

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

* * * * *

ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., NEVADA
STATE ENGINEER, DIVISION OF
WATER RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT
OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL
RESOURCES; SOUTHERN NEVADA
WATER AUTHORITY; CENTER FOR
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY; AND
MUDDY VALLEY IRRIGATION CO.

Appellant,

v.

LINCOLN COUNTY WATER
DISTRICT; et al.,

Respondents.

Electronically Filed
Jun 09 2022 09:08 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

Case No. 84739

(Consolidated with 84741, 84742,
84809)

**OPPOSITION TO SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
AUTHORITY'S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR STAY**

Sylvia Harrison (NSBN 4106)
Lucas Foletta (NSBN 12154)
Jane Susskind (NSBN 15099)
McDonald Carano LLP
100 West Liberty Street, 10th Floor
Reno, Nevada 89501
Telephone: (775) 788-2000
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
jsusskind@mcdonaldcarano.com

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

NRAP 26.1 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to NRAP 26.1, the undersigned counsel of record certifies that the following are persons and entities as described in NRAP 26.1(a) and must be disclosed. These representations are made in order that the justices of the Supreme Court and the judges of the Court of Appeals may evaluate possible disqualification or recusal.

Respondent Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC (“Georgia-Pacific”) is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Koch Industries, Inc.

Respondent Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc. (“Republic”) is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Republic Services, Inc.

The following law firm has lawyers who appeared for Georgia-Pacific and Republic in the case or are expected to appear on their behalf in this Court:
McDonald Carano LLP.

DATED: June 8, 2022.

MCDONALD CARANO LLP

By: /s/ Lucas Foletta

Sylvia Harrison (NSBN 4106)

Lucas Foletta (NSBN 12154)

Jane Susskind (NSBN 15099)

100 W. Liberty St., 10th Floor

Reno, Nevada 89501

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

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 19, 2022, and after extensive briefing and oral argument, the district court issued a well-reasoned *Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Granting Petitions for Judicial Review* (“Order”). In its Order, the district court vacated Order 1309, concluding that the State Engineer did not have the statutory authority to consolidate already-established hydrographic basins into one hydrographic superbasin and that the proceedings deprived Respondents of their due-process rights. In district court, Southern Nevada Water Authority (“SNWA”) challenged Order 1309 through a petition for judicial review, admitted that the State Engineer deprived it of its opportunity to be meaningfully heard, and urged the district court to reverse Order 1309 (at least in part). The district court did what SNWA initially asked it to do, yet SNWA is now *defending* Order 1309, and asks this Court to stay the district court’s order vacating it. In other words, SNWA is asking this Court to condone the State Engineer’s overreach of power and deprivation of constitutional rights (which SNWA admitted), and keep an unconstitutional and unlawful order in place for an undefined period of time.

This is wholly inappropriate, for at least three reasons: (1) despite exceeding the page limit for motions by 14 pages, SNWA’s motion does not satisfy NRAP 8(c); (2) SNWA inappropriately attempts to present the dispositive issues on appeal

in its motion; and (3) SNWA is not an aggrieved party, and thus does not have standing to bring its appeal. Respondents Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc. (collectively, “GP-R”) therefore request that this Court deny SNWA’s Emergency Motion for Stay.

II. ARGUMENT

1. SNWA Fails to Satisfy NRAP 8(c)’s Factors.

In deciding whether to issue a stay pending resolution of an appeal, the Court considers four factors. NRAP 8(c). The party moving for a stay pending appeal “bears the burden of showing that the circumstances justify an exercise of that discretion.” *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 433–34, (2009). As explained below, SNWA has failed to satisfy its burden of demonstrating that a stay is warranted here.

a. The Object of the Appeal Will Not be Defeated if the Stay is Denied.

NRAP 8(c) requires this Court to evaluate “whether the object of the . . . appeal will be defeated if the stay . . . is denied.” SNWA argues that the object of the appeal is “the protection of senior surface water rights and habitat for the Moapa dace.” Mot. at 8. SNWA seems to suggest that the *only* method to achieve this object is through the State Engineer’s prohibition on groundwater pumping beyond 8,000 afa that was contained in the unconstitutional Order 1309. This ignores the ample other mechanisms in place to limit pumping and protect senior water rights, providing protection during the pendency of the appeal.

For example, the Memorandum of Agreement (“MOA”) involving the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and several major water users in the Lower White River Flow System (“LWRFS”) requires mitigation measures at certain spring flow levels, protecting both decreed rights and the Moapa Dace, regardless of the status of Order 1309. The district court correctly noted these mechanisms in its oral ruling denying SNWA’s motion for stay, explaining that are statutes that allow the State Engineer to curtail pumping, including NRS 534.110(7), which provides the State Engineer with authority to “designate as a critical management area any basin in which withdrawals of groundwater consistently exceed the perennial yield of the basin”, and there is an MOA in place regarding the Moapa dace. App MFS 186:20-187:4. Thus, SNWA cannot prove that the object of their appeal will be defeated absent a stay.

b. SNWA Will Not Suffer Irreparable Harm if the Court Denies the Motion for Stay, but Respondents Will.

Under NRAP 8(c), a party moving for a stay must prove that it will suffer “irreparable or serious injury.” SNWA’s claim of irreparable harm is based on its assertion that increased groundwater pumping is a “threat to SNWA’s water rights and the Moapa dace.” (Mot. at 10.) But “simply showing *some possibility* of irreparable injury is insufficient.” *Al Otro Lado v. Wolf*, 952 F.3d 999, 1007 (9th Cir. 2020) (internal quotation marks omitted) (emphasis added). Rather, SNWA must show “that irreparable injury is *likely to occur* during the period before the

appeal is likely to be decided.” *Id.* (finding that the government failed to make such showing where it relies on “estimates, assumptions, and projections”) (emphasis added); *see also Berryman v. Int’l Bhd. Elec. Workers*, 82 Nev. 277, 280, 416 P.2d 387, 389 (1966) (stating that in the context of an injunction, there should be a “reasonable probability that real injury will occur if the injunction does not issue”).

Here, SNWA’s claims are entirely speculative. SNWA provides no evidence of the likelihood of increased pumping while this matter is pending appeal. Though SNWA summarily cites a subdivision map filed by CSI as proof that the threat of over pumping is “real and immediate,” it fails to provide any evidence that the State Engineer is without any alternative means to limit or prevent such pumping. Mot. at 9. It also fails to cite any request of the State Engineer to authorize pumping that was not already occurring at the time Order 1309 was issued. Its sole citation to CSI’s statements made during the hearing in district court is insufficient evidence to show that increased pumping will *likely* occur. *See* Mot. at 10-11. On the contrary, the record on appeal evidences that CSI has already agreed to *curtail* pumping at trigger levels set by the MOA (and agreed to by SNWA); the State Engineer noted that the 8,000 afa number could be higher (i.e., more pumping could occur); and any additional pumping by CSI is not likely to occur at a volume that could directly affect Muddy River flows. Most importantly, the 8,000 afa limit that SNWA tries to enforce was never approved, either implicitly or otherwise, by the district court.

Further, and as explained above, SNWA also completely fails to note that there are other mechanisms in place (beside Order 1309) that protect senior decreed rights and the Moapa Dace. What's more, since Order 1309 issued, there has been additional data indicating that spring flows in the LWRFS are recovering. *See* Request for Judicial Notice, **Exhibit 1**. For example, the Hydrologic Review Team ("HRT Report") includes an in-depth analysis of the impacts on Muddy River Springs and Muddy River flows resulting from regional groundwater pumping, and is the result of extensive data collection, monitoring, and other analytical activities during 2020. *Id.* The HRT Report concludes that both the Pederson Spring and Warm Springs West are recovering, not declining. *Id.* Further, recent research shows that the Moapa dace population has significantly rebounded since the elimination of invasive predatory species, like tilapia, from the Muddy River and tributaries where the dace populate. *See* Request for Judicial Notice, Ex. 2, the "Moapa Dace Article". In fact, the research on which the Moapa Dace Article relies is research conducted by SNWA. Thus, SNWA knows full well that other factors play into the ecological health of the Moapa Dace population and the LWRFS. This additional data directly undercuts SNWA claims regarding the current state of the LWRFS.

SNWA's claim of irreparable harm is also inconsistent with its own characterization of the implications of Order 1309. In its brief in district court, SNWA (disingenuously) argued that Order 1309 did not affect a curtailment and that

any management action potentially reducing pumping would be the subject of future regulatory proceedings. Specifically, SNWA said:

Finally, the question of priority is only important if a curtailment action is initiated. In a curtailment situation, the State Engineer “restricts water use to conform to priority rights.” This means, that junior uses that are in excess of the available supply get curtailed. Order 1309 did not initiate curtailment. Instead, Order 1309 established the factual predicate to the possibility of curtailment in the future (i.e., the State Engineer defined the extent of the aquifer and the quantity of the available supply). If the State Engineer orders a water right to be curtailed in the future, such an action would be separately appealable under NRS 533.450.

SNWA Answering Brief at 24, **Exhibit 2**. SNWA now asks this Court to protect its senior water rights by preserving Order 1309 while this matter is appealed, effectively arguing that Order 1309 itself protects its senior decreed rights. This is contrary to its earlier contention that Order 1309 merely established the “factual predicate” for future management decisions. If the Order has no legally operative implications, then it is unclear why it is so important to preserve it.

To that point, it is GP-R not SNWA that will be harmed by a stay. GP-R’s due process rights have been deprived in connection with the issuance of Order 1309. Asking GP-R and all other respondents to continue to suffer the effects of that deprivation is entirely unreasonable. Order 1309 subjected respondents’ existing water rights to serious questions regarding the continued viability of those rights. Those questions caused respondents to re-think their business strategies for southern

Nevada and re-assess the value of their water rights. Allowing Order 1309 to stand will perpetuate the harm that the court already found exists as a result of Order 1309.

And staying only the portion of Order 1309 that establishes an 8,000 afa pumping limit is not an option. In its Motion, SNWA unsuccessfully tries to separate the State Engineer's finding that pumping should be limited to 8,000 afa from the unconstitutional procedure through which it was rendered. Mot. at 8.¹ But this is impossible. Once the district court found that the petitioners were deprived due process, as SNWA urged it to do, the district court had no other option but to vacate the entire unconstitutional order.

c. SNWA is Not Likely to Prevail on the Merits.

Finally, this Court must analyze whether SNWA “is likely to prevail on the merits in the . . . appeal.” NRAP 8(c). Although movants do not always have to show a probability of success on the merits, the movant must “present a substantial case on the merits when a serious legal question is involved and show that the balance of equities weighs *heavily* in favor of granting the stay.” *Hansen v. Eighth Jud. District Court*, 116 Nev. 650, 659, 6 P.3d 982, 987 (2000) (emphasis added).

This is a high bar to meet.

¹ SNWA also tried to do this at the hearing in district court, conceding that “there’s a lot of parts to 1309 that you vacated that we don’t have a problem with it being vacated. I mean, that -- we’re comfortable with it.” 2 APP MFS 130:6-8. But Nevada caselaw precludes piecemeal appeal, and thus does not support SNWA’s attempt to preserve one specific finding of Order 1309. *Ford v. Showboat Operating Co.*, 110 Nev. 752, 756, 877 P.2d 546, 549 (1994) (holding that “no court rule or statute provides for an appeal from a finding of fact or from a conclusion of law”).

Despite SNWA's improper attempt to argue the merits of the appeal in its motion, it has failed to provide any argument that the balance of equities weighs heavily in its favor. Perhaps nothing more clearly illustrates how the balance of equities favors the denying the Emergency Motion for Stay than the State Engineer's (ill-considered) Partial Joinder that he filed in this appeal on June 8, 2022. He states:

In the absence of Order 1309 . . . the State Engineer is without means to address the next management and administrative steps to identify how to balance the interests of the water right holders within the LWRFS while being protective of the water resource.

In short, notwithstanding this Court's unequivocal finding that Order 1309 was issued without authority and unconstitutionally violated due process rights, the State Engineer wishes to utilize a stay to perpetuate the harmful impact of Order 1309 by *relying* on that vacated Order to develop management and administrative steps for the LWRFS. Rather than rely on unconstitutional and ultra vires action, the State Engineer should use the tools available to him to find an alternative solution to the management of this region. If this Court grants SNWA's Emergency Motion for Stay and allows a constitutionally and statutorily unsound order to remain in place, the State Engineer will simply delay in finding a constitutional and lawful resolution, which harms all parties involved.

2. SNWA Conflates the Purpose of an Appeal with that of a Motion in an Attempt to Prematurely Argue the Merits of its Appeal.

A motion for stay is not the appropriate method through which to raise

substantive issues in the appeal. For this very reason, the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure provide different rules for motions and appeals. SNWA nonetheless raises its substantive arguments in its motion, and then asks this Court to make an expedited ruling. SNWA ignores the critical differences between a motion and appeal—namely, that an appeal is decided after full briefing, an opportunity to be heard, and extensive review by all justices assigned to the appeal. As GP-R argued in its Opposition to SNWA’s Motion to Exceed Page Limits (which it fully incorporates by reference herein), SNWA’s unmistakable misuse of the appellate process for the purpose of delay and blind sighting both the respondents and this Court should be rejected.

3. Under the Definitions in NRAP 3A(a), Appellant SNWA is Not an Aggrieved Party, and Therefore Lacks Standing.

Under NRAP 3A(a), only a “party who is aggrieved by an appealable judgment or order may appeal from that judgment or order” A party is “aggrieved” when a “judgment adversely and substantially affects either a personal right or a property right.” *Roth v. Bayerische Motoren Werke Aktiengesellschaft*, 124 Nev. 1504, 238 P.3d 851 (2008). A party who has prevailed below cannot be said to be aggrieved. *Calloway v. City of Reno*, 116 Nev. 250, 271, 993 P.2d 1259, 1272 (2000) (dismissing cross-appeal for lack of jurisdiction because “the City prevailed in the district court, [so] the City is not an aggrieved party”).

In its petition for judicial review, SNWA argued that the State Engineer violated due process, arbitrarily and capriciously ignored certain evidence, and applied erroneous analysis. It requested that the district court remove or strike the findings in Order 1309 regarding conflicts with senior water. SNWA received the exact relief it requested when the district court vacated Order 1309 for the very reasons SNWA presented in its petition. That the district court also struck the rest of Order 1309 does not mean that SNWA did not get the relief it requested. And as Coyote Springs Investments, LLC (“CSI”) points out in its Opposition, the only reason why the district court’s Order did not expressly grant SNWA’s petition for judicial review is because SNWA represented that it had settled with the State Engineer. SNWA’s contradictory position on appeal is disingenuous.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Respondents GP-R respectfully requests that this Court deny SNWA’s Emergency Motion for Stay.

DATED: June 8, 2022.

MCDONALD CARANO LLP

By: /s/ Lucas Foletta
Sylvia Harrison (NSBN 4106)
Lucas Foletta (NSBN 12154)
Jane Susskind (NSBN 15099)
100 W. Liberty St., 10th Floor
Reno, Nevada 89505

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

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to NRAP 27(d), I hereby certify that this response to a motion complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this motion has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in 14-point font, Times New Roman style. I further certify that this response to a motion complies with the page limits of NRAP 27(d)(2) because it does not exceed 10 pages.

Pursuant to NRAP 28.2, I hereby certify that I have read this response to a motion, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose. I further certify that this response to a motion complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that this motion is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.

DATED: June 8, 2022.

MCDONALD CARANO LLP

By: /s/ Lucas Foletta
Sylvia Harrison (NSBN 4106)
Lucas Foletta (NSBN 12154)
Jane Susskind (NSBN 15099)

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of McDonald Carano LLP, and on June 8, 2022, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **OPPOSITION TO SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER AUTHORITY’S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR STAY** was e-filed and e-served on all registered parties to the Supreme Court’s electronic filing system:

<p>Steven Shevorski James N. Bolotin Laena St-Jules Kiel B. Ireland Office of the Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, NV 89071-4717 sshevorksi@ag.nv.gov jbolotin@ag.nv.gov lstjules@ag.nv.gov kireland@ag.nv.gov</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Nevada State Engineer</i></p>	<p>Kent R. Robison Hannah E. Winston Michaela Davies Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust 71 Washington Street Reno, NV 89503 krobison@rssblaw.com hwinston@rssblaw.com mdavies@rssblaw.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investments</i></p>
<p>William Coulthard Coulthard Law 840 South Rancho Drive, #4-627 Las Vegas, NV 89106 wlc@coulthardlaw.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investments</i></p>	<p>Bradley Herrema Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck 100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600 Las Vegas, NV 89106 bherrema@bhfs.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investments</i></p>

<p>Dylan V. Frehner Lincoln County District Attorney P.O. Box 60 Pioche, NV 89043 dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District</i></p>	<p>Emilia Cargill 3100 State Route 168 P.O. Box 37010 Coyote Springs, NV 89037 Emilia.Cargill@wingfieldnevadagroup.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investments</i></p>
<p>Severin A. Carlson Sihomara L. Graves Kaempfer Crowell, Ltd. 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700 Reno, NV 89502 scarlson@kcnvlaw.com sgraves@kcnvlaw.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints</i></p>	<p>Dylan V. Frehner Lincoln County District Attorney P.O. Box 60 Pioche, NV 89043 dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Vidler Water Company and Lincoln County Water District</i></p>
<p>Karen Peterson Allison MacKenzie, LTD. 402 North Division Street Carson City, NV 89703 kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Vidler Water Company and Lincoln County Water District</i></p>	<p>Wayne O. Klomp Great Basin Law 1783 Trek Trail Reno, NV 89521 wayne@greatbasinlawyer.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Vidler Water Company and Lincoln County Water District</i></p>
<p>Robert A. Dotson Justin C. Vance Dotson Law 5355 Reno Corporate Drive, Suite #100 Reno, NV 89511 rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal jvance@dotsonlaw.legal</p>	<p>Steve King, Esq. 227 River Road Dayton, NV 89403 kingmont@charter.net</p> <p><i>Attorney for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company</i></p>

<p><i>Attorneys for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company</i></p>	
<p>Paul Taggart Thomas P. Duensing Taggart & Taggart, Ltd. 108 North Minnesota Street Carson City, NV 89703 paul@legaltnt.com tom@legaltnt.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA</i></p>	<p>Greg Morrison Parson Behle & Latimer 50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 750 Reno, NV 89501 gmorrison@parsonsbehle.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Moapa Valley Water District</i></p>
<p>Steven C. Anderson Las Vegas Valley Water District 1001 S. Valley View Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89153 sc.anderson@lvvwd.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for LVVWD</i></p>	<p>Christian Balducci Jordan W. Montet Marquis Aurbach Coffing 10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, NV 89145 cfbalducci@maclaw.com jmontet@maclaw.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC</i></p>
<p>Justina A. Caviglia Michael Knox 6100 Neil Road Reno, NV 89511 jcaviglia@nvenergy.com mknnox@nvenergy.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Sierra Pacific Power Company dba NV Energy and Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy</i></p>	<p>Lisa T. Belenk Scott Lake Center for Biological Diversity 1212 Broadway, #800 Oakland, CA 94612 lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org slake@biologicaldiversity.org</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Center for Biological Diversity</i></p>

<p>Therese A. Ure Laura A. Schroeder Caitlin R. Skulan Schroeder Law Offices, P.C. 10615 Double R Blvd., Suite 100 Reno, NV 89521 counsel@water-law.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Bedroc Limited, LLC, City of North Law Vegas, and Western Elite Environmental, Inc.</i></p>	<p>Francis Flaherty Dyer Lawrence, LLP 2805 Mountain Street Carson City, NV 89703 fflaherty@dyerlawrence.com smatuska@dyerlawrence.com</p> <p><i>Attorneys for Nevada Cogeneration Association Nos. 1 and 2</i></p>
--	--

Dated: June 8, 2022.


/s/ Caitlin Pagni
An Employee of McDonald Carano LLC

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	NO. OF PAGES
1.	Georgia Pacific Gypsum LLC and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.'s Republic's Request for Judicial Notice In Support of Opposition to LVVWD and SNWA's Motion for Stay Pending Appeal	40
2.	Answering Brief of Petitioners' Las Vegas Valley Water District and Southern Nevada Water Authority	70

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1



1 **RFJN**
2 Sylvia Harrison NV Bar No. 4106
3 Lucas Foletta NV Bar No. 12154
4 Sarah Ferguson NV Bar No. 14515
5 McDONALD CARANO LLP
6 100 W. Liberty St., Suite 1000
7 Reno, NV 89501
8 Telephone: (775) 788-2000
9 Facsimile: (775) 788-2020
10 sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
11 lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
12 sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com

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

15 **DISTRICT COURT**
16 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

17 * * * *

18 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT,
19 and SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
20 AUTHORITY,

21 Petitioners,

22 vs.

23 TIM WILSON, P.E. State Engineer, State of
24 Nevada, Department of Conservation and Natural
25 Resources, Division of Water Resources,

26 Respondent.

27 CASE NO.: A-20-816761-C (Lead Case)

28 DEPT. NO.: 1

Consolidated with:

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-21-833571-J

29 **REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO LVVWD**
30 **AND SNWA'S MOTION FOR STAY PENDING APPEAL**

31 Georgia-Pacific Gypsum, LLC ("Georgia-Pacific") and Republic Environmental
32 Technologies, Inc. ("Republic") (collectively, "Petitioners" or "GP-R"), by and through their
33 counsel, Sylvia Harrison, Lucas Foletta, and Sarah Ferguson of McDonald Carano, LLP, hereby
34 submit this Request for Judicial Notice in support of their concurrently filed Opposition to Las

1 Vegas Valley Water District’s (“LVVWD”) and Southern Nevada Water Authority’s (“SNWA”)
2 Motion for Stay Pending Appeal (“Opposition”). Petitioners sought judicial notice of the same
3 documents contained in this request when they filed their Answering Brief. The Court denied
4 Petitioners’ request because the documents post-dated the State Engineer’s Order 1309, and the
5 Court therefore found that they were not facts in issues under NRS 47.130(1). This reasoning
6 does not apply here because this Court’s review of LVVWD’s and SNWA’s Motion for a Stay is
7 not limited to the record on appeal, but rather requires this Court to consider current and future
8 conditions. Thus, while this Court did not find that judicial notice was appropriate in the limited
9 context of reviewing the State Engineer’s *previous* order, it can find that judicial notice is
10 appropriate in the context of reviewing a *forward-looking* motion, for the reasons stated more
11 fully below.

12 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

13 **I. Request for Judicial Notice.**

14 Petitioners move the Court pursuant to NRS 47.150 to take judicial notice of the following
15 publicly available documents that are cited in Petitioner’s Opposition filed concurrently herewith,
16 incorporated by reference in the record, and germane to the issues presented in the Answering
17 Brief:

- 18 • Screenshot of and excerpts from 2021 Annual Determination Report, prepared by
19 Hydrologic Review Team (August 2021), publicly posted on:
20 <http://water.nv.gov/LWRFS/Annual%20HRT%20Reports/2021%20HRT%20Annual%20Determination%20Report.pdf>, attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**;¹
- 21 • Moapa Dace Numbers Tick Up Once Again, The Progress, publicly posted on
22 <https://mvprogress.com/2021/08/24/moapa-dace-numbers-tick-up-once-again/>
and attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

23 **II. Legal Standard.**

24 A court must take judicial notice “if requested by a party and supplied with the necessary
25 information.” NRS 47.150(2); *Mack v. Est. of Mack*, 125 Nev. 80, 91, 206 P.3d 98, 106 (2009).

26 _____
27 ¹ Due to the large size of this report, Petitioners do not attach the entire report, but instead attach
28 a screenshot showing the location of this file online, as well as relevant excerpts.

1 Facts that are subject to judicial notice “are facts in issue or facts from which they may be
2 inferred.” NRS 47.130(1). To be judicially noticed, a fact must be “[g]enerally known” or
3 “capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot
4 reasonably be questioned.” NRS 47.130(2); *see Mack*, 125 Nev. at 91, 206 P.3d at 106; *Sheriff,*
5 *Clark County v. Kravetz*, 96 Nev. 919, 919, 620 P.2d 868, 869 (1980) (“[F]act, not reasonably
6 open to dispute, should be judicially noticed.”). A court may also take judicial notice of matters
7 of law, NRS 47.140, and certain public documents. *Andolino v. State*, 99 Nev. 346, 351, 662 P.2d
8 631, 633-34 (1983) (courts may take judicial notice of official government publications); *Barron*
9 *v. Reich*, 13 F.3d 1370, 1377 (9th Cir. 1994) (courts may take judicial notice of documents
10 obtained from administrative agencies); *Greeson v. Imperial Irr. Dist.*, 59 F.2d 529, 531 (9th Cir.
11 1932) (courts may take judicial notice of “public documents”).

12 **III. Arguments in Support of Request for Judicial Notice.**

13 The above-listed documents are appropriately subject to judicial notice because all of the
14 documents are posted publicly on the Internet and are “capable of accurate and ready
15 determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.” NRS
16 47.130(2). The report excerpted in Exhibit 1 is the Annual Determination Report (referred to
17 herein as the “HRT Report”), dated August 2021, prepared by the Hydrologic Review Team
18 established under the Memorandum of Agreement dated April 20, 2006, which included, among
19 others, SNWA.² As illustrated by the screenshot presented as the first page in Exhibit 1, the
20 Division of Water Resources has located the HRT Report under “News” and the folder titled
21 “LWRFS” (*See Ex. 1 at 1*), which is publicly available online. *Andolino*, 99 Nev. at 351, 662 P.2d
22 at 633-34; *Greeson*, 59 F.2d at 531 (9th Cir. 1932).

23 The HRT Report includes a monitoring report prepared for the Moapa Valley Water
24 District which presents spring flow data from 2012 through calendar year 2020 and demonstrates

25 _____
26
27 ² Other members of the Hydrologic Review Team include United States Fish and Wildlife Service
28 (“FWS”); Coyote Springs Investment LLC (“CSI”), a Nevada limited liability company; (d) Moapa Band of Paiute Indians (“Tribe”); and (e) Moapa Valley Water District (“MVWD”), a political subdivision of the State of Nevada.

1 that spring flows in the Muddy River Springs Area are generally stable relative to the levels
2 following the Order 1169 pumping, and in some cases are increasing, not declining. The HRT
3 Report is the result of extensive data collection, monitoring, and other analytical activities during
4 2020. SNWA was involved in preparing the HRT Report, yet in direct contravention of the data
5 contained in the report it helped prepare, SNWA now attempts to argue the opposite is true in its
6 Motion for Stay. Specifically, SNWA argues that increased pumping will cause irreparable harm
7 to SNWA and will threaten the Moapa Dace population. (Mot. at 4-5.) The HRT Report
8 demonstrates why SNWA’s claim of future harm is misguided and unsupported, making the report
9 directly relevant to the facts in issue here. *See Ragland v. U.S. Bank Nat’l Assn.*, 147 Cal. Rptr.
10 3d 41, 52 (Cal. Ct. App. 2012) (explaining that courts may take judicial notice of the existence of
11 audit reports, websites, and blogs); *see also Sowell v. State*, No. 81586-COA, 2021 WL 978515
12 at *1 (Nev. App. 2021) (district court did not err in taking judicial notice of probation report).

13 Exhibit 2 is a news article published by Vernon Robison of The Progress, an
14 independently-owned newspaper in northwest Clark County, titled *Moapa Dace Numbers Tick*
15 *Up Once Again* (“Moapa Dace Article”). *See* Ex. 2. Citing research conducted by SNWA, US
16 Fish and Wildlife Service (“USFWS”), and Nevada Department of Wildlife, the article concludes
17 that the Moapa dace population has significantly rebounded since the elimination of invasive
18 predatory species, like tilapia, from the Muddy River and tributaries where the dace populate. *Id.*
19 As discussed in Petitioners’ Opposition, SNWA ignores its own research when it suggests that
20 Order 1309 is the *only tool* protecting the Moapa Dace population, when in fact several factors
21 affect the health of the Moapa Dace population. As the Moapa Dace Article shows, conservation
22 efforts *unrelated* to spring flows and *unrelated* to the unconstitutional and unlawful Order 1309
23 are successfully improving survival prospects for the dace population. Like the HRT Report, the
24 article presented in Exhibit 2 supports Petitioners’ argument that SNWA’s claim for irreparable
25 harm is unsupportable and simply incorrect given the recent research.

26 Petitioners’ request is consistent with the caselaw cited above and Nevada’s “flexible”
27 application of the rule regarding judicial notice. *See Mack*, 125 Nev. at 91-92, 206 P.3d at 106
28 (explaining that the rule for judicial notice of records in related proceedings “is flexible in its

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

application”). For these reasons, Petitioners request the Court take judicial notice of Exhibits 1 and 2 of this Motion.

AFFIRMATION

Pursuant to NRS 239B.030, the undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the personal information of any person as defined in NRS 603A.040.

DATED this 9th day of May, 2022.

McDONALD CARANO LLP

/s/ Lucas Foletta

Sylvia Harrison NV Bar No. 4106
Lucas Foletta NV Bar No. 12154
Sarah Ferguson NV Bar No. 14515
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.*

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

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT #	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF PAGES
1	Excerpts from 2021 Annual Determination Report (including screenshot of file on DWR website)	26
2	Moapa Dace Numbers Tick Up Once Again	4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury, that I am an employee of McDonald Carano LLP and that on May 9, 2022, a true and correct copy of REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO LVVWD AND SNWA’S MOTION FOR STAY PENDING APPEAL was electronically submitted to the Clerk of the Court via the Clark County District Court Electronic Filing Program which will provide copies to all counsel of record registered to receive such electronic notification. The parties below were also served via U.S. Mail, postage-prepaid:

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
Kent R. Robison Hannah E. Winston 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>

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

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>
Paul Taggart Timothy O'Connor Taggart & Taggart, Ltd. 108 North Minnesota Street Carson City, NV 89703 <i>Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA</i>	Greg Morrison Parson Behle & Latimer 50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 750 Reno, NV 89501 <i>Attorneys for Moapa Valley Water District</i>
Steven C. Anderson Las Vegas Valley Water District 1001 S. Valley View Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89153 <i>Attorneys for LVVWD</i>	Christian Balducci Marquis Aurbach Coffing 10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, NV 89145 <i>Attorneys for Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC</i>

/s/Carole Davis
An Employee of McDonald Carano LLP

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1



State of Nevada Division of Water Resources

Site Search

News

Recent	General	Recent Presentations	Hearings, Adjudications, and Orders	Well Driller and Surveyor News	Water Right
Humboldt Announcements	Humboldt Orders	Humboldt Presentations	Walker River Curtailment	Diamond Valley GMP	LWRFS
AB 62 Regulations	Order 1307	Proposed Orders	NSC Water Law Commission	Hearings Exhibits	

/LWRFS/Annual HRT Reports

- LWRFS
 - Annual HRT Reports
 - 2021 HRT Annual Determination Report.pdf
 - HRT Report 2007_Baseline Pumping Report.pdf
 - Data
 - Kane Springs URS 2006
 - NDWR Pumpage Inventories
 - Order 1303
 - Order 1303 Hearing Documents
 - Order 1303 Hearing- Participants' Exhibits
 - Order 1303 rebuttal reports August 16 2019
 - Order 1303 reports July 03 2019
 - Order 1309
 - Public Meetings
 - Rulings
 - Written Public Comment

2006 Memorandum of Agreement

Hydrologic Review Team

2021 Annual Determination Report

August 2021



2021 Annual Determination Report

Introduction

This Annual Determination Report, dated August 2021, was prepared by the Hydrologic Review Team (HRT) established under the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) dated April 20, 2006, among: (a) Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA), a political subdivision of the State of Nevada; (b) United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS); (c) Coyote Springs Investment LLC (CSI), a Nevada limited liability company; (d) Moapa Band of Paiute Indians (Tribe); and (e) Moapa Valley Water District (MVWD), a political subdivision of the State of Nevada (MOA Signatories). This report was prepared in accordance with requirements set forth in Section 6(d) and 6(e) of the MOA.

2021 Annual Determination

The HRT recommends no change to the pumping restrictions set forth in the MOA at this time. Extensive data collection and analytical efforts have occurred since 2006 when the MOA was signed, including the completion of the Order 1169 Study and subsequent data collection and analyses presented during the NSE Lower White River Flow System administrative hearing in September 2019. The MOA Signatories are continuing to work to refine and share their analyses with the goal of furthering the objectives of the MOA and protecting the Moapa dace.

The MOA Signatories have also unanimously agreed that inclusion of the very lengthy Regional Baseline Pumping Report, completed by the HRT in October 2007, as an appendix to the Annual Determination Report is unnecessary, notwithstanding Section 6(e) of the MOA, because the Regional Baseline Pumping Report is a public document available upon request.

Objectives of the HRT

The objectives and responsibilities of the HRT are set forth in Section 6(b) of the MOA, which states:

The objectives of the HRT shall be: (1) to identify opportunities and make recommendations for the purpose of coordinating and ensuring accuracy, consistency and efficiency in monitoring, other data collection, and analytical activities performed under the Regional Monitoring Plans; (2) to establish technically sound analyses of impacts on Muddy River Springs and Muddy River flows resulting from regional groundwater pumping; (3) to assess based thereon whether the pumping restrictions, but not the Trigger Ranges, under paragraphs I(5)(c) through (g) above (or any successors thereto) should be adjusted to better reflect the extent to which regional groundwater pumping by the respective Parties causes, or is likely to cause, impacts on Muddy River Springs and Muddy River flows;

and (4) to adopt by consensus appropriate adjustments to such restrictions, if warranted.

Purpose of Annual Determination Report

Sections 6(d) and 6(e) of the MOA state the purpose and guidelines for the Annual Determination Report:

d. Annual Determination. Based on the Regional Baseline Pumping Analysis, and no later than one year after preparation of that analysis and annually thereafter, the HRT shall endeavor to determine by consensus ("Annual Determination") whether the groundwater pumping restrictions, but not the Trigger Ranges, under paragraphs I(5)(c) through (g) above (or any successors thereto) should remain in place, or whether and how any of such restrictions should be adjusted ("Pumping Restriction Adjustments") to better reflect the extent to which regional groundwater pumping by the respective Parties causes, or is likely to cause, impacts on Muddy River Springs and Muddy River flows. However, no Pumping Restriction Adjustments will be made within the first five years following the Effective Date of this MOA. All Annual Determinations (including any Pumping Restriction Adjustments adopted by HRT consensus) shall be final and binding on all Parties, except that by consensus the HRT may at any time modify or vacate any Annual Determination.

e. Annual Determination Reports. Each Annual Determination shall be set forth and explained in a written Annual Determination Report which includes as appendices the Regional Baseline Pumping Analysis, all previously submitted Annual Technical Representative's Reports, and any other data or analytical materials considered by the HRT. If the Annual Determination is not made due to lack of consensus or any other reason, the positions thereon of the HRT Representatives shall be set forth and explained in the Annual Determination Report. Furthermore, if the HRT fails to adopt Pumping Restriction Adjustments recommended in a timely submitted Annual Technical Representative's Report, the Annual Determination Report shall briefly explain why such recommendation was not adopted.

HRT Calendar Year 2020 Activities

The MOA Signatories continue to collect and share groundwater level, spring/stream discharge, precipitation and pumping data to monitor and allow for interpretation of hydrologic changes related to groundwater pumping in fulfillment of Section 6(b) of the MOA. Data collected and available in calendar year 2020 (described in the next section) met Nevada Division of Water Resources (NDWR) water-right permit requirements and/or the provisions of the MOA.

A representative of the office of the NDWR typically attends HRT meetings. The participants share data and information and discuss trends and analyses with each other and the NDWR.

Hydrologic Monitoring Activities

Table 1 lists the frequency of groundwater level, spring/stream discharge, and precipitation data collected for monitoring sites that were available to the HRT for review and interpretation during calendar year 2020, including data collected and reported by others. The monitoring locations are depicted on Figure 1. Groundwater level data collected at these sites were submitted to NDWR and are available on the NDWR website at <http://water.nv.gov/mapping/order1169/>. The spring and stream discharge data collected by the U.S. Geological Survey are available at <http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nv/nwis/current/?type=flow>, with the exception of discharge data collected by MVWD at Jones and Baldwin springs, which are available on the NDWR website.

Additional groundwater level data not listed in Table 1 are available for review on the NDWR website for broader regional interpretations.

Much of the monitoring by the MOA signatories for specific water-right permits is part of a larger monitoring program administered by NDWR. This program was updated in 2020. Appendix A outlines the locations and frequency of monitoring required by NDWR as of 2020.

The SNWA and MVWD submitted calendar year 2020 annual monitoring reports to the NDWR which document and summarize the groundwater level, precipitation, production and streamflow data collected by these agencies. These reports are included in Appendices B and C.

Groundwater Rights and Pumping

Groundwater rights subject to curtailment under the MOA are in Coyote Spring Valley (hydrographic area [HA] 210) and California Wash (HA 218) in the volumes listed below. These volumes represent potential pumping from the regional carbonate-rock aquifer.

CSI	4,140 afy Coyote Spring Valley
SNWA	9,000 afy Coyote Spring Valley
Tribe	2,500 afy California Wash

Actual development of the rights has varied over time. In 2020, a small fraction of the permitted rights was utilized to pump groundwater from the carbonate-rock aquifer. The SNWA, MVWD, CSI, and Tribe reported production data to the NDWR quarterly. Figures 2 through 5 depict the groundwater produced by CSI, SNWA and the Tribe from the carbonate-rock aquifer in Coyote Spring Valley and California Wash. Figures 6 and 7 depict groundwater production by MVWD in Muddy River Springs Area (HA 219).

**MUDDY SPRINGS AREA MONITORING REPORT
FOR JANUARY 2020 THROUGH DECEMBER 2020**



**Prepared for:
Moapa Valley Water District
PO Box 257
Logandale, NV 89201**



GLORIETA GEOSCIENCE, INC.
P.O.Box 5727 Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 983-5446 Fax (505) 983-6482
ggi@glorietageo.com

Prepared by:
Glorieta Geoscience, Inc.
PO Box 5027
Santa Fe, NM 87502
505.983.5446
April 30, 2021
In cooperation with:
NV Energy
National Park Service

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures ii

INTRODUCTION 1

SPRING DISCHARGE AND TEMPERATURE MONITORING 1

 Pederson Spring..... 1

 Warm Springs West..... 5

 Muddy Spring 5

 Baldwin Spring 5

 Pipeline Jones Spring..... 5

 Rogers Spring and Blue Point Spring 5

WATER LEVEL MONITORING 10

 Carbonate Aquifer Monitoring..... 10

RIVER DISCHARGE MONITORING 16

PRECIPITATION MONITORING..... 17

GROUND WATER WITHDRAWALS..... 17

APPENDIX..... 20

List of Tables

Table 1. Baseline conditions and trigger levels..... 4

Table 2. Comparison of monthly average discharge at springs within Moapa Valley and the Muddy River since completion of Order 1169 pumping test on December 31, 2012..... 6

Table 3: Depth to Water Levels (ft) for Carbonate Wells in 2020..... 10

Table 4: Depth to Water Levels (ft) for Alluvial Wells in 2020. 13

Table 5. Comparison of monthly depth to water (DTW) measurements for carbonate and alluvial wells within Moapa Valley since completion of Order 1169 pumping test on December 31, 2012. 13

Table 6: Sheep Range precipitation data collected by the Moapa Valley Water District (in.) 17

Table 7: Total Water Diversions by the Moapa Valley Water District in 2020..... 19

Table 8: Historic Diversions by the Moapa Valley Water District 19

List of Figures

Figure 1. Location of Alluvial and Carbonate Wells, Carbonate Springs, and River Gage within ~2.5 Miles of the Moapa Valley National Wildlife Refuge..... 2

Figure 2. Location of Carbonate Production and Monitoring Wells in the Muddy River and Coyote Springs Valley Area 3

Figure 3. Daily Discharge at the Monitoring Springs..... 8

Figure 4. Discharge at Baldwin Spring and Pipeline Jones Spring 9

Figure 5. Discharge at Rogers Spring from the USGS website. 9

Figure 6. Hydrographs for Monitoring Wells in the Carbonate Aquifer 12

Figure 7. Hydrographs of Monthly Water Levels for Monitoring Wells in the Alluvial Aquifer..... 15

Figure 8. Thirty-day Running Average Discharge for the Muddy River near Moapa Uncorrected for Upstream Diversions..... 16

Figure 9: Carbonate pumpage (millions of gallons) from the Carbonate Aquifer in the Muddy River and Coyote Springs Valley by the District (MVWD), Coyote Springs Investment, LLC (CSI) and Southern Nevada Water Authority (MX-5). 2020 pumping data for CSI and MX-5 are not available at this time..... 18

INTRODUCTION

In January 1996, the Moapa Valley Water District (MVWD) submitted the Muddy Springs Area Monitoring Plan to the Nevada Division of Water Resources for approval. This plan was prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Interior's National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and Nevada Energy (formerly Nevada Power Company). In September 1997, the plan was approved by the Nevada State Engineer. In 2002, the plan was revised to change some trigger levels and monitoring frequencies. This report covers the results of monitoring for the calendar year of 2020.

The locations of monitoring sites are shown in Figures 1 and 2. Table 1 provides summary information on the baseline discharge rates for springs and baseline water levels for monitoring wells. Included in Table 1 are the trigger levels that were developed as part of the monitoring effort. Initial trigger levels were established that, if reached, would lead to the notification of each cooperating organization so that the cause of the spring discharge or water level decline could be determined along with the appropriate actions. Mitigation trigger levels were also established for each monitoring station; if these levels are reached, mitigation measures can be implemented following approval by the cooperating organizations. Pursuant to a request by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the trigger levels were modified in March 1999 to establish a less arbitrary set of action levels.

SPRING DISCHARGE AND TEMPERATURE MONITORING


The USFWS monitors discharge at Pederson Spring and Warm Springs West and temperature at Pederson Spring. Final discharge data for Pederson Spring, Pederson East Spring, Warm Springs West and Muddy Spring at LDS were obtained from the USGS for the period of January 1, 2020 to December 31, 2020. Changes in spring discharge since the completion of the Order 1169 pumping test, December 31, 2012, are summarized in Table 2.

Pederson Spring

The Pederson Spring gage was damaged in the fire of 1994 and the reliability of the discharge records was subsequently brought into question after the disturbance caused by the mechanical removal of palm trees around the station. The gage was replaced, and other restoration activities were completed in April 2004. In addition, a gage was installed at the Pederson East Spring. Beginning in May 2004, records for this new location became available and are evaluated along with the information from springs with longer periods of record.

The long-term discharge records for Pederson Spring and Pederson East Spring are shown on Figure 3. During 2020, the daily discharge at Pederson Spring ranged from 0.07 to 0.16 and averaged 0.12 cfs. There is no discharge trigger level for Pederson Spring.

At Pederson East Spring, the discharge ranged between 0.10 to 0.16 cfs. The average for the year was 0.13 cfs. There are no trigger levels associated with this spring gage. The record for both Pederson East and Pederson Spring showed a decrease in discharges in 2012/2013. The declines in discharge at both Pederson Springs can most likely attributed to the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) pumping test of MX-5 that began in fall 2010, since MVWD diversions have changed comparatively little (see Figure 9). Discharge shows a recovery trend from the pumping test beginning in late 2013.



Legend

- Carbonate Spring
- Gaging Station
- Alluvial Production Well
- Alluvial Monitoring Well
- Carbonate Production Well
- Carbonate Monitoring Well





Muddy Springs Area Annual Monitoring Report

Figure 1: Location of Alluvial & Carbonate Wells, Carbonate Springs, and River Gage within ~2.5 Miles of the Moapa Valley National Wildlife Refuge



GLORIETA GEOSCIENCE, INC.
 P.O. Box 5727
 Santa Fe, NM 87502
 (505) 985-5446
 ggi@glorietageo.com
 www.glorietageo.com
 Web Address:



- Legend**
- Carbonate Production Well
 - Carbonate Monitoring Well

Muddy Springs Area Annual Monitoring Report
 Figure 2: Location of Carbonate Production and Monitoring Wells in Muddy River and Coyote Springs Valley Area



GLORIETA GEOSCIENCE, INC.
 Santa Fe, NM 87502
 P.O. Box 5727
 (505) 983-5446
 Fax (505) 983-6482
 E-mail: ggi@gglorietageo.com
 Web Address: www.glorietageo.com

Table 1. Baseline conditions and trigger levels

Spring or Well or River		Source Aquifer	Baseline Conditions Discharge or Minimum Water Level (cfs or ft bls)		Upstream Diversions	Transmission Losses	Trigger Levels (cfs, degrees C, or ft below land surface)	
			30-day min	annual mean			Initial	Mitigate
Baldwin Spring	S	Carbonate	n/a	n/a	No	No	none	none
Pipeline Jones Spring	S	Carbonate	n/a	n/a	No	No	none	none
Muddy Spring	S	Carbonate	6.43	7.38	Yes	Yes	5.79 (60 days)	5.14 (30 days)
Pederson Spring	S	Carbonate	n/a	n/a	No	No	30°C (60 days)	28°C (30 days)
Warm Spring West	S	Carbonate	3.14	3.59	No	Yes	3.17 30°C (60 days)	2.94 28°C (30 days)
Muddy River at Moapa	R	n/a	28.0	42.7	Yes	Possible Seasonal	30.3 (annual)	22.4 (30-day)
EH-5B	W	Carbonate	29	n/a	n/a	n/a	34	39
EH-4	W	Carbonate	117	n/a	n/a	n/a	122	127
CSV-2	W	Carbonate	392	n/a	n/a	n/a	397	402
CE-DT-4	W	Carbonate	354	n/a	n/a	n/a	359	364
MX-6	W	Carbonate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	tbd	tbd
Lewis 1 (Old)	W	Alluvial	40	n/a	n/a	n/a	43	50
Lewis 2	W	Alluvial	42	n/a	n/a	n/a	45	52
Lewis North	W	Alluvial	33	n/a	n/a	n/a	36	43
Perkins Old	W	Alluvial	29	n/a	n/a	n/a	32	39
CE-VF-1	W	Carbonate	550	n/a	n/a	n/a	553	560
CE-VF-2	W	Carbonate	612	n/a	n/a	n/a	615	622

n/a not available or not applicable
tbd - to be developed, baseline data lacking

Warm Springs West

Long-term discharge records for Warm Springs West are shown in Figure 3. The discharge at Warm Springs West varied between 3.22 and 3.47 cfs during 2020. The baseline conditions for this spring are 3.14 cfs (30 day min) and 3.59 cfs (annual mean). The mean annual discharge for the period was 3.35 cfs.

Muddy Spring

The long-term discharge records for Muddy Spring near LDS are shown in Figure 3. The discharge at Muddy Spring ranged between 6.73 and 8.25 cfs during 2020. Discharge rates during this period were all above the trigger level of 5.79 cfs. The average discharge in 2020 was 7.40 cfs.

Baldwin Spring

The District monitors monthly discharge at Baldwin Spring. During 2020, the average monthly discharge rate from the spring varied dramatically from 0.29 to 2.79 cfs and averaged 2.33 cfs. The long-term record for Baldwin Spring is shown in Figure 4. Baldwin Spring does not have a trigger level. Breaks in the record are associated with meter failures, and anomalous decreases or increases in discharge following meter replacements may represent differences in meters rather than actual changes in discharge. Due to a malfunction meter display screen, the December 2020 spring discharge was estimated from SCADA. This inconsistency in data reporting is likely responsible for the anomalously low discharge estimates in March (0.29 cfs) and April (1.34 cfs).

Pipeline Jones Spring

The District also monitored monthly discharge at Pipeline Jones Spring. The average monthly discharge rate ranged from 1.50 to 5.18 cfs with an overall average of 1.89 cfs for 2020. The March discharge estimate is likely due to malfunctioning equipment, as our records indicate the highest ever previous discharge was 2.08 cs in 1997. The Pipeline Jones Spring does not have a trigger level. The long-term record for Pipeline Jones Spring is shown in Figure 4.

Rogers Spring and Blue Point Spring

The National Park Service contracts with the USGS to monitor spring discharge rates at Rogers Spring and Blue Point Spring in Lake Mead National Recreation Area. Data for Rogers Spring were available online via the USGS Water Data for the Nation website. Rogers Spring recorded a mean discharge of 1.61 cfs in 2020, an increase in overall discharge from 1.53 cfs in 2019. Blue Point Spring showed a brief peak in discharge in early 2011 after which discharge declined below the long-term average (Appendix 3). However, since 2015, discharge was steadily increasing toward the mean. In 2020, average discharge again fell by nearly 10% to 0.50 cfs. Please refer to (Appendix 3) for the hydrograph of Blue Point Spring. Please note, mean annual discharge for Rogers and Blue Point Spring is not averaged over the traditional calendar year, but the USGS water year which runs from October to September.

Table 2. Comparison of monthly average discharge at springs within Moapa Valley and the Muddy River since completion of Order 1169 pumping test on December 31, 2012.


Measurement Point	Source Aquifer	Average discharge (cfs)		Δ in discharge (cfs)
		January 2013	December 2020	
Baldwin Spring	Carbonate	2.63	2.61	0.02
Pipeline Jones Spring	Carbonate	1.58	1.69	0.11
Muddy Spring	Carbonate	7.70	7.74	0.04
Pederson Spring	Carbonate	0.08	0.09	0.01
Pederson East Spring	Carbonate	0.13	0.12	0.01
Warm Spring West	Carbonate	3.40	3.25	0.15
Rogers Spring	Carbonate	1.65	1.56	0.09
Blue Point Spring	Carbonate	**0.47	***0.51	0.04
Muddy River at Moapa		43.55	44.14	0.59



Red = decreased discharge; Green = increased discharge; Black = no change in discharge

*Display is not working on meter – average daily discharge estimated from SCADA

**Average data for January 2013 comes from measurements from January 29-31, 2013

***December 2020 data is currently unavailable; data shown above is from September 2020, the end of the USGS water year.









Figure 3. Daily Discharge at the Monitoring Springs.






Figure 4. Discharge at Baldwin Spring and Pipeline Jones Spring




Figure 5. Discharge at Rogers Spring from the USGS website.

WATER LEVEL MONITORING

The District monitored water levels on a monthly basis at Arrow Canyon and MX-6 wells during 2020. NVE continued their extensive water level monitoring program and provided the monthly water level data for wells in the upper Muddy River Valley that are included within the Muddy Springs Area monitoring network. Water levels in Coyote Spring Valley at CE-DT-4 and in the Muddy Spring area at CSV-2 were obtained from the USGS website.

Carbonate Aquifer Monitoring



The results of monitoring of the carbonate aquifer are presented as hydrographs in Figure 6 and Table 3. Data for EH-5B and EH-4 were collected monthly by NVE, while data for CSV-2 and CE-DT-4 represent daily averages obtained from the USGS. At CE-VF-2, the USGS measured water levels approximately six times per year; the last reading available is 7/31/2009. Because of the lack of current data this well is excluded from the report.

Records for all wells showed approximately 1-foot fluctuations between the minimum and maximum depth to water. All wells had water levels above the initial trigger levels. The decline in water levels since 2010/2011 can most likely be attributed to the SNWA pumping test of MX-5 that began in fall 2010. All wells are showing signs of recovery beginning in late 2013.

Table 3: Depth to Water Levels (ft) for Carbonate Wells in 2020.

Well	Minimum	Maximum	Annual Average	Initial Trigger
EH-5B	31.04	32.19	31.57	34
EH-4	120.03	120.99	120.50	122
CSV-2*	394.94	396.43	395.67	397
CE-DT-4*	355.69	357.11	356.51	359

*Values reported from USGS daily measurements.






Figure 6. Hydrographs for Monitoring Wells in the Carbonate Aquifer

Alluvial Aquifer Monitoring

The results of monitoring of the alluvial aquifer are presented as hydrographs in Figure 7 and Table 4. These hydrographs are based on monthly water level measurements provided by NVE.

Lewis North showed greater seasonal fluctuations than in previous years. All water levels were above trigger levels. Lewis 1 & 2 had higher water levels than in 2013/2014 with lower magnitude fluctuations than in previous years. Perkins Old water levels are likely related to nearby Perkins production well withdrawals, which had increased from 2010 through 2013, but dropped in 2014. There has been no production from the Perkins well field since late 2017. Overall, the recovery of

the alluvial water levels is likely related to reduced pumping from the aquifer by NVE, as shown by Figure 7.

Table 4: Depth to Water Levels (ft) for Alluvial Wells in 2020.



Well	Minimum	Maximum	Annual Average	Initial Trigger
Lewis N.	34.15	35.56	34.91	36
Lewis 1 (Old)	29.36	31.12	30.33	43
Lewis 2	28.15	29.91	29.16	45
Perkins Old	20.23	23.31	21.94	32

Table 5. Comparison of monthly depth to water (DTW) measurements for carbonate and alluvial wells within Moapa Valley since completion of Order 1169 pumping test on December 31, 2012.

Measurement Point	Source Aquifer	Depth to Water (ft)		Δ in depth to water (ft)
		January 2013	December 2020	
EH-5B	Carbonate	31.93	32.18	0.25
EH-4	Carbonate	121.11	120.95	0.16
CSV-2	Carbonate	396.01	*396.19	0.18
CE-DT-4	Carbonate	357.20	356.97	0.23
Lewis N.	Alluvial	35.07	35.32	0.25
Lewis 1 (Old)	Alluvial	31.74	30.84	0.90
Lewis 2	Alluvial	29.87	29.46	0.41
Perkins Old	Alluvial	39.78	21.84	17.94

Red = lower ground water level; Green = higher ground water level; Black = no change in water level

*Data only available through November 23, 2020







Figure 7. Hydrographs of Monthly Water Levels for Monitoring Wells in the Alluvial Aquifer

RIVER DISCHARGE MONITORING

The USGS continued monitoring the daily discharge of the Muddy River at the gage near Moapa (USGS 09416000 MUDDY RV NR MOAPA, NV). During 2020, the minimum unadjusted 30-day average discharge rate was 39.55 cfs, well above the mitigating trigger of 22.4 cfs (Figure 8). The annual average unadjusted discharge was 42.39 cfs, above the respective trigger level of 30.30 cfs. Because these discharges were already above the trigger levels, no adjustments were made.




Figure 8. Thirty-day Running Average Discharge for the Muddy River near Moapa Uncorrected for Upstream Diversions

PRECIPITATION MONITORING

The District continued Sheep Range precipitation measurements in 2020, and data for 2019/2020 is shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Sheep Range precipitation data collected by the Moapa Valley Water District (in.)

2019						2020					
Elevation (ft)						Elevation (ft)					
Date	4000	5000	6000	7000	8000	Date	4000*	5000	6000	7000	8000**
4/23/2019	5.51	5.1	0	0.64	0						
8/30/2019	2.14	0	5.2								
10/2/2019	1.7	3.7	4.5	4.45	2.45	6/9/2020	0	6.67	7.29	8.68	3.19
						7/10/2020	0	0	0		
						10/15/2020	0	0	^	7.40	^
Total	9.35	8.8	9.7	5.09	2.45	Total	0	6.67	7.29	16.08	3.19

*Swapped out display; **Need to take bigger pack to bring old gauge back from 8000' gauge;
 ^Dead batteries

GROUND WATER WITHDRAWALS

Ground water withdrawals from the carbonate aquifer from the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA), Coyote Springs Investment, LLC (CSI), and MVWD are shown in Figure 9. Total MVWD diversions for 2020 are shown in Table 7. Historic diversions from MVWD are shown in Table 8.




Figure 9: Carbonate pumpage (millions of gallons) from the Carbonate Aquifer in the Muddy River and Coyote Springs Valley by the District (MVWD), Coyote Springs Investment, LLC (CSI) and Southern Nevada Water Authority (MX-5). 2020 pumping data for CSI and MX-5 are not available at this time.

Table 7: Total Water Diversions by the Moapa Valley Water District in 2020.

Source	Acre Feet
Arrow Canyon Wells	2672.28
MX-6 Well	0.00
Baldwin Spring	318.57
Pipeline Jones Spring	0.00
Total Diversions	2,990.85

Table 8: Historic Diversions by the Moapa Valley Water District

Calendar Year	Permitted Withdrawals	Actual Withdrawals (Ac-ft)
1995	2.0 cfs 1,464 afy	304
1996	3.2 cfs 2,342 afy	274
1997	3.9 cfs 2,855 afy	501
1998	4.5 cfs 3,294 afy	1,969
1999	5.2 cfs 5,068 afy	2,434
2000	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,777
2001	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,434
2002	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,264
2003	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,468
2004	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,505
2005	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,289
2006	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	1,971
2007	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	1,844
2008	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	1,888
2009	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,033
2010	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	1,815
2011	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	1,835
2012	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,460
2013	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,241
2014	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	1,442
2015	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,395
2016	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,798
2017	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,819
2018	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,781
2019	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,588
2020	6.0 cfs 5,937 afy	2,991

EXHIBIT 2

EXHIBIT 2



Your hometown newspaper since 1987

- HOME
- LOCAL NEWS
- SPORTS
- OPINION
- VALLEY LIFE
- SOCIETY
- OBITUARIES
- CLASSIFIEDS
- EEDITION
- CALENDAR
- CONTACT US

YOU ARE HERE: HOME / LOCAL NEWS / MOAPA DACE NUMBERS TICK UP ONCE AGAIN

Moapa Dace Numbers Tick Up Once Again

AUGUST 24, 2021 BY VROBISON — LEAVE A COMMENT

By VERNON ROBISON

The Progress

There are still plenty of fish in the stream. In fact, more than have been seen in nearly three decades, according to biologists.

The annual summer count of the endangered Moapa dace, which took place on Aug. 10-11, tallied a total of 2,444 of the finger-sized fish currently living in the Warm Springs headwaters of the Muddy River.

"It was the highest count since 1994," said Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) biologist David Syzdek. "It was a 4 percent increase from the August 2020 count and an 85 percent increase over August 2019."

The count brought together scientists from Southern Nevada Water Authority, US Fish and Wildlife and Nevada Department of Wildlife. The group also received support from Coyote Springs personnel who helped to gather and record the data during the two-day count.



NDOW biologist Kevin Guadalupe (left) calls out his observations to Michael Yetter (right) during the annual summer dace count. PHOTO BY VERNON ROBISON/The Progress.



NDOW biologist Kevin Guadalupe snorkels the stream counting Moapa dace during a fish count in the Warm Springs area on Aug. 11. PHOTO BY VERNON ROBISON/The Progress.

The biologists donned wetsuits, masks and snorkels and plunged into the stream. Over the two days they methodically swam, crawled or waded through more than six miles of streams counting every fish they could see. A data-taker accompanied each snorkeler, clipboard in hand, recording the data and keeping careful notes about stream conditions.

On Wednesday, Aug. 11, NDOW biologist Kevin Guadalupe was found crawling his way up the

Lower Pederson Stream at the Warm Springs Natural Area, a former ranch operation now owned by SNWA.

Guadalupe would surface every few seconds and call out the number of dace he had just observed. Right behind him, Michael Yetter, also from NDOW, was wading through the stream recording Guadalupe's observations.

Though it appeared to be entirely natural, this segment of stream was actually an artificial channel designed and built by biologists in 2008 to re-create the ideal dace habitat. The new stream segment had replaced a failed irrigation ditch that had not been able to support the dace.

That morning, Guadalupe and Yetter counted 502 dace in that segment of the stream alone. Syzdek explained that the Moapa dace are typically found in pockets of "slack water" that are immediately adjacent to faster-moving stream flows. When a food object, such as a small invertebrate or piece of algae, floats by, the dace darts into the fast water to grab the tasty morsel. Then it moves back to the slack water to await the next meal drifting by.

"That makes them fairly easy to count," Syzdek said. "The snorkeler crawls up the stream and when a dace, or school of dace, are seen, they are counted. When the snorkeler crawls further up the stream the fish will swim around the snorkeler. Due to the current, and the narrow width of the streams, the dace can't really pass the snorkeler and won't be double-counted."

The dace are counted twice each year. Once in August and again in February. "August numbers are generally higher than February due to recently hatched larval fish," Syzdek explained.

This month, the scientists counted 1,836 adult dace, 484 juveniles and 124 larvae.

"That indicates that we are likely to have good numbers for our next count in February 2022," Syzdek said.

Perhaps the best news for the scientists is that the dace seem to be expanding their habitat. They are being found in more reaches of the stream and in greater numbers. And most importantly, the fish are beginning to use the main stem of the river as a more permanent habitat.

For many years, the dace had not been seen in the main stem. Early on, it was a perilous place because it was frequented by tilapia, an invasive predator fish. Then between 1998 and 2014, a fish barrier was put in place to keep the tilapia out of the tributaries where the dace had retreated.

Eventually, scientists were able to eradicate the non-native tilapia from the main stem and the fish barriers were removed. That allowed the dace to return to the main stem of the river. But it has taken a long time for the fish to find their way back.

"While we knew that dace would occasionally move between tributaries using the river, they were not staying in this habitat and we were unsure why," Syzdek said. "However, this summer count was different."

Many of the deeper areas of the main stem actually had large, adult dace observed feeding in the current. Nearly sixty dace were counted in the three reaches of the main stem. That is a marked increase from the 24 fish counted in those reaches in the 2020 summer count. In 2019, the number found there was less than 5.

"This is exciting because we think that life in the tributaries is hard for these fish," Syzdek said. "It is close to their thermal limit and is energetically expensive. Fish in the cooler water of the main stem should grow bigger, live longer and produce more eggs."

The Warm Springs Natural Area (WSNA) will be open again for the season on Sept. 7. Visiting hours will be Tuesday through Sunday from 7 am to 3 pm.

Guided one-hour tours of the WSNA will occur on Sept. 25, Oct. 2 and Nov. 6 at 10 am, 12 pm, and 2 pm each day. Visitors can sign up for the tours at the kiosk at WSNA.

The WSNA will also be hosting a planting event for the public to help restore wildlife habitat on Saturday, Oct. 9. Lunch will be provided. Registration can be done at www.eventbrite.com/e/warm-springs-natural-area-green-up-tickets-165045528619.

FILED UNDER: LOCAL NEWS

Leave a Reply

Your email address will not be published. Required fields are marked *

Comment


Name *

Email *

Website

EXHIBIT 2

EXHIBIT 2



1 **ANSB**
2 PAUL G. TAGGART, ESQ.,
3 Nevada State Bar No. 6136
4 TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR, ESQ.,
5 Nevada State Bar No. 14098
6 THOMAS P. DUENSING, ESQ.,
7 Nevada State Bar No. 15213
8 TAGGART & TAGGART, LTD.
9 108 North Minnesota Street
10 Carson City, Nevada 89703
11 T: (775) 882-9900; F: (775) 883-9900
12 paul@legaltnt.com; tim@legaltnt.com; tom@legaltnt.com
13 *Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA*

9 **DISTRICT COURT**
10 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

10 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER
11 DISTRICT, and SOUTHERN NEVADA
12 WATER AUTHORITY,

13 Petitioners,

14 vs.

15 ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E., Nevada State
16 Engineer, DIVISION OF WATER
17 RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF
18 CONSERVATION AND NATURAL
19 RESOURCES,

20 Respondents.

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

Hearing Requested

**ANSWERING BRIEF OF
PETITIONERS' LAS VEGAS VALLEY
WATER DISTRICT AND SOUTHERN
NEVADA WATER AUTHORITY**

21 Petitioners LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT ("LVVWD") and
22 SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER AUTHORITY ("SNWA") by and through their
23 counsel of record, file their Answering Brief pursuant to EDCR 2.15.
24

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....ii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES v

ISSUES PRESENTED 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 1

STATEMENT OF FACTS 3

I. History of groundwater administration in LWRFS region 3

 A. Application 46777 4

 B. Order 1169 5

II. Interim Ruling 1303 7

III. Evidence presented by SNWA and LVVWD 9

 A. Boundary of LWRFS 9

 B. Hydrologic connection within the LWRFS 10

 C. Protection of Moapa dace 10

 D. Quantity of long-term pumping that is sustainable in LWRFS 11

IV. Ruling 1309 11

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 12

ARGUMENT 13

I. The State Engineer Has Authority To Designate The LWRFS And To Jointly Regulate Groundwater In That Area. 14

 A. The State Engineer had the authority to delineate the LWRFS. 14

 1. NRS 532.120..... 15

 2. NRS 534.030..... 15

 3. NRS 534.110..... 16

 4. Basin should not be narrowly defined. 17

 B. The State Engineer did not rely on NRS 533.024(1) as independent statutory authority. 19

1 C. The State Engineer did not re-prioritize the
2 priority dates of water rights in the formerly
3 independent sub-basins.20
4 D. While the State Engineer is authorized to
5 regulate water rights in the LWRFS based
6 on priority, in Order 1309 he did not change
7 any priority dates or initiate curtailment of
8 any specific water rights.....22
9 E. The State Engineer is legally allowed to
10 defer management decisions to future
11 actions.....24
12 1. *Eureka County v. State Engineer*.....24
13 2. Due Process.....26
14 F. The State Engineer had authority to
15 consider the Endangered Species Act in his
16 public interest analysis.27
17 II. The State Engineer’s Decision To Designate The
18 LWRFS Basin Was Proper.....30
19 A. The State Engineer’s decision to delineate
20 the LWRFS boundary is based on
21 substantial evidence.31
22 B. The State Engineer considered all relevant
23 evidence in delineating the LWRFS
24 boundary.....35
25 C. The criteria used by the State Engineer to
26 delineate the LWRFS boundary are proper.39
27 1. The State Engineer properly considered the results
28 from the Aquifer Test.39
29 2. The State Engineer properly considered
30 groundwater budgets.....40
31 D. The State Engineer provided adequate due
32 process.....43
33 III. The State Engineer’s Decision To Restrict
34 LWRFS Groundwater Pumping To 8,000 Acre
35 Feet, Or Less, Was Proper.....45

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

A. The State Engineer relied on substantial evidence to find pumping should be limited to 8,000 afa or less.46

B. The State Engineer properly analyzed the evidence to support the 8,000 afa pumping limitation.47

C. The State Engineer’s determination that capping pumping at 8,000 afa, with possible reductions to that cap in the future, will adequately protect the Moapa dace is supported by substantial evidence.51

D. Climate conditions were properly included in State Engineer’s LWRFS pumping limit analysis.....52

 1. SNWA and LVVWD Evidence 54

 2. USFWS, NPS and MVWD Evidence.....54

 3. State Engineer’s Conclusion Regarding Climate Conditions.....55

E. The State Engineer provided adequate due process.....56

CONCLUSION.....56

ATTORNEY CERTIFICATE58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

Cases

Bacher v. State Eng'r,
122 Nev. 1110, 146 P.3d 793 (2006).....31, 48

Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Holsten,
541 F. Supp.2d 1073 (D. Minn. 2008) 29

Eureka County v. State Engineer,
359 P.3d 1114 (2015)24, 25

Kobobel v. State Dept. of Natural Resources,
249 P.3d 1127 (Col. 2011).....22

McLaughlin v. Housing Authority of the City of Las Vegas,
68 Nev. 84, 93, 227 P.3d 206 (1951)..... 19

Mesagate Homeowners' Ass'n v. City of Fernley,
124 Nev. 1092, 1097, 194 P.3d 1248 (2008)21

Min. Cty. v. Lyon Cty.,
136 Nev. 503, 473 P.3d 418 (2020).....27, 28, 29

Ormsby County v. Kearney,
37 Nev. 314, 142 P. 803 (Nev. 1914).....23

Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians v. Ricci,
126 Nev. 521, 245 P.3d 1145 (2010).....48

Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians v. Washoe County,
112 Nev. 743, 918 P.2d 697 (1996).....27, 32, 38

Revert v. Ray,
95 Nev. 782, 603 P.2d 262 (1979).....31, 32, 35, 38, 41

State Eng'r v. Morris,
107 Nev. 699, 819 P.2d 203 (1991).....32, 38

State, Employee Sec. Dep't v. Hilton Hotels Corp.,
102 Nev. 606, 729 P.2d 497 (1986).....48

Strahan v. Coxe,
127 F.3d 155 (1st Cir. 1997)29

Tennessee Valley Auth. v. Hill,
437 U.S. 153 (1978)28

Wilson v. Pahrump Fair Water, LLC,
481 P.3d 853 (Nev. 2021).....31

1	Statutes	
2	NRS 233 B.039(1)(i).....	42
3	NRS 532.030.....	33
4	NRS 532.120.....	14, 15
5	NRS 533.020.....	14
6	NRS 533.024(1).....	19, 20, 40
7	NRS 533.030.....	16, 22
8	NRS 533.085 (1).....	23
9	NRS 533.345.....	27, 29
10	NRS 533.355(1).....	22
11	NRS 533.367.....	29
12	NRS 533.370.....	27, 29, 48, 49
13	NRS 533.395(3).....	22
14	NRS 533.450.....	24, 31, 32, 35, 38
15	NRS 533.450(10).....	31
16	NRS 534.0105.....	17
17	NRS 534.020.....	22
18	NRS 534.030.....	14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 25
19	NRS 534.080(3).....	22
20	NRS 534.110.....	14, 16, 17, 24
21	NRS 534.120.....	14, 25, 26
22		
23		
24		

ISSUES PRESENTED

1
2 1. Whether the State Engineer has the authority to designate the LWRFS as
3 an independent hydrological unit for management purposes.

4 2. Whether the State Engineer’s decision to designate the LWRFS is
5 supported by substantial evidence.

6 3. Whether the State Engineer’s factual finding that 8,000 acre-feet annually
7 (“afa” or “acre-feet”) is the maximum amount of groundwater that can be sustainably
8 pumped on an annual basis in the LWRFS is supported by substantial evidence.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE¹

9
10 The LWRFS is an over-appropriated groundwater system in southern Nevada,
11 north of the Las Vegas Valley. The *basins* that make up the LWRFS were formally
12 considered separate *basins* largely on the assumption that the groundwater aquifers
13 reflected the topographic boundaries. For decades, however, the State Engineer
14 expressed uncertainty about that assumption, and investigated whether groundwater
15 throughout the LWRFS is, in fact, connected as a single unit. Only large-scale pumping
16 could yield the data needed to analyze what basins in the LWRFS are connected. The
17 State Engineer ordered a large pumping test, rigorously reviewed the drawdown data
18 throughout the LWRFS, and found that groundwater levels responded uniformly. Thus,
19 the State Engineer confirmed that the LWRFS basins are not separate hydrographic
20 units, but instead, operate as a single aquifer that underlies various topographic
21 mountains and valleys.

22
23 _____
24 ¹ SNWA and LVVWD incorporate by reference their Statement of the Case from their
Opening Brief.

1 Since the 1980s, the State Engineer’s office was concerned that groundwater
2 pumping in the LWRFS would impact senior surface water rights and the endangered
3 Moapa dace. His office therefore evaluated the maximum volume of groundwater that
4 can be sustainability pumped in the LWRFS. Initial estimates of water availability
5 varied widely, and protests were filed against water development in the region. While
6 some groundwater rights were granted, the State Engineer conditioned the approval of
7 those groundwater permits on protecting senior rights and the Moapa dace.

8 In 2002, the State Engineer refused to grant new groundwater rights until he
9 understood the impact from pumping *existing* rights, but most of the groundwater rights
10 he already granted were not yet pumped.² Instead of granting new permits, the State
11 Engineer ordered a comprehensive pumping test to obtain aquifer data necessary to
12 understand groundwater connectivity and availability (“Aquifer Test”). The Aquifer
13 Test, conducted in 2010-2012, revealed that pumping even less than half of the existing
14 rights caused immediate and significant impacts to the Muddy River within two years.
15 Based on the Aquifer Test, the State Engineer denied all pending applications for *new*
16 groundwater rights in the LWRFS.³

17 In 2019, prompted largely by Coyote Springs Investment’s (“CSI”) intention to
18 use existing groundwater rights to support large residential and commercial project in
19 Coyote Spring Valley, the State Engineer issued Interim Order 1303.⁴ Prior to issuing
20 Order 1303, the State Engineer held several public workshops that invited stakeholders
21 to provide input on water issues in the area. Order 1303 initiated a two-phased process

22 ² ROA 665-66.

23 ³ ROA 75-76 (Several parties including NV Energy, CSI, LVVWD, and SNWA had
applications for new groundwater rights in the LWRFS denied).

24 ⁴ ROA 70-88.

1 designed to ensure the State Engineer could create rules for administering water rights
2 in the LWRFS using the best available data and science.

3 The first phase involved fact-finding on discrete hydrologic issues through a two-
4 week hearing, which resulted in Order 1309. The findings of Order 1309 are the subject
5 of this Petition. The second phase will involve development of administrative rules for
6 managing groundwater use in the LWRFS.

7 In Order 1309, the State Engineer made hydrologic findings to define (1) the area
8 where the regional aquifer is connected (the LWRFS) and (2) how much groundwater
9 can be developed in that aquifer. The appeals currently before the Court arise from the
10 factual findings in Order 1309, not groundwater management decisions the State
11 Engineer will not make until Phase 2 of the administrative process. The two key factual
12 findings addressed in this Answering Brief are the geographic extent of the
13 hydrologically connected LWRFS, and the 8,000 afa limit on groundwater production
14 in the LWRFS.⁵

15 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**⁶

16 **I. History of groundwater administration in LWRFS region**

17 Order 1309 is the culmination of decades of LWRFS investigation. In the 1980s,
18 the State Engineer began an in-depth study of the area now known as the LWRFS with
19 the United States Department of Interior, Geological Survey (“USGS”).⁷ The initial

20
21 ⁵ Another determination in Order 1309 related to the impact of existing groundwater
22 pumping on senior surface water rights in the Muddy River. SNWA and LVVWD
23 challenged that determination in their petition for judicial review and presented their
24 argument against that determination in their Opening Brief.

⁶ SNWA and LVVWD incorporate by reference their Statement of Facts from their
Opening Brief.

⁷ See SE ROA 654-658 for a history of the studies conducted prior to 2002.

1 USGS studies did not have pumping data because significant groundwater development
2 had not yet occurred in the area. Therefore, the USGS relied on groundwater budgets
3 and other theoretical methods to estimate the amount of available supply. The estimates
4 varied widely from a few thousand acre-feet based on local recharge, to over 50,000
5 acre-feet based on underground flow from upgradient basins.

6 **A. Application 46777**

7 In 1983, Application 46777 was filed by Nevada Power to appropriate
8 groundwater in Coyote Spring Valley.⁸ Today, CSI desires to use water rights
9 originating from Application 46777 for CSI's proposed development. But even in 1983,
10 the sustainability of that groundwater use was in serious question. Protests were filed
11 against Application 46777 by the United States and Nevada's Department of Wildlife
12 based on potential impacts to the Moapa dace. Protests were also filed by Muddy River
13 water right owners who claimed groundwater pumping would capture river flows and
14 impact their water rights.⁹

15 In 1997, Application 46777 was conditionally granted. After an evidentiary
16 hearing, the State Engineer granted Permit 46777 with specific permit terms that
17 preclude impacts to the Muddy River. Specifically, the State Engineer issued Ruling
18 4542 and stated that protests were withdrawn "on the understanding that *groundwater*
19 *pumping would be stopped* should the project adversely affect the water table in the
20 Muddy River Springs Area."¹⁰ To protect the Muddy River and Moapa dace from
21 pumping that Permit 46777 authorized, the State Engineer established an early warning

22
23 ⁸ SE ROA 47837.

24 ⁹ SE ROA 48114-48130, 47837-47840 (Ruling 4542, Permit 46777).

¹⁰ SE ROA 48115 (emphasis added).

1 system. The State Engineer found that “if, at some future time, it is determined that
2 pumping the [Permit 46777 wells] has adverse effects on the springs [and river . . .] *those*
3 *effects would be detected early.*”¹¹ Accordingly, the State Engineer issued Permit 46777
4 “subject to existing rights” and expressly stated the “State Engineer retains the right to
5 regulate the use of the water herein granted *at any and all times.*”¹² Similar language
6 was included in all other groundwater permits that were issued in the LWRFS area.¹³

7 **B. Order 1169**

8 Joint management of the LWRFS region began with Order 1169 and continued
9 with Rulings 6254-6261 because the region shares a close hydrologic connection, and a
10 *joint* groundwater supply. In the early 2000s, the State Engineer had to consider
11 additional applications for groundwater in Coyote Spring Valley and the LWRFS region.
12 Instead of acting on those applications, he issued Order 1169 to require the Aquifer
13 Test.¹⁴ The State Engineer ordered that half the existing rights issued in the LWRFS be
14 pumped and the effects of pumping be monitored.¹⁵ Order 1169 included all the LWRFS
15 basins, except Kane Springs Valley.¹⁶ The Aquifer Test yielded data that proved
16 groundwater in Coyote Spring Valley has a close hydrologic connection to groundwater
17
18

19 ¹¹ SE ROA 48123 (emphasis added).

20 ¹² SE ROA 47838.

21 ¹³ *See e.g.*, SE ROA 33952, 35507-35508, 41852.

22 ¹⁴ SE ROA 654-669.

23 ¹⁵ The State Engineer had previously issued approximately 50,465 afa in six of the
24 LWRFS Basins, usually with strict permit terms noting that the permits are subject to
reductions in pumping if harm occurs to others or the environment, and had pending
applications before him requesting over 100,000 afa of additional appropriations.

¹⁶ *See* SE ROA 992-994. The State Engineer added Kane Springs Valley to the LWRFS
in Order 1309.

1 in adjacent valleys. The test also proved that pumping in Coyote Spring Valley directly
2 impacts the Muddy River and Moapa dace habitat.

3 After the Aquifer Test, the State Engineer had data the USGS did not have in the
4 1980s. Rather than simple theoretical estimates, empirical data showed common
5 groundwater level responses throughout the LWRFS region due to Aquifer Test stress
6 imposed by pumping.¹⁷ More importantly, monitoring wells near the Muddy River and
7 critical Moapa dace habitat showed a direct and nearly immediate groundwater decline
8 in response to Aquifer Test pumping.

9 Based on the Aquifer Test evidence, the State Engineer issued Rulings 6254-6261
10 in 2014. His office treated the LWRFS (except Kane Springs Valley) as one aquifer.¹⁸
11 Each ruling addressed a different basin in the LWRFS and denied each pending water
12 right application that existed in that basin. The rationale for all the rulings was the same:
13 “because these basins share a unique and close hydrologic connection and share virtually
14 all of the same source and supply of water, unlike other basins in Nevada, these five
15 basins will be jointly managed.”¹⁹ The State Engineer then set one perennial yield for
16 all the Order 1169 basins and the Muddy River.²⁰

19 ¹⁷ SE ROA 41986.

20 ¹⁸ SE ROA 726-948.

21 ¹⁹ *See e.g.*, SE ROA 479.

22 ²⁰ *Id.* (“The perennial yield of these basins cannot be more than the total annual supply
23 of 50,000 acre-feet. Because the Muddy River and Muddy River springs also utilize this
24 supply, and are the most senior water rights in the region, the perennial yield is further
reduced to an amount less than 50,000 acre-feet. The State Engineer finds that the
amount and location of groundwater that can be developed without capture of and
conflict with senior water rights on the Muddy River and springs remains unclear, but
the evidence is overwhelming that unappropriated water does not exist.”).

1 **II. Interim Ruling 1303**

2 In 2019, the State Engineer issued Interim Order 1303 to initiate a two-phase
3 process to develop management rules for the use of existing groundwater rights in the
4 LWRFS.²¹ The State Engineer was explicit – he had to address hydrologic factual
5 questions with the help of stakeholders and their experts before management decisions
6 could be made.²² For Phase 1, the State Engineer asked all stakeholders to submit expert
7 reports to address four specific factual matters: (1) the geographic boundary of the
8 LWRFS, (2) aquifer recovery since the Aquifer Test, (3) the long-term annual quantity
9 of groundwater that may be pumped from the LWRFS, and (4) the effects of moving
10 water rights between the carbonate and alluvial systems to senior water rights on the
11 Muddy River.²³

12 Many of the stakeholders that presented evidence understood the work that had
13 been completed since the 1980s. Many parties agreed that the State Engineer already
14 rejected theoretical estimates (water budgets) in favor of empirical pumping and
15 recovery data from the Aquifer Test. They acknowledged that an exceptionally flat
16 groundwater gradient exists with a high degree of transmissivity throughout the LWRFS
17 indicating a high degree of hydraulic connection. Importantly, most parties agreed that
18 prior State Engineer findings were correct. They also agreed that the data shows that the
19 aquifer has not fully recovered since the Aquifer Test. Many parties agreed that no new
20 long-term pumping should occur, and a reduction of existing pumping is probably

21
22 _____
23 ²¹ SE ROA 84.

24 ²² SE ROA 81.

²³ SE ROA 82-83. The State Engineer also include a fifth general request for “[a]ny other matter believed to be relevant to the State Engineer’s analysis.”

1 required. Thus, without mitigation, even the existing pumping of about 8,300 afa poses
2 an imminent threat to senior water rights in the Muddy River.²⁴

3 A decided majority of stakeholders further agreed: (1) the precise LWRFS
4 boundary is debatable, but ultimately, a hydrologic connection exists with Kane Springs
5 Valley; (2) the aquifer is highly transmissive and pumping from virtually all reaches of
6 the LWRFS impacts the Muddy River and its springs; (3) pumping, not climate, is the
7 primary factor for the declines; (4) maximum recovery has been reached and
8 groundwater declines are once again occurring; and (5) a water user cannot pump
9 “underflow” without capturing the source of supply for the Muddy River.

10 A few parties were outliers and ignored the prior findings of the State Engineer.
11 For instance, CSI sought to turn the clock back to a time before the availability of Aquifer
12 Test data. CSI’s experts relied on water budgets, and not on the much more instructive
13 aquifer stress and recovery data even though the State Engineer, and virtually all other
14 experts, acknowledged water budgets are of limited value when there is actual Aquifer
15 Test data available.²⁵ And despite widely accepted expert conclusions regarding the
16 hydrologic connectivity in the LWRFS, CSI also proffered geologic evidence to
17 *hypothesize* new barriers to flow. Based upon this evidence, CSI argued that its water
18 rights exist in a discrete LWRFS compartment accessible for conflict-free pumping.
19 This was vigorously disputed by many experts.²⁶

20 //

21 //

23 ²⁴ SE ROA 56.

24 ²⁵ SE ROA 49-50.

²⁶ SE ROA 22 at fn. 104.

1 **III. Evidence presented by SNWA and LVVWD**

2 SNWA and LVVWD are main stakeholders in the LWRFS and have a long-term
3 responsibility for maintaining sustainable water supplies in southern Nevada.
4 Accordingly, SNWA and LVVWD urged the State Engineer to limit LWRFS
5 groundwater pumping to that which does not threaten the existence of the Moapa dace,
6 does not impact senior rights, and is sustainable in the long term.

7 **A. Boundary of LWRFS**

8 At the administrative hearing, SNWA and LVVWD did not recommend that the
9 State Engineer extend the boundary of the LWRFS beyond what was defined in Order
10 1169.²⁷ Rather, SNWA and LVVWD recommended adjacent basins be included in
11 Phase 2 when groundwater management decisions could be made regarding those basins
12 because, “regardless of the boundary, we know that the State will have to continue
13 managing the adjacent basins to” protect the LWRFS from pumping in those basins.²⁸
14 Ultimately, the boundary must be protected from activities that could cause drawdown
15 to propagate to the LWRFS, such as allowing a “pile-up” of “points of diversion along
16 the boundary [of the LWRFS].”²⁹ The State Engineer considered this testimony, but
17 determined based upon his previous criteria for an area’s inclusion in the LWRFS
18 management area (described in Rulings 6254-6261) that Kane Springs Valley, and a
19 modified section of Black Mountain Area, should be added to the LWRFS Hydrographic
20 Basin.³⁰

21
22 _____
23 ²⁷ SE ROA 34-35.

24 ²⁸ SE ROA 53335 at 876:2-15.

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ SE ROA 48-49.

1 **B. Hydrologic connection within the LWRFS**

2 SNWA and LVVWD presented evidence that showed a close hydrologic
3 connection between pumping in the LWRFS, especially in the Coyote Spring Valley
4 sub-basin, and the Muddy River.³¹ This evidence was based on hydrographs from
5 monitoring wells and springs, which are measurements of water levels over time. Those
6 hydrographs were compared to pumping data, and a direct response was found. SNWA
7 and LVVWD also demonstrated that the decline in spring flows from the Aquifer Test
8 was caused by the close hydrologic connection, not a climate phenomenon like
9 drought.³² The State Engineer found this evidence, and other similar evidence from the
10 National Park Service, to be persuasive.³³

11 **C. Protection of Moapa dace**

12 SNWA and LVVWD have prioritized protection of the Moapa dace for decades.
13 Since the 1990s, habitat restoration and other conservation efforts have been completed
14 by SNWA, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (“USFWS”) and others to
15 increase dace populations.³⁴ SNWA and LVVWD’s experts Zane Marshall and Robert
16 Williams are highly experienced in the field of conservation biology and in protecting
17 Moapa dace, and they testified regarding their involvement in the development of the
18 2006 Memorandum of Agreement, associated Biological Opinion, and other studies and
19 conservation efforts for protection of Moapa dace. They testified that 3.2 cubic feet per
20 second (“cfs”) of flow at the Warm Springs West gage is necessary to protect the Moapa
21

22 ³¹ SE ROA 35-36; SE ROA 53340 at 899 – SE ROA 53341 at 900.

23 ³² SE ROA 34; SE ROA 42187-42189; SE ROA 53341 at 903:14-53343 at 909:9.

24 ³³ SE ROA 53, 56.

³⁴ SE ROA 42087-89.

1 dace.³⁵ This testimony was based on extensive scientific study and documentation. The
2 State Engineer relied on their testimony and found that “it is clear that it is necessary for
3 spring flow measured at the Warm Springs West gage to flow at a minimum rate of 3.2
4 cfs in order to maintain the habitat for the Moapa dace.”³⁶

5 **D. Quantity of long-term pumping that is sustainable in LWRFS**

6 SNWA and LVVWD presented evidence that only 4,000 to 6,000 afa can be
7 sustainably pumped from the groundwater aquifer in the LWRFS.³⁷ Based on the
8 evidence presented, SNWA and LVVWD recommended that the State Engineer limit
9 pumping to protect the Moapa dace and senior rights. Specifically, SNWA and LVVWD
10 urged the State Engineer to limit pumping to sustainable levels, because new
11 communities cannot rely on water that may not exist, and an unsustainable groundwater
12 supply threatens public health and safety.

13 **IV. Ruling 1309**

14 After an evidentiary hearing with extensive testimony from many experts, Order
15 1309 was issued with four factual findings that are relevant to these appeals. First, the
16 State Engineer delineated the LWRFS Hydrographic Basin.³⁸ Second, the State
17 Engineer determined the maximum quantity of groundwater that can be pumped in the
18 LWRFS Hydrographic Basin is 8,000 afa, or could be less.³⁹ Third, the State Engineer
19 found that the 8,000 afa cap may be reduced if it is determined that pumping will impact
20

21 ³⁵ SE ROA 53438 at 1121:21-1122:24; SE ROA 53439 at 1127:2 – SE ROA 53440 at
22 1128:18.

23 ³⁶ SE ROA 46.

24 ³⁷ SE ROA 42014.

³⁸ SE ROA 66, item 1.

³⁹ SE ROA 66, item 2.

1 the endangered Moapa Dace.⁴⁰ Fourth, the State Engineer rescinded the provisions in
2 Order 1303 that were not specifically addressed in Order 1309.⁴¹ These appeals
3 followed.

4 **SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

5 The State Engineer has broad authority to regulate the withdrawal of groundwater
6 in the State of Nevada to fulfill his or her duty to protect existing rights, the public trust,
7 and wildlife. The office has many statutory tools to carry forth the State Engineer's
8 duties, including the power to study aquifers and determine their available supply of
9 water for appropriation, the power to designate hydrographic areas for additional
10 regulation, power to regulate basins, and the continuing power to manage and regulate
11 permits issued by the office. With these tools, the State Engineer has jointly managed
12 the basins in the LWRFS for decades. Order 1309 is simply the latest of in a forty-year
13 of LWRFS Orders and Rulings issued by the office using the powers conferred by
14 statute.

15 Based on the best available science, the State Engineer properly designated the
16 boundary of the interconnected aquifer comprising the LWRFS. Substantial evidence
17 supports his decision. In Order 1309, the State Engineer carefully analyzed all evidence
18 that was presented as to the extent of the groundwater aquifer. The State Engineer's
19 analysis was careful and detailed, and substantial evidence supports those conclusions
20 about the LWRFS boundary.

21 The State Engineer presented a careful review of all evidence in Order 1309
22 regarding the amount of groundwater available for pumping, and a careful and detailed

23 ⁴⁰ SE ROA 66, item 3.

24 ⁴¹ SE ROA 67, item 6.

1 analysis to support his conclusion. Substantial evidence supports that if more than 8,000
2 afa is withdrawn from the LWRFS aquifer, deleterious impacts will occur to existing
3 water rights and the environment. SNWA and LVVWD, for example, presented the best
4 available science and substantial evidence that only 6,000 afa can be pumped. The State
5 Engineer’s decision to not allow pumping to exceed 8,000 afa, which is approximately
6 equivalent to existing pumping, is supported by the best available science and substantial
7 evidence. The 8,000 afa limitation includes the acknowledgement that pumping may
8 have to be reduced below 8,000 afa in the future to protect the Moapa dace and senior
9 rights based on rigorous monitoring.

10 **ARGUMENT**

11 This Answering Brief refutes three challenges to Order 1309.⁴² First, several
12 Petitioners allege the State Engineer lacks statutory authority to delineate the LWRFS
13 boundary and regulate groundwater in that area as one administrative unit. Second, some
14 Petitioners allege the State Engineer’s criteria for creating the LWRFS and his decision
15 to designate the LWRFS are not supported by substantial evidence. Third, the same
16 Petitioners claim the State Engineer’s 8,000 afa cap on LWRFS groundwater production
17 is not supported by substantial evidence. Each challenge lacks merit for the reasons
18 stated below.

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 _____
23 ⁴² SNWA and LVVWD presented its challenge to another aspect of Order 1309 in its
24 opening brief. SNWA and LVVWD support all aspects of Order 1309 except the limited
portions that are addressed in that opening brief.

1 **I. The State Engineer Has Authority To Designate The LWRFS And To Jointly**
2 **Regulate Groundwater In That Area.**

3 The State Engineer’s authority to delineate the LWRFS is well established in
4 Nevada law.⁴³ While several parties claim that the State Engineer does not have
5 authority under Nevada law to establish the LWRFS boundary,⁴⁴ those arguments are
6 either based on a misunderstanding of the statutory authority the State Engineer relied
7 upon in Order 1309, or an overly narrow and self-serving reading of statutory authority.

8 The State Engineer has authority over all water in the State (NRS 533.030(1)),
9 limited only by the continued authority of the courts, or act of Congress (NRS 533.0245).
10 The State Engineer has express authority to “make such reasonable rules and regulations
11 as may be necessary for the proper and orderly execution of the powers conferred by
12 law.”⁴⁵ The State Engineer has authority to regulate the withdrawal of groundwater
13 within the LWRFS because the LWRFS is entirely located within the State of Nevada.
14 The State Engineer properly used the tools available to him under NRS 534.030,
15 534.110, and 534.120 to exercise this power to establish the extent of an area in need of
16 special administration and set a maximum quantity of groundwater that can be pumped.

17 **A. The State Engineer had the authority to delineate the LWRFS.**

18 Nevada law gives the State Engineer numerous tools to administer groundwater
19 and surface water. Those tools include the ones the State Engineer expressly relied on -
20 NRS 532.120, NRS 534.030, NRS 534.110 and NRS 534.120.⁴⁶ Taken separately, each

21 ⁴³ NRS 532.120, 534.030, 534.110, 533.020, 534.120. *See generally*, SE ROA 43 and
22 NRS Chapters 532-534.

23 ⁴⁴ Apex Opening Brief at 8:6-10:2; CSI Opening Brief at 17:26-22:19; Georgia-Pacific
24 Opening Brief at 20:27-23:4; LCWD and Vidler Opening Brief at 15:23-20:27; Nevada
Co-Gen Opening Brief at 20:4-25:4.

⁴⁵ NRS 532.120.

⁴⁶ SE ROA 43-44.

1 power relates to a specific condition for administering groundwater use. But taken as a
2 whole, these statutes form a mosaic of powers evidencing one primary objective –
3 protect the public from over-pumping a groundwater basin so the basin can continue to
4 provide water for future generations.

5 **1. NRS 532.120**

6 The State Engineer’s office was created by NRS Chapter 532, and NRS 532.120
7 directs the State Engineer to adopt “such reasonable rules and regulations as may be
8 necessary for the proper and orderly execution of the powers conferred by law.” The
9 powers “conferred by law” include NRS 534.030 which directs the State Engineer to
10 identify whether administration of a basin is justified.

11 **2. NRS 534.030**

12 Based on Order 1169 and Interim Order 1303 investigations, the State Engineer
13 properly delineated the boundary of the LWRFS based on his statutory authority
14 provided by NRS 534.030(2). The legislature expressly provided power to the State
15 Engineer to “designate [an area in need of administration] by basin, or portion therein,
16 and make an official order describing the boundaries by legal subdivision as nearly as
17 possible.”⁴⁷ The State Engineer is required to hold a hearing and take testimony from
18 the stakeholders in the area to be so designated.⁴⁸ If the State Engineer determines, after
19 hearing and investigation, that the proposed basin needs additional administration, the
20 State Engineer may enter a designation order for the basin.⁴⁹

21
22
23 ⁴⁷ NRS 534.030.

24 ⁴⁸ NRS 534.030(2).

⁴⁹ *Id.*

1 Here, the State Engineer held stakeholder meetings and a formal administrative
2 hearing to take testimony regarding the designation of the LWRFS.⁵⁰ The State Engineer
3 specifically held the hearing to determine the geographic boundary of the LWRFS and
4 establish the need for additional administration, as required by NRS 533.030.⁵¹ Based
5 on these meetings and hearings, the State Engineer designated the LWRFS Hydrographic
6 Basin, and established Kane Springs Valley, Coyote Spring Valley, Muddy River
7 Springs Area, California Wash, Hidden Valley, Garnet Valley, and the northwest portion
8 of the Black Mountains Area as sub-basins.⁵² As expressly permitted by NRS
9 534.030(2),⁵³ the State Engineer designated the LWRFS as an area in need of
10 administration based on the evidence and input from public meetings and the Order 1303
11 evidentiary hearing.

12 3. NRS 534.110

13 The State Engineer completed a robust, long-term, and thorough “due
14 investigation” of each basin, or portion thereof, that was later consolidated into the
15 LWRFS, as required by NRS 534.110. The “due investigation” began with Order 1169,
16 and continued with Interim Order 1303, wherein the State Engineer first began joint
17 management, and then exercised the powers conferred by NRS 534.110(2). Under NRS
18
19
20

21 ⁵⁰ SE ROA 12; SE ROA 33863-922.

22 ⁵¹ SE ROA 11.

23 ⁵² SE ROA 66, 69.

24 ⁵³ NRS 534.030(2)(b) (“If the basin is found, after due investigation, to be in need of
administration the State Engineer may enter an order” designating the area by basin, or
portion therein, and make an official order describing the boundaries by legal
subdivision as nearly as possible.).

1 534.110(2), the State Engineer is specifically authorized to determine the specific
2 [sustainable] yield of an aquifer and to determine permeability characteristics.⁵⁴

3 The LWRFS is, effectively, a single aquifer. An aquifer is “a geological formation
4 or structure that stores or transmits water, or both.”⁵⁵ The State Engineer found, based
5 on extensive empirical evidence of hydrologic connection, that the LWRFS is a single
6 aquifer with homogenous characteristics that stores and transmits groundwater. The
7 State Engineer concluded the LWRFS is not five or seven separate aquifers, regardless
8 of historic administrative boundary lines generally based on topography and not
9 hydrological considerations. The State Engineer was fully authorized to rely on aquifer
10 characteristics (specific yield and permeability) to define the LWRFS, to determine if
11 over-pumping is occurring, and to set a quantity of available water supply.⁵⁶ Therefore,
12 the State Engineer was clearly authorized to designate the LWRFS.

13 **4. Basin should not be narrowly defined.**

14 Several parties argue that NRS 534.030(2) does not give the State Engineer
15 authority to designate an area that is made up of formerly independent sub-basins.⁵⁷
16 They rely exclusively on the fact the term *basin* is singular and not plural in statute. This
17 argument is without merit because it is overly simplistic, ignores the larger statutory
18 scheme in the water law, and disregards the reality of what the Aquifer Test
19 demonstrated. NRS 534.030 does not limit the State Engineer’s ability to designate an

20
21 ⁵⁴ NRS 534.110(2) (“Upon his or her own initiation, [the State Engineer may] conduct
22 pumping tests to determine if overpumping is indicated, to determine the specific yield
of the aquifers and to determine permeability characteristics”).

23 ⁵⁵ NRS 534.0105.

24 ⁵⁶ NRS 534.110(2).

⁵⁷ Apex Opening Brief at 11-12; CSI Opening Brief at 17-19; LCWD and Vidler
Opening Brief at 16-17.

1 area that consists of already designated basins, as he did in Order 1309.⁵⁸ Contrary to
2 other parties' arguments, the fact that the term *basin* is used in NRS 534.030 does not
3 mean that the State Engineer cannot combine previously designated basins.

4 While *basin* is not a defined term in statute, the term is used in different contexts
5 and has different definitions. For example, in the Division of Water Resources Water
6 Words Dictionary the word *basin* has multiple definitions including the following:

7 *The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and the Nevada Division*
8 *of Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural*
9 *Resources, have divided the state into discrete hydrologic units*
10 *for water planning and management purposes. These have been*
identified as 232 Hydrographic Areas (256 areas and sub-areas,
*combined) within 14 major Hydrographic Regions or Basins.*⁵⁹

11 To the extent the Water Words Dictionary has any legal significance, its definition
12 of the term "basin" does not refer to the 232 Hydrographic areas in Nevada, as opposing
13 parties suggest, but rather to the *14 major Hydrographic regions or basins*. One of these
14 regions, the Colorado River Basin, includes all the formerly independent sub-basins
15 which became the LWRFS Hydrographic Basin in Order 1309.⁶⁰ The opposing parties'
16 conclusory argument fails to consider how the term *basin* is actually used in different
17 contexts. By contrast, the overwhelming authority in NRS 534.030(2) for designating
18

19 ⁵⁸ SE ROA 71-72 (Coyote Spring Valley, Black Mountains Area, Garnet Valley,
20 California Wash, Hidden Valley, and Muddy River Springs Area Hydrographic Basins
were all previously designated pursuant to NRS 534.030).

21 ⁵⁹ Division of Water Resources Water Words Dictionary at 25-26. Available at
<http://water.nv.gov/programs/planning/dictionary/wwords-B.pdf> (last visited October 12,
22 2021).

23 ⁶⁰ Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Office of the State Engineer,
Division of Water Resources, *Designated Groundwater Basins of Nevada*. Available at
24 http://water.nv.gov/mapping/maps/designated_basinmap.pdf (last visited November 5,
2021).

1 an area “within a basin” (the Colorado River Basin) clearly authorized designation of
2 the LWRFS.

3 **B. The State Engineer did not rely on NRS 533.024(1) as independent**
4 **statutory authority.**

5 Several parties argue that the State Engineer improperly relied on NRS 533.024(1)
6 as the exclusive source of authority to designate the LWRFS.⁶¹ This claim is also without
7 merit. In Order 1309, the State Engineer expressly stated he was relying on many
8 different provisions of the water statutes, not NRS 533.024(1). Also, even though NRS
9 533.024(1) is a legislative declaration of policy, the Supreme Court has held a
10 “declaration of policy by the legislature, though not necessarily binding or conclusive
11 upon the courts, is entitled to great weight.”⁶²

12 In 2017, the Nevada legislature clarified that the State Engineer’s obligation to
13 protect existing water rights included protection from impacts caused by groundwater
14 pumping that depletes the surface water. Nevada’s legislative policy in this respect is to
15 “manage conjunctively the appropriation, use and administration of all waters regardless
16 of the source of the water.”⁶³ This declaration clarified that the State Engineer’s express
17 statutory powers must be used to manage all waters – groundwater and surface water –
18 to protect existing surface water rights and the public from over-pumping groundwater.

19 ⁶¹ Apex Opening Brief at 8 – 9; CSI Opening Brief at 22; Georgia Pacific Opening Brief
20 at 20-23; LCWD and Vidler Opening Brief at 16, 18-19, 25; Nevada Co-Gen Opening
21 Brief at 3, 10, 21-25. Notably, these same parties also rely on NRS 533.024 in other
22 areas of their argument as requiring the State Engineer to act in other regards. See e.g.
23 CSI Opening Brief at 20 and 54, and LCWD and Vidler Opening at 30 (relating to “best
24 available science”).

⁶² *McLaughlin v. Housing Authority of the City of Las Vegas*, 68 Nev. 84, 93 227 P.3d
206, 210 (1951).

⁶³ SE ROA 43.

1 While NRS 534.030 authorized the State Engineer to designate the LWRFS, NRS
2 533.024(1)(e) is particularly notable in the present case because it clarifies that authority.
3 The legislature directed the State Engineer to recognize that ground and surface water
4 sources routinely have a hydrological connection. For example, groundwater often
5 produces springs, and those springs contribute to river flows. Here, those are the flows
6 relied upon by senior Muddy River surface water rights holders and the Moapa Dace in
7 this case. Thus, groundwater and surface water cannot be viewed in isolation.

8 That hydrologic connection between groundwater and surface water is certainly
9 relevant in the State Engineer's determination of whether a basin needs additional
10 administration. The factual question of whether a hydrologic connection exists between
11 ground and surface water is also critical to how the State Engineer executes his or her
12 other statutory obligations to protect senior water rights from impacts that are caused by
13 the use and development of junior water rights. In the LWRFS, the State Engineer made
14 strongly supported factual determinations that junior groundwater pumping is impacting
15 senior surface water rights in the Muddy River. The State Engineer is obligated to
16 protect senior water rights by express provisions in Nevada's statutes and case law. NRS
17 533.024(1)(e) made that obligation clearer.

18 C. **The State Engineer did not re-prioritize the priority dates of water**
19 **rights in the formerly independent sub-basins.**

20 Despite being conspicuously absent from the State Engineer's findings, several
21 parties incorrectly argue the State Engineer re-prioritized all water rights in the LWRFS
22
23
24

1 basin by combining the priorities of all water rights into one list.⁶⁴ Not a single word in
2 Order 1309 re-prioritizes the water rights in the LWRFS. The only language in Order
3 1303 related to this question was rescinded in Order 1309.⁶⁵ The State Engineer did not
4 address the issue of priorities within the LWRFS in Order 1309, which included the
5 following language, “[a]ll other matters set forth in Interim Order 1303 that are not
6 specifically addressed herein are hereby rescinded.”⁶⁶ Therefore, the State Engineer did
7 not re-prioritize the priority of water rights in Order 1309.

8 The State Engineer was just as clear in Order 1309 that the relative priority of
9 water rights in the LWRFS will be addressed in Phase 2 - the management portion of the
10 administrative process regarding the LWRFS. The Order 1303 hearing was intended to
11 address threshold factual issues. Management questions, such as the relative priority of
12 LWRFS water rights, were always intended to be addressed at a later part of the
13 administrative process. Therefore, the issue of priority of LWRFS water rights is not
14 ripe and is irrelevant to the present appeals of Order 1309.⁶⁷

16
17 ⁶⁴ CSI Opening Brief at 25:9-26:10; Apex Opening Brief at 10:3-11:3, LCWD and Vidler
18 Opening Brief at 20:24-27; Georgia-Pacific Opening Brief at 20:27-21:4. Several parties
19 claim that the State Engineer “re-prioritized” the relative priority of LWRFS
20 groundwater rights in Order 1309. In other words, several parties believe that all water
21 rights were combined in one priority table and parties lost their relative priority within
22 the original sub-basins that make up the LWRFS hydrographic basin.

23 ⁶⁵ SE ROA 82 (“All water rights within the Lower White River Flow System will be
24 administered based upon their respective date priorities in relation to other rights within
the regional groundwater unit.”).

⁶⁶ SE ROA 67.

⁶⁷ The State Engineer has not taken a final action in relation to management of water
rights or their relative priorities, thus this issue is not ripe as a final action appealable
under NRS 533.450. *See generally, Mesagate Homeowners' Ass'n v. City of Fernley*,
124 Nev. 1092, 1097, 194 P.3d 1248, 1251 (2008).

1 **D. While the State Engineer is authorized to regulate water rights in the**
2 **LWRFS based on priority, in Order 1309 he did not change any**
3 **priority dates or initiate curtailment of any specific water rights.**

4 All statutory water rights are issued a “priority” date based on when the first
5 application to appropriate the public waters of the state occurred.⁶⁸ These dates are then
6 used to apply the principles of “first in time, first in right,”⁶⁹ as all the water rights issued
7 by the State Engineer are permitted subject to prior senior water rights. The State
8 Engineer did not alter the priority date of any water right in the LWRFS, nor has any
9 party argued that their actual priority date has changed.

10 Also, the specific permit terms that condition the approval for all statutory water
11 rights run counter to the claim of a right to relative priority. In prior appropriation states,
12 a water right holder only owns their right within the prior appropriation system.⁷⁰ Under
13 NRS 534.020 all groundwater rights in Nevada are issued subject to existing rights.⁷¹
14 All statutory water rights also include specific permit terms that state their use of water
15 is “subject to existing rights” as a condition of approval. In other words, no water right
16 holder has a right to use their water if that use would conflict with a water right that
17 existed at the time of its approval. A conflict occurs when a senior right holder is unable

18 ⁶⁸ NRS 533.355(1); NRS 534.080(3) (“Except for [domestic wells], the date of priority
19 of all appropriations of water from an underground source mentioned in this section is
20 the date when application is made in proper form and filed in the Office of the State
21 Engineer pursuant to the provisions of chapter 533 of NRS.”).

22 ⁶⁹ Priority can only be lost if a water right is cancelled for failure to perfect the
23 appropriation (place the water to the requested beneficial use in a diligent manner) and
24 is later re-instated. NRS 533.395(3) (If the decision of the State Engineer modifies or
rescinds the cancellation of a permit, the effective date of the appropriation under the
permit is vacated and replaced by the date of the filing of the written petition with the
State Engineer.).

⁷⁰ *Kobobel v. State Dept. of Natural Resources*, 249 P.3d 1127, 1134 (Col. 2011).

⁷¹ NRS 533.030 also provides that all statutory water rights are issued “subject to existing
rights.”

1 to make full beneficial use of its existing rights. Thus, as long as water rights can impact
2 the availability of water to a senior right, regardless of source or arbitrary topographic
3 basin-boundary lines, that water right's priority is relative to those rights.⁷² Order 1309
4 did not change these core concepts of priority and non-impairment.

5 All groundwater rights in the LWRFS were issued subject to existing rights,
6 including decreed Muddy River water rights.⁷³ The State Engineer has the power to
7 enforce the permit terms in those groundwater rights to protect senior water rights.
8 Additionally, the State Engineer has a separate affirmative duty to protect vested decreed
9 rights. And he cannot issue a permit, or take any administrative action, that impairs
10 vested rights.⁷⁴ The water rights confirmed in the Muddy River Decree were used prior
11 to 1913 and thus are protected against any impairment as vested rights in addition to
12 being protected from conflicts as senior rights.

13 Other parties argue they should be permitted to continue to use groundwater, even
14 though this use will harm existing rights on the source, including senior decreed rights

15 ⁷² LCWD and Vidler's well was originally drilled in what was believed to be Coyote
16 Spring Valley but later was determined to be Kane Springs Valley. SE ROA 54234. The
17 USGS originally recognized that Coyote Spring Valley and Kane Springs Valley were
18 one hydrographic basin based on similar topographic features. SE ROA 9347.

19 ⁷³ For Example, CSI's water right has the specific permit term that the "permit is issued
20 subject to existing rights" and that the "State Engineer retains the right to regulate the
21 use of the water herein granted at any and all times." SE ROA 47838. Other water rights
22 in the LWRFS area have similar permit terms. SE ROA 33952; SE ROA 35507-35508;
23 SE ROA 41852.

24 ⁷⁴ NRS 533.085 (1) is unambiguous: "Nothing contained in this chapter shall impair the
vested right of any person to the use of water, nor shall the right of any person to take
and use water be impaired or affected by any of the provisions of this chapter where
appropriations have been initiated in accordance with law prior to March 22, 1913."
NRS 533.085, and its concept on non-impairment, have been upheld by the Courts since
the statute was first litigated in 1914. *See Ormsby County v. Kearney*, 37 Nev. 314, 142
P. 803 (Nev. 1914).

1 in the Muddy River. Obviously, such a result is prohibited by law as noted above.
2 Therefore, even if the State Engineer had re-prioritized LWRFS water rights based on
3 relative priority, under Nevada law and the prior appropriation system, he is obligated
4 to do so to protect senior water rights and vested water rights.

5 Finally, the question of priority is only important if a curtailment action is
6 initiated. In a curtailment situation, the State Engineer “restricts water use to conform
7 to priority rights.”⁷⁵ This means, that junior uses that are in excess of the available supply
8 get curtailed. Order 1309 did not initiate curtailment.⁷⁶ Instead, Order 1309 established
9 the factual predicate to the possibility of curtailment in the future (i.e., the State Engineer
10 defined the extent of the aquifer and the quantity of the available supply). If the State
11 Engineer orders a water right to be curtailed in the future, such an action would be
12 separately appealable under NRS 533.450.

13 **E. The State Engineer is legally allowed to defer management decisions to**
14 **future actions.**

15 **1. Eureka County v. State Engineer**

16 Lincoln County Water District (“LCWD”) and Vidler Water Company (“Vidler”)
17 argue that in Order 1309, the State Engineer improperly deferred management and
18 administration decision to the future in violation of *Eureka County v. State Engineer*.⁷⁷

19 ⁷⁵ NRS 534.110(6).

20 ⁷⁶ Notable, NRS 534.110(6) provides the State Engineer *shall* conduct investigations
21 where the average supply may not be adequate to satisfy all rights. That is what he did
22 in Order 1309 – he investigated the extent of the groundwater supply available to
23 permittees and vested right owners. However, NRS 534.110(6) does not require
24 curtailment occur at the same time of study. Instead, NRS 534.110(6) provides the State
Engineer discretion to curtail use (i.e., limit withdrawals to conform to priority rights).
How, or if, the State Engineer proceeds with curtailment is an issue to be heard in later
proceedings at the State Engineer’s discretion.

⁷⁷ LCWD and Vidler Opening Brief at 38.

1 This argument relies on a misreading of *Eureka County*. In *Eureka County*, the Supreme
2 Court addressed the issue of whether the State Engineer could approve an application
3 that would conflict with an existing right if the State Engineer conditioned his approval
4 on a yet-to-be-developed mitigation plan.⁷⁸ The *Eureka County* Court prohibited the
5 State Engineer from relying on future evidence (a mitigation plan to prevent a conflict)
6 that was not available for review prior to approval of the water right application.
7 Logically, the *Eureka County* holding was rooted in due process concerns.

8 Here, the State Engineer made a decision based on the evidence before him. The
9 State Engineer did not approve an application that would result in a conflict and did not
10 assume that such a conflict could be mitigated through some future management plan.
11 He used specific criteria related to the scope and extent of the boundary of the
12 management system and determined the quantity of water available for pumping. The
13 State Engineer properly deferred other management decisions to future proceedings,
14 which allows all parties the continued opportunity to be heard before those future
15 decisions are made. Order 1309 was narrowly tailored to four factual inquires and
16 related to determining the extent of a management area and the amount of available
17 supply. The determinations of the State Engineer in Order 1309 are related to those
18 specific issues and are not reliant on the outcome of any future proceeding or evidence.

19 Furthermore, the water statutes specifically contemplate management of
20 groundwater in stages.⁷⁹ Order 1309 is the initial designation of the LWRFS under NRS
21 534.030. Under NRS 534.120(1), the State Engineer has the authority to make rules and

23 ⁷⁸ *Eureka County v. State Engineer*, 359 P.3d 1114, 1120 (2015).

24 ⁷⁹ NRS 534.030 and 534.120.

1 regulations *after designation*.⁸⁰ The law expressly recognizes that management
2 decisions can be deferred until after designation and does not require all rules and
3 regulations to be implemented simultaneously with the designation order.

4 **2. Due Process**

5 In an argument similar to LCWD and Vidler, Apex Holding Company, LLC and
6 Dry Lake Water, LLC (“Apex”) contends that the due process rights of the Order 1303
7 Hearing participants were violated because they were not allowed to comment on
8 management decisions.⁸¹ This argument fails to recognize that the State Engineer has
9 not made management decisions and expressly deferred those decisions to a later point
10 in the administrative process.⁸² The Order 1303 Hearing was intended to address
11 specific threshold issues that were factual and a necessary predicate to any evaluation of
12 future management decisions.

13 The scope of the hearing related to the delineation of the boundary of the LWRFS
14 and the amount of groundwater that could be sustainably pumped from the LWRFS. All
15 parties had notice of the limited issues that were being considered. The State Engineer
16 provided all parties adequate notice of those issues through Order 1303 and the pre-
17 hearing notice. All parties had the ability to be heard on the enumerated issues. All
18 parties are also on notice that any future decisions will be subject to further
19

20 ⁸⁰ NRS 534.120(1) (“Within an area that has been designated by the State Engineer, as
21 provided for in this chapter, where, in the judgment of the State Engineer, the
22 groundwater basin is being depleted, the State Engineer in his or her administrative
capacity may make such rules, regulations and orders as are deemed essential for the
welfare of the area involved.”) (emphasis added).

23 ⁸¹ Apex Opening Brief at 12.

24 ⁸² This argument puts the “cart before the horse” and asks this court to resolve issues that
have yet to be heard by the administrative agency.

1 administrative proceedings, with their own notices and additional opportunities to
2 submit evidence and be heard on the later issues. Thus, no due process violations exist
3 with regard to parties' ability comment of future management decisions.

4 **F. The State Engineer had authority to consider the Endangered Species**
5 **Act in his public interest analysis.**

6 Georgia-Pacific Gypsum LLC, and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.
7 ("Georgia-Pacific") and Apex argue the State Engineer was not authorized to consider
8 the Endangered Species Act ("ESA") in Order 1309.⁸³ The parties fail to explain why
9 the State Engineer should ignore his agency's need to comply with federal law. Not only
10 is it obvious that the State Engineer must comply with the ESA, the State Engineer also
11 has an express duty to protect the public interest.

12 The State Engineer's duty to the public interest is twofold: he has a fiduciary
13 public trust obligation and a statutory duty to protect the public interest.⁸⁴ Public interest
14 has been defined and interpreted by the State Engineer and the Supreme Court.⁸⁵
15 Pursuant to instructions from the Supreme Court, specific public interest criterion and
16 guidelines exist within the meaning of NRS 533.370.⁸⁶ Specifically, the State Engineer

17 _____
18 ⁸³ Apex Opening Brief at 13; Georgia-Pacific Opening Brief at 28.

19 ⁸⁴ NRS 533.345; NRS 533.370(2); *Min. Cty. v. Lyon Cty.*, 136 Nev. 503, 514, 473 P.3d
20 418, 427 (2020) ("Nevada's water statutes constrain water allocations to those that are
21 public uses and require the State Engineer to reject permits if they are unnecessary or
22 detrimental to the public interest. These considerations are consistent with
23 the public trust doctrine.").

24 ⁸⁵ *Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians v. Washoe County*, 112 Nev. 743, 918 P.2d 697
(1996). *See also*, State Engineer Ruling 3786A (October 9, 1992) available at
<http://images.water.nv.gov/images/rulings/3786Ar.pdf> (last visited 10/14/2021);

⁸⁶ *See* State Engineer Ruling 6454 (December 26, 2018) at 11-13, available at
<http://images.water.nv.gov/images/rulings/6454r.pdf> (last visited October 14, 2021))

1 must look to water law statutes and policies in the public interest analysis.⁸⁷ Importantly,
2 the protection of wildlife and establishment and maintenance of wetlands and fisheries
3 are statutory mandates in Nevada water law.⁸⁸ Additionally, the State Engineer has
4 public trust obligations to responsibly manage water resources.⁸⁹ Courts have long held
5 that protection of biodiversity and endangered species is a part of the public trust
6 obligations of the government.⁹⁰

7 The State Engineer has consistently and historically considered the ESA. Robert
8 Williams, a former State Supervisor for the USFWS, testified that the State Engineer has
9 historically taken ESA compliance into consideration: (1) in 1991, when the State
10 Engineer protected in-stream flows to protect the Lahontan cutthroat trout; (2) in 1998,
11 when the State Engineer granted the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe water rights to protect
12 Lahontan cutthroat trout and cui-ui; and (3) when the State Engineer decided to limit
13 water use to protect the Devils Hole pupfish based on federal reserved water rights.⁹¹
14 Therefore, the State Engineer properly followed the law and his prior practices to
15 consider the impact of the ESA in Order 1309.

16 In addition to the clear statutory authority that authorized the State Engineer to
17 consider the ESA, the State Engineer correctly recognized that a state agency could be
18

19 (“Ruling 6454”). *See also*, State Engineer Ruling 6164 (March 22, 2012) available at
20 <http://images.water.nv.gov/images/rulings/6164r.pdf> (last visited October 14, 2021)
21 (“Ruling 6164”) at 152-158.

21 ⁸⁷ Ruling 6454 at 10-11.

22 ⁸⁸ *See* NRS 533.023, NRS 533.367.

23 ⁸⁹ *Min. Cty. v. Lyon Cty.*, 136 Nev. at 520, 473 P.3d at 431 (“To allow the state to
24 otherwise allocate waters without due regard for the public trust would permit the state
23 to evade its fiduciary duties, and this we cannot sanction.”).

⁹⁰ *Tennessee Valley Auth. v. Hill*, 437 U.S. 153 (1978).

⁹¹ SE ROA 53434 at 1107:14 – SE ROA 53435 at 1108:16.

1 held liable for “take” under the ESA.⁹² As explained in testimony, violations of the take
2 prohibitions under ESA are subject to civil and criminal penalties.⁹³ In addition, the
3 Federal government can seek injunctive relief to stop an activity that threatens harm or
4 take of a listed species or its habitat.⁹⁴ The State Engineer found that managing LWRFS
5 pumping to maintain flows above 3.2 cfs at the Warm Springs West gage would avoid
6 possible civil and criminal penalties for an ESA violation.⁹⁵

7 Georgia-Pacific also argued that the State Engineer has no authority to determine
8 the circumstances where a “take” would occur.⁹⁶ However, the State Engineer did not
9 make such a finding. The State Engineer properly reviewed evidence of the minimal
10 flows necessary to “ensure access of wildlife it customarily uses,”⁹⁷ to protect the public
11 interest and fulfill his obligations under the public trust.⁹⁸ The State Engineer relied
12 upon USFWS’s determination of acceptable incidental take of Moapa dace as defined in
13 multiple Biological Opinions provided as exhibits during the hearing.⁹⁹ The State

14 ⁹² SE ROA 45-47 (“a state regulator is not exempted from the EA for takings that occur
15 as a result of a licensee’s regulated activity. States have faced the impediment of their
16 administrative management actions being subservient to the ESA. For example, the
17 Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries was subject to an injunction prohibiting it
18 from issuing commercial fishing licenses because doing so would likely lead to the
19 taking of an endangered species.” See *Strahan v. Coxe*, 127 F.3d 155, 163 (1st Cir.
20 1997)).

19 ⁹³ 16 U.S.C. § 1540, *Ctr.for Biological Diversity v. Holsten*, 541 F. Supp.2d 1073, 1079
(D. Minn. 2008).

20 ⁹⁴ SE ROA 42121.

21 ⁹⁵ SE ROA 42134.

22 ⁹⁶ Georgia Pacific Opening Brief at 30.

23 ⁹⁷ NRS 533.367.

24 ⁹⁸ NRS 533.345; NRS 533.370(2); *Min. Cty. v. Lyon Cty.*, 136 Nev. at 514 , 473 P.3d at
427 (“Nevada’s water statutes constrain water allocations to those that are public uses
and require the State Engineer to reject permits if they are unnecessary or detrimental to
the public interest. These considerations are consistent with the public trust doctrine.”).

⁹⁹ SE ROA 42124-46, 47605, 47807.

1 Engineer properly relied on expert testimony supported by substantial evidence, a trigger
2 established by the USFWS, and new information from the Aquifer Test to avoid
3 exceeding that *take* and ensuring that wildlife will have access to the spring water upon
4 which it relies.

5 **II. The State Engineer’s Decision To Designate The LWRFS Basin Was Proper.**

6 The LWRFS sub-basins have been the subject of testing and assessment for
7 decades. As a result, the record of available information and data is extensive. The
8 Interim Order 1303 administrative hearing built on the existing record and allowed for
9 stakeholder input and evaluation of the volumes of existing data. The 2010 Aquifer
10 Test produced valuable empirical data about impacts throughout the LWRFS from
11 pumping existing rights. The Aquifer Test yielded critical information, and drastically
12 altered the outlook for groundwater management and availability in the LWRFS. The
13 test revealed a uniquely close hydrologic connectivity within the LWRFS. That unique
14 connectivity is supported by additional information obtained in the years following the
15 Aquifer Test.¹⁰⁰

16 As chronicled in Interim Order 1303, the State Engineer made sound factual
17 findings regarding the high degree of hydrologic connectivity within the LWRFS based
18 on the Aquifer Test. Those findings were confirmed during the administrative hearing
19 and acknowledged by a substantial majority of the parties after ample opportunity for
20 additional evidence, cross examination, and rebuttal.¹⁰¹ A few outliers disregarded of

21
22 ¹⁰⁰ SE ROA 53167 at 509:11-12; SE ROA 53453 at 1178:1-18; SE ROA 53341 at 903:2-
5; SE ROA 53167 at 509:12; SE ROA 53453 at 1178:10-11.

23 ¹⁰¹ SE ROA 53060 at 266:3-11; SE ROA 53167 at 509:7-8; SE ROA 53354 at 953:6-8;
24 SE ROA 53453 at 1178:1-18; SE ROA 53618 at 1526:23 - SE ROA 53619 at 1527:5;

1 the State Engineer’s prior and consistent findings of hydrologic connectivity because
2 those findings are not convenient to their business interests. They had a full opportunity
3 to present evidence and rebut opposing evidence at the administrative hearing. For
4 example, CSI argued that drought is the reason for observed groundwater declines and
5 argued that its water rights in Coyote Spring Valley are isolated from the LWRFS.¹⁰²
6 Similarly, Georgia-Pacific and Republic, LCWD and Vidler, and Western Elite
7 Environmental and Bedroc, argued in favor of most sub-basins being included in the
8 LWRFS except – not coincidentally - for the areas containing their own water rights.¹⁰³
9 Those parties are now asking this Court to reweigh their evidence and substitute its
10 judgment for that of the State Engineer, which is improper.¹⁰⁴ The State Engineer’s
11 decision is based on a well-reasoned review of substantial evidence, and is supported by
12 the record.

13 **A. The State Engineer’s decision to delineate the LWRFS boundary is**
14 **based on substantial evidence.**

15 In Order 1309, the State Engineer found that “the geographic extent of the LWRFS
16 is intended to represent the area that shares both a unique and close hydrologic

17 SE ROA 53670 at 1645:7-10; SE ROA 53722 at 1763 to SE ROA 53723 at 1765; SE
18 ROA 52984 at 95:14-16.

19 ¹⁰² SE ROA 16-19.

20 ¹⁰³ SE ROA 19-23, 30-32, 40-42.

21 ¹⁰⁴ The Court may not “substitute its judgment for that of the State Engineer.” *Wilson v.*
22 *Pahrump Fair Water, LLC*, 481 P.3d 853, 858 (Nev. 2021) (internal citation omitted).
23 When reviewing a decision or order of the State Engineer, the court may not “pass upon
24 the credibility of the witness nor reweigh the evidence.” *Revert v. Ray*, 95 Nev. 782, 786,
603 P.2d 262, 264 (1979); *see also, Bacher v. State Eng’r*, 122 Nev. 1110, 1121, 146
P.3d 793,800 (2006). The Legislature has specified that “[t]he decision of the State
Engineer shall be prima facie correct, and the burden of proof shall be upon the party
attacking the same.” NRS 533.450(10); *see also, Revert*, 95 Nev. at 786, 603 P.2d at
264.

1 connection and virtually all of the same source and supply of water, and *therefore will*
2 *benefit from joint and conjunctive management.*”¹⁰⁵ The State Engineer also developed
3 a common set of criteria, that were consistent with characteristics considered in prior
4 rulings regarding the LWRFS, to determine if the hydrologic connection between basins
5 requires joint management.¹⁰⁶ These criteria account for water level, hydrographic, and
6 hydrogeologic data to determine the extent of hydrologic connection between sub-
7 basins in the LWRFS. Such factual determinations should not be lightly disregarded or
8 disturbed.¹⁰⁷ Indeed, the State Engineer is entrusted with administering this important
9
10

11 ¹⁰⁵ SE ROA 55 (emphasis added).

12 ¹⁰⁶ SE ROA 48-49. These criteria include: “(1) Water level observations whose spatial
13 distribution indicates a relatively uniform or flat potentiometric surface are consistent
14 with a close hydrologic connection. (2) Water level hydrographs that, in well-to-well
15 comparisons, demonstrate a similar temporal pattern, irrespective of whether the pattern
16 is caused by climate, pumping, or other dynamic is consistent with close hydrologic
17 connection. (3) Water level hydrographs that demonstrate an observable decrease in
18 drawdown, or a recovery, that corresponds to a decrease in pumping and an observable
19 decrease in pumping, are consistent with a direct hydraulic connection and close
20 hydrologic connection to the pumping location(s). (4) Water level observations that
21 demonstrate a relatively steep hydraulic gradient are consistent with a poor hydraulic
22 connection and a potential boundary. (5) Geologic structures that have caused a
23 juxtaposition of the carbonate-rock aquifer with low permeability bedrock are consistent
24 with a boundary. (6) When hydrologic information indicates a close hydraulic
connection (based on criteria 1-5), but limited, poor quality or low resolution water level
data obfuscate a determination of the extent of that connection, a boundary should be
established such that it extends out to the nearest mapped feature that juxtaposes the
carbonate-rock aquifer with low permeability bedrock, or in absence of that, to the basin
boundary.”

¹⁰⁷ *State Eng’r v. Morris*, 107 Nev. 699, 701, 819 P.2d 203, 205 (1991); *Revert*, 95 Nev.
at 786, 603 P.2d at 264. *See also, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe v. Washoe Cty.*, 112 Nev.
at 751, 918 P.2d at 702 (Generally, the State Engineer’s “factual determinations will not
be disturbed” by the reviewing court on a petition for judicial review pursuant to NRS
533.450 so long as they are “supported by substantial evidence.”).

1 and technical subject because he possesses the necessary technical qualifications and
2 experience to understand and analyze complex issues.¹⁰⁸

3 After evaluating the evidence and expert testimony that was presented at the
4 Interim Order 1303 Hearing, the State Engineer delineated the LWRFS boundary in
5 Order 1309.¹⁰⁹ This finding was based on previous findings made by the State Engineer
6 in Rulings 6254-6261 and a general consensus among the experts testifying at the
7 hearing concerning the boundary of the LWRFS.¹¹⁰ In Rulings 6254-6261, the State
8 Engineer found that the results from the Aquifer Test provided “clear proof of the close
9 hydrologic connection of the basins that distinguishes these basins from other basins in
10 Nevada.”¹¹¹ Again, the State Engineer is particularly well-suited to assess expert
11 testimony based on his own expertise, as required by NRS 532.030.

12 At the administrative hearing, there was also a general consensus among experts
13 that pumping in the LWRFS caused corresponding drawdowns throughout the LWRFS
14 groundwater aquifer and a decline of Muddy River spring flows.¹¹² Volumes of

15 ¹⁰⁸ NRS 532.030 (“No person may be appointed as State Engineer who is not a licensed
16 professional engineer pursuant to the provisions of chapter 625 of NRS and who does
17 not have such training in hydraulic and general engineering and such practical skill and
18 experience as shall fit that person for the position”).

18 ¹⁰⁹ SE ROA 66.

19 ¹¹⁰ SE ROA 745-746.

20 ¹¹¹ SE ROA 746.

21 ¹¹² SE ROA 13-14 (Center for Biological Diversity), SE ROA 15-16 (City of North Las
22 Vegas), SE ROA 19 (Georgia Pacific and Republic); SE ROA 27 (Moapa Valley Water
23 District); SE ROA 28 (Muddy Valley Irrigation Company); SE ROA 29-30 (United
24 States Department of the Interior, National Park Service); SE ROA 33-34 (NV Energy);
SE ROA 34-36 (SNWA and LVVWD); SE ROA 38 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service);
See, e.g., SE ROA 53340 at 899:17 to SE ROA 53341 at 900:16 (Burns); SE ROA 53170
at 521:5-24 (Waddell); SE ROA 53056 at 251:4 to SE ROA 53057 at 252:12
(Braumiller); SE ROA 53454 at 1187:11 to SE ROA 53455 at 1188:21 (Lazarus); SE

1 geographic and hydrologic data were submitted to the State Engineer that evaluated the
2 connectivity of all surrounding basins in relation to the Muddy River and each other.
3 While the State Engineer recognized discrete aquifers may conceptually exist within the
4 LWRFS, he found none had been proven to exist.¹¹³

5 The contrary evidence submitted by CSI and LCWD and Vidler to cleave specific
6 areas from the LWRFS were thoroughly rebutted at the hearing.¹¹⁴ Expert after expert
7 testified for numerous parties with varying interests that important and relevant data was
8 “conspicuously absent from [CSI’s experts’] report.”¹¹⁵ Order 1303 plainly identifies
9 the initial hydrologic work that was done in the LWRFS, including the significant
10 pumping stress that provided real data, not hopeful speculation, on how various parts of
11 the aquifer responded. That evidence, and the new groundwater level data and analysis,
12 disproved CSI’s and LCWD and Vidler’s hypotheses that impermeable faults
13 conveniently exist at select locations to insulate their wells from causing any drawdown
14 elsewhere in the LWRFS.

15
16 ROA 53618 at 1526:23 to SE ROA 53619 at 1527:5 (Myers); SE ROA 48620; SE ROA
17 53352 at 945:14 to 946:16 (Burns); SE ROA 53340 at 899:17-20 (Burns). The State
18 Engineer found this evidence more compelling than the counter evidence by CSI, LCWD
19 and Vidler, and the Moapa Band of Paiutes.

18 ¹¹³ SE ROA 54.

19 ¹¹⁴ SE ROA 42178; SE ROA 42179-42180 (*see* Figure 2-4). SE ROA 53173 at 533-
20 534; SE ROA 53173 at 534:4-7.

20 ¹¹⁵ SE ROA 42179. Evidence exists to demonstrate there is a clear hydraulic connection
21 between CSI’s wells and the rest of the LWRFS. SE ROA 42179 to SE ROA 42181.
22 SE ROA 53173 at 534:11-12; SE ROA 53220 at 628:5-9 (making similar conclusions to
23 those SNWA reached in notes 23-25, *supra*): SE ROA 53173 at 534:8-9; SE ROA 53220
24 at 629:12-16; SE ROA 53173 at 534:2-7; SE ROA 53452 at 1176:18 to 1177:3; SE ROA
53452 at 1177:1-18; SE ROA 53449 at 1165:23 to 1166:1; SE ROA 53450 at 1169:9-
24; SE ROA 53463 at 1220:7-10; SE ROA 53731 at 1800:15-23; SE ROA 53722 at
1761:4-14; SE ROA 53616 at 1518:9-24.

1 In sum, the State Engineer was persuaded by his own judgment and a consensus
2 view among many experts with decades of experience studying groundwater in southern
3 Nevada who testified on behalf of parties with a wide range of interests. By rejecting
4 the more creative opinions that were repeatedly undermined by other experts and that
5 ignored well-established groundwater dynamics in the region, the State Engineer used
6 his own expertise to reach a decision supported by substantial evidence. From there, the
7 State Engineer provided well-reasoned analysis of the relevant evidence, and sufficiently
8 articulated the basis for determining the LWRFS boundary. Given the weight of the
9 evidence supporting his decisions and the deference the State Engineer’s factual findings
10 must receive, this Court should uphold his findings.¹¹⁶

11 **B. The State Engineer considered all relevant evidence in delineating the**
12 **LWRFS boundary.**

13 In any contested hearing, the decisionmaker must decide between competing and
14 conflicting arguments. Through Order 1309, the State Engineer carefully summarized
15 the various parties’ evidence and arguments and, with extensive citations to the record,
16 explained why he was persuaded by certain evidence and unpersuaded by other
17 evidence.¹¹⁷ Certain parties argue the State Engineer ignored their evidence. But this is
18 not the case. Considering evidence and rejecting it in favor of other evidence does not
19

20
21 ¹¹⁶ *Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe v. Washoe Cty.*, 112 Nev. at 751, 918 P.2d at 702 (The
22 State Engineer's “factual determinations will not be disturbed” by the reviewing court
23 on a petition for judicial review pursuant to NRS 533.450 so long as they are "supported
24 by substantial evidence."). The Legislature has specified that “[t]he decision of the State
Engineer shall be prima facie correct, and the burden of proof shall be upon the party
attacking the same.” NRS 533.450(10) *see also, Revert*, 95 Nev. at 786, 603 P.2d at 264.

¹¹⁷ SE ROA 47-55, 66.

1 mean the testimony or evidence was ignored. It means the State Engineer, with his
2 office’s collective expertise, found the opposing evidence more reliable and persuasive.

3 CSI argues that the State Engineer only relied on the Aquifer Test data to the
4 exclusion of all other evidence.¹¹⁸ This argument is false. The State Engineer considered
5 geologic mapping, water level measurement accuracy, water budget analysis, water flow
6 paths, and groundwater modeling in Order 1309.¹¹⁹ While the State Engineer was not
7 convinced by CSI’s evidence, he clearly considered it when coming to his decision
8 define the boundary of the LWRFS. For example, the State Engineer found that “while
9 water budget and groundwater flow path analysis [used by CSI] are useful to
10 demonstrate a hydrologic connection, additional information is required to demonstrate
11 the relative strength of that connection.”¹²⁰ Other parties provided that additional
12 information and demonstrated the high degree of connectivity in the LWRFS.¹²¹ The
13 State Engineer agreed with nearly all other participants that the “regional water budget
14 is not the limiting measure to determine water availability.”¹²² Accordingly, the State
15 Engineer properly considered and weighed all the relevant evidence, and substantial
16 evidence supports his determination.

17 CSI also argues that the State Engineer ignored evidence that geologic faults may
18 act as complete or partial barriers to groundwater flow and a close hydraulic connection
19

20 ¹¹⁸ CSI Opening Brief at 29-35.

21 ¹¹⁹ SE ROA 17, 53, 52, 49-51, 60.

22 ¹²⁰ SE ROA 49. The State Engineer further found that “availability of groundwater for
23 pumping based on water budget should consider whether the same water is appropriated
24 for use in upgradient and downgradient basins, and CSI did not account for this.” SE
ROA 58.

¹²¹ SE ROA 13-15, 25-36, 38-39.

¹²² SE ROA 59.

1 does not exist where heterogeneities occur within the LWRFS.¹²³ Contrary to CSI’s
2 claim, however, the State Engineer recognized that heterogeneities exist in the LWRFS,
3 but concluded they do not “create hydraulically isolated compartments or subareas
4 within the LWRFS carbonate-rock aquifer from which pumping can occur without effect
5 on the Warm Springs area.”¹²⁴

6 While CSI and other parties presented evidence of new fault structures, the State
7 Engineer considered this evidence and found the parties failed to demonstrate the faults
8 act as a barrier to flow in any way.¹²⁵ For example, CSI and the Moapa Band of Paiute
9 Indians argued against managing the LWRFS as a single basin, claiming that geologic
10 barriers create isolated flow paths.¹²⁶ Other parties rebutted this hypothesis, pointing to
11 hydraulic data obtained from observed impacts from pumping that clearly demonstrate
12 a close connectivity.¹²⁷ Additionally, the Aquifer Test supports that impacts from
13 pumping were widespread throughout the LWRFS and demonstrate a close hydrologic
14 connection between the sub-basins.¹²⁸

15 In contrast to CSI and the Moapa Band of Paiute Indians, SNWA and LVVWD
16 presented expert testimony that because wells on different sides of the same faults
17 behaved similarly, those faults did not create discrete pockets where CSI could pump
18 water without impacting groundwater levels throughout the LWRFS.¹²⁹ The National
19

20 ¹²³ CSI Opening Brief at 42.

21 ¹²⁴ SE ROA 60.

22 ¹²⁵ SE ROA 52-54, 59-60.

23 ¹²⁶ SE ROA 59-60.

24 ¹²⁷ SE ROA 60. *See, e.g.*, SE ROA 42195-96, SE ROA 51543-51547. *See also*, SE
ROA 28-30.

¹²⁸ SE ROA 65; SE ROA 10883-10974.

¹²⁹ SE ROA 53352 at 944:6 to SE ROA 53353 at 950:2.

1 Park Service (“NPS”) also noted that the claim of geological barriers to flow are not only
2 unproven but are also “inconsistent with prevailing opinions and data about the
3 carbonate rock aquifer data.”¹³⁰ NPS also found that, based on pumping and well data
4 along the alleged barrier, “it is unlikely that the carbonate rock acts as a barrier.”¹³¹ The
5 well drilled within the geologic structure at issue (MX-5) is very productive and impacts
6 from its pumping are evidenced on both sides of the structure.¹³² To support his finding
7 that CSI did not prove fault structures will prevent impacts from groundwater pumping
8 from propagating throughout the LWRFS, the State Engineer relied on this substantial
9 evidence, which refutes CSI and other parties’ geologic evidence.

10 The State Engineer, therefore, did exactly what he is supposed to do. He relied
11 on the expertise of his office and the best available science to assess the credibility of
12 the various arguments made by expert witnesses. Order 1309 thoroughly sets forth the
13 competing evidence, analyzes it, and then explains the State Engineer’s basis for
14 reaching his findings and conclusions. Order 1309 is well reasoned, supported by
15 substantial evidence provided by many credible experts from numerous parties, and is
16 thus not arbitrary or capricious. The Court should therefore uphold the State Engineer’s
17 findings.¹³³

20 ¹³⁰ SE ROA 51543

21 ¹³¹ SE ROA 51546.

22 ¹³² *Id.*

23 ¹³³ *State Eng’r v. Morris*, 107 Nev. at 701, 819 P.2d at 205; *Revert*, 95 Nev. at 786, 603
24 P.2d at 264. *See also, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe v. Washoe Cty.*, 112 Nev. at 751, 918
P.2d at 702 (Generally, the State Engineer's “factual determinations will not be
disturbed” by the reviewing court on a petition for judicial review pursuant to NRS
533.450 so long as they are “supported by substantial evidence.”).

1 **C. The criteria used by the State Engineer to delineate the LWRFS**
2 **boundary are proper.**

3 The criteria used by the State Engineer are scientific ways of demonstrating
4 hydrologic connectivity. As explained in Order 1309, the criteria for inclusion of an
5 area within the LWRFS are based on the characteristics considered critical in
6 demonstrating a close hydrologic connection from Rulings 6254-6261.¹³⁴ The criteria
7 take into account geologic data and water level observations in different contexts that
8 provide the State Engineer with the proper tools to determine the hydrologic connection
9 between sub-basins and whether that connection requires joint management.¹³⁵ These
10 criteria are also consistent with prior findings in Rulings 6254-6261, and do not represent
11 any surprise or new reasoning the parties could not anticipate.

12 **1. The State Engineer properly considered the results from the**
13 **Aquifer Test.**

14 CSI argues that the State Engineer should not have relied on water level data from
15 the Aquifer Test because the Aquifer Test was designed to determine how much water
16 was available for additional appropriation, and not to test the *hydraulic* connection
17 between certain wells or basins.¹³⁶ CSI further contends the Aquifer Test results do not
18 provide a comprehensive view of the LWRFS hydrographic basin.¹³⁷ This argument is
19 baseless, both logically and hydrologically. Regardless of the Aquifer Test's *original*
20 *objective*, the study produced compelling data and results. The resultant data was not
21 what was expected because many parties expected water to be available for

22 ¹³⁴ SE ROA 48.

23 ¹³⁵ SE ROA 48-49.

24 ¹³⁶ CSI Opening Brief at 30:19-35:25.

¹³⁷ *Id.*

1 appropriation. Instead, the Aquifer Test revealed widespread impact of groundwater
2 pumping and an extensive hydrologic connection within the LWRFS.

3 Additionally, CSI is wrong in its assertion that the Aquifer Test’s sole purpose
4 was to determine how much water was available for appropriation. Order 1169 states
5 clearly that the purpose of the test was to gain a better understanding of hydrologic
6 connectivity of the groundwater system.¹³⁸ As the State Engineer articulated in later
7 rulings “[one] of the goals of the Order 1169 test was to determine the perennial yield of
8 Coyote Spring Valley.”¹³⁹ The Aquifer Test was also meant to determine if pumping
9 from groundwater rights that had already been issued “will have any detrimental impacts
10 on existing water rights or the environment.”¹⁴⁰ The Aquifer Test was also intended to
11 aid in determining ideal locations for monitoring wells and to manage water rights so
12 that groundwater pumping will not harm existing rights.¹⁴¹ In short, the Aquifer Test’s
13 *actual* purpose was to better understand the groundwater system. The Aquifer Test data
14 is indeed being used as it was originally intended, to inform a better understating of the
15 aquifer. The State Engineer properly relied upon this data, fulfilling his direction to rely
16 upon the best available science.¹⁴²

17 **2. The State Engineer properly considered groundwater budgets.**

18 The State Engineer properly found that groundwater budgets are useful, but only
19 a starting point in determining hydrologic connectivity or the amount of water available
20
21

22 ¹³⁸ SE ROA 664.

23 ¹³⁹ SE ROA 780.

24 ¹⁴⁰ SE ROA 665.

¹⁴¹ SE ROA 664.

¹⁴² NRS 533.024(1)(c).

1 to be pumped.¹⁴³ Groundwater budgets do not consider whether water is already
2 appropriated, or whether the estimated quantity is able to be captured and developed
3 without harm to others.¹⁴⁴ Instead of a hypothetical connection that results from
4 accounting from groundwater budgets, the State Engineer properly listed five factors
5 based on real-world data that must be considered in determining the boundary of the
6 LWRFS.

7 CSI argues that the criteria used for inclusion of a basin in the LWRFS boundary
8 is subjective and “dependent on who the [State Engineer] is.”¹⁴⁵ CSI then argues that
9 the only “objective” method for determining inclusion of a basin in the LWRFS is to use
10 a groundwater budget method.¹⁴⁶ These arguments are a red herring and meant only to
11 confuse the issue.

12 Whether or not evidence provided at a hearing meets the criteria is logically
13 subjective, and within the discretion of the State Engineer. Such findings must be upheld
14 by this court if they are supported by substantial evidence and are not otherwise arbitrary
15 or capricious.¹⁴⁷ However, the criteria themselves are objective scientific factors and a
16 list of evidence that must be evaluated in making a determination. The factors to be
17 consider are 1) spatial distribution of water level observations, 2) temporal patterns of
18 hydrographs, 3) correlation of observed water level responses to pumping stress, 4) water
19
20

21 ¹⁴³ SE ROA 49-50, 58-59.

22 ¹⁴⁴ SE ROA 59.

23 ¹⁴⁵ CSI Opening Brief at 38:2-4.

24 ¹⁴⁶ CSI Opening Brief at 33:2-5.

¹⁴⁷ *See generally, Revert*, 95 Nev. 782, 603 P.2d 262.

1 level gradients, and 5) geologic structures.¹⁴⁸ These factors are logically relevant to
2 determining hydrologic connectivity.¹⁴⁹

3 CSI also argues that based on the groundwater budget method between 16,000 afa
4 and 17,000 afa of groundwater flows through Coyote Spring Valley and bypasses the
5 Muddy River Springs Area.¹⁵⁰ While Order 1169 did state that “ground water outflow
6 from Coyote Spring Valley is believed to discharge at a rate of approximately 37,000
7 afa at the Muddy River Springs area and approximately 16,000 to 17,000 afa annually
8 flows to groundwater basins further south,”¹⁵¹ it did not find that development of this
9 water would not impact the Muddy River or existing rights as CSI claims.¹⁵² Instead,
10 Order 1169 indicated that the estimated 16,000 afa was already appropriated in Coyote
11 Spring Valley alone, but not yet developed (without accounting for appropriations in
12 downgradient basins where the water naturally flows).¹⁵³

13 Order 1169 specifically found that a portion of the 16,000 afa of water
14 appropriated in Coyote Spring Valley was to be included in the Aquifer Test “to
15 determine if the pumping of those water rights will have any detrimental impacts on
16

17 ¹⁴⁸ SE ROA 48-49. Note, the sixth criteria is how the State Engineer is to address
18 uncertainty: if factors 1-5 support a connection, but data is limited, the boundary will
match visible features on the land surface.

19 ¹⁴⁹ LCWD and Vidler argued that the State Engineer’s criteria were unauthorized ad hoc
20 rule making that should have been done through an administrative process that involves
21 notice and comment. LCWD and Vidler Opening Brief at 23:24-27. This argument is
22 baseless. The State Engineer is exempt from the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act
and is not required to provide notice and a comment opportunity for rules of general
applicability. NRS 233B.039(1)(i).

¹⁵⁰ CSI Opening Brief at 31:3-32:11.

¹⁵¹ SE ROA 663.

¹⁵² CSI Opening Brief at 32:5-6.

¹⁵³ SE ROA 664.

1 existing water rights or the environment.”¹⁵⁴ The results of the Aquifer Test showed that
2 pumping just a fraction of the 16,000 afa issued in Coyote Spring Valley for only a few
3 years “measurably reduced flows in the headwater springs of the Muddy River.”¹⁵⁵
4 Obviously, if pumping just a fraction of the estimated 16,000 afa harmed existing rights,
5 the full amount is not available for development. Lastly, CSI’s argument would have
6 the State Engineer disregard decades of additional science and findings by his office that
7 reduced the initial estimate of 16,000 afa to 9,900 afa.¹⁵⁶ In other words, the State
8 Engineer properly found that the drawdown and recovery that occurred after the Aquifer
9 Test accurately predicts the impact of increased groundwater pumping in the LWRFS,
10 and that 16,000 afa is not available for development in Coyote Spring Valley without
11 harming existing rights and the environment.

12 **D. The State Engineer provided adequate due process.**

13 CSI and other parties argue that the State Engineer violated their due process
14 rights because they were not notified of the State Engineer’s criteria for determining
15 hydrologic connection in the LWRFS before the Order 1303 Hearing.¹⁵⁷ This argument
16 lacks merit. Order 1303 put all parties on notice of what factual issues would be
17 addressed at the administrative hearing, and all parties had the opportunity to present
18 evidence and testimony on those factual issues. The extent of hydrologic connection
19 was one of the main issues. Parties submitted expert reports, faced questioning from the
20

21 ¹⁵⁴ SE ROA 665.

22 ¹⁵⁵ SE ROA 782.

23 ¹⁵⁶ SE ROA 779 (based on decades of additional studies, the State Engineer revised his
initial estimate and determined the subsurface outflow was likely closer to 9,900 afa and
not the 16,000 afa as originally estimated).

24 ¹⁵⁷ CSI Opening Brief at 28:12-15, LCWD and Vidler Opening Brief at 22:13-21.

1 State Engineer and his office's staff, and submitted closing briefs. At no point did these
2 parties object to the fact that they did not have enough direction on this issue.

3 The State Engineer is not required how to tell parties how to support their case.
4 Instead, he properly posed a question to be answered, and relied upon submitted
5 evidence to answer that question. For example, if the height of a building was a relevant
6 issue at trial, the trier of fact would not have to provide the parties with an exact method
7 of addressing the issue. Instead, each party would offer a method of measuring the
8 building and submit evidence to support their case. The trier of fact would then be able
9 to weigh the evidence and determine which method is most accurate and believable. By
10 selecting a preferred method based on the arguments before it, the trier of fact does not
11 violate any due process rights as all parties had notice and the ability to be heard on the
12 issue.

13 Along those lines, requiring the State Engineer to establish specific criteria before
14 he has reviewed all the arguments and evidence presented by the hearing participants
15 would be illogical. The State Engineer had to wait and give each party the opportunity
16 to present their own criteria for consideration. All parties were on notice that the SE
17 would be making these determinations. The parties presented arguments on what they
18 felt the criteria should be. They were provided evidence from other parties and given
19 the opportunity to rebut that evidence and cross examine witnesses. Thus, they were
20 provided notice and the opportunity to be heard on the issue.

21 Additionally, LCWD and Vidler argue that the participants' due process rights
22 were violated because experts testified to new opinions that differed from their reports.¹⁵⁸

23
24 ¹⁵⁸ LCWD and Vidler Opening Brief at 40.

1 This is false, parties had the opportunity to object to expert testimony at the hearing and
2 if they did the hearing officer evaluated the objection and found that the expert was not
3 testifying to new opinions. Furthermore, even if this did occur, LCWD and Vidler fail
4 to explain how these opinions prejudiced them in any way. They also had the
5 opportunity to cross-examine these witnesses and address the same issues with their own
6 witnesses. They also were provided the opportunity to file closing briefs, wherein such
7 issues as this were able to be presented for review and consideration of the State
8 Engineer. Alternatively, to the extent that LCWD and Vidler did not object at the
9 hearing, they have waived their ability to make these objections now.

10 **III. The State Engineer’s Decision To Restrict LWRFS Groundwater Pumping**
11 **To 8,000 Acre Feet, Or Less, Was Proper.**

12 SNWA and LVVWD presented persuasive evidence that only 4,000 to 6,000 afa
13 can be sustainably pumped from the LWRFS.¹⁵⁹ SNWA and LVVWD recommended
14 that the State Engineer limit pumping to protect the Moapa dace and senior rights to an
15 amount less than 6,000 afa. The State Engineer considered this evidence but found
16 groundwater pumping in the LWRFS must be capped at 8,000 afa, *or maybe less*, if
17 pumping 8,000 afa impacts the endangered Moapa dace.¹⁶⁰ The State Engineer relied
18 on his conclusion that approximately 8,000 afa is currently pumped in the LWRFS, and
19 that pumping may *be reaching* equilibrium (i.e., the level of impacts *may be* stabilizing).

22 ¹⁵⁹ SE ROA 35-36.

23 ¹⁶⁰ SE ROA 66, item 2-3 (emphasis added); *see also*, SE ROA 57, 63 (“the current
24 amount of pumping in the LWRFS is a maximum amount that may need to be reduced
in the future if the stabilizing trend in spring discharge does not continue”).

1 But, he said, that 8,000 afa cap “may need to be reduced in the future if the stabilizing
2 trend in spring discharge does not continue.”¹⁶¹

3 SNWA and LVVWD do not completely agree that 8,000 afa is available to be
4 pumped and stands by its evidence that no more than 6,000 afa is available. Nonetheless,
5 SNWA and LVVWD agree that the 8,000 afa cap is a prudent starting point for limiting
6 groundwater pumpage, particularly given the State Engineer’s determination the 8,000
7 afa cap will be reduced in the future based on monitoring for impacts, and if impacts
8 have not stabilized.¹⁶²

9 **A. The State Engineer relied on substantial evidence to find pumping**
10 **should be limited to 8,000 afa or less.**

11 The State Engineer based his 8,000 afa cap on several factors and supporting
12 evidence. First, historic pumping data and monitoring data supports the State Engineer’s
13 determination. During the Aquifer Test, over 14,535 afa was pumped throughout the
14 LWRFS.¹⁶³ That pumping depleted the groundwater reservoir enough to cause
15 deleterious effects on spring flows that support senior Muddy River water rights and the
16 Moapa dace. Since the end of the Aquifer Test, groundwater pumping reduced to
17 between 7,000 afa and 8,000 afa.¹⁶⁴ Experts debated whether the impact from this level
18 of pumping through 2019 has stabilized (i.e., reached equilibrium).¹⁶⁵ Thus, substantial

19 ¹⁶¹ SE ROA 63.

20 ¹⁶² If pumping over 6,000 afa is allowed in the LWRFS it should be temporary in nature
21 because the pumping may need to be reduced if impacts do not stabilize.

22 ¹⁶³ SE ROA 56.

23 ¹⁶⁴ SE ROA 56, 64.

24 ¹⁶⁵ SE ROA 64. Evidence shows that even the existing pumping of 8,000 afa is causing
spring flow declines, just less rapidly. *See* SE ROA 53349 at 932:21-22; SE ROA 53336
at 880:6-9; SE ROA 53169 at 519:24 to 520:4; SE ROA 53623 at 1545:16 to 1546:1; SE
ROA 41876; SE ROA 53729 at 1790:6-10.

1 evidence supports that 8,000 afa is the upper limit on the amount of water that can be
2 safely pumped in the LWRFS based on existing data.

3 In addition, the State Engineer also relied on the 3.2 cfs threshold at the Warm
4 Springs West gage to support the 8,000 afa pumping limitation. The State Engineer
5 recognized that “it is clear that it is necessary for spring flow measured at the Warm
6 Springs West gage to flow a minimum rate of 3.2 cfs in order to maintain habitat for the
7 Moapa dace.”¹⁶⁶ Sufficient evidence exists to demonstrate that spring flow at the Warm
8 Springs West gage is highly correlated to water levels in the LWRFS aquifer.¹⁶⁷ The
9 current levels of production are causing water levels and spring flows at the Warm
10 Springs West gage to fluctuate around 3.2 cfs. Therefore, substantial evidence exists to
11 support that pumping 8,000 afa, or less, is necessary to maintain the 3.2 cfs flows at the
12 Warm Springs West gage and protect the Moapa dace.

13 **B. The State Engineer properly analyzed the evidence to support the 8,000**
14 **afa pumping limitation.**

15 Various parties argue that the State Engineer did not develop clear analysis or cite
16 to substantial evidence to support the pumping limitation of 8,000 afa.¹⁶⁸ However, the
17 State Engineer relied upon decades of pumping data, observed flows in the Muddy River,
18 and extensive scientific study to support his conclusion. Since empirical pumping and
19 water level data show the pumping of approximately 8,000 afa in the LWRFS is
20 *approaching steady state*, a reasonable mind can conclude that the amount of water
21

22 ¹⁶⁶ SE ROA 45.

23 ¹⁶⁷ SE ROA 41986, Figure 5-9.

24 ¹⁶⁸ Georgia-Pacific Opening Brief at 18:1-20:24; LCWD and Vidler Opening Brief at 36:21-38:8.

1 available to be sustainably pumped is approximately 8,000 afa.¹⁶⁹ The State Engineer
2 properly recognized that if the system does not continue to approach equilibrium at this
3 level of pumping, that pumping would need to be further reduced to protect existing
4 rights and the environment.

5 Georgia-Pacific argues that the State Engineer wrongly applied the 8,000 afa
6 limitation to the entire LWRFS without regard to the location of pumping.¹⁷⁰ This
7 argument fails for three reasons. First, the LWRFS is a closely connected hydrologic
8 system, and the pumping limitation should apply throughout that system. Second, the
9 maximum quantity of water that can be pumped from a source is based on a limit of total
10 available water from that source. Total availability is determined by whether the system
11 can reach equilibrium, or *steady state*, given a certain amount of pumping.¹⁷¹ The State
12 Engineer found that the LWRFS is *reaching equilibrium* from the Aquifer Test and
13 subsequent annual pumping of about 8,000 acre feet. Third, site-specific limitations
14 were included by the State Engineer for impacts from specific points of diversion to be
15 addressed on a case-by-case when acting on a specific application.¹⁷² Even though the
16 8,000 afa limitation applies throughout the interconnected portion of the LWRFS, the
17
18

19 ¹⁶⁹ *Bacher*, 122 Nev. at 1121, 146 P.3d at 800 (quoting *State, Employee Sec. Dep't v.*
20 *Hilton Hotels Corp.*, 102 Nev. 606, 608, 729 P.2d 497, 498 (1986) (An agency decision
21 is only supported by substantial evidence if it includes evidence that a “reasonable mind
22 might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.”).

21 ¹⁷⁰ Georgia-Pacific Opening Brief at 19:14-19.

22 ¹⁷¹ *Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians v. Ricci*, 126 Nev. 521, 524, 245 P.3d 1145,
23 1147 (2010) (the amount of water available to be pumped from a groundwater aquifer
24 “is the equilibrium amount or maximum amount of water that can safely be used without
depleting the source.”).

24 ¹⁷² NRS 533.370(2).

1 State Engineer properly acknowledged that allegations that certain areas are
2 disconnected from the flow system can be addressed on a case-by-case basis.¹⁷³

3 Similarly, LCWD and Vidler argue that the pumping cap is “discriminatory and
4 contrary” because the pumping cap ignores the location of pumping.¹⁷⁴ They argue that
5 even though their rights are junior to most rights in the LWRFS, they should be treated
6 differently because their wells are located twenty-two miles from the Muddy River.¹⁷⁵
7 However, in making such arguments, LCWD and Vidler are confusing the three separate
8 limitations to groundwater pumping: unappropriated water, conflicts, and public
9 interest.¹⁷⁶ The cumulative quantity of water available to all appropriations is relevant
10 under an unappropriated water analysis, which means that all appropriations must be less
11 than or equal to the amount of available supply. The unappropriated water analysis is
12 relevant to a *regional* conflict analysis as pumping above the amount of available supply
13 will necessarily cause conflicts and be detrimental to the public interest.¹⁷⁷ In contrast,
14 location of pumping from a specific well is relevant under a *case-by-case* analysis and
15 not an unappropriated water analysis. Accordingly, the 8,000 afa cap is a proper regional
16 limit, and movement of individual water rights will be considered case-by-case, and
17 these two concepts work together and are not in conflict with each other.

18
19 ¹⁷³ SE ROA 54.

20 ¹⁷⁴ LCWD and Vidler Opening Brief at 39:15-40:2.

21 ¹⁷⁵ LCWD and Vidler Opening Brief at 39:15-40:2.

22 ¹⁷⁶ NRS 533.370(2).

23 ¹⁷⁷ As explained by the NPS, regardless of the location, pumping anywhere in the
24 LWRFS will “eventually expand from [basins in the LWRFS] to the Muddy River
Springs.” SE ROA 51545. Similarly, the NPS pointed out that “the effect of distal
pumping in the carbonate aquifer of the LWRFS is sufficient to cause considerable
impacts on the Muddy River Springs, especially when cumulative pumping effects are
considered.” *Id.*

1 The Center for Biological Diversity (“CBD”) argues that the *steady state* analysis
2 in Order 1309 was not supported by substantial evidence.¹⁷⁸ SNWA and LVVWD
3 agreed with this argument at the Interim Order 1303 hearing. The thrust of the argument
4 was that groundwater levels continue to decline, and a new equilibrium has not been
5 achieved. Many experts agreed with this proposition. Even though the State Engineer
6 found the system is *appears to be reaching steady state*, he recognized the uncertainty
7 in this determination.¹⁷⁹ The State Engineer recognized that continued monitoring is
8 necessary, and that pumping may need to be further reduced in the future if water levels
9 continue to decline.¹⁸⁰

10 CSI also argues that that the State Engineer ignored the location of pumping wells
11 when evaluating aquifer recovery, “such that a change in pumping rates by some wells
12 might mask observations of recovery.”¹⁸¹ This is false. The State Engineer accounted
13 for changes in pumping in all wells located within the interconnected portion of the
14 LWRFS. He properly found that the effects of pumping, and the recovery from pumping
15 throughout the LWRFS eventually manifests in the observed water levels.¹⁸² The current
16 location of wells is impliedly in the current observation of recovery.

17 //

18 //

20 ¹⁷⁸ CBD Opening Brief at 24:4-28:10.

21 ¹⁷⁹ SE ROA 64.

21 ¹⁸⁰ SE ROA 63.

22 ¹⁸¹ CSI Opening Brief at 47:26-28.

23 ¹⁸² SE ROA 63 (“The State Engineer finds that the current data are adequate to establish
24 an approximate limit on the amount of pumping that can occur within the system, but
the continued monitoring of pumping, water levels, and spring flow is essential to refine
and validate this limit.”).

1 **C. The State Engineer’s determination that capping pumping at 8,000 afa,**
2 **with possible reductions to that cap in the future, will adequately**
3 **protect the Moapa dace is supported by substantial evidence.**

4 CBD argues that the State Engineer’s cap on pumping in the LWRFS will not
5 adequately protect the Moapa dace.¹⁸³ However, CBD’s argument fails to recognize that
6 the State Engineer conditioned the 8,000 afa limitation on further reductions if the flow
7 rate at Warm Springs West continues to decline because the minimum flow of 3.2 cfs
8 must be maintained to protect the existing population of the Moapa Dace. More than
9 sufficient evidence indicates flow is necessary at a minimum rate of 3.2 cfs for the
10 Moapa dace.¹⁸⁴ Mr. Marshall testified that in the last few years the flows at Warm
11 Springs West were “bouncing [a]round 3.3 to 3.4 cfs.”¹⁸⁵ Then in Order 1309 the State
12 Engineer recognized that pumping at 8,000 afa has coincided with a period where spring
13 discharge may be approaching steady state.¹⁸⁶ Hence, imposing a pumping limitation of
14 8,000 afa will keep spring flows above 3.2 cfs. But, since the State Engineer was clear
15 that the pumping limit may be reduced further,¹⁸⁷ CBD’s argument is without merit.

16 CBD also argues that even if the 8,000 afa cap protects decreed senior water rights,
17 protecting senior rights does not, in and of itself mean that the Moapa dace will be
18 protected. Rather than use impacts to senior water rights as a proxy for protecting the
19 dace,¹⁸⁸ the State Engineer based his decision about protecting the dace on scientific
20 evidence that was submitted regarding the needs of the fish. Also, since the State

21

22 ¹⁸³ CBD Opening Brief at 28.

23 ¹⁸⁴ SE ROA 46.

24 ¹⁸⁵ SE ROA 53437 at 1116:14-16.

¹⁸⁶ SE ROA 64.

¹⁸⁷ SE ROA 66.

¹⁸⁸ CBD Opening Brief at 30.

1 Engineer only has authority over water, and not environmental factors, he properly
2 confined his review and regulation to ensure water availability for the fish.

3 Finally, CBD argues the State Engineer failed to properly complete a public
4 interest analysis when he established the 8,000 afa pumping limit.¹⁸⁹ Yet, the State
5 Engineer ended his review of the evidence with a conclusion that allowing groundwater
6 pumping to reduce spring flow in the Warm Springs area to a level that would impair the
7 habitat necessary for survival of the Moapa dace is against the public interest,¹⁹⁰ and
8 could result in *take* of the endangered species (as defined by the USFWS).¹⁹¹ Therefore
9 CBD's argument is without merit.

10 **D. Climate conditions were properly included in State Engineer's LWRFS**
11 **pumping limit analysis.**

12 Many parties tried to blame water level declines on drought. Experts vigorously
13 debated whether changes in recent climate conditions are a material factor in
14 groundwater level changes. For instance, SNWA and LVVWD's experts developed
15 numerical models to explain that climate conditions are a minor factor in changes to the
16 flows that are critical to the Moapa dace and senior surface water rights. Also, experts
17 for USFWS, NPS, and Moapa Valley Water District ("MVWD") emphatically opined
18 that drought and climate change are not the reason for decline in flow at the Muddy River
19 and its headwater springs. The State Engineer properly relied on this evidence and found
20 pumping, not drought-type climate conditions, is causing the decline in spring flows at
21 the Muddy River.

22 _____
23 ¹⁸⁹ CBD Opening Brief at 28.

24 ¹⁹⁰ SE ROA 66.

¹⁹¹ SE ROA 47.

1 The State Engineer also properly recognized he must regulate pumping, regardless
2 of changes in climate conditions. If less water is available from rainfall on an annual
3 basis, he must limit groundwater development to protect existing water rights and the
4 environment.¹⁹² The water law is clear, senior users are first in time, and thus first in
5 right. The relationship of junior water right holders to seniors remains unchanged,
6 regardless of negative impacts on supply. In fact, priority is only important in times of
7 shortage – such as drought conditions. The State Engineer properly found that he must
8 protect against impacts from pumping, regardless of climate conditions. Also, to the
9 extent climate conditions reduce recharge to the LWRFS, the State Engineer properly
10 concluded that pumping may have to be reduced below 8,000 afa in the future.

11 The State Engineer was also aware that short climate trends, like most droughts,
12 are reflected in the long-term averages in the climate record. The sustainable yield of an
13 aquifer system is based on these long-term climate trends. He also understands that long-
14 term water levels are created and maintained by long-term recharge trends. The minor
15 variability of water levels caused by climate fluctuations within the LWRFS evens out
16 to the average observed levels over long periods of time. The changes in water levels in
17 the LWRFS exceed what can be caused by changes in short term climate conditions.
18 The State Engineer properly placed climate conditions in the proper context.

19 As substantial evidence supports the State Engineer’s decision, and his decision
20 is supported by a well-reasoned and thorough analysis that a reasonable mind would
21
22

23 ¹⁹² SE ROA 57 (“The State Engineer only has authority to regulate pumping, not climate,
24 in consideration of its potential to cause conflict or to be detrimental to the public interest
and must do so regardless of the relative contributing effects of climate.”).

1 accept as supportive of his conclusion, his 8,000 afa pumping limitation should be
2 upheld.

3 **1. SNWA and LVVWD Evidence**

4 SNWA and LVVWD submitted written evidence and testimony that established
5 when “local and dominant natural or anthropogenic stress is imposed on the carbonate
6 aquifer, its impact on water levels and spring flow can be detected on the hydrographs
7 within short time periods, and everywhere within the interconnected carbonate
8 aquifer.”¹⁹³ Mr. Burns identified the extraordinary precipitation event of 2005 (natural),
9 and the Order 1169 pumping test and subsequent pumping (anthropogenic), as obvious
10 examples. To test this observation, multiple linear regression (“MLR”) analysis was
11 completed to extract the effects of groundwater pumping from other stresses, including
12 climate.¹⁹⁴ The MLR analysis confirmed that groundwater production from the aquifer,
13 not climate, is the main cause of the observed long-term declines in aquifer levels and
14 Muddy River spring flows.¹⁹⁵

15 **2. USFWS, NPS and MVWD Evidence**

16 Dr. Mayer, a USFWS expert, explained clearly there is “no credible evidence that
17 drought has impacted water levels in the LWRFS.”¹⁹⁶ Consistent with this, Dr. Waddell,
18 a NPS expert, presented compelling evidence that groundwater levels in similarly
19 situated climatic basins are *increasing* where there is no human stress from groundwater
20 pumping, yet the LWRFS aquifer levels continue to decline.¹⁹⁷ He testified, “[i]f there

21 _____
22 ¹⁹³ SE ROA 42188.

23 ¹⁹⁴ *Id.*

24 ¹⁹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁹⁶ SE ROA 53074, 322:15-19.

¹⁹⁷ SE ROA 53183 at 574:4 to SE ROA 53185 at 582:23.

1 are any seasonal fluctuations during the pumping test, the pressure response from the
2 MX-5 pumping test throughout the highly confined aquifer system . . . had overridden
3 any type of climate response.”¹⁹⁸ Mr. Lazarus, a MVWD expert, testified that the stable
4 groundwater levels during drought periods “contradict[] the idea that the declining water
5 levels during the test were normalizing after 2004-2005.”¹⁹⁹

6 **3. State Engineer’s Conclusion Regarding Climate Conditions**

7 Throughout Order 1309, the State Engineer thoroughly discussed climate factors
8 and the evidence in the record he used to support his decision.²⁰⁰ Unlike what LCWD
9 and Vidler claim, the State Engineer properly supported his determination that the
10 Aquifer Test, and the lack of recovery thereafter, proves that pumping is causing the
11 impact to senior rights, not climate conditions.²⁰¹ The Court need not guess, as LCWD
12 and Vidler claim, about how the State Engineer considered climate evidence. The State
13 Engineer fully evaluated the impacts of climate on the ability of the LWRFS aquifer to
14 recover, making his review far more sound than CSI’s hypothetical calculations.²⁰²

16 ¹⁹⁸ SE ROA 53455 at 1190:8-12.

17 ¹⁹⁹ SE ROA 53455 at 1190:24-1191:2.

18 ²⁰⁰ SE ROA 8 (citing NSE Ex. 245), SE ROA 13 (citing CBD Ex. 3, CBD Ex. 4,
19 Transcripts of CBD’s experts), SE ROA 17 (citing CSI Ex. 1, CSI Ex. 2), SE ROA 19
20 (Citing GP-REP Ex. 1 and Closing Arguments of Georgia Pacific); SE ROA 24 (citing
21 MBOP Ex. 2), SE ROA 29-30 (citing NPS Ex. 2, and NPS Closing Arguments); SE
22 ROA 35 (citing SNWA Ex. 9, SNWA Closing Arguments); SE ROA 39 (citing USFWS
23 Ex. 5, USFWS Ex. 7, transcripts of USFWS expert); SE ROA 53 (citing LC-V Ex. 1,
24 LLC-V Closing Arguments, CSI Closing Arguments, Transcripts, NPS Presentation
slides); SE ROA 57 (citing USGS 1993 Open File Report 93-642, SNWA Ex. 7,
Transcript pages, NPS Ex. 3); SE ROA 60 (citing NSE Exs. 15-21); SE ROA 61 (citing
CBD Ex. 3, SNWA Ex. 7, MVIC Ex. 3, NSE Ex. 333); SE ROA 63 (citing NPS Ex. 3,
Transcripts, LC-V Ex. 11, CNLV Ex. 3).

²⁰¹ LCWD and Vidler Opening Brief at 12, 26.

²⁰² CSI Opening Brief at 32.

1 Similarly, Georgia-Pacific’s argument that climate controls the observed groundwater
2 levels, and not hydrologic connectivity, ignores that the State Engineer heard this
3 argument, found it lacking, and his determination is entitled to deference.²⁰³ Rather than
4 take a single sentence of Order 1309 out of context, and ignore the voluminous
5 discussion of the State Engineer’s analysis of climate impacts, this Court can readily
6 uphold the State Engineer’s determination based on his thorough review and analysis of
7 the volumes of evidence related to climate impacts.

8 **E. The State Engineer provided adequate due process.**

9 Georgia-Pacific argues that the State Engineer violated parties’ due process rights
10 because the State Engineer failed to provide notice he would consider the ESA in
11 deciding the flow requirements of the Moapa dace.²⁰⁴ This argument fails because, in
12 Interim Order 1303, the State Engineer put all parties on notice that impacts to the Moapa
13 dace would be considered by the State Engineer.²⁰⁵ The State Engineer even mentioned
14 the flow requirement for the Moapa dace in Interim Ruling 1303. Then all parties,
15 including Georgia-Pacific, had the opportunity to present evidence regarding the Moapa
16 dace.²⁰⁶

17 **CONCLUSION**

18 For the reasons stated herein, the State Engineer’s decision to designate the
19 LWRFS, and to cap groundwater use in the LWRFS at 8,000 afa, should be affirmed.

20 ²⁰³ Georgia-Pacific Opening Brief at 14.

21 ²⁰⁴ Georgia-Pacific Opening Brief at 31.

22 ²⁰⁵ SE ROA 79.

23 ²⁰⁶ Ironically, since Georgia-Pacific has not consulted with the USFWS to have its
24 pumping authorized under the ESA *take* provisions, the State Engineer is protecting
parties like Georgia-Pacific from potential liability under the ESA by capping pumping
to maintain Moapa dace habitat.

ATTORNEY CERTIFICATE

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

Pursuant to NRAP 28.2, undersigned counsel certifies that:

1. I have read this entire answering brief.

2. To the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose.

3. This answering brief complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, in particular NRAP 28(e)(1), which requires every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by a reference to the page and volume number, if any, of the transcript or appendix where the matter relied on is to be found.

4. This answering brief complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5), and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this answering brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced font using Microsoft Word in 14-point Times New Roman font.

5. The page-volume limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7) have been waived in this matter.

//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//

1 I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that the accompanying
2 answering brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of
3 Appellate Procedure.

4 DATED this 24th day of November 2021.

5 TAGGART & TAGGART, LTD.

6
7 By: /s/ Paul Taggart

8 PAUL G. TAGGART, ESQ.
9 Nevada State Bar No. 6136
10 TIMOTHY D. O'CONNOR, ESQ.
11 Nevada State Bar No. 14098
12 THOMAS P. DUENSING
13 Nevada State Bar No. 15213
14 108 North Minnesota Street
15 Carson City, Nevada 89703
paul@legaltnt.com
tim@legaltnt.com
tom@legaltnt.com
Attorneys for LVVWD and SNWA

16 IN ASSOCIATION WITH:
17 STEVEN C. ANDERSON, ESQ.,
18 Nevada State Bar No. 11901
19 LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT
20 SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER
21 AUTHORITY
22 1001 S. Valley View Blvd.
23 Las Vegas, NV 89153
24

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I certify that I am an employee of Taggart & Taggart, LTD, and that on this 24th
3 day of November 2021, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing document by
4 electronic service to the participants in this case who are registered with the Eighth
5 Judicial District Court’s Odyssey eFile NV File & Serve system to this matter:

6 **OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL**

7 JAMES N. BOLOTIN #13829

8 LAENA ST-JULES #15156C

9 100 North Carson Street

10 Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717

11 Email: jbolotin@ag.nv.gov

12 Email: lstjules@ag.nv.gov

13 *Attorneys for Nevada State Engineer*

14 **ROBISON, SHARP, SULLIVAN & BRUST**

15 KENT R. ROBISON #1167

16 THERESE M. SHANKS #12890

17 71 Washington Street

18 Reno, Nevada 89593

19 Email: krobison@rssblaw.com

20 Email: tshanks@rssblaw.com

21 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**

22 BRADLEY J. HERREMA #10368

23 BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP

24 100 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

1 EMILIA K. CARGILL #6493
3100 State Route 168
2 P.O. Box 37010
Coyote Springs, Nevada 89037
3 Email: emilia.cargill@coyotesprings.com
Attorneys for Coyote Springs Investment, LLC

4
5 MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING
CHRISTIAN T. BALDUCCI #12688
6 10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
7 Email: cbalducci@maclaw.com
Email: kwilde@maclaw.com
8 *Attorneys for Apex Holding Company, LLC and Dry Lake Water, LLC*

9 CAVANAUGH-BILL LAW OFFICES, LLC
10 JULIE CAVANAUGH-BILL #11533
Henderson Bank Building
11 401 Railroad Street, Suite 307
Elko, Nevada 89801
12 Email: julie@cblawoffices.org

13 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**

14 LISA T. BELENKY (Pro Hac Vice to be submitted)
Center for Biological Diversity
15 1212 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, California 94612
16 Email: lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

17 DOUG WOLF (Pro Hac Vice to be submitted)
Center for Biological Diversity
18 3201 Zafarano Drive, Suite C, #149
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87507
19 Email: dwolf@biologicaldiversity.org
20 *Attorneys for Center for Biological Diversity*

21
22
23
24

1 KAEMPFER CROWELL
ALEX J. FLANGAS #664
2 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700
Reno, Nevada 89501
3 Email: aflangas@kcnvlaw.com
Attorneys for Nevada Cogeneration Associates Nos. 1 and 2

4
5 KAEMPFER CROWELL
SEVERIN A. CARLSON #9373
6 SIHOMARA L. GRAVES #13239
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 700
7 Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
8 Email: sgraves@kcnvlaw.com
9 *Attorneys for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*

10 DOTSON LAW
ROBERT A. DOTSON #5285
11 JUSTIN C. VANCE #11306
5355 Reno Corporate Drive, Suite 100
12 Reno, Nevada 89511
Email: rdotson@dotsonlaw.legal
13 Email: jvance@dotsonlaw.legal

14 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
15 STEVEN D. KING #4304
227 River Road
16 Dayton, Nevada 9403
Email: kingmont@charter.net
17 *Attorneys for Muddy Valley Irrigation Company*

18 McDONALD CARANO LLP
19 SYLVIA HARRISON #4106
LUCAS FOLETTA #12154
20 SARAH FERGUSON #14515
100 W. Liberty Street, Suite 1000
21 Reno, Nevada 89501
Email: sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com
22 Email: lfoletta@mcdonaldcarano.com
23 Email: sferguson@mcdonaldcarano.com
24 *Attorneys for Georgia-Pacific Gypsum, LLC and Republic Environmental Technologies, Inc.*

1 PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
2 GREGORY H. MORRISON #12454
3 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750
4 Reno, Nevada 89501
5 Email: grrison@parsonsbehle.com
6 *Attorneys for Moapa Valley Water District*

7 NEVADA ENERGY
8 JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA #9999
9 MICHAEL D. KNOX #8143
10 6100 Neil Road
11 Reno, Nevada 89511
12 Email: justina.caviglia@nvenergy.com
13 Email: mknnox@nvenergy.com
14 *Attorneys for Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy*

15 SCHROEDER LAW OFFICES, P.C.
16 THERESE A. URE STIX #10255
17 LAURA A. SCHROEDER #3595
18 10615 Double R Blvd., Suite 100
19 Reno, Nevada 89521
20 Email: t.ure@water-law.com
21 Email: schroeder@water-law.com
22 *Attorneys for City of North Las Vegas, Western Elite Environmental, Inc. and Bedroc
23 Limited, LLC*

24 LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
25 DYLAN V. FREHNER #9020
26 181 North Main Street, Suite 205
27 P.O. Box 60
28 Pioche, Nevada 89043
29 Email: dfrehner@lincolncountynv.gov

30 **IN ASSOCIATION WITH:**
31 WAYNE O. KLOMP #10109
32 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
33 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510
34 Reno, Nevada 89501
35 Email: wklomp@swlaw.com
36 *Attorneys for Lincoln County Water District*

1 ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD.
2 KAREN A. PETERSON #366
3 402 North Division Street
4 Carson City, Nevada 89703
5 Email: kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com
6 *Attorneys for Vidler Water Company, Inc.*

7 DATED this 24th day of November 2021.

8 */s/ Thomas Duensing*
9 Employee of Taggart & Taggart, LTD

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24