11 An aggrieved party may appeal a decision of the State Engineer pursuant to NRS 533.450(1).
12 The proceedings, which are heard by the court, must be informal and summary, but must afford the
13 parties a full opportunity to be heard. NRS 533.450(2). The decision of the State Engineer is
14 considered to be prima facie correct, and the burden of proof is on the party challenging the
15 decision. NRS 533.450(10).

16 **A. Questions of Law**

17 Questions of statutory construction are questions of law which require de novo review.
18 The Nevada Supreme Court has repeatedly held courts have the authority to undertake an
19 independent review of the State Engineer's statutory construction, without deference to the State
20 Engineer's determination. *Andersen Family Assoc. v. Ricci*, 124 Nev. 182, 186, 179 P.3d 1201,
21 1203 (2008) (citing *Bacher v. State Engineer*, 122 Nev. 1110, 1115, 146 P.3d 793, 798 (2006) and
22 *Kay v. Nunez*, 122 Nev. 1100, 1103, 146 P.3d 801, 804 (2006)).

23 Any "presumption of correctness" of a decision of the State Engineer as provided by NRS
24 533.450(10), "does not extend to 'purely legal questions,' such as 'the construction of a statute,'
25 as to which 'the reviewing court may undertake independent review.'" *In re State Engineer*
26 *Ruling No. 5823*, 128 Nev. 232, 238-239, 277 P.3d 449, 453 (2012) (quoting *Town of Eureka v.*
27 *State Engineer*, 108 Nev. 163, 165, 826 P.2d 948, 949 (1992)). At no time will the State
28

Engineer’s interpretation of a statute control if an alternative reading is compelled by the plain language of the statute. *See Andersen Family Assoc.*, 124 Nev. at 186, 179 P.3d at 1203.

Although “[t]he State Engineer’s ruling on questions of law is persuasive... [it is] not entitled to deference.” *Sierra Pac. Indus. v. Wilson*, 135 Nev. Adv. Op. 13, 440 P.3e 37, 40 (2019). A reviewing court is free to decide legal questions without deference to an agency determination. *See Jones v. Rosner*, 102 Nev. 215, 216-217, 719 P.2d 805, 806 (1986); *accord Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe v. Ricci*, 126 Nev. 521, 525, 245 P.3d 1145, 1148 (2010) (“[w]e review purely legal questions without deference to the State Engineer’s ruling.”).

B. Questions of Fact

The Court’s review of the Order 1309 is “in the nature of an appeal” and limited to the record before the State Engineer. *Revert v. Ray*, 95 Nev. 782, 786, 603 P.2d 262, 264 (1979). On appeal, a reviewing court must “determine whether the evidence upon which the engineer based his decision supports the order.” *State Engineer v. Morris*, 107 Nev. 699, 701, 819 P.2d 203, 205 (1991) (citing *State Engineer v. Curtis Park*, 101 Nev. 30, 32, 692 P.2d 495, 497 (1985)).

As to questions of fact, the State Engineer’s decision must be supported by “substantial evidence in the record [.]” *Eureka Cty. v. State Engineer*, 131 Nev. 846, 850, 359 P.3d 1114, 1117 (2015) (quoting *Town of Eureka*, 108 Nev. at 165, 826 P.2d at 949). Substantial evidence is “that which a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” *Bacher*, 122 Nev. at 1121, 146 P.3d at 800 (finding that a reasonable person would expect quantification of water rights needed and no evidence of such quantification or calculations by the State Engineer is included in the record). The Court may not substitute its judgment for that of the State Engineer, “pass upon the credibility of the witness nor reweigh the evidence.” *Revert*, 95 Nev. at 786, 603 P.2d at 264.

Where a decision is arbitrary and capricious it is not supported by substantial evidence. *See Clark Cty. Educ. Ass’n v. Clark Cty. Sch. Dist.*, 122 Nev. 337, 339-40, 131 P.3d 5, 7 (2006) (concluding that an arbitrator’s award was “supported by substantial evidence and therefore not arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the arbitration agreement”).

In *Revert*, 95 Nev. at 787, 603 P.2d at 264–65, the Nevada Supreme Court noted:

1 The applicable standard of review of the decisions of the State Engineer, limited
2 to an inquiry as to substantial evidence, presupposes the fullness and fairness of
3 the administrative proceedings: all interested parties must have had a ‘full
4 opportunity to be heard,’ *See* NRS 533.450(2); the State Engineer must
5 clearly resolve all the crucial issues presented, *See Nolan v. State Dep’t. of*
6 *Commerce*, 86 Nev. 428, 470 P.2d 124 (1970) (on rehearing); the decisionmaker
7 must prepare findings in sufficient detail to permit judicial review, *Id.*; *Wright v.*
8 *State Insurance Commissioner*, 449 P.2d 419 (Or.1969); *See also* NRS 233B.125.
9 When these procedures, grounded in basic notions of fairness and due process, are
10 not followed, and the resulting administrative decision is arbitrary, oppressive, or
11 accompanied by a manifest abuse of discretion, this court will not hesitate to
12 intervene. *State ex rel. Johns v. Gragson*, 89 Nev. 478, 515 P.2d 65 (1973).

13 Thus, in order to survive review, Order 1309 must be statutorily authorized, resolve all
14 crucial issues presented, must include findings in detail to permit judicial review, and must be
15 based on substantial evidence.

16 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

17 **A. The State Engineer Did Not Have the Authority to Jointly Administrate Multiple** 18 **Basins by Creating the LWRFS “Superbasin,” Nor Did He Have the Authority to** 19 **Conjunctively Manage This Superbasin.**

20 The powers of the State Engineer are limited to those set forth in the law. *See, e.g., City of*
21 *Henderson v. Kilgore*, 122 Nev. 331, 334, 131 P.3d 11, 13 (2006); *Clark Cty. School Dist. v. Clark*
22 *Cty. Classroom Teachers Ass’n*, 115 Nev. 98, 102, 977 P.2d 1008, 1011 (1999) (*en banc*) (An
23 administrative agency’s powers “are limited to those powers specifically set forth by statute.”);
24 *Clark Cty. v. State, Equal Rights Comm’n*, 107 Nev. 489, 492, 813 P.2d 1006, 1007 (1991)); *Wilson*
25 *v. Pahrump Fair Water, LLC*, 137 Nev. Adv. Op. 2, 481 P.3d 853, 856(2021) (The State Engineer’s
26 powers thereunder are limited to “only those . . . which the legislature expressly or implicitly
27 delegates.”); *Andrews v. Nevada State Bd. of Cosmetology*, 86 Nev. 207, 208, 467 P.2d 96, 97
28 (1970) (“Official powers of an administrative agency cannot be assumed by the agency, nor can they
be created by the courts in the exercise of their judicial function. The grant of authority to an agency
must be clear.”) (*internal citation omitted*).

The Nevada Supreme Court has made clear that the State Engineer is a creature of statute and
his or her actions must be within a statutory grant of authority. *Pahrump Fair Water LLC*, 481 P.3d

at 856 (explaining that “[t]he State Engineer’s powers thereunder are limited to ‘only those . . . which the legislature expressly or implicitly delegates’” (quoting *Clark Cty.*, 107 Nev. at 492, 813 P.2d at 1007)); *see also Howell v. Ricci*, 124 Nev. 1222, 1230, 197 P.3d 1044, 1050 (2008) (holding that the State engineer cannot act beyond his or her statutory authority).

The State Engineer’s authority is outlined in NRS Chapters 532, 533 and 534. Chapter 533 deals generally with “water rights,” which addresses surface water as well as groundwater, and chapter 534 is limited to groundwater, dealing specifically with “underground water and wells.”

In the instant case, the State Engineer relied on the following specific statutes as authority for combining prior independently designated basins as a superbasin newly named the LWRFS, and then conjunctively managing⁵⁷ this superbasin:

- NRS 533.024(1)(c), which is a legislative declaration “encourag[ing] the State Engineer to consider the best available science in rendering decisions concerning the available surface and underground sources of water in Nevada.”⁵⁸
- NRS 534.024(1)(e), another legislative declaration that states the policy of Nevada is “[t]o manage conjunctively the appropriation, use and administration of all waters of this State, regardless of the source of the water.”⁵⁹
- NRS 534.020, which provides that all waters of the State belong to the public and are subject to all existing rights.⁶⁰
- NRS 532.120, which allows the State Engineer to “make such reasonable rules and regulations as may be necessary for the proper and orderly execution of the powers conferred by law.”⁶¹

⁵⁷ The Nevada Water Words Dictionary, defines “Conjunctive (Water) Use” in part, as “the integrated use and management of hydrologically connected groundwater and surface water.” *Water Words Dictionary, Nevada Division of Water Planning* (2022) (available online at <http://water.nv.gov/WaterPlanDictionary.aspx>) The same dictionary separately defines “Conjunctive Management” as, “the integrated management and use of two or more water resources, such as a (groundwater) aquifer and a surface body of water.” *Id.*

⁵⁸ SE ROA 43.

⁵⁹ *Id.*

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ SE ROA 44.

- NRS 534.110(6), which allows the State Engineer to conduct investigations into any basin where average annual replenishment is not adequate for the needs of all water rights holders, and then subsequently restrict withdrawals to conform to priority rights.⁶²
- NRS 534 and specifically NRS 534.120, which allows the State Engineer to make such rules, regulations and orders as are deemed essential for the welfare of an area where the groundwater basin is being depleted.”⁶³

However, as further discussed below, the State Engineer’s reliance on these statutes for authority is misplaced, and his actions upend the bedrock principles of the prior appropriation doctrine.

1. **The Prior Appropriation Doctrine**

The doctrine of prior appropriation has been part of Nevada’s common law since the 1800’s, and is a fundamental principle of water law in Nevada. *See Lobdell v. Simpson*, 2 Nev. 274, 277-78 (1866). “An appropriative right ‘may be described as a state administrative grant that allows the use of a specific quantity of water for a specific beneficial purpose if water is available in the source free from the claims of others with earlier appropriations.’” *Desert Irr., Ltd. v. State*, 113 Nev. 1049, 1051 n.1, 944 P.2d 835, 837 (1997) (quoting Frank J. Trelease & George A. Gould, *Water Law Cases and Materials* 33 (4th ed. 1986)).

“Water rights are given ‘subject to existing rights,’ NRS 533.430(1), given dates of priority, NRS 533.265(2)(b), and determined based on relative rights, NRS 533.090(1)-(2).” *Mineral Cty. v. Lyon Cty.*, 136 Nev. 503, 513, 473 P.3d 418, 426 (2020). Thus, “[i]n Nevada, the doctrine of prior appropriation determines the priority of both pre-1905 vested water rights and modern statutory water law.” *Rand Properties, LLC v. Filippini*, 484 P.3d 275, Docket 78319 at 2 (Nev. 2021) (unpublished disposition). It is universally understood that the priority of a water right is its most valuable component. *See* Gregory J. Hobbs, Jr., *Priority: The Most Misunderstood Stick in the Bundle*, 32 *Env’tl. L.* 37, 43 (2002) (“Priority determines the value of a water right”).

“A priority in a water right is property in itself”; therefore, “to deprive a person of his

⁶² *Id.*

⁶³ *Id.*

1 priority is to deprive him of a most valuable property right.” *Colorado Water Conservation*
2 *Bd. v. City of Cent.*, 125 P.3d 424, 434 (Colo. 2005) (internal quotation marks omitted). “A loss of
3 priority that renders rights useless ‘certainly affects the rights’ value’ and ‘can amount to a de facto
4 loss of rights.’” *Wilson v. Happy Creek, Inc.*, 135 Nev. 301, 313, 448 P.3d 1106, 1115 (2019)
5 (quoting *Andersen Family Assocs.*, 124 Nev. at 190-1, 179 P.3d at 1201).

6 Nevada’s statutory water law reflects the importance of priority. Not only did the
7 Legislature choose not to bestow the State Engineer with discretion to alter priority rights, but it also
8 affirmatively requires the State Engineer to preserve priority rights when performing the State
9 Engineer’s statutory duties. *See, e.g.*, NRS 534.110(6) (providing that any curtailment “be restricted
10 to conform to priority rights”); NRS 534.110(7) (same); NRS 533.040(2) (“If at any time it is
11 impracticable to use water beneficially or economically at the place to which it is appurtenant, the
12 right may be severed from the place of use and be simultaneously transferred and become
13 appurtenant to another place of use, in the manner provided in this chapter, without losing priority of
14 right.”).

15 The prior appropriation doctrine in Nevada, “the driest state in the Nation”⁶⁴ becomes
16 particularly critical when, as in the instant case, there is not enough water to satisfy all of the
17 existing rights of the current water right holders, and the threat of curtailment looms ominously in
18 the near future. One of the greatest values of a senior priority right is the assurance that the holder
19 will be able to use water even during a time of water shortage because junior water right holders will
20 be curtailed first. Thus, senior right holders rely on their senior priority rights when developing
21 businesses, entitling and permitting land development, negotiating agreements, making investments,
22 obtaining permits and various approvals from State and local agencies, and generally making
23 financial and other decisions based on the relative certainty of their right.

24 Priority in time of a right is only as valuable as where the holder stands in relation to others
25 in the same situation, or more specifically in this case, in the same basin. As the statutes are written,
26

27
28 ⁶⁴ *United States v. State Engineer*, 117 Nev. 585, 592, 27 P.3d 51, 55 (2001)(Becker, J., concurring in part and
dissenting in part).

1 water right holders only compete in time for their “place in line” with other water right holders in
2 their same basin. Therefore, the year that one acquires a priority right is only as important as the
3 year that other water right holders in your basin acquired theirs. It is in this setting that State
4 Engineer has issued Order 1309.

5 **2. Joint Administration**

6 The State Engineer’s position is that the “best available science” demonstrates that the
7 seven⁶⁵ named hydrographic basins are so hydrologically interconnected that science dictates they
8 must be managed together in one superbasin. However, NRS 533.024(1)(c) is a policy declaration
9 of the Legislature’s intent that simply “encourages” the State Engineer “to consider the best
10 available science in rendering decisions” that concern water he has authority to manage. NRS
11 533.024(1)(c).

12 Statements of policy from the Legislature do not serve as a basis for government action, but
13 rather inform the interpretation of statutes that authorize specific action. *See, Pawlik v. Deng*, 134
14 Nev. 83, 85, 412 P.3d 68, 71 (2018). In *Pawlik*, the Nevada Supreme Court expressed the relevance
15 of statements of policy in terms as follows: “if the statutory language is subject to two or more
16 reasonable interpretations, the statute is ambiguous, and we then look beyond the statute to the
17 legislative history and interpret the statute in a reasonable manner ‘in light of the policy and the
18 spirit of the law.’” *Id.* (quoting *J.E. Dunn Nw., Inc. v. Corus Constr. Venture, LLC*, 127 Nev. 72, 79,
19 249 P.3d 501, 505 (2011)).

20 While such statements of policy are accorded deference in terms of statutory interpretation,
21 the Nevada Supreme Court has specifically held that they are not binding. *See McLaughlin v. Hous.*
22 *Auth. of the City of Las Vegas*, 227 P.2d 206, 93 (1951) (“It has often been said that the declaration
23 of policy by the legislature, though not necessarily binding or conclusive upon the courts, is entitled
24 to great weight, and that it is neither the duty nor prerogative of the courts to interfere in such
25 legislative finding unless it clearly appears to be erroneous and without reasonable foundation.”); *see*
26

27
28 ⁶⁵ More accurately, the LWRFS is comprised of six hydrographic basins and a portion of a seventh.

1 also *Clean Water Coal. v. M Resort, LLC*, 127 Nev. 301, 313, 255 P.3d 247, 255 (2011) (“The State
2 acknowledges that when legislative findings are expressly included within a statute, those findings
3 should be accorded great weight in interpreting the statute, but it points out that such findings are not
4 binding and this court may, nevertheless, properly conclude that section 18 is a general law despite
5 the Legislature's declaration to the contrary.”).

6 Statements of policy set forth by the Legislature are therefore not operative statutory
7 enactments, but rather tools to be used in interpreting operative statutes—and only then where such
8 statutes are ambiguous on their face. *See Pawlik*, 134 Nev. at 85, 412 P.3d at 71; *see also Cromer v.*
9 *Wilson*, 126 Nev. 106, 109-10, 225 P.3d 788, 790 (2010) (if the plain language of a statute “is
10 susceptible of another reasonable interpretation, we must not give the statute a meaning that will
11 nullify its operation, and we look to policy and reason for guidance”).

12 This statement of policy is not, in and of itself, a grant of authority that allows the State
13 Engineer to change boundaries of established hydrographic basins as science dictates. This Court
14 certainly acknowledges that since the time the 256 hydrographic basins and sub-basins were
15 delineated, that science and technology have made great strides. While certain navigable waters and
16 topography were more easily identifiable at the time the basins were established, the complexity lies
17 in the less obvious interconnectivity and formations of sub-surface structures that were more
18 difficult to detect at that time. There is no doubt that scientific advancements allow experts to more
19 accurately assess sub-surface formations and groundwater than they have in the past, and certainly
20 technology will continue to improve accuracy in the future. However, this Court notes that the
21 Legislature specifically used the word “encourages” to describe how the Nevada State Engineer
22 should utilize the best available science. NRS 533.024(1)(c). The statute does not declare that the
23 best available science should dictate the decisions.

24 Indeed, if science was the sole governing principle to dictate the Nevada State Engineer’s
25 decisions, there would be a slippery slope in the changes that could be made in the boundaries of the
26 basins and how they are managed; each time scientific advancements and discoveries were made
27 regarding how sub-surface water structures are situated or interconnected, under this theory of
28

1 authority, the Nevada State Engineer could change the boundaries of the existing basins. Each
2 boundary change would upend the priority of water right holders as they relate to the other water
3 right holders in the new, scientifically-dictated “basin.” This would lead to an absurd result as it
4 relates to the prior appropriation doctrine. Every water right holder would be insecure in their
5 priority, as their relative priority could change at any moment that science advances in determining
6 further interconnectivity of water below the surface. In the administration of water rights, the
7 certainty of those rights is particularly important and prior appropriation is “largely a product of the
8 compelling need for certainty in the holding and use of water rights.” *Mineral Cty. v. Lyon Cty.*, 136
9 Nev. at 518, 473 P.3d at 429 (quoting *Arizona v. California*, 460 U.S. 605, 620 (1983)). Science in
10 and of itself cannot alter common law and statutes. Thus, the State Engineer’s reliance on NRS
11 533.024(1)(c) for giving him authority to create a superbasin out of seven existing basins is
12 misplaced.

13 While NRS 532.120 allows the State Engineer to make reasonable rules and regulations as
14 may be necessary for proper and orderly execution, this authority is not without its limits, and is
15 only authorized for those “powers conferred by law.” Nothing in Chapters 532, 533 or 534 gives the
16 State Engineer direct authority to eliminate, modify, or redraw the boundaries of existing
17 hydrographic basins, or to consolidate multiple, already established, hydrographic basins into a
18 single hydrographic superbasin. For at least 50 years, holders of groundwater rights in Nevada have
19 understood a “hydrographic basin” to be an immutable administrative unit. This has been the case
20 regardless of whether the boundaries of the unit accurately reflected the boundaries of a particular
21 water resource. The Nevada Legislature has adopted a comprehensive scheme that provides the
22 framework for the State Engineer to administer surface water and groundwater. Moreover, the State
23 Engineer has, for decades, administered water on the basis of hydrographic basins identified,
24 described, and released to the public and relied upon by the Legislature, former State Engineers, and
25 the public. Applications to appropriate water are and have been on the basis of each hydrographic
26 basin. Protests, agreements, and resolutions of water applications have been on the basis of each
27 basin. Furthermore, statutes require that the State Engineer consider available water and
28

1 appropriations based on the basins already defined.

2 It is interesting to note that in the statutes that *do* confer authority on the Nevada State
3 Engineer to manage water, they specifically mention the management as being done on a basin-by-
4 basin (or a sub-basin within a basin) basis. NRS 534.030 is the original source of authority for the
5 State Engineer’s designation of an “administrative area” by “basin.” NRS 534.030. Through NRS
6 534.030 and NRS 534.011, the State Engineer has authority to designate “any groundwater basin, or
7 portion therein” an “area of active management,” which refers to an area “[i]n which the State
8 Engineer is conducting particularly close monitoring and regulation of the water supply because of
9 heavy use of that supply.” Under the statute’s plain meaning, a *basin* is intended to be an
10 *administrative unit*, defined by boundaries described by “legal subdivision as nearly as possible.”
11 NRS 534.030(1)(b). In other words, a hydrographic basin so designated was synonymous with an
12 administrative unit—a *legal* construct, defined thereafter by a *geographic* boundary. Water rights
13 within these basins are to be administered according to the laws set forth in NRS Chapters 533 and
14 534, and the principles of prior appropriation are applied to water uses *within* each basin.

15 Moreover, the Legislature consistently refers to a singular basin throughout the statute. *See*,
16 *e.g.*, 534.030(1) (describing a petition under NRS Chapter 534 as one that requests the State
17 Engineer “to administer the provisions of this chapter as relating to designated areas, ... in any
18 particular basin or portion therein”); NRS 534.030(2) (“a groundwater basin”); NRS 534.030(2)
19 (“the basin”). In fact, in the State Engineer’s prior rulings and orders, including Order 1169, Order
20 1169A, and Rulings 5712 and 6455, the State Engineer employs a basin-by-basin management
21 approach.

22 NRS 534.110(6) sets forth the State Engineer’s ability to make basin-specific determinations
23 and provides the authority to curtail water rights where investigations into specific basins
24 demonstrate that there is insufficient groundwater to meet the needs of all permittees and all vested-
25 right claimants. NRS 534.110 plainly applies to investigations concerning administration and
26 designation of critical management areas within a basin. If the State Engineer conducts an
27 investigation as set forth in NRS 534.110(6) and determines that the annual replenishment to the
28

1 groundwater supply is not adequate for the permittees and vested-right claimants, he has the
2 authority to either (1) order that withdrawals from domestic wells be restricted to conform to priority
3 rights, or (2) designate as a critical management area the basin in which withdrawals of groundwater
4 consistently exceed the perennial yield. NRS 534.110(6)-(7). It is important to note, however, that
5 the statute does not provide authority to change the boundaries of established basins, combine
6 multiple basins into one unit or superbasin, and then modify or curtail groundwater rights based
7 upon restructured priority dates in this newly created superbasin.

8 The Court acknowledges that the State Engineer can and should take into account how water
9 use in one basin may affect the water use in an adjoining or closely related basin when determining
10 how best to “actively manage” a basin. However, this is much different than how the State Engineer
11 defines “joint management”: erasing the borders of seven already established legal administrative
12 units and creating one legal superunit in the LWRFS superbasin. If the Legislature intended for the
13 State Engineer to designate areas across multiple basins for “joint administration,” it would have so
14 stated. *See Slade v. Caesars Entm’t Corp.*, 132 Nev. 374, 380-81, 373 P.3d 74, 78 (2016) (citing
15 Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Garner, *Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts*, 107 (2012)
16 (“The expression of one thing implies the exclusion of others.”)). Thus, under NRS 534.030, while
17 the State Engineer can administer basins individually, the statute does not allow the State Engineer
18 to combine basins for joint administration, nor do NRS 532.120, NRS 533.024, or NRS 534.110(6)
19 confer express authority on the State Engineer to do so.

20 **3. Conjunctive Management**

21 The Nevada State Engineer relies on NRS 534.024(1)(e), as the source of authority that
22 allows him to manage both surface and groundwater together through “conjunctive management.”⁶⁶
23 Historically, surface water and ground water have been managed separately. In fact, the term
24 “conjunctive management” was only introduced in the statutes in the 2017 session of the Nevada
25 Legislature when it added subsection 1(e) to NRS 533.024. However, as discussed previously, this
26
27

28 ⁶⁶ SE ROA 43.

1 statute is a declaration of legislative intent, and as a statement of policy, it does not constitute a grant
2 of authority to the State Engineer, nor is it a water management tool in and of itself.

3 In fact, there is no authority or guidance whatsoever in the statutes as to how to go about
4 conjunctively managing water and water rights. While the Court agrees that it makes sense to take
5 into account how certain groundwater rights may affect other surface water rights when managing
6 water overall, as this Court noted previously, the powers of the State Engineer are limited to those
7 set forth in the law. While Nevada law provides certain tools for the management of water rights in,
8 for example, over appropriated basins, *e.g.*, NRS 534.110(7) (authorizing the State Engineer to
9 “designate as a critical management area any basin in which withdrawals of groundwater
10 consistently exceed the perennial yield of the basin”), nothing in Chapters 532, 533 or 534 gives the
11 State Engineer express authority to conjunctively manage, in this proceeding, both the surface and
12 groundwater flows he believes are occurring in the LWRFS superbasin.

13 This Court finds that as a result of the consolidation of the basins, the relative priority of all
14 water rights within the seven affected basins will be reordered and the priorities will be considered
15 in relation to all water rights holders in the consolidated basins, rather than in relation only to the
16 other users within the original separate basins.⁶⁷ By redefining and combining seven established
17 basins for “joint administration,” and “conjunctive management,” the State Engineer essentially
18 strips senior right holders of their priority rights by deciding that all water rights within the LWRFS
19 superbasin should be administered based upon their respective dates of priority in relation to other
20 rights “within the regional groundwater unit.”

21 The State Engineer’s position is that the determination of conflicts and priorities has not yet
22 occurred since that is to occur in the second step of the proceeding. However, by the very nature of
23 erasing the existing basins and putting all of the water rights holders in one superbasin, he has
24

25
26 ⁶⁷ This Court rejects the State Engineer’s argument that Order 1309 did not change priorities merely because it did not
27 change priority dates. His argument conflates the meaning of *priority* as defined by the date of a water right application,
28 and the common meaning of *priority*, as defined by one’s “place in line.” While it is true that the Order does not change
priority dates, this Court finds that it *does* change the relative priorities, as petitioners who previously held the most
senior rights within their singular basin may now be relegated to more junior status within the “superbasin.”

1 already reprioritized certain rights as they relate to one another, even if their priority dates remain
2 the same.⁶⁸ As a result of creating this superbasin, water rights holders with some of the most senior
3 priority rights within their basin are now relegated to a much a lower priority position than some
4 water right holders in basins outside of their own. Such a loss of priority would potentially render
5 certain water rights valueless, given the State Engineer’s restrictions on pumping in the entire
6 LWRFS. The Court concludes that the State Engineer does not have authority to redefine Nevada
7 basins so as to reorder the priority rights of water right holders through conjunctive management
8 within those basins. Accordingly, Order 1309 stands at odds with the prior appropriation doctrine.

9 The Court determines that the question of whether the State Engineer has *authority* to change
10 the boundaries of basins that have been established for decades, or subject that newly created basin
11 to conjunctive management, or not, is a legal question, not a factual one. The State Engineer has
12 failed to identify a statute that authorizes him to alter established basin boundaries or engage in
13 conjunctive management. Based upon the plain language of the applicable statutes, the Court
14 concludes that the State Engineer acted outside the scope of his authority in entering Order 1309.

15 **B. The State Engineer Violated Petitioners’ Due Process Rights in Failing to Provide**
16 **Notice to Petitioners or an Opportunity to Comment on the Administrative Policies Inherent**
17 **in the Basin Consolidation.**

18 The Nevada Constitution protects against the deprivation of property without due process of
19 law. Nev. Const. art. 1, § 8(5). “Procedural due process requires that parties receive notice and an
20 opportunity to be heard.” *Eureka Cty. V. Seventh Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 134 Nev. 275, 279, 417 P.3d 1121,
21 1124 (2018)(internal quotation marks omitted). “In Nevada, water rights are ‘regarded and
22 protected as real property.’” *Id.*(quoting *Application of Filippini*, 66 Nev. 17, 21-22, 202 P.2d 535,
23

24 ⁶⁸ Although this Court refrains from analyzing whether or not 1309 is supported by substantial evidence, the Court notes
25 that part of the State Engineer’s 1309 decision of limiting use to 8,000afa or less is based on the concern of adversely
26 impacting the endangered Moapa Dace, located in the Muddy River Springs. This decision does not appear to take into
27 account more nuanced effects of how pumping in each separate basin affects the Muddy River flows, no matter how far
28 away the basin is from the river. In other words, reprioritization of each water rights holder in relation to the other (by
prioritization date in the newly created superbasin) means that their standing (and more importantly, their potential for
curtailment) is only by date. Water use in one basin may not have the same effect as another in reducing Muddy River
flows; however, these distinguishing factors are all erased by combining all of the basins together for joint
administration.

537 (1949)). Therefore, holders of water rights in Nevada are entitled to constitutional protections regarding those property rights, including procedural due process. *See id.*

The Nevada Supreme Court has held that “[a]lthough proceedings before administrative agencies may be subject to more relaxed procedural and evidentiary rules, due process guarantees of fundamental fairness still apply.” *Dutchess Bus. Serv. ’s, Inc. v. Nev. State Bd. of Pharmacy*, 124 Nev. 701, 711, 191 P.3d 1159, 1166 (2008). In *Dutchess*, the Nevada Supreme Court noted further that “[a]dministrative bodies must follow their established procedural guidelines and give notice to the defending party of ‘the issues on which decision will turn and . . . the factual material on which the agency relies for decision so that he may rebut it.’” *Id.*

With respect to notice and hearing, the Nevada Supreme Court has held that “[i]nherent in any notice and hearing requirement are the propositions that the notice will accurately reflect the subject matter to be addressed and that the hearing will allow full consideration of it.” *Public Serv. Comm’n of Nev. v. Southwest Gas Corp.*, 99 Nev. 268, 271, 772 P.2d 624, 626 (1983). “Notice must be given at an appropriate stage in the proceedings to give parties meaningful input in the adjudication of their rights.” *Seventh Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 134 Nev. at 280-81, 417 P.3d at 1125-26 (citing *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 533, 124 S.Ct. 2633, 159 L.Ed.2d 578 (2004) (“It is equally fundamental that the right to notice and an opportunity to be heard must be granted at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner.”)). A party’s due process rights attach at the point at which a proceeding holds the *possibility* of curtailing water rights, and due process necessitates notice of that possibility to the party potentially affected.⁶⁹

For the reasons that follow, this Court concludes that (a) the notice and hearing procedure employed by the State Engineer failed to satisfy the requirements of due process because the notice failed to put the parties on notice that the State Engineer would decide on a management protocol for

⁶⁹ “[B]ecause the language in the show cause order indicates that the district court may enter an order forcing curtailment to begin, junior water rights holders must be given an opportunity to make their case for or against the option of curtailment. Notice must be given at an appropriate stage in the proceedings to give parties meaningful input in the adjudication of their rights...Thus, junior water rights holders must be notified before the curtailment decision is made, even if the specific “how” and “who” of curtailment is decided in a future proceeding.” *Seventh Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 134 Nev. 275, 280-81, 417 P.3d 1121, 1125 (2018).

1 the LWRFS at the conclusion of the proceeding; (b) the hearing itself failed to satisfy due process
2 because the parties were not afforded a full and complete opportunity to address the implications of
3 the State Engineer's decision to subject the LWRFS to conjunctive management and joint
4 administration, and (c) the State Engineer's nondisclosure, before or during the Order 1303
5 proceedings of the six criteria he would use in evaluating the connectivity of the basins and
6 determining the new consolidated basin boundary, failed to satisfy the requirements of due process.

7 Specifically, the notice of hearing and amended notice of hearing ("Notice") noticed an
8 opportunity for the parties that submitted Order 1303 reports to explain their positions and
9 conclusions with respect to the questions posed for consideration in Order 1303.^{70 71} But the
10 questions posed in Order 1303 did not relate to management of the LWRFS, such as issues of
11 conjunctive or joint administration, but rather related to factual inquiries. Instead, Order 1303
12 specifically authorized stakeholders to file reports addressing four specific areas, none of which
13 related to the management of the LWRFS.⁷²

14 In noticing the hearing to consider the reports submitted pursuant to Order 1303, there was
15 no mention of consideration of the prospective management of the LWRFS, *i.e.*, whether it would be
16 appropriately managed conjunctively and as a joint administrative unit. Indeed, this was consistent
17 with the Hearing Officer's opening remarks at the August 8, 2019, prehearing conference in which
18

19 ⁷⁰ See SE ROA 262-82, Ex. 2; SE ROA 284-301, Ex. 3

20 ⁷¹ The Notice included the following summary:

21 On August 9, 2019, the State Engineer held a pre-hearing conference regarding the hearing on the
22 submission of reports and evidence as solicited in Order 1303.... The State Engineer established that
23 the purpose of the hearing on the Order 1303 reports was to provide the participants an opportunity to
24 explain the positions and conclusions expressed in the reports and/or rebuttal reports submitted in
25 response to the Order 1303 solicitation. The State Engineer directed the participants to limit the offer of
26 evidence and testimony to the salient conclusions, including directing the State Engineer and his staff
27 to the relevant data, evidence and other information supporting those conclusions. ***The State Engineer
further noted that the hearing on the Order 1303 reports was the first step in determining to what
extent, if any, and in what manner the State Engineer would address future management decisions,
including policy decisions, relating to the Lower White River Flow System basins. On that basis, the
State Engineer then addressed other related matters pertaining to the hearing on the Order 1303
reports, including addressing the date and sequence of the hearing, as set forth in this Notice of
Hearing.*** SE ROA 285, Ex. 3 (emphasis added).

28 ⁷² SE ROA 647-48. Ex. 6.

1 the State Engineer actively discouraged participants from providing input regarding that very
2 question. The hearing officer stated as follows at the August 8 prehearing conference:

3 And so, and I'm going to talk about this and we've spoken about this before, is
4 that really this is a threshold reporting aspect, that this is part of a multi-tiered
5 process in terms of determining the appropriate management strategy to the
6 Lower River Flow System.

7 This larger substantive policy determination is not part of the particular
8 proceeding. That's part of later proceedings....

9 SE ROA 522, Ex. 5 (Hr'g Tr. at 10:6-20).

10 The hearing officer gave additional consistent guidance at the outset of the September 23
11 hearing, further directing the parties not to address policy issues even in relation to the fact that
12 Order 1303 authorized stakeholders to include in their reports "[a]ny other matter believed to be
13 relevant to the State Engineer's analysis."⁷³ Specifically, the Hearing Officer directed as follows:

14 And while that fifth issue is [as set forth in Ordering Paragraph 1(e) of Order
15 1303] not intended to expand the scope of this hearing into making policy
16 determinations with respect to management of the Lower White River Flow
17 System basin's individual water rights, those different types of things, because
18 those are going to be decisions that would have to be made in subsequent
19 proceedings should they be necessary.

20 SE ROA 52962, Ex. 26 (Hr'g Tr. 6:4-15).

21 Not only did the notice not adequately notify the parties of the possibility of the
22 consideration and resolution of policy issues, but the Hearing Officer consistently
23 directed the parties to avoid the subject, compounding the due process violation.

24 Notwithstanding the Hearing Officer's admonitions and the plain language of the notice, the
25 State Engineer ultimately issued a dramatic determination regarding management of the LWRFS. In
26 doing so, the State Engineer precluded the participants from providing input that would have
27 allowed for the full consideration of the issue. Specifically, participants and experts did not have the
28 opportunity to, and were actively discouraged from addressing policy issues critical to the

⁷³ SE ROA 648, Ex. 6.

1 management of the LWRFS.⁷⁴ The refusal to consider these issues ensured that the State Engineer's
2 decision was not based on a fully developed record.

3 The State Engineer acknowledged as much in Order 1309 itself. There, the State Engineer
4 noted the fact that Georgia-Pacific and Republic raised concerns over the sufficiency of the scope of
5 the proceedings at hearing but inexplicably asserted that a to-be-determined management scheme
6 would be developed to address "management issues" in the LWRFS:

7 Georgia-Pacific and Republic asserted that boundaries are premature without
8 additional data and without a legally defensible policy and management tools in
9 place. They expressed concern that creating an administrative unit at this time
10 inherently directs policy without providing for due process. The State Engineer
11 has considered these concerns and agrees that additional data and improved
12 understanding of the hydrologic system is critical to the process. He also believes
13 that the data currently available provide enough information to delineate LWRFS
14 boundaries, and that an effective management scheme will provide for the
15 flexibility to adjust boundaries based on additional information, retain the ability
16 to address unique management issues on a sub-basin scale, and maintain
17 partnership with water users who may be affected by management actions
18 throughout the LWRFS.

19 SE ROA 54, Ex. 1.

20 This language reflects a serious misunderstanding of the effect of Order 1309. Insofar as
21 Order 1309 subjects the LWRFS to conjunctive management and joint administration, resulting in
22 effectively reordering of priority of water rights in the LWRFS superbasin, the order effectuates a
23 management scheme with far reaching consequences. Thus, agreeing on the one hand that an
24 "effective management scheme" will be necessary to address challenges in the LWRFS, but
25

26 ⁷⁴ These issues include, but are not limited to: whether Nevada law allows the State Engineer to conjunctively manage
27 multiple hydrographic basins in a manner that modifies the relative priority of water rights due to the administration
28 consolidation of basins; whether the State Engineer would establish a "critical management area" pursuant to NRS
534.110 and, if so, whether he would develop a groundwater management plan or defer to the stakeholders to develop
one; whether Nevada law gives the State Engineer authority to designate a management area that encompasses more than
one basin; whether "safe-yield" discrete management areas should be established within the proposed administrative
unit; whether water rights holders enjoy a "property right" in the relative priority of their water rights such that impairing
that right may constitute a "taking"; whether unused (or only sporadically used) senior water rights take precedence over
certificated or fully used junior rights, particularly where these junior rights are in continuous use to support
economically significant enterprises; whether States compel quantification of federal reserved rights by a date certain;
and whether the State Engineer should approach the legislature to seek different or additional management tools or
authority. See SE ROA 52801-8, Ex. 25 (Georgia Pacific and Republic Closing Argument, outlining policy questions
for consideration by the State Engineer at later proceedings, proceedings that never took place).

1 contending it will be developed in the future, reveals a lack of appreciation of the implications of the
2 order to the detriment of not only the participants but all water rights holders in the LWRFS basins.
3 Without consideration of the implications of the management decision contained in the order, it
4 cannot be based on a full consideration of the issues presented. In affirmatively limiting the scope of
5 the proceeding to include a full consideration of the issues, the State Engineer violated the
6 stakeholders' due process rights. Both the notice and the hearing procedures employed failed to
7 comport with due process.

8 Finally, as noted above, the State Engineer did not give notice or disclose before or during
9 the Order 1303 proceedings, the six specific criteria that he would use in evaluating the connectivity
10 of the basins and determining the new consolidated basin boundary. Although the State Engineer
11 asserted that he considered the evidence and testimony presented in the public hearing "on the basis
12 of a common set of criteria that are consistent with the original characteristics conserved critical in
13 demonstrating a close hydrologic connection requiring joint management in Rulings 6254-6261,"⁷⁵
14 a review of these rulings reveals that none of the six criteria or characteristics were previously
15 identified, examined in the hydrological studies and subsequent hearing that followed the
16 completion of the Order 1169 aquifer test, or expressly disclosed in Rulings 6254-6261.⁷⁶ These
17 criteria were instead explicitly disclosed for the first time in Order 1309, which means the
18 participants had no opportunity to directly address these criteria in their presentations, or critically,
19 to address the appropriateness of these criteria.

20 This Court is unpersuaded by the State Engineer's argument that it could develop the criteria
21 only after it heard all the evidence at the hearing. Even if it did, this does not justify a deprivation of
22 the right to due process. In order to provide the parties due process and a meaningful opportunity to
23 present evidence on these issues, the State Engineer should have included these factors in the Notice
24 of Pre-Hearing Conference. *See Eureka Cty.*, 131 Nev. at 855, 359 P.3d at 1120; *Revert*, 95 Nev. at
25 787, 603 P.2d at 265 (criticizing the state engineer for engaging in post hoc rationalization). This

26
27 ⁷⁵ See SE ROA 48.

28 ⁷⁶ SE ROA 726-948.

1 due process violation is particularly harmful to water rights holders in Kane Springs, the sole basin
2 that had not been previously designated for management under NRS 534.030, had not been included
3 in the Order 1169 aquifer test, and had not been identified as a basin to be included in the LWRFS
4 superbasin in Order 1303.

5 Accordingly, this Court concludes that revealing the criteria only after stakeholders had
6 engaged in the extensive investigations, expert reporting, and the intense factual hearing requested
7 by Order 1303 further violates the participants' due process rights.

8 As this Court has determined that the Nevada State Engineer exceeded his statutory authority
9 and violated the participants' due process rights in issuing Order 1309, it declines to reach further
10 analysis on whether his factual findings in Order 1309 were supported by substantial evidence.

11 **IV.**

12 **CONCLUSION**

13 The Court FINDS that the Nevada State Engineer exceeded his statutory authority and had
14 no authority based in statute to create the LWRFS superbasin out of multiple distinct, already
15 established hydrographic basins. The Nevada State Engineer also lacked the statutory authority to
16 conjunctively manage this LWRFS superbasin.

17 The Court ALSO FINDS that the Nevada State Engineer violated the Petitioners'
18 Constitutional right to due process by failing to provide adequate notice and a meaningful
19 opportunity to be heard.

20 As a result, Order 1309 is arbitrary, capricious, and therefore void.

21 Good cause appearing, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the
22 Court ORDERS, ADJUDGES AND DECREES as follows:

23 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition for review of the Nevada State Engineer's
24 Order No. 1309 filed by Petitioners Lincoln County Water District and Vidler Water Company, Inc.
25 is GRANTED.

26 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for review of the Nevada State Engineer's
27 Order No. 1309 filed by Petitioners Coyote Springs Investment, LLC is GRANTED.
28

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for review of the Nevada State Engineer's
2 Order No. 1309 filed by Petitioners Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC is
3 GRANTED.


4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for review of the Nevada State Engineer's
5 Order No. 1309 filed by Petitioners Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2 is GRANTED.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for review of the Nevada State Engineer's
7 Order No. 1309 filed by Petitioners Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC, and Republic Environmental
8 Technologies, Inc. is GRANTED.

9 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the State Engineer's Order 1309 is VACATED in its
10 entirety.

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 19th day of April, 2022

13 
14

15 66B 24A E875 2549
16 Bita Yeager
17 District Court Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4
5
6 Southern Nevada Water
Authority, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-816761-C

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

8
9 Nevada State Engineer, Division
of Water Resources,
10 Defendant(s)

11
12 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
14 Court. The foregoing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order was served via the
15 court's electronic eFile system to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled
case as listed below:

16 Service Date: 4/19/2022

17 Sev Carlson scarlson@kcnvlaw.com

18 Dorene Wright dwright@ag.nv.gov

19 James Bolotin jbolotin@ag.nv.gov

20 Mary Pizzariello mpizzariello@ag.nv.gov

21 Mike Knox mknox@nvenergy.com

22 Christian Balducci cbalducci@maclaw.com

23 Laena St-Jules lstjules@ag.nv.gov

24 Kiel Ireland kireland@ag.nv.gov

25 Justina Caviglia jcaviglia@nvenergy.com

26
27
28


1	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
6	Therese Ure	counsel@water-law.com
7	Sharon Stice	sstice@kcnvlaw.com
8	Gregory Morrison	gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
9	Paul Taggart	paul@legaltnt.com
10	Derek Muaina	DerekM@WesternElite.com
11	Andy Moore	moorea@cityofnorthvegas.com
12	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
13	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
14	Lisa Belenky	lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
15	Douglas Wolf	dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
16	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
17	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
18	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
19	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
22	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
23	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
2	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@wingfieldnevadagroup.com
3	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
4	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
5	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
6	Andrew Moore	moorea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com
7	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
8	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
9	Steve King	kingmont@charter.net
10	Karen Peterson	kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com
11	Wayne Klomp	wayne@greatbasinlawyer.com
12	Dylan Frehner	dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov
13	Scott Lake	slake@biologicaldiversity.org
14	Hannah Winston	hwinston@rssblaw.com
15	Nancy Hoy	nhoy@mcdonaldcarano.com
16	Carole Davis	cdavis@mcdonaldcarano.com
17	Thomas Duensing	tom@legaltnt.com
18	Thomas Duensing	tom@legaltnt.com
19	Jane Susskind	jsusskind@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Jane Susskind	jsusskind@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Kellie Piet	kpiet@maclaw.com
22	Francis Flaherty	fflaherty@dyerlawrence.com
23	Courtney Droessler	cdroessler@kcnvlaw.com
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

EXHIBIT 19

EXHIBIT 19


CLERK OF THE COURT

FFCO

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
AUTHORITY,

Petitioners,

vs.

TIM WILSON, P.E., Nevada State Engineer,
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND
NATURAL RESOURCES,

Respondent.

And All Consolidated Cases.

Case No. A-20-816761-C
Dept. No. I

Consolidated with Cases:

A-20-817765-P
A-20-818015-P
A-20-817977-P
A-20-818069-P
A-20-817840-P
A-20-817876-P
A-21-833572-J

**ADDENDUM AND CLARIFICATION TO COURT'S FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER GRANTING PETITIONS FOR JUDICIAL
REVIEW FILED ON APRIL 19, 2022**

This matter came before this Court on consolidated petitions for judicial review of State Engineer's Order 1309 filed by Petitioners:

- Southern Nevada Water Authority and Las Vegas Valley Water District
- Coyote Spring Investment, LLC
- Apex Holding Co. and Dry Lake Water, LLC
- The Center for Biological Diversity
- Muddy Valley Irrigation Company
- Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2
- Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.
- Lincoln County Water District and Vidler Water Company.

1 In the Order filed April 19, 2022, the Court determined that the Nevada State Engineer
2 exceeded his statutory authority and violated the participants' due process rights in issuing Order
3 1309, and declined to reach further analysis on whether his factual findings in Order 1309 were
4 supported by substantial evidence.

5 The Petitions filed by petitioners Southern Nevada Water Authority and Las Vegas Valley
6 Water District, Muddy Valley Irrigation Company, and The Center for Biological Diversity
7 supported the Nevada State Engineer's position that Order 1309 did not exceed the State Engineer's
8 statutory authority nor violated participant's due process rights in issuing Order 1309. However,
9 each of these three petitioners challenged the factual findings as not being supported by substantial
10 evidence.

11 **IV.**

12 **CONCLUSION**

13 To the extent that the petition for review of the Nevada State Engineer's Order No. 1309
14 filed by Southern Nevada Water Authority and Las Vegas Valley Water District seeks relief for
15 violating their due process rights, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition is GRANTED IN
16 PART. The remaining portion of the petition that support the position that the Nevada State
17 Engineer did not exceed his statutory authority in issuing Order 1309 is DISMISSED.

18 To the extent that the remaining petitions support the position that Nevada State Engineer did
19 not exceed his statutory authority and provided due process in issuing Order 1309;

20 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for review of the Nevada State Engineer's
21 Order No. 1309 filed by Petitioner Muddy Valley Irrigation Company is DISMISSED.

22 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for review of the Nevada State Engineer's
23 Order No. 1309 filed by Petitioner The Center for Biological Diversity is DISMISSED.

24
25
26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated this 13th day of May, 2022



EE8 27A A594 AF7E
Bita Yeager
District Court Judge

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5
6 Southern Nevada Water
7 Authority, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-816761-C

8 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 1

9 Nevada State Engineer, Division
10 of Water Resources,
11 Defendant(s)

12 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

13 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
14 Court. The foregoing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Judgment was served via the
15 court's electronic eFile system to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled
16 case as listed below:

Service Date: 5/13/2022

17 Sev Carlson scarlson@kcnvlaw.com

18 Dorene Wright dwright@ag.nv.gov

19 James Bolotin jbolotin@ag.nv.gov

20 Mary Pizzariello mpizzariello@ag.nv.gov

21 Mike Knox mknox@nvenergy.com

22 Christian Balducci cbalducci@maclaw.com

23 Laena St-Jules lstjules@ag.nv.gov

24 Kiel Ireland kireland@ag.nv.gov

25 Justina Caviglia jcaviglia@nvenergy.com

26
27
28

1	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
2	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
3	Therese Shanks	tshanks@rssblaw.com
4	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
5	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
6	Therese Ure	counsel@water-law.com
7	Sharon Stice	sstice@kcnvlaw.com
8	Gregory Morrison	gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com
9	Paul Taggart	paul@legaltnt.com
10	Derek Muaina	DerekM@WesternElite.com
11	Andy Moore	moorea@cityofnorthvegas.com
12	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
13	Steven Anderson	Sc.anderson@lvvwd.com
14	Lisa Belenky	lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
15	Douglas Wolf	dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
16	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
17	Sylvia Harrison	sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
18	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
19	Lucas Foletta	lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Sarah Ferguson	sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
22	Alex Flangas	aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
23	Kent Robison	krobison@rssblaw.com
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	Bradley Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
2	Emilia Cargill	emilia.cargill@wingfieldnevadagroup.com
3	William Coulthard	wlc@coulthardlaw.com
4	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
5	Christian Balducci	cbalducci@maclaw.com
6	Andrew Moore	moorea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com
7	Robert Dotson	rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
8	Justin Vance	jvance@dotsonlaw.legal
9	Steve King	kingmont@charter.net
10	Karen Peterson	kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com
11	Wayne Klomp	wayne@greatbasinlawyer.com
12	Dylan Frehner	dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov
13	Scott Lake	slake@biologicaldiversity.org
14	Hannah Winston	hwinston@rssblaw.com
15	Nancy Hoy	nhoy@mcdonaldcarano.com
16	Carole Davis	cdavis@mcdonaldcarano.com
17	Thomas Duensing	tom@legaltnt.com
18	Thomas Duensing	tom@legaltnt.com
19	Jane Susskind	jsusskind@mcdonaldcarano.com
20	Jane Susskind	jsusskind@mcdonaldcarano.com
21	Kellie Piet	kpiet@maclaw.com
22	Francis Flaherty	fflaherty@dyerlawrence.com
23	Courtney Droessler	cdroessler@kcnvlaw.com
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	